

From: Fromm, Martha

Sent: 2/13/2013 5:18:07 PM

To: TTAB EFiling

CC:

Subject: U.S. TRADEMARK APPLICATION NO. 79104646 - I SMART OPENID -
MEYE03-00005 - Request for Reconsideration Denied - Return to TTAB

Attachment Information:

Count: 1

Files: 79104646.doc

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

U.S. APPLICATION SERIAL NO. 79104646

MARK: I SMART OPENID



CORRESPONDENT ADDRESS:

DYAN M. HOUSE
CARTER STAFFORD ARNETT HAMADA &
MOCKLER,
8150 N. CENTRAL EXPRESSWAY, SUITE 1950
DALLAS, TX 75206

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

APPLICANT: Novalyst IT AG

CORRESPONDENT'S REFERENCE/DOCKET NO.:

MEYE03-00005

CORRESPONDENT E-MAIL ADDRESS:

trademarks@carterstafford.com

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION DENIED

ISSUE/MAILING DATE: 2/13/2013
INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION NO. 1096037

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. §2.64(b); TMEP §§715.03(a)(2)(B), (a)(2)(E), 715.04(a). The requirement(s) and/or refusal(s) made final in the Office action dated July 23, 2012 are maintained and continue to be final. *See* TMEP §§715.03(a)(2)(B), (a)(2)(E), 715.04(a).

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

The applicant continues to argue that confusion is unlikely because the proposed and cited marks are different in "sound, look, and connotation." However, as stated previously, when comparing marks, the test is not whether the marks can be distinguished in a side-by-side comparison, but rather whether the marks are sufficiently similar in their entirety that confusion as to the source of the goods and/or services offered under applicant's and registrant's marks is likely to result. *Midwestern Pet Foods, Inc. v. Societe des Produits Nestle S.A.*, 685 F.3d 1046, 1053, 103 USPQ2d 1435, 1440 (Fed. Cir. 2012); *Edom Labs., Inc. v. Lichter*, 102 USPQ2d 1546, 1551 (TTAB 2012); TMEP §1207.01(b). The focus is on the recollection of the average purchaser, who normally

retains a general rather than specific impression of trademarks. *L'Oreal S.A. v. Marcon*, 102 USPQ2d 1434, 1438 (TTAB 2012); *Sealed Air Corp. v. Scott Paper Co.*, 190 USPQ 106, 108 (TTAB 1975); TMEP §1207.01(b).

Here, the applicant's mark merely adds a design element encompassing the letter "I" and the highly suggestive word "SMART" to the registrant's mark. The mere addition of a term to a registered mark generally does not obviate the similarity between the marks nor does it overcome a likelihood of confusion under Trademark Act Section 2(d). *See In re Chatam Int'l Inc.*, 380 F.3d 1340, 71 USPQ2d 1944 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (GASPAR'S ALE and JOSE GASPAR GOLD); *Coca-Cola Bottling Co. v. Jos. E. Seagram & Sons, Inc.*, 526 F.2d 556, 188 USPQ 105 (C.C.P.A. 1975) (BENGAL and BENGAL LANCER); *Lilly Pulitzer, Inc. v. Lilli Ann Corp.*, 376 F.2d 324, 153 USPQ 406 (C.C.P.A. 1967) (THE LILLY and LILLI ANN); *In re Toshiba Med. Sys. Corp.*, 91 USPQ2d 1266 (TTAB 2009) (TITAN and VANTAGE TITAN); *In re El Torito Rests., Inc.*, 9 USPQ2d 2002 (TTAB 1988) (MACHO and MACHO COMBOS); *In re Corning Glass Works*, 229 USPQ 65 (TTAB 1985) (CONFIRM and CONFIRMCELLS); *In re U.S. Shoe Corp.*, 229 USPQ 707 (TTAB 1985) (CAREER IMAGE and CREST CAREER IMAGES); *In re Riddle*, 225 USPQ 630 (TTAB 1985) (ACCUTUNE and RICHARD PETTY'S ACCU TUNE); TMEP §1207.01(b)(iii).

The applicant also argues that the applicant is "not aware of any instances of confusion between the two marks;" however, the test under Trademark Act Section 2(d) is whether there is a likelihood of confusion. It is unnecessary to show actual confusion in establishing likelihood of confusion. TMEP §1207.01(d)(ii); *e.g.*, *Weiss Assocs. Inc. v. HRL Assocs. Inc.*, 902 F.2d 1546, 1549, 14 USPQ2d 1840, 1842-43 (Fed. Cir. 1990). The Trademark Trial and Appeal Board stated as follows:

[A]pplicant's assertion that it is unaware of any actual confusion occurring as a result of the contemporaneous use of the marks of applicant and registrant is of little probative value in an ex parte proceeding such as this where we have no evidence pertaining to the nature and extent of the use by applicant and registrant (and thus cannot ascertain whether there has been ample opportunity for confusion to arise, if it were going to); and the registrant has no chance to be heard from (at least in the absence of a consent agreement, which applicant has not submitted in this case).

In re Kangaroos U.S.A., 223 USPQ 1025, 1026-27 (TTAB 1984).

Finally, in response to the applicant's argument that the registrant has not objected to the applicant's use of the mark, it is noted that use and registration are separate issues. Assuming *arguendo* that the registrant is amenable to the applicant's use of the registrant's mark in providing its services, this does not equate to the registrant's consent to the applicant's registration of the proposed mark.

Accordingly, for the foregoing reasons, the request is denied.

The filing of a request for reconsideration does not extend the time for filing a proper response to a final Office action or an appeal with the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board (Board), which runs from the date the final Office action was issued/mailed. *See* 37 C.F.R. §2.64(b); TMEP §715.03, (a)(2)(B), (a)(2)(E), (c).

If time remains in the six-month response period to the final Office action, applicant has the remainder of the response period to comply with and/or overcome any outstanding final requirement(s) and/or refusal(s) and/or to file an appeal with the Board. TMEP §715.03(a)(2)(B), (c). However, if applicant has already filed a timely notice of appeal with the Board, the Board will be notified to resume the appeal when the time for responding to the final Office action has expired. *See* TMEP §715.04(a).

/Martha L. Fromm/
Trademark Examining Attorney
Law Office 106
(571)272-9320
Martha.Fromm@USPTO.gov