

From: Goodsaid, Ira

Sent: 2/1/2016 10:02:25 AM

To: TTAB E Filing

CC:

Subject: U.S. TRADEMARK APPLICATION NO. 76716811 - NO-BURN FABRIC FIRE GARD - N/A - Request for Reconsideration Denied - Return to TTAB

\*\*\*\*\*

Attachment Information:

Count: 1

Files: 76716811.doc

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (USPTO)  
OFFICE ACTION (OFFICIAL LETTER) ABOUT APPLICANT'S TRADEMARK APPLICATION**

**U.S. APPLICATION SERIAL NO.** 76716811

**MARK:** NO-BURN FABRIC FIRE GARD



**CORRESPONDENT ADDRESS:**

CHRISTOPHER JOHN RUDY

209 HURON AVE STE 8

PORT HURON, MI 48060-3860

**GENERAL TRADEMARK INFORMATION:**

<http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/index.jsp>

**APPLICANT:** No-Burn Investments, L.L.C.

**CORRESPONDENT'S REFERENCE/DOCKET NO:**

N/A

**CORRESPONDENT E-MAIL ADDRESS:**

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION DENIED**

**ISSUE/MAILING DATE:**

The trademark examining attorney has carefully reviewed applicant's request for reconsideration and is denying the request for the reasons stated below. See 37 C.F.R. §2.63(b)(3); TMEP §§715.03(a)(ii)(B), 715.04(a). The following refusal made final in the Office action dated 7/2/2015 is maintained and continues to be final: the refusal to register based on likelihood of confusion with Reg. No. 3869687. See TMEP §§715.03(a)(ii)(B), 715.04(a).

In the present case, applicant's request has not resolved the outstanding issue, nor does it raise a new issue or provide any new or compelling evidence with regard to the outstanding issue in the final Office action. In addition, applicant's analysis and arguments are not persuasive nor do they shed new light on the issues. Accordingly, the request is denied.

The cited mark is FIREGUARD for fire retardant chemicals. The applicant's fire retardant compositions are essentially the same goods. Where the goods of an applicant and registrant are identical or virtually identical, the degree of similarity between the marks required to support a finding of likelihood of confusion is not as great as in the case of diverse goods. See *United Global Media Grp., Inc. v. Tseng*, 112 USPQ2d 1039, 1049 (TTAB 2014) (quoting *Century 21 Real Estate Corp. v. Century Life of Am.*, 970 F.2d 874, 877, 23 USPQ2d 1698, 1701 (Fed. Cir. 1992)); TMEP §1207.01(b).

Adding a term to a registered mark generally does not obviate the similarity between the compared marks, as in the present case, nor does it overcome a likelihood of confusion under Section 2(d). See *Coca-Cola Bottling Co. v. Jos. E. Seagram & Sons, Inc.*, 526 F.2d 556, 557, 188 USPQ 105, 106 (C.C.P.A. 1975) (finding BENGAL and BENGAL LANCER and design confusingly similar); *In re Toshiba Med. Sys. Corp.*, 91 USPQ2d 1266, 1269 (TTAB 2009) (finding TITAN and VANTAGE TITAN confusingly similar); *In re El Torito Rests., Inc.*, 9 USPQ2d 2002, 2004 (TTAB 1988) (finding MACHO and MACHO COMBOS confusingly similar); TMEP §1207.01(b)(iii). In the present case, the marks are identical in part. The addition of the descriptive wording, NO-BURN FABRIC fails to distinguish the marks.

The fact that purchasers are sophisticated or knowledgeable in a particular field does not necessarily mean that they are sophisticated or knowledgeable in the field of trademarks or immune from source confusion. TMEP §1207.01(d)(vii); see, e.g., *Stone Lion Capital Partners, LP v. Lion Capital LLP*, 746 F.3d 1317, 1325, 110 USPQ2d 1157, 1163-64 (Fed. Cir. 2014); *Top Tobacco LP v. N. Atl. Operating Co.*, 101 USPQ2d 1163, 1170 (TTAB 2011).

If applicant has already filed a timely notice of appeal with the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board, the Board will be notified to resume the appeal. See TMEP §715.04(a).

If no appeal has been filed and time remains in the six-month response period to the final Office action, applicant has the remainder of the response period to (1) comply with and/or overcome any outstanding final requirement(s) and/or refusal(s), and/or (2) file a notice of appeal to the Board. TMEP §715.03(a)(ii)(B); see 37 C.F.R. §2.63(b)(1)-(3). The filing of a request for reconsideration does not stay or extend the time for filing an appeal. 37 C.F.R. §2.63(b)(3); see TMEP §§715.03, 715.03(a)(ii)(B), (c).

/Ira Goodsaid/

Law Office 101

571-272-9166

[ira.goodsaid@uspto.gov](mailto:ira.goodsaid@uspto.gov)