

From: Herrera, Roselle

Sent: 7/14/2016 8:23:04 AM

To: TTAB EFiling

CC:

Subject: U.S. TRADEMARK APPLICATION NO. 79148196 - BEAN BAGS - 70388-4003.0 - Request for Reconsideration Denied - Return to TTAB

Attachment Information:

Count: 1

Files: 79148196.doc

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

U.S. APPLICATION SERIAL NO. 79148196

MARK: BEAN BAGS



CORRESPONDENT ADDRESS:

PATCHEN M HAGGERTY

PERKINS COIE LLP

1201 THIRD AVENUE SUITE 4900

SEATTLE, WA 98101

GENERAL TRADEMARK INFORMATION:

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

[VIEW YOUR APPLICATION FILE](#)

APPLICANT: BELL TEA & COFFEE COMPANY LIMITED

CORRESPONDENT'S REFERENCE/DOCKET NO:

70388-4003.0

CORRESPONDENT E-MAIL ADDRESS:

pctrademarks@perkinscoie.com

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION DENIED

ISSUE/MAILING DATE: 7/14/2016

INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION NO. 1206357

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 February 18, 2016 are maintained and continue to be final: Section 2(d) Refusal. See TMEP §§715.03(a)(ii)(B), 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.

Where the goods and/or services 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 and/or services. See *In re Bay State Brewing Co.*, 117 USPQ2d 1958, 1960 (TTAB 2016) (citing *Coach Servs., Inc. v. Triumph Learning LLC*, 668 F.3d 1356, 1368, 101 USPQ2d 1713, 1721 (Fed. Cir. 2012)); *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).

For a composite mark containing both words and a design, the word portion may be more likely to be impressed upon a purchaser's memory and to be used when requesting the goods and/or services. *Joel Gott Wines, LLC v. Rehoboth Von Gott, Inc.*, 107 USPQ2d 1424, 1431 (TTAB 2013) (citing *In re Dakin's Miniatures, Inc.*, 59 USPQ2d 1593, 1596 (TTAB 1999)); TMEP §1207.01(c)(ii); see *In re Viterra Inc.*, 671 F.3d 1358, 1362, 101 USPQ2d 1905, 1908, 1911 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (citing *CBS Inc. v. Morrow*, 708 F.2d 1579, 1581-82, 218 USPQ 198, 200 (Fed. Cir. 1983)). Thus, although such marks must be compared in their entireties, the word portion is often considered the dominant feature and is accorded greater weight in determining whether marks are confusingly similar, even where the word portion has been disclaimed. *In re Viterra Inc.*, 671 F.3d at 1366, 101 USPQ2d at 1911 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (citing *Giant Food, Inc. v. Nation's Foodservice, Inc.*, 710 F.2d 1565, 1570-71, 218 USPQ2d 390, 395 (Fed. Cir. 1983)).

Unlike *In re Covalinski*, 113 USPQ2d 1166 (TTAB 2014), the registrant's design element does not obscure the registrant's wording in the mark. Hence, it is clear to consumers what to verbally call the registrant's mark. The only other wording in the registrant's mark is the descriptive term CAFÉ which has been disclaimed. The registrant's wording is in a large font size and is easily recognizable as part of the mark rather than playing a minor part of the mark as the wording did in *In re White Rock Distilleries, Inc.*, 92 USPQ2d 12982 (TTAB 2009).

Accordingly, the request is denied.

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).

/R.M. Herrera/

Roselle M. Herrera

Trademark Examining Attorney

571-272-1909

Roselle.Herrera@uspto.gov