

From: DeJonge, Kathleen

Sent: 4/14/2013 6:08:04 PM

To: TTAB E Filing

CC:

Subject: U.S. TRADEMARK APPLICATION NO. 85554445 - ALL-WAYS - ALL-100 - Request for
Reconsideration Denied - Return to TTAB

Attachment Information:

Count: 21

Files: 77864733P001OF003.JPG, 77864733P002OF003.JPG, 77864733P003OF003.JPG,
85048006P001OF003.JPG, 85048006P002OF003.JPG, 85048006P003OF003.JPG,
85071025P001OF002.JPG, 85071025P002OF002.JPG, 85088451P001OF003.JPG,
85088451P002OF003.JPG, 85088451P003OF003.JPG, 85120484P001OF003.JPG,
85120484P002OF003.JPG, 85120484P003OF003.JPG, 85313205P001OF002.JPG,
85313205P002OF002.JPG, 85326949P001OF004.JPG, 85326949P002OF004.JPG,
85326949P003OF004.JPG, 85326949P004OF004.JPG, 85554445.doc

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

U.S. APPLICATION SERIAL NO. 85554445

MARK: ALL-WAYS



CORRESPONDENT ADDRESS:

DARA L ONOFRIO

ONOFRIO LAW

15 N MILL ST STE 225

NYACK, NY 10960-3015

GENERAL TRADEMARK INFORMATION:

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

APPLICANT: All-Ways Forwarding Int'l Inc.

CORRESPONDENT'S REFERENCE/DOCKET NO:

ALL-100

CORRESPONDENT E-MAIL ADDRESS:

dara@onofriolaw.com

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION DENIED

ISSUE/MAILING DATE: 4/14/2013

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 September 28, 2012 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 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.

There is a likelihood of confusion with the mark in U.S. Registration No. 4015760. As explained in the final refusal, applicant's **ALL-WAYS** mark is confusingly similar to the dominant wording **ALL WAYS** in the registrant's mark. The wording "MOVING AND STORAGE" in the registrant's mark has been disclaimed. It is well settled that, although marks are compared in their entireties, one feature of a mark may be more significant or dominant in creating a commercial impression. See *In re Viterra Inc.*, 671 F.3d 1358, 1362, 101 USPQ2d 1905, 1908 (Fed. Cir. 2012); *In re Nat'l Data Corp.*, 753 F.2d 1056, 1058, 224 USPQ 749, 751 (Fed. Cir. 1985); TMEP §1207.01(b)(viii), (c)(ii). Disclaimed matter is typically less significant or less dominant when comparing marks. See *In re Dixie Rests., Inc.*, 105 F.3d 1405, 1407, 41 USPQ2d 1531, 1533-34 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *In re Nat'l Data Corp.*, 753 F.2d 1056, 1060, 224 USPQ 749, 752 (Fed. Cir. 1985); TMEP §1207.01(b)(viii), (c)(ii). In this case, the dominant wording in the registrant's mark is very similar in sound, appearance, meaning and commercial impression to applicant's **ALL-WAYS** mark. Moreover, **ALL-WAYS** or **ALL WAYS** is the first wording in the marks. Consumers are generally more inclined to focus on the first word, prefix or syllable in any trademark or service mark. See *Palm Bay Imps., Inc. v. Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin Maison Fondee En 1772*, 396 F.3d 1369, 1372, 73 USPQ2d 1689, 1692 (Fed. Cir. 2005); see also *Mattel Inc. v. Funline Merch. Co.*, 81 USPQ2d 1372, 1374-75 (TTAB 2006); *Presto Prods., Inc. v. Nice-Pak Prods., Inc.*, 9 USPQ2d 1895, 1897 (TTAB 1988) ("it is often the first part of a mark which is most likely to be impressed upon the mind of a purchaser and remembered" when making purchasing decisions).

Applicant's assorted freight and shipping-related services are related to the registrant's broadly-identified "moving company services" because "moving company services" may encompass storage, forwarding, transportation, warehousing and delivery services for others. See evidence attached to the final refusal dated September 28, 2012, and incorporated herein by reference; see also the attached evidence from the USPTO's X-Search database, consisting of a number of third-party marks registered for use in connection with the same or similar services as those of both applicant and registrant in this case. This evidence shows that the services listed therein, namely "moving company services" and air freight shipping services, freight transportation services, supply chain logistics and reverse logistics

services, namely, storage, transportation and delivery of documents, packages, raw materials, and other freight for others by air, rail, ship or truck, packing, storage and warehouse services and/or freight forwarding the goods of others, are of a kind that may emanate from a single source under a single mark. *See In re Anderson*, 101 USPQ2d 1912, 1919 (TTAB 2012); *In re Albert Trostel & Sons Co.*, 29 USPQ2d 1783, 1785-86 (TTAB 1993); *In re Mucky Duck Mustard Co.*, 6 USPQ2d 1467, 1470 n.6 (TTAB 1988); TMEP §1207.01(d)(iii).

Applicant's claim of priority of use is not relevant to this ex parte proceeding. *See In re Calgon Corp.*, 435 F.2d 596, 168 USPQ 278 (C.C.P.A. 1971). Trademark Act Section 7(b), 15 U.S.C. §1057(b), provides that a certificate of registration on the Principal Register is prima facie evidence of the validity of the registration, of the registrant's ownership of the mark, and of the registrant's exclusive right to use the mark in commerce on or in connection with the goods and/or services specified in the certificate. During ex parte prosecution, the trademark examining attorney has no authority to review or to decide on matters that constitute a collateral attack on the cited registration. TMEP §1207.01(d)(iv).

In a likelihood of confusion analysis, any doubt regarding a likelihood of confusion determination is resolved in favor of the registrant. TMEP §1207.01(d)(i); *see Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Packard Press, Inc.*, 281 F.3d 1261, 1265, 62 USPQ2d 1001, 1003 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *In re Hyper Shoppes (Ohio), Inc.*, 837 F.2d 463, 464-65, 6 USPQ2d 1025, 1025 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Given the similar dominant wording in the marks for related services, there is a likelihood of confusion regarding the source of the services.

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).

TEAS PLUS APPLICANTS MUST SUBMIT DOCUMENTS ELECTRONICALLY OR SUBMIT FEE: Applicants who filed their application online using the reduced-fee TEAS Plus application must continue to submit certain documents online using TEAS, including responses to Office actions. *See* 37 C.F.R. §2.23(a)(1). For a complete list of these documents, see TMEP §819.02(b). In addition, such applicants must accept

correspondence from the Office via e-mail throughout the examination process and must maintain a valid e-mail address. 37 C.F.R. §2.23(a)(2); TMEP §§819, 819.02(a). TEAS Plus applicants who do not meet these requirements must submit an additional fee of \$50 per international class of goods and/or services. 37 C.F.R. §2.6(a)(1)(iv); TMEP §819.04. In appropriate situations and where all issues can be resolved by amendment, responding by telephone to authorize an examiner's amendment will not incur this additional fee.

/Kathy de Jonge/

Examining Attorney

Law Office 107

(571) 272-9152