

## Request for Reconsideration after Final Action

**The table below presents the data as entered.**

Input Field	Entered
<b>SERIAL NUMBER</b>	85560074
<b>LAW OFFICE ASSIGNED</b>	LAW OFFICE 111
<b>MARK SECTION (no change)</b>	
<b>EVIDENCE SECTION</b>	
<b>EVIDENCE FILE NAME(S)</b>	
<b>ORIGINAL PDF FILE</b>	<a href="#">evi_98231141236-151153410 . Savi Response to Final SMTS.pdf</a>
<b>CONVERTED PDF FILE(S) (8 pages)</b>	<a href="#">\\TICRS\EXPORT16\IMAGEOUT16\855\600\85560074\xml12\RFR0002.JPG</a>
	<a href="#">\\TICRS\EXPORT16\IMAGEOUT16\855\600\85560074\xml12\RFR0003.JPG</a>
	<a href="#">\\TICRS\EXPORT16\IMAGEOUT16\855\600\85560074\xml12\RFR0004.JPG</a>
	<a href="#">\\TICRS\EXPORT16\IMAGEOUT16\855\600\85560074\xml12\RFR0005.JPG</a>
	<a href="#">\\TICRS\EXPORT16\IMAGEOUT16\855\600\85560074\xml12\RFR0006.JPG</a>
	<a href="#">\\TICRS\EXPORT16\IMAGEOUT16\855\600\85560074\xml12\RFR0007.JPG</a>
	<a href="#">\\TICRS\EXPORT16\IMAGEOUT16\855\600\85560074\xml12\RFR0008.JPG</a>
	<a href="#">\\TICRS\EXPORT16\IMAGEOUT16\855\600\85560074\xml12\RFR0009.JPG</a>
<b>DESCRIPTION OF EVIDENCE FILE</b>	Please see the actual argument text attached within the Evidence section.
<b>SIGNATURE SECTION</b>	
<b>RESPONSE SIGNATURE</b>	/s/Andrew C. Aitken/
<b>SIGNATORY'S NAME</b>	Andrew C. Aitken
<b>SIGNATORY'S POSITION</b>	Attorney of Record
<b>DATE SIGNED</b>	10/11/2013
<b>AUTHORIZED</b>	

<b>SIGNATORY</b>	YES
<b>CONCURRENT APPEAL NOTICE FILED</b>	YES
<b>FILING INFORMATION SECTION</b>	
<b>SUBMIT DATE</b>	Fri Oct 11 15:20:13 EDT 2013
<b>TEAS STAMP</b>	USPTO/RFR-98.231.141.236-20131011152013417835-85560074-5002f43be6b1edfdb724e302428d928ab25328685b3ab0ca97907de47bbcb3689c-N/A-N/A-20131011151153410954

PTO Form 1930 (Rev 9/2007)  
OMB No. 0651-0050 (Exp. 05/31/2014)

## **Request for Reconsideration after Final Action To the Commissioner for Trademarks:**

Application serial no. **85560074** has been amended as follows:

### **EVIDENCE**

Evidence in the nature of Please see the actual argument text attached within the Evidence section. has been attached.

#### **Original PDF file:**

[evi\\_98231141236-151153410 . Savi Response to Final SMTS.pdf](#)

#### **Converted PDF file(s) (8 pages)**

[Evidence-1](#)

[Evidence-2](#)

[Evidence-3](#)

[Evidence-4](#)

[Evidence-5](#)

[Evidence-6](#)

[Evidence-7](#)

[Evidence-8](#)

### **SIGNATURE(S)**

#### **Request for Reconsideration Signature**

Signature: /s/Andrew C. Aitken/ Date: 10/11/2013

Signatory's Name: Andrew C. Aitken

Signatory's Position: Attorney of Record

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: 85560074

Internet Transmission Date: Fri Oct 11 15:20:13 EDT 2013

TEAS Stamp: USPTO/RFR-98.231.141.236-201310111520134

17835-85560074-5002f43be6b1edfdb724e3024

28d928ab25328685b3ab0ca97907de47bbcb3689

c-N/A-N/A-20131011151153410954

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re Application of:  
SAVI TECHNOLOGY, INC.  
Application No.: 85560074  
Filed: March 5, 2012  
For: SMTS

International Class 009  
Examiner Margery A. Tierney  
Law Office 111

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION AFTER FINAL REFUSAL**

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Appellant, Savi Technology, Inc. (hereinafter, "Applicant") hereby requests reconsideration of the Examining Attorney's (hereinafter, "Examiner") Final Refusal Action dated April 11, 2013 to register the above-identified mark. The Applicant is concurrently filing a Notice of Appeal.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has refused to the registration of the mark under Section 2(e)(1) of the Trademark Act. The Examiner contends that the term SMTS is an acronym that generically describes the services recited in the application and therefore the mark cannot be registered. The applicant respectfully disagrees. In support of the objection the examiner cites to the [www.acronymfinder.com](http://www.acronymfinder.com) database that ascribes a number of meanings of the term "SMTS." Specifically, the Examiner cites that the term may signify "Software Management Tracking System" or "Software Maintenance Tracking System." The Applicant disagrees that the evidence cited by the Examiner establishes that the term is merely descriptive—a conclusion that is belied by the examiner own ascription of multiple meanings to the term.

But more importantly, even if the mark SMTS describes “software management tracking system” or “software maintenance tracking system”, the services recited by the Applicant are separate, distinct and directed to a materially different market than those consumers that may be interested in purchasing products to track or maintain *software* across an enterprise or network. The Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the final refusal.

## **II. STATEMENT OF FACTS**

On March 5, 2012, Applicant filed its application to register the word mark SMTS on the principal register for

“computer hardware and computer software for use in tracking, monitoring, and managing the condition, status, location, security and integrity of tangible assets, equipment, vehicles and cargo; computer hardware and computer software for use with GPS, GPRS, RFID, and satellite communication technologies for monitoring and managing tangible assets, equipment, vehicles and cargo; computer hardware and computer software for use in collecting, analyzing, and displaying data on the identity, location, and status of tangible assets, equipment, vehicles, and cargo; computer hardware and computer software for use in analyzing and displaying mapped routes to monitor the identity, location, and status of tangible assets, equipment, vehicles, and cargo; computer hardware and computer software to detect, alert, and respond to tampering and unauthorized access to tangible assets, equipment, vehicles, and cargo; computer hardware and computer software for use in providing real-time alerts and updates on the location of tangible assets, equipment, vehicles and cargo to improve transit times, identify diversion of tangible assets from established routes and locations, identify theft, and recover stolen tangible assets; computer hardware and computer software for real-time identification and tracking of the location, movement and condition of high-value tangible assets; computer hardware and computer software for use by large organizations, manufacturers, heavy industry and governments to manage tangible assets in distributed supply chains and complex logistics.”

On June 15, 2012, the Examiner issued her rejection based on Section 2(e)(1) and the Applicant responded on March 14, 2013. On April 11, 2013, the Examiner issued her second and final refusal.

### III. ARGUMENT

Assuming the Examiner's premise that SMTS has the meanings ascribed by the Examiner, the services that provided in association with the mark by applicant are neither synonymous nor related to services that are ascribed to the term SMTS by the Examiner. Secondly, as explained herein, the acronym finder database cited by the Examiner is not appropriate evidence to base a rejection because it is not reliable.

#### A. The Mark SMTS Does Not Describe the Goods Recited in the Application.

In connection with the first meaning of the term, in addition to [www.acronymfinder.com](http://www.acronymfinder.com) (hereinafter "AcronymFinder website"), the Examiner further cites to an article published in the internet by ZDNet that used the acronym SMTS to refer to Software Management Tracking System. As understood by the applicant a "Software Management Tracking System" is used to identify the existence of a software product in a particular network environment or enterprise. This meaning is confirmed by the ZDNET article and further references to [indeed.com](http://indeed.com) and the New Orleans Jobs website at <http://jobsneworleans.com> cited by the Examiner. The latter meaning cited by the Examiner, Software Maintenance Tracking Systems, apparently refers to techniques used to ensure that **software** that has been installed on the network is properly updated and maintained in networks or enterprises.

In contrast, as clearly recited in the application, the goods that are recited relate to both hardware and software for the tracking or monitoring of "tangible assets, including equipment, vehicles, and cargo." These goods are provided to customers that are interested in the management of "tangible assets in distributed supply chains and complex

logistics.” *Id.* As such, the goods described in the present application are completely unrelated to either software management tracking services or software maintenance tracking services. Software tracking and software maintenance services relate to the tracking of intangible software, computer programs or applications that reside on a computer network. Such products may be used by IT professionals – not logistics managers seeking to locate and track tangible assets. The term SMTS has never been used to describe tracking efforts as it relates to hardware, such as trucks, equipment and cargo. While the term computer software is included in the applicant’s goods and services, it is merely a component or tool that is used to track and monitor a customer’s tangible assets in a supply chain.

In addition, it is respectfully submitted that the customers for the applicant’s goods and the channels of trade of applicant’s products are materially different from those that may purchase either software tracking or software maintenance programs or services. The applicant directs its sales and marketing efforts to logistics managers and professionals. In contracts, as best understood, the likely customers of software tracking and software maintenance products and services would be information technology professionals. And this market is confirmed by the Examiner’s citation to the ZDNet web-based publication which is described as an “enterprise IT-focused online publication,” In summary, both the respective customers and channels of trade are different.

A term is considered descriptive if it forthwith conveys an immediate idea of the ingredients, qualities or characteristics of the goods. See *Stix Products, Inc. v. United Merchants & Manufacturers Inc.*, 295 F.Supp. 479, 488 (S.D.N.Y.1968) — a formulation

deriving from *General Shoe Corp. v. Rosen*, 111 F.2d 95, 98 (4 Cir. 1940). See also *In re Engineering Systems Corp.*, 2 USPQ2d 1075 (TTAB 1986); *In re Bright-Crest, Ltd.*, 204 USPQ 591 (TTAB 1979). (The test for determining whether a mark is merely descriptive is whether it immediately conveys information concerning a quality, characteristic, function, ingredient, attribute or feature of the product or service in connection with which it is used, or intended to be used.) Further, it is well-established that the determination of mere descriptiveness must be made not in the abstract or on the basis of guesswork, but in relation to the goods or services for which registration is sought, the context in which the mark is used, and the impact that it is likely to make on the average purchaser of such goods or services. *In re Abcor Dev. Corp.*, 588 F.2d 811, 200 USPQ 215, 218 (CCPA 1978).

The test for determining whether a series of initials is merely descriptive was established by the Court of Claims in *Modern Optics, Inc. v. Univis Lens Co.*, 234 F.2d 504, 110 USPQ 293 (CCPA 1956). There the court adopted that not all initials of combinations of descriptive words are *ipso facto* unregistrable. While each case may be decided on the basis of the particular facts involved, as a general rule, initials “cannot be considered descriptive unless they have become so generally understood as representing descriptive words as to be accepted as substantially synonymous therewith.” 110 USPQ at 295. Here, it is respectfully submitted that the consumers for the goods sold by applicant would not recognize that the abbreviation SMTS describes the goods. *In re Omaha National Corp.*, 819 F.2d 1117, 2 USPQ2d 1859 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (Holding that in determining the average consumer’s recognition of the abbreviation, the court must look at the average or ordinary prospective customers of applicant’s identified goods).

It is submitted that the term SMTS is neither generally understood nor substantially synonymous with the services recited. In contrast, there are numerous exhibits of record showing the use of the letters “SMTS” refer to a wide variety of goods and services from transportation services (Southeast Missouri Transportation Services) to a teacher’s association (Saskatchewan Mathematics Teacher’s Society). While the record shows that there are limited instances where the combination of initials “SMTS” refers to some sort of a tracking system, it is a mere exception, rather than a rule, that the two latter letters “TS” in the proposed mark “SMTS” constitutes a generic designation of tracking systems. Moreover, the average consumer of the goods and services for Applicant’s products would not be familiar with the use of the term SMTS in connection with IT services nor make an association between the applicant’s services and the unrelated IT services that may have used the acronym SMTS. Therefore the record is unconvincing that “SMTS” is a generally recognized term for a mobile tracking system.

**B. The [www.acronymfinder.com](http://www.acronymfinder.com) web page is not reliable evidence.**

On separate and independent grounds, it is submitted that the basis for Examiner’s refusal, namely the citation to the [www.acronymfinder.com](http://www.acronymfinder.com) (hereinafter AcronymFinder website”) is not well founded. Although material obtained from the Internet can be accepted as evidence *In re Davey Prods. Pty Ltd.*, 92 USPQ 2d 1198, 1202-03 (TTAB 2009); *In re Rodale Inc.*, 80 USPQ 2d 1696, 1700 (TTAB 2006); *In re White*, 80 USPQ 2d 1654, 1662 (TTAB 2006); *In re Joint-Stock Co. “Baik”*, 80 USPQ 2d 1305, 1308-09 (TTAB 2006); *In re Consol. Specialty Rests. Inc.*, 71 USPQ 2d 1921, 1927-29 (TTAB 2004); *In re Gregory*, 70 USPQ 2d 1792, 1793, 1795 (TTAB 2004); *In re Fitch IBCA Inc.*, 64 USPQ 2d 1058, 1060-61

(TTAB 2002)), Internet search results alone carry limited probative value. *In re Fitch IBCA Inc.*, 64; USPQ2d 1058 (TTAB 2002); TBMP § 1208.03; See also, *In re Finisar Corp.*, 78 USPQ 2d 1618, 1631 (TTAB 2006). Therefore, it is critical that such material must be determined to be reliable. In this regard, the TTB has found that an online dictionary is not considered reliable unless it also appears in print form. See *In re Total Quality Group, Inc.*, 51 USPQ2d 1474, 1476 (TTAB 1999). The reliability of the particular webpage is further undermined in view of the actual guidelines published by the website. For example, anyone can submit an acronym (See <http://www.acronymfinder.com/guidelines.htm>) and the website does not take responsibility for the accuracy of the information (See <http://www.acronymfinder.com/terms.htm> “We've done our best to ensure the accuracy of the AcronymFinder database, however, we do not take responsibility for the accuracy of any of the information in the acronym database”) In view of the website's own admonition, the existence of the term SMTS on Acronymfinder website the Examiner should be given no weight to the reference.

The additional evidence relied upon the Examiner, namely the use of abbreviation in the ZDNet article is *de minimus* and also not authoritative in view of the entire record. The existence of a relatively few instances of use of a term that are consistent with the Examiner's argument does not establish that the term is “well known in the field of software in the computer industry.” In the websites that the Examiner cited in the Final Refusal, the term “SMTS” was defined by the user. If the term was well known in the industry, the definition of “SMTS” in the various presentations would not have been necessary. Moreover, the position is inapposite because the relevant market is not the software in the computer industry. The Applicant's market it is the logistics industry.

### **C. The Applicant's Other Purported Activities**

In the final office action the Examiner also argues that the Applicant offers a management and maintenance functions. It is submitted, that whether the Applicant offers such services is not relevant because it has not sought a registration for such services in connection with the mark. In any event, to the extent that Applicant provides these services, they are once again rendered in connection with the management and maintenance of tangible asserts – not software. For example, the “Journey Management” feature cited by the examiner relates to “multiple assets” and the “Vehicle and Driver Management System” relates to information “about the vehicle.”

### **IV. CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, the applicant requests that the refusal be reversed and the mark be allowed and approved for publication.

By: /s/ Andrew C. Aitken/  
Andrew C. Aitken  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 36,729

Date: October 11, 2013

IP Law Leaders PLLC  
1701 Pennsylvania Avenue  
Suite 300  
Washington, DC 20006  
Telephone: (202) 248-5410  
Facsimile: (202) 318-4538  
Email: [acaitken@ipllfirm.com](mailto:acaitken@ipllfirm.com)