

From: Rappaport, Seth A.

Sent: 12/1/2014 10:02:37 AM

To: TTAB E Filing

CC:

Subject: U.S. TRADEMARK APPLICATION NO. 85250061 - DASH - N/A - Request for Reconsideration
Denied - Return to TTAB

Attachment Information:

Count: 1

Files: 85250061.doc

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

| | |
|--|--|
| U.S. APPLICATION SERIAL NO. 85250061 MARK: DASH |  |
| CORRESPONDENT ADDRESS: JENNIFER KO CRAFT GORDON & SILVER LTD 3960 HOWARD HUGHES PARKWAY NINTH FLOOR LAS VEGAS, NV 89169 | GENERAL TRADEMARK INFORMATION: http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/index.jsp VIEW YOUR APPLICATION FILE |
| APPLICANT: Kimsaprincess Inc. | |
| CORRESPONDENT'S REFERENCE/DOCKET NO: N/A CORRESPONDENT E-MAIL ADDRESS: trademarks@gordonsilver.com | |

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION DENIED

ISSUE/MAILING DATE: 12/1/2014

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 refusal made final in the Office action dated 12/21/2011 is maintained and continues 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, 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 applicant submitted evidence consisting of a list of clothing businesses that contain the wording DASH. The applicant argues that this shows that a likelihood of confusion would not exist between the applicant's mark and the registrants' marks. However, these marks are not registered and many of them include other wording that distinguishes them from the applicant's mark and the registrants' mark. The applicant's mark and the registrants' marks only contain the wording DASH and are identical.

Furthermore, even if the registrants' marks were considered weak, the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit and the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board have recognized that marks deemed "weak" or merely descriptive are still entitled to protection against the registration by a subsequent user of a similar mark for closely related goods and/or services. *In re Colonial Stores, Inc.*, 216 USPQ 793, 795 (TTAB 1982); TMEP §1207.01(b)(ix); see *King Candy Co. v. Eunice King's Kitchen, Inc.*, 496 F.2d 1400, 1401, 182 USPQ 108, 109 (C.C.P.A. 1974). This protection extends to marks registered on the Supplemental Register. TMEP §1207.01(b)(ix); see, e.g., *In re Clorox Co.*, 578 F.2d 305, 307-08, 198 USPQ 337, 340 (C.C.P.A. 1978); *In re Hunke & Jochheim*, 185 USPQ 188 (TTAB 1975).

Furthermore, consumers are likely to be confused by the use of similar marks on or in connection with goods and with services featuring or related to those goods. TMEP §1207.01(a)(ii); see *In re Hyper Shoppes (Ohio), Inc.*, 837 F.2d 463, 6 USPQ2d 1025 (Fed. Cir. 1988) (holding BIGG'S for retail grocery and general merchandise store services likely to be confused with BIGGS for furniture); *In re United Serv. Distribs., Inc.*, 229 USPQ 237 (TTAB 1986) (holding design for distributorship services in the field of health and beauty aids likely to be confused with design for skin cream); *In re Phillips-Van Heusen Corp.*, 228 USPQ 949 (TTAB 1986) (holding 21 CLUB for various items of men's, boys', girls' and women's clothing likely to be confused with THE "21" CLUB (stylized) for restaurant services and towels); *In re U.S. Shoe Corp.*, 229 USPQ 707 (TTAB 1985) (holding CAREER IMAGE (stylized) for retail women's clothing store services and clothing likely to be confused with CREST CAREER IMAGES (stylized) for uniforms); *Steelcase Inc. v. Steelcare Inc.*, 219 USPQ 433 (TTAB 1983) (holding STEELCARE INC. for refinishing of

furniture, office furniture, and machinery likely to be confused with STEELCASE for office furniture and accessories); *Mack Trucks, Inc. v. Huskie Freightways, Inc.*, 177 USPQ 32 (TTAB 1972) (holding similar marks for trucking services and on motor trucks and buses likely to cause confusion).

Finally, where the marks of the respective parties are identical or virtually identical, the relationship between the relevant goods and/or services need not be as close to support a finding of likelihood of confusion. See *In re Shell Oil Co.*, 992 F.2d 1204, 1207, 26 USPQ2d 1687, 1689 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Davey Prods. Pty Ltd.*, 92 USPQ2d 1198, 1202 (TTAB 2009); *In re Thor Tech, Inc.*, 90 USPQ2d 1634, 1636 (TTAB 2009); TMEP §1207.01(a).

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. See TMEP §715.04(a).

If applicant has questions regarding this Office action, please telephone or e-mail the assigned trademark examining attorney. All relevant e-mail communications will be placed in the official application record; however, an e-mail communication will not be accepted as a response to this Office action and will not extend the deadline for filing a proper response. See 37 C.F.R. §2.191; TMEP §§304.01-.02, 709.04-.05. Further, although the trademark examining attorney may provide additional explanation pertaining to the refusal(s) and/or requirement(s) in this Office action, the trademark examining attorney may not provide legal advice or statements about applicant's rights. See TMEP §§705.02, 709.06.

/Seth A. Rappaport/

Seth A. Rappaport

Trademark Examining Attorney

Law Office 103

Phone: (571) 270-1508

Fax: (571) 270-2508

email: seth.rappaport@uspto.gov