

Request for Reconsideration after Final Action

The table below presents the data as entered.

Input Field	Entered
SERIAL NUMBER	77585158
LAW OFFICE ASSIGNED	LAW OFFICE 112
MARK SECTION (no change)	
ARGUMENT(S)	

Examining Attorney issued a Final Office Action for Applicant, Finanz St. Honore's, mark LOVE'S HEART THROB, serial number 77/585,158, on October 28, 2009, making its refusal to register the mark final. Examining Attorney maintains that Applicant's mark is confusing similar to Registrant, Australian Gold's, registered mark, HEART THROB, registration number 3,593,007. Applicant and Registrant (collectively referred to as the "Parties") have entered into a Consent Agreement. In view of the Consent Agreement, the difference between the marks, the difference between the channels of trade, and the controlling authorities cited by the Applicant, the Applicant has fully established that there is no likelihood of confusion between the marks at issue. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the Final Refusal. Applicant is also filing a Notice of Appeal with the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board following the submission of this Request for Reconsideration.

I. Existence of Consent Agreement

The Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit requires that the USPTO give "great weight" to consent agreements. Further, the Federal Circuit cautions the USPTO to not substitute its own judgment concerning likelihood of confusion for the judgment of the real parties in interest without good reason. *Amalgamated Bank of New York v. Amalgamated Trust & Savings Bank*, 842 F.2d 1270, 6 USPQ2d 1305 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *Bongrain Int'l (American) Corp. v. Delice de France Inc.*, 811 F.2d 1479, 1 USPQ2d 1775 (Fed. Cir. 1987); and *In re N.A.D. Inc.*, 754 F.2d 996, 224 USPQ 969 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Further still, as stated by the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals in *In re E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 476 F.2d 1357, 1363, 177 USPQ 563, 568 (C.C.P.A. 1973):

[W]hen those most familiar with use in the marketplace and most interested in precluding confusion enter Consent Agreements designed to avoid it, the scales of evidence are clearly tilted. It is at least difficult to maintain a subjective view that confusion will occur when those directly concerned say it won't. A mere *assumption* that confusion is likely will rarely prevail against uncontroverted evidence from those on the firing

line that it is not.

Here, the Registrant consents to the registration of LOVE'S HEART THROB. (See Attachment 1) Moreover, the Consent Agreement provides significant detail as to why the Parties agree that there is no likelihood of confusion, and the steps they will take to ensure that no likelihood of confusion will exist in the future. The key provisions of the Consent Agreement confirm that:

- The channels of trade are different because Registrant sells its products almost exclusively in tanning salons and Applicant sells its products in various retail outlets, excluding tanning salons.
- Applicant agrees never to sell its products in tanning salons.
- Applicant agrees to amend its identification of goods to remove "body lotions" and "skin moisturizers" to emphasize the difference between the goods, and further obviate any remaining concern regarding any perceived similarity between the goods sold by the Parties.
- Applicant will not use its mark on tanning products.
- Registrant will not use its mark on cosmetics, fragrances, body sprays or body washes.
- The parties agree to take all reasonable steps necessary to prevent a likelihood of confusion.
- The parties agree that should a likelihood of confusion arise, they will work together to eliminate or reduce such confusion.

Accordingly, this Consent Agreement comprehensively details the arrangements undertaken by the parties to avoid any likelihood of confusion. *Cf. In re Permagrain Products, Inc.*, 223 USPQ 147 (TTAB 1984) (requiring that consent agreements restrict the markets in which goods are sold so as to avoid confusion). The parties have clearly examined the situation and determined that confusion does not currently exist, and have determined ways in which to further reduce or eliminate any present or future likelihood of confusion.

As the parties agree there is currently no confusion and agreed to take steps to avoid any confusion in the future, Applicant respectfully asserts that this Consent Agreement coupled with the Applicant's other arguments provide irrefutable evidence that there is no likelihood of confusion here. Applicant further maintains that the other factors do not clearly dictate a finding that confusion between the marks in question is likely.

II. Likelihood of Confusion Analysis

In addition to the existence of the Consent Agreement, Applicant asserts there is no likelihood of confusion based on other relevant factors, including differences between the marks, the products, and the channels of trade.

A. The Differences Between Marks Favor Allowance

Differences in the marks and the manner of use weigh heavily against a likelihood of confusion.

In a likelihood of confusion analysis, the marks must be compared in light of what happens in the marketplace. *Sullivan v. CBS Corp.*, 385 F.3d 772, 777 (7th Cir. 2004). It is the "overall impression" of the marks that counts, and part of the "overall impression" includes the manner in which a mark is to be used. *See, e.g., Armstrong Cork Co. v. World Carpets, Inc.*, 597 F.2d 496, 502 (5th Cir. 1979) (finding that the proper comparison was between the marks as used on carpet labels, as

that was the manner in which the consumer would find them); *Lang v. Retirement Living Publishing Co., Inc.*, 949 F.2d 576, 581 (2d Cir. 1991) (stating that in determining whether marks are so similar to provoke confusion, a court should look at the general impression created by the marks, taking into account all factors a potential purchaser is likely to perceive and remember); *Luigino's, Inc. v. Stouffer Corp.*, 170 F.3d 827, 830 (8th Cir. 1999) (stating that in addition to the marks themselves, the trade dress of the products can be considered in determining whether the total effect conveyed by two marks is confusingly similar).

In comparing the overall impression created by the marks, Applicant again asserts there is not likely to be confusion among prospective purchasers. In its response to the First Office Action issued by the Examining Attorney, Applicant stated that the products sold under the LOVE'S HEART THROB mark were part of the famous LOVE'S line that consumers have been exposed to since the early 1970's. The Exhibits attached to the response to the First Office Action show the manner in which consumers will see the products sold under LOVE'S HEART THROB in the marketplace. As seen by those exhibits and as discussed in the first response, Applicant's trade dress is consistent with the LOVE'S line of products; that is, the goods are sold in packaging that is predominantly pastel in color, and the mark appears in script font like the rest of the LOVE'S products. Applicant's products are targeted to girls in their preteens or early teens, and give an overall impression of youth and innocence.

In addition, as the Consent Agreement confirms, the goods sold under Registrant's mark, HEART THROB, are part of a larger line of products, namely Registrant's CARIBBEAN GOLD line of products. More specifically, the goods are part of the CARIBBEAN GOLD CHEERS! line. As illustrated on the Registrant's website (Attachment 2), the CARIBBEAN GOLD CHEERS! are similarly packaged. The bottles are the same size, and all consistently have the CARIBBEAN GOLD CHEERS! house mark above the names of each product. A closer image of the HEART THROB bottle is provided a more persuasive image of the CARIBBEAN GOLD CHEERS! house mark. (Attachment 3) Further, an Internet search shows that in the on-line marketplace, consumers are likely to see CARIBBEAN GOLD and HEART THROB together when presented with Registrant's goods sold under the HEART THROB mark. See, for example, an attached image from Google's marketplace showing Registrant's HEART THROB goods for sale. (Attachment 4) Applicant again asserts that the trade dress of Registrant's products is significantly different than that of its LOVE'S HEART THROB. In addition to the presence of the CARIBBEAN GOLD CHEERS! house mark, the trade dress of Registrant's goods is brighter and bolder in nature. The colors are more vibrant, and the typeface on Registrant's goods is distinctly different. The overall commercial impression of Registrant's HEART THROB products is distinctly different from Applicant's LOVE'S HEART THROB products.

Thus, in addition to Applicant's goods always being sold under the LOVE'S house mark, Registrant's goods sold under the HEART THROB mark are consistently presented to the consumer with its house mark CARIBBEAN GOLD CHEERS!. The fact that both products are sold under prominent house marks is still another factor weighing against a finding of likelihood of confusion. See, e.g., *General Mills, Inc. v. Kellogg Co.*, 824 F.2d 622, 627 (8th Cir. 1987) (determining no likelihood of confusion between OATMEAL RAISIN CRISP and APPLE RAISIN CRISP in part because the parties, two widely recognized food manufacturers, included their house marks prominently on the packages of the goods sold under these marks). Further, the trade dress and the appearance of the marks to consumers further weigh against a finding of likelihood of confusion. *Id.* (looking at differences such as

color schemes, lettering styles and box designs in finding no likelihood of confusion between OATMEAL RAISIN CRISP and APPLE RAISIN CRISP). *See also Lang*, 949 F.2d at 527-28 (comparing the general impression of the marks to find no likelihood of confusion between NEW CHOICES PRESS and NEW CHOICES FOR THE BEST YEARS for magazines; the focal point of the presentation of both marks was NEW CHOICES, but each was consistently presented with additional features, in different typeface and in different locations on the magazine covers).

B. The Differences Between the Goods Favor Allowance

The goods sold under the marks of the parties differ. Applicant has amended the identification of goods, and no longer seeks registration for "body lotions" and "skin moisturizers." Registrant's mark is registered for "skin care preparations, namely non-medicated indoor and outdoor tanning preparations." Applicant now seeks registration for "cosmetics, fragrances, body sprays and body washes for personal use." All products fall into class 003, but are distinctly different. Registrant's goods are very specific, and limited to only tanning preparations, and Applicant's goods no longer list any sort of lotions. Class 003 contains a number of personal care products, which undoubtedly is a very broad category of goods.

Examining Attorney states that the normal fields of expansion must be considered when determining if goods are related. However, the Consent Agreement obviates this concern. As stated in the Consent Agreement, Registrant agrees that it will not use the mark HEART THROB in association with Applicant's goods, and Applicant agrees it will not use LOVE'S HEART THROB in association with Registrant's goods.

As such, the goods remaining in Applicant's application do not overlap with Registrant's goods, and neither party intends to expand into the other's market. The parties' are merely part of a very broad category of goods that encompasses personal care products and various types of toiletries, which does not necessarily indicate that consumers will think the goods are from a common source or that they are related. *See, e.g., Mejia and Associates Inc., v. International Business Machines Corp.*, 920 F.Supp. 540, 548 (S.D.N.Y. 1996) (finding the class of "educational services" to be so broad as to be meaningless and stating that two services falling into education services does not lead to a finding of relatedness or proximity).

C. The Differences Between the Channels of Trade Favor Allowance

As stated in the Consent Agreement, the parties acknowledge that they sell the products under the marks in question in distinctly different markets. A likelihood of confusion warranting refusal to register a trademark requires consideration of the degree of similarity between goods, in context of the usual channels of trade and methods of distribution. *In re Research and Trading Corp.*, 793 F.2d 1276, 1278 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Further, confusion as referred to in section 2(d) "is that of purchasers in the marketplace where the goods are used." *Id.*

In the present situation, and as the Parties attest to in the Consent Agreement, the goods under the marks are not sold in the same channels. As stated in the Consent Agreement, Registrant sells its goods under its HEART THROB mark almost exclusively in tanning salons. Applicant sells goods under its LOVE'S HEART THROB mark in big box stores and other retail stores, specifically *excluding* tanning salons. Applicant further agrees that it will never sell its goods in tanning salons. As

such, the channels of trade for these goods currently do not, and will not, overlap.

III. Conclusion—The LOVE’S HEART THROB Mark is in Condition for Allowance

Applicant has established that differences between the marks, the goods, and the channels of trade prevent any likelihood of consumer confusion. In addition, the Parties themselves agree there is no confusion between the marks, as evidenced by the Consent Agreement the Parties have entered into. Indeed, the Consent Agreement itself merits great weight. The Consent Agreement expresses the Parties’ belief and desire that the marks are being used, and can continue to be used without any likelihood of consumer confusion.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection set forth on October 28, 2009 in the present application of LOVE’S HEART THROB. Should the Examining Attorney have any questions relating to the application or this response, the Examining Attorney is encouraged to contact the Attorney of Record.

EVIDENCE SECTION

EVIDENCE FILE NAME(S)	
JPG FILE(S)	<u>\\TICRS\EXPORT9\IMAGEOUT9\775\851\77585158\xml1\RF R0005.JPG</u> <u>\\TICRS\EXPORT9\IMAGEOUT9\775\851\77585158\xml1\RF0006.JPG</u> <u>\\TICRS\EXPORT9\IMAGEOUT9\775\851\77585158\xml1\RF0007.JPG</u>
ORIGINAL PDF FILE	<u>evi_6617511686-171515944 . ConsentAgreement.pdf</u>
CONVERTED PDF FILE(S) (3 pages)	<u>\\TICRS\EXPORT9\IMAGEOUT9\775\851\77585158\xml1\RF0002.JPG</u> <u>\\TICRS\EXPORT9\IMAGEOUT9\775\851\77585158\xml1\RF0003.JPG</u> <u>\\TICRS\EXPORT9\IMAGEOUT9\775\851\77585158\xml1\RF0004.JPG</u>
DESCRIPTION OF EVIDENCE FILE	The attached evidence consist of Attachments 1-4 as discussed in the present Request for Reconsideration. The first Attachment is the Consent Agreement entered into between the parties. The remaining three Attachments are images displaying products with HEART THROB. Should Examining Attorney have any questions regarding the attachments, please contact the attorney of record.

GOODS AND/OR SERVICES SECTION (current)

INTERNATIONAL CLASS 003

DESCRIPTION

cosmetics, fragrances, skin moisturizers, body lotions, body sprays and body washes for personal use

FILING BASIS Section 1(b)

GOODS AND/OR SERVICES SECTION (proposed)

INTERNATIONAL CLASS 003

DESCRIPTION

cosmetics, fragrances, body sprays and body washes for personal use

FILING BASIS Section 1(b)

SIGNATURE SECTION

RESPONSE SIGNATURE /Leslie A. Dempsey/

SIGNATORY'S NAME Leslie A. Dempsey

SIGNATORY'S POSITION Attorney of record, Florida bar member

DATE SIGNED 03/12/2010

AUTHORIZED SIGNATORY YES

CONCURRENT APPEAL NOTICE FILED YES

FILING INFORMATION SECTION

SUBMIT DATE Fri Mar 12 17:27:44 EST 2010

TEAS STAMP USPTO/RFR-66.175.116.86-2
0100312172744453811-77585
158-4602a969cb9dadee1f239
c15ec4ede6f557-N/A-N/A-20
100312171515944346

Request for Reconsideration after Final Action

To the Commissioner for Trademarks:

Application serial no. **77585158** has been amended as follows:

ARGUMENT(S)

In response to the substantive refusal(s), please note the following:

Examining Attorney issued a Final Office Action for Applicant, Finanz St. Honore's, mark LOVE'S HEART THROB, serial number 77/585,158, on October 28, 2009, making its refusal to register the mark final. Examining Attorney maintains that Applicant's mark is confusing similar to Registrant,

Australian Gold's, registered mark, HEART THROB, registration number 3,593,007. Applicant and Registrant (collectively referred to as the "Parties") have entered into a Consent Agreement. In view of the Consent Agreement, the difference between the marks, the difference between the channels of trade, and the controlling authorities cited by the Applicant, the Applicant has fully established that there is no likelihood of confusion between the marks at issue. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the Final Refusal. Applicant is also filing a Notice of Appeal with the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board following the submission of this Request for Reconsideration.

I. Existence of Consent Agreement

The Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit requires that the USPTO give "great weight" to consent agreements. Further, the Federal Circuit cautions the USPTO to not substitute its own judgment concerning likelihood of confusion for the judgment of the real parties in interest without good reason. *Amalgamated Bank of New York v. Amalgamated Trust & Savings Bank*, 842 F.2d 1270, 6 USPQ2d 1305 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *Bongrain Int'l (American) Corp. v. Delice de France Inc.*, 811 F.2d 1479, 1 USPQ2d 1775 (Fed. Cir. 1987); and *In re N.A.D. Inc.*, 754 F.2d 996, 224 USPQ 969 (Fed. Cir. 1985).

Further still, as stated by the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals in *In re E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 476 F.2d 1357, 1363, 177 USPQ 563, 568 (C.C.P.A. 1973):

[W]hen those most familiar with use in the marketplace and most interested in precluding confusion enter Consent Agreements designed to avoid it, the scales of evidence are clearly tilted. It is at least difficult to maintain a subjective view that confusion will occur when those directly concerned say it won't. A mere *assumption* that confusion is likely will rarely prevail against uncontroverted evidence from those on the firing line that it is not.

Here, the Registrant consents to the registration of LOVE'S HEART THROB. (See Attachment 1) Moreover, the Consent Agreement provides significant detail as to why the Parties agree that there is no likelihood of confusion, and the steps they will take to ensure that no likelihood of confusion will exist in the future. The key provisions of the Consent Agreement confirm that:

- The channels of trade are different because Registrant sells its products almost exclusively in tanning salons and Applicant sells its products in various retail outlets, excluding tanning salons.
- Applicant agrees never to sell its products in tanning salons.
- Applicant agrees to amend its identification of goods to remove "body lotions" and "skin moisturizers" to emphasize the difference between the goods, and further obviate any remaining concern regarding any perceived similarity between the goods sold by the Parties.
- Applicant will not use its mark on tanning products.
- Registrant will not use its mark on cosmetics, fragrances, body sprays or body washes.
- The parties agree to take all reasonable steps necessary to prevent a likelihood of confusion.
- The parties agree that should a likelihood of confusion arise, they will work together to eliminate or reduce such confusion.

Accordingly, this Consent Agreement comprehensively details the arrangements undertaken by the parties to avoid any likelihood of confusion. *Cf. In re Permagrain Products, Inc.*, 223 USPQ 147 (TTAB 1984) (requiring that consent agreements restrict the markets in which goods are sold so as to

avoid confusion). The parties have clearly examined the situation and determined that confusion does not currently exist, and have determined ways in which to further reduce or eliminate any present or future likelihood of confusion.

As the parties agree there is currently no confusion and agreed to take steps to avoid any confusion in the future, Applicant respectfully asserts that this Consent Agreement coupled with the Applicant's other arguments provide irrefutable evidence that there is no likelihood of confusion here. Applicant further maintains that the other factors do not clearly dictate a finding that confusion between the marks in question is likely.

II. Likelihood of Confusion Analysis

In addition to the existence of the Consent Agreement, Applicant asserts there is no likelihood of confusion based on other relevant factors, including differences between the marks, the products, and the channels of trade.

A. The Differences Between Marks Favor Allowance

Differences in the marks and the manner of use weigh heavily against a likelihood of confusion.

In a likelihood of confusion analysis, the marks must be compared in light of what happens in the marketplace. *Sullivan v. CBS Corp.*, 385 F.3d 772, 777 (7th Cir. 2004). It is the "overall impression" of the marks that counts, and part of the "overall impression" includes the manner in which a mark is to be used. *See, e.g., Armstrong Cork Co. v. World Carpets, Inc.*, 597 F.2d 496, 502 (5th Cir. 1979) (finding that the proper comparison was between the marks as used on carpet labels, as that was the manner in which the consumer would find them); *Lang v. Retirement Living Publishing Co., Inc.*, 949 F.2d 576, 581 (2d Cir. 1991) (stating that in determining whether marks are so similar to provoke confusion, a court should look at the general impression created by the marks, taking into account all factors a potential purchaser is likely to perceive and remember); *Luigino's, Inc. v. Stouffer Corp.*, 170 F.3d 827, 830 (8th Cir. 1999) (stating that in addition to the marks themselves, the trade dress of the products can be considered in determining whether the total effect conveyed by two marks is confusingly similar).

In comparing the overall impression created by the marks, Applicant again asserts there is not likely to be confusion among prospective purchasers. In its response to the First Office Action issued by the Examining Attorney, Applicant stated that the products sold under the LOVE'S HEART THROB mark were part of the famous LOVE'S line that consumers have been exposed to since the early 1970's. The Exhibits attached to the response to the First Office Action show the manner in which consumers will see the products sold under LOVE'S HEART THROB in the marketplace. As seen by those exhibits and as discussed in the first response, Applicant's trade dress is consistent with the LOVE'S line of products; that is, the goods are sold in packaging that is predominantly pastel in color, and the mark appears in script font like the rest of the LOVE'S products. Applicant's products are targeted to girls in their preteens or early teens, and give an overall impression of youth and innocence.

In addition, as the Consent Agreement confirms, the goods sold under Registrant's mark, HEART THROB, are part of a larger line of products, namely Registrant's CARIBBEAN GOLD line of products. More specifically, the goods are part of the CARIBBEAN GOLD CHEERS! line. As illustrated on the

Registrant's website (Attachment 2), the CARIBBEAN GOLD CHEERS! are similarly packaged. The bottles are the same size, and all consistently have the CARIBBEAN GOLD CHEERS! house mark above the names of each product. A closer image of the HEART THROB bottle is provides a more persuasive image of the CARIBBEAN GOLD CHEERS! house mark. (Attachment 3) Further, an Internet search shows that in the on-line marketplace, consumers are likely to see CARIBBEAN GOLD and HEART THROB together when presented with Registrant's goods sold under the HEART THROB mark. See, for example, an attached image from Google's marketplace showing Registrant's HEART THROB goods for sale. (Attachment 4) Applicant again asserts that the trade dress of Registrant's products is significantly different than that of it's LOVE'S HEART THROB. In addition to the presence of the CARIBBEAN GOLD CHEERS! house mark, the trade dress of Registrant's goods is brighter and bolder in nature. The colors are more vibrant, and the typeface on Registrant's goods is distinctly different. The overall commercial impression of Registrant's HEART THROB products is distinctly different from Applicant's LOVE'S HEART THROB products.

Thus, in addition to Applicant's goods always being sold under the LOVE'S house mark, Registrant's goods sold under the HEART THROB mark are consistently presented to the consumer with its house mark CARIBBEAN GOLD CHEERS!. The fact that both products are sold under prominent house marks is still another factor weighing against a finding of likelihood of confusion. *See, e.g., General Mills, Inc. v. Kellogg Co.*, 824 F.2d 622, 627 (8th Cir. 1987) (determining no likelihood of confusion between OATMEAL RAISIN CRISP and APPLE RAISIN CRISP in part because the parties, two widely recognized food manufacturers, included their house marks prominently on the packages of the goods sold under these marks). Further, the trade dress and the appearance of the marks to consumers further weigh against a finding of likelihood of confusion. *Id.* (looking at differences such as color schemes, lettering styles and box designs in finding no likelihood of confusion between OATMEAL RAISIN CRISP and APPLE RAISIN CRISP). *See also Lang*, 949 F.2d at 527-28 (comparing the general impression of the marks to find no likelihood of confusion between NEW CHOICES PRESS and NEW CHOICES FOR THE BEST YEARS for magazines; the focal point of the presentation of both marks was NEW CHOICES, but each was consistently presented with additional features, in different typeface and in different locations on the magazine covers).

B. The Differences Between the Goods Favor Allowance

The goods sold under the marks of the parties differ. Applicant has amended the identification of goods, and no longer seeks registration for "body lotions" and "skin moisturizers." Registrant's mark is registered for "skin care preparations, namely non-medicated indoor and outdoor tanning preparations." Applicant now seeks registration for "cosmetics, fragrances, body sprays and body washes for personal use." All products fall into class 003, but are distinctly different. Registrant's goods are very specific, and limited to only tanning preparations, and Applicant's goods no longer list any sort of lotions. Class 003 contains a number of personal care products, which undoubtedly is a very broad category of goods.

Examining Attorney states that the normal fields of expansion must be considered when determining if goods are related. However, the Consent Agreement obviates this concern. As stated in the Consent Agreement, Registrant agrees that it will not use the mark HEART THROB in association with Applicant's goods, and Applicant agrees it will not use LOVE'S HEART THROB in association with Registrant's goods.

As such, the goods remaining in Applicant's application do not overlap with Registrant's goods,

and neither party intends to expand into the other's market. The parties' are merely part of a very broad category of goods that encompasses personal care products and various types of toiletries, which does not necessarily indicate that consumers will think the goods are from a common source or that they are related. *See, e.g., Mejia and Associates Inc., v. International Business Machines Corp.*, 920 F.Supp. 540, 548 (S.D.N.Y. 1996) (finding the class of "educational services" to be so broad as to be meaningless and stating that two services falling into education services does not lead to a finding of relatedness or proximity).

C. The Differences Between the Channels of Trade Favor Allowance

As stated in the Consent Agreement, the parties acknowledge that they sell the products under the marks in question in distinctly different markets. A likelihood of confusion warranting refusal to register a trademark requires consideration of the degree of similarity between goods, in context of the usual channels of trade and methods of distribution. *In re Research and Trading Corp.*, 793 F.2d 1276, 1278 (Fed. Cir. 1986). Further, confusion as referred to in section 2(d) "is that of purchasers in the marketplace where the goods are used." *Id.*

In the present situation, and as the Parties attest to in the Consent Agreement, the goods under the marks are not sold in the same channels. As stated in the Consent Agreement, Registrant sells its goods under its HEART THROB mark almost exclusively in tanning salons. Applicant sells goods under its LOVE'S HEART THROB mark in big box stores and other retail stores, specifically *excluding* tanning salons. Applicant further agrees that it will never sell its goods in tanning salons. As such, the channels of trade for these goods currently do not, and will not, overlap.

III. Conclusion—The LOVE'S HEART THROB Mark is in Condition for Allowance

Applicant has established that differences between the marks, the goods, and the channels of trade prevent any likelihood of consumer confusion. In addition, the Parties themselves agree there is no confusion between the marks, as evidenced by the Consent Agreement the Parties have entered into. Indeed, the Consent Agreement itself merits great weight. The Consent Agreement expresses the Parties' belief and desire that the marks are being used, and can continue to be used without any likelihood of consumer confusion.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the rejection set forth on October 28, 2009 in the present application of LOVE'S HEART THROB. Should the Examining Attorney have any questions relating to the application or this response, the Examining Attorney is encouraged to contact the Attorney of Record.

EVIDENCE

Evidence in the nature of The attached evidence consist of Attachments 1-4 as discussed in the present Request for Reconsideration. The first Attachment is the Consent Agreement entered into between the parties. The remaining three Attachments are images displaying products with HEART THROB. Should Examining Attorney have any questions regarding the attachments, please contact the attorney of record. has been attached.

JPG file(s):

Evidence-1

Evidence-2

Evidence-3

Original PDF file:

evi_6617511686-171515944 . ConsentAgreement.pdf

Converted PDF file(s) (3 pages)

Evidence-1

Evidence-2

Evidence-3

CLASSIFICATION AND LISTING OF GOODS/SERVICES

Applicant proposes to amend the following class of goods/services in the application:

Current: Class 003 for cosmetics, fragrances, skin moisturizers, body lotions, body sprays and body washes for personal use

Original Filing Basis:

Filing Basis: Section 1(b), Intent to Use: The applicant has a bona fide intention to use or use through the applicant's related company or licensee the mark in commerce on or in connection with the identified goods and/or services as of the filing date of the application. (15 U.S.C. Section 1051(b)).

Proposed: Class 003 for cosmetics, fragrances, body sprays and body washes for personal use

Filing Basis: Section 1(b), Intent to Use: The applicant has a bona fide intention to use or use through the applicant's related company or licensee the mark in commerce on or in connection with the identified goods and/or services as of the filing date of the application. (15 U.S.C. Section 1051(b)).

SIGNATURE(S)

Request for Reconsideration Signature

Signature: /Leslie A. Dempsey/ Date: 03/12/2010

Signatory's Name: Leslie A. Dempsey

Signatory's Position: Attorney of record, Florida bar member

The signatory has confirmed that he/she is an attorney who is a member in good standing of the bar of the highest court of a U.S. state, which includes the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and other federal territories and possessions; and he/she is currently the applicant's attorney or an associate thereof; and to the best of his/her knowledge, if prior to his/her appointment another U.S. attorney or a Canadian attorney/agent not currently associated with his/her company/firm previously represented the applicant in this matter: (1) the applicant has filed or is concurrently filing a signed revocation of or substitute power of attorney with the USPTO; (2) the USPTO has granted the request of the prior representative to withdraw; (3) the applicant has filed a power of attorney appointing him/her in this matter; or (4) the applicant's appointed U.S. attorney or Canadian attorney/agent has filed a power of attorney appointing him/her as an associate attorney in this matter.

The applicant is filing a Notice of Appeal in conjunction with this Request for Reconsideration.


Serial Number: 77585158

Internet Transmission Date: Fri Mar 12 17:27:44 EST 2010

TEAS Stamp: USPTO/RFR-66.175.116.86-2010031217274445

3811-77585158-4602a969cb9dadede1f239c15cc

4ede6f557-N/A-N/A-20100312171515944346



CONSENT TO APPLICATION SERIAL NO. 77/585158

This Agreement is entered into between Australian Gold, Inc. ("Australian Gold"), an Indiana corporation with a business address of 6270 Corporation Drive, Indianapolis, Indiana 46278, Dana Classic Fragrances, Inc. ("Dana"), a Delaware corporation having a place of business at 400 Lyster Avenue, Saddle Brook, New Jersey 07663 and Finanz St. Honore B.V. ("Finanz") (collectively "parties"), a corporation of the Netherlands having a place of business at Prins Bernhardplein 200, 1097 JB Amsterdam, Netherlands.

WHEREAS, Australian Gold is a leading manufacturer of lotions used in the tanning industry. Australian Gold sells its products almost exclusively through tanning salons.

WHEREAS, Australian Gold manufactures and sells a variety of products under the brand product line Caribbean Gold®. The Caribbean Gold® brand product line includes a tanning product sold under the mark HEART THROB.

WHEREAS, Australian Gold is the owner of the mark HEART THROB, U.S. Registration No. 3,593,003, with a registration date of March 17, 2009 and a priority date of February 24, 2005, for "skin care preparations, namely non-medicated indoor and outdoor tanning preparations" in class 003;

WHEREAS, Dana is a leading manufacturer of fragrances, cosmetics, and other consumer products not marketed for tanning applications. Dana sells such products almost exclusively in drug stores, superstores, large department stores and other retail venues, excluding tanning salons.

WHEREAS, Dana sells a variety of products under the brand product line LOVE'S® HEART THROB for "cosmetics, fragrances, skin moisturizers, body lotions, body sprays and body washes for personal use" in class 003.

WHEREAS, Finanz is the owner of U.S. Application No. 77585158 for the mark LOVE'S HEART THROB for "cosmetics, fragrances, skin moisturizers, body lotions, body sprays and body washes for personal use" in class 003, and has granted Dana a license to use the mark LOVE'S HEART THROB.

WHEREAS, Application No. 77585158 has been refused registration based on prior issuance of U.S. Registration No. 3,593,007 to Australian Gold on the grounds that the marks are confusingly similar.

WHEREAS, the parties believe they can coexist without the creation of any confusion, as the goods offered and sold by the parties are distinctly different and sold through distinctly different channels of trade.

WHEREAS, the parties agree to be bound by the following terms and conditions to avoid any conflict with the other's use and/or registration of its marks.

NOW THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual promises set forth herein and for other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which are hereby acknowledged, the parties hereto agree as follows:

1. Finanz agrees to immediately amend the identification of goods claimed in U.S. Application No. 77585158 to delete "skin moisturizers" and "body lotions" so that U.S. Application No. 77585158 reads "cosmetics, fragrances, body sprays and body washes for personal use".
2. Dana and Finanz agree that they will not use the mark LOVE'S HEART THROB on tanning lotions or other tanning-related preparations for indoor or outdoor use.
3. Dana agrees that it will not market or sell goods under the LOVE'S HEART THROB mark in tanning salons.
4. Australian Gold agrees that it will not use the mark HEART THROB in association with cosmetics, fragrances, body sprays or body washes.
5. Australian Gold agrees to and hereby consents to the registration by Finanz of the mark claimed by Application No. 77585158.
6. The parties agree to take all reasonable steps to avoid a likelihood of confusion between the parties and their goods and to avoid any inaccurate implication that either party endorses, sponsors, or is connected or affiliated with the other party and/or its goods.
7. In the event that either party becomes aware of instances of actual confusion, that party shall promptly notify the other party and both parties shall work together in good faith to examine the circumstances surrounding such confusion, and to take reasonable action as necessary to eliminate or reduce further the possibility of such confusion.
8. This Agreement is binding upon the parties, their respective subsidiaries, affiliates, licensees, successors and assigns. In the event that either party licenses its mark to any third party, that party shall instruct its licensee of its obligations hereunder, including but not limited to its obligation not to act in a manner so as to cause a likelihood of confusion between the parties hereto and their respective goods.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'J. J. [unclear]', is located in the bottom right corner of the page.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties enter into this Agreement this day as set forth below.

DANA CLASSIC FRAGRANCES, INC.

Date 1-5-10
By [Signature]
Name JOSEPH C. SIKORAK
Title CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER

AUSTRALIAN GOLD, INC.

Date December 23, 2009
By [Signature]
Name Leslie Hartlieb
Title President

FINANZ ST. HONORE B.V.

Date 1-5-10
By [Signature]
Name JOSEPH C. SIKORAK
Title CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER



Cheers! products

Get the best out of your skin and the best out of yourself! That's exactly what we've done with the new Caribbean Gold lotions and upgrades in the new Cheers line. The fantastic ingredients that you already know are used as the basis for the special mixes, together with extra new ingredients. The result: a lovely tanned skin that gives you a healthy glow full of self confidence! Cheers!



amazon.com

Close w

2009 Caribbean Gold Heart Throb Dark Tanning Accelerator 8.5 oz




[Close Window](#)

- Show only
- Google Checkout
- Free shipping
- New items
- Any price
- Under \$5
- \$5 - \$15
- Over \$15
- \$ to \$

Caribbean-gold
www.caribbean540.com CaribbeanGold.com @ CaribbeanGold - Play Now!
 Tax and shipping for Miami, FL 33109 - [Change](#)

Sort by Preference

 **Caribbean Gold Heart Throb Tanning Lotion 8.5 OZ** **\$9.00** new
 Seriously! Hello. You'll be breaking hearts once you use this fabulous, dark tanning formula ...
[Add to Shopping List](#)
 Also in: Tanning Lotion

 **2009 Heart Throb Bronzer Tanning Lotion - Caribbean Gold** **\$9.49** new
 Dark Bronzing Accelerator Tanning Lotion 8.5 oz. bottle
[Add to Shopping List](#)
 ***** 14 *****

 **Caribbean Gold heart throb pkt. 5 oz** **\$1.32** new
 Seriously! Hello. You'll be breaking hearts once you use this fabulous, dark tanning formula. Fall in love with immediate dark color and awesome skincare ...
[Add to Shopping List](#)
 Heart Throb

 **Caribbean Gold Heart Throb Tanning Lotion 8.5 OZ** **\$9.00** new
CARIBBEAN GOLD HEART THROB 8.5 OZ \$9.00 ACCELERATOR + BRONZER TANNING LOTION Seriously! Hello. You'll be breaking hearts once you use this fabulous, ...
[Add to Shopping List](#)
 Any body in tanning lotion

 **Caribbean Gold Heart Throb Dark Tanning Lotion Sexy** **\$18.00** used
 Caribbean Gold Name Brand Heart Throb Dark Tanning Lotion Dark Bronzing Accelerator 3.5oz *All items are Described to the Best of My Ability ...
[Add to Shopping List](#)
 eBay

 **Caribbean Gold Heart Throb Tanning Lotion 8.5 OZ** **\$9.00** new
 Seriously! Hello. You'll be breaking hearts once you use this fabulous, dark tanning formula. Fall in love with immediate dark color and awesome skincare. ...
[Add to Shopping List](#)
 A Plus in tanning lotion

 **Caribbean Gold heart throb 8.5 oz** **\$7.00**