

**To:** ETONIC Holdings, LLC ([wcox@gordonherlands.com](mailto:wcox@gordonherlands.com))  
**Subject:** U.S. TRADEMARK APPLICATION NO. 86227093 - DRX - 5215.01  
**Sent:** 6/20/2016 11:02:21 AM  
**Sent As:** ECOM116@USPTO.GOV  
**Attachments:**

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

U.S. APPLICATION SERIAL NO. 86227093

MARK: DRX

**\*86227093\***

**CORRESPONDENT ADDRESS:**  
WILLIAM H COX  
GORDON HERLANDS RANDOLPH & COX LLP  
355 LEXINGTON AVE FL 10  
NEW YORK, NY 10017-6603

**CLICK HERE TO RESPOND TO THIS LETTER:**

[http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/teas/response\\_forms.jsp](http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/teas/response_forms.jsp)

[VIEW YOUR APPLICATION FILE](#)

**APPLICANT:** ETONIC Holdings, LLC

**CORRESPONDENT'S REFERENCE/DOCKET NO :**

5215.01

**CORRESPONDENT E-MAIL ADDRESS:**

[wcox@gordonherlands.com](mailto:wcox@gordonherlands.com)

**OFFICE ACTION**

**STRICT DEADLINE TO RESPOND TO THIS LETTER**

TO AVOID ABANDONMENT OF APPLICANT'S TRADEMARK APPLICATION, THE USPTO MUST RECEIVE APPLICANT'S COMPLETE RESPONSE TO THIS LETTER **WITHIN 6 MONTHS** OF THE ISSUE/MAILING DATE BELOW.

**ISSUE/MAILING DATE: 6/20/2016**

**THIS IS A FINAL ACTION.**

This Office action is in response to applicant's communication filed on May 17, 2016. The applicant argued against the refusal to register the mark under Section 2(d) of the Trademark Act.

For the reasons set forth below, the refusal under Trademark Act Section 2(d) is now made ***FINAL*** with respect to U.S. Registration Nos. 3883054 and 3936551. See 15 U.S.C. §1052(d); 37 C.F.R. §2.63(b).

## LIKELIHOOD OF CONFUSION

Registration of the applied-for mark is refused because of a likelihood of confusion with the marks in U.S. Registration Nos. 3883054 and 3936551. Trademark Act Section 2(d), 15 U.S.C. §1052(d); *see* TMEP §§1207.01 *et seq.*

In any likelihood of confusion determination, two key considerations are similarity of the marks and similarity or relatedness of the goods and/or services. *In re Aquamar, Inc.*, 115 USPQ2d 1122, 1126 (TTAB 2015) (citing *Federated Foods, Inc. v. Fort Howard Paper Co.*, 544 F.2d 1098, 1103, 192 USPQ 24, 29 (C.C.P.A. 1976)); *In re Iolo Techs., LLC*, 95 USPQ2d 1498, 1499 (TTAB 2010); *see* TMEP §1207.01. That is, the marks are compared in their entireties for similarities in appearance, sound, connotation, and commercial impression. *In re Viterra Inc.*, 671 F.3d 1358, 1362, 101 USPQ2d 1905, 1908 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (quoting *In re E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 476 F.2d 1357, 1361, 177 USPQ 563, 567 (C.C.P.A. 1973)); TMEP §1207.01(b)-(b)(v). Additionally, the goods and/or services are compared to determine whether they are similar or commercially related or travel in the same trade channels. *See Coach Servs., Inc. v. Triumph Learning LLC*, 668 F.3d 1356, 1369-71, 101 USPQ2d 1713, 1722-23 (Fed. Cir. 2012); *Herbko Int'l, Inc. v. Kappa Books, Inc.*, 308 F.3d 1156, 1165, 64 USPQ2d 1375, 1381 (Fed. Cir. 2002); TMEP §1207.01, (a)(vi).

The applicant applied to register the mark **DRX** for athletic footwear; footwear.

The registered marks are:

**DRX** (stylized) (Reg. No. 3936551) for insoles; and

**DRX ROMANELLI** (Reg. No. 3883054) for pants; shirts; shorts; T-shirts.

Marks are compared in their entireties for similarities in appearance, sound, connotation, and commercial impression. *Stone Lion Capital Partners, LP v. Lion Capital LLP*, 746 F.3d 1317, 1321, 110 USPQ2d 1157, 1160 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (quoting *Palm Bay Imps., Inc. v. Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin Maison Fondée En 1772*, 396 F.3d 1369, 1371, 73 USPQ2d 1689, 1691 (Fed. Cir. 2005)); TMEP §1207.01(b)-(b)(v). “Similarity in any one of these elements may be sufficient to find the marks confusingly similar.” *In re Davia*, 110 USPQ2d 1810, 1812 (TTAB 2014) (citing *In re 1st USA Realty Prof'ls, Inc.*, 84 USPQ2d 1581, 1586 (TTAB 2007)); *In re White Swan Ltd.*, 8 USPQ2d 1534, 1535 (TTAB 1988)); TMEP §1207.01(b).

The applicant argued that (1) reg. no 3883054 includes the term ROMANELLI which applicant’s mark does not, (2) it includes the term Roman which gives the cited mark an association with ITALY or with an Italian family, (3) the cited mark and the name ROMANELLI are associated with the well-known designer, marketer and director, (4) the term ROMANELLI is the dominant part of the mark, (5) the goods of the parties are different in that the goods of the cited registration pertain to clothing, whereas applicant’s goods pertain to athletic footwear and footwear, (6) reg. no. 3936551 appears in a stylized font and includes a distinctive design, (7) the cited marks is a play on Dr. Rx with DR being an abbreviation for “doctor” and Rx for “prescription,” and (8) goods would not be marketed and sold in the same channels of trade.

With regard to US Registration No. 3936551 for DRX stylized, applicant’s mark is DRX and the literal portion of the registrant’s mark is DRX. These marks are identical in sound and meaning, “and have the potential to be used . . . in exactly the same manner.” *In re i.am.symbolic, Llc*, 116 USPQ2d 1406, 1411 (TTAB 2015). Additionally, because they are identical, these marks are likely to engender the same connotation and overall commercial impression when considered in connection with applicant’s and registrant’s respective goods. *In re i.am.symbolic, Llc*, 116 USPQ2d at 1411. The addition of a design element does not obviate the similarity of the marks in this case. *See In re Shell Oil Co.*, 992 F.2d 1204, 1206, 26 USPQ2d 1687, 1688 (Fed. Cir. 1993); TMEP §1207.01(c)(ii).

Therefore, the marks are confusingly similar.

A mark in typed or standard characters may be displayed in any lettering style; the rights reside in the wording or other literal element and not in any particular display or rendition. *See In re Viterra Inc.*, 671 F.3d 1358, 1363, 101 USPQ2d 1905, 1909 (Fed. Cir. 2012); *In re Mighty Leaf Tea*, 601 F.3d 1342, 1348, 94 USPQ2d 1257, 1260 (Fed. Cir. 2010); 37 C.F.R. §2.52(a); TMEP §1207.01(c)(iii). Thus, a mark presented in stylized characters and/or with a design element generally will not avoid likelihood of confusion with a mark in typed or standard characters because the marks could be presented in the same manner of display. *See, e.g., In re Viterra Inc.*, 671 F.3d at 1363, 101 USPQ2d at 1909; *Squirtco v. Tomy Corp.*, 697 F.2d 1038, 1041, 216 USPQ 937, 939 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (stating that “the argument concerning a difference in type style is not viable

where one party asserts rights in no particular display”).

As to applicant’s argument that the cited mark is play of word there is no correct pronunciation of a mark because it is impossible to predict how the public will pronounce a particular mark. *See Embarcadero Techs., Inc. v. RStudio, Inc.*, 105 USPQ2d 1825, 1835 (TTAB 2013) (quoting *In re Viterra Inc.*, 671 F.3d 1358, 1367, 101 USPQ2d 1905, 1912 (Fed. Cir. 2012); *In re The Belgrade Shoe Co.*, 411 F.2d 1352, 1353, 162 USPQ 227, 227 (C.C.P.A. 1969)); TMEP §1207.01(b)(iv). The marks in question could clearly be pronounced the same; such similarity in sound alone may be sufficient to support a finding that the marks are confusingly similar. *In re White Swan Ltd.*, 8 USPQ2d 1534, 1535 (TTAB 1988); *see In re 1st USA Realty Prof’ls, Inc.*, 84 USPQ2d 1581, 1586 (TTAB 2007); TMEP §1207.01(b)(iv).

With regard U.S. Registration No. 3883054 for DRX ROMANELLI, applicant’s mark and the registered mark share the same identical term DRX. The term DRX is the first term in registrant’s mark. 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 Fondée En 1772*, 396 F. 3d 1369, 1372, 73 USPQ2d 1689, 1692 (Fed. Cir. 2005); *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).

In addition, 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 that is descriptive of or generic for a party’s goods and/or services 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 at 1060, 224 USPQ at 752; TMEP §1207.01(b)(viii), (c)(ii).

Further, incorporating the entirety of one mark within another does not obviate the similarity between the compared marks, as in the present case, nor does it overcome a likelihood of confusion under Section 2(d). *See Wella Corp. v. Cal. Concept Corp.*, 558 F.2d 1019, 1022, 194 USPQ 419, 422 (C.C.P.A. 1977) (finding CALIFORNIA CONCEPT and surfer design and CONCEPT confusingly similar); *Coca-Cola Bottling Co. v. Jos. E. Seagram & Sons, Inc.*, 526 F.2d 556, 557, 188 USPQ 105, 106 (C.C.P.A. 1975) (finding BENGAL and BENGAL LANCER and design confusingly similar); *Hunter Indus., Inc. v. Toro Co.*, 110 USPQ2D 1651, 1660-61 (TTAB 2014) (finding PRECISION and PRECISION DISTRIBUTION CONTROL confusingly similar); TMEP §1207.01(b)(iii). In the present case, the marks are identical in part.

Regarding the goods of the parties, the goods of the parties need not be identical or even competitive to find a likelihood of confusion. *See On-line Careline Inc. v. Am. Online Inc.*, 229 F.3d 1080, 1086, 56 USPQ2d 1471, 1475 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Recot, Inc. v. Becton*, 214 F.3d 1322, 1329, 54 USPQ2d 1894, 1898 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (“[E]ven if the goods in question are different from, and thus not related to, one another in kind, the same goods can be related in the mind of the consuming public as to the origin of the goods.”); TMEP §1207.01(a)(i).

The respective goods need only be “related in some manner and/or if the circumstances surrounding their marketing [be] such that they could give rise to the mistaken belief that [the goods and/or services] emanate from the same source.” *Coach Servs., Inc. v. Triumph Learning LLC*, 668 F.3d 1356, 1369, 101 USPQ2d 1713, 1722 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (quoting *7-Eleven Inc. v. Wechsler*, 83 USPQ2d 1715, 1724 (TTAB 2007)); TMEP §1207.01(a)(i).

On the June 25, 2014 Office action the examining attorney attached evidence that illustrated how companies such as Rei, Foot Locker and FootSmart sale footwear and insoles and how companies such as Nike and Under Armour provide clothing, insoles and/or shoes.

In addition, on the December 22, 2014 and November 17, 2015 Office actions, the examining attorney attached additional evidence to show that the goods of the parties are marketed and/or sold in the same channels of trade.

The fact that the goods of the parties differ is not controlling in determining likelihood of confusion. The issue is not likelihood of confusion between particular goods, but likelihood of confusion as to the source or sponsorship of those goods. *In re Majestic Distilling Co.*, 315 F.3d 1311, 1316, 65 USPQ2d 1201, 1205 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *In re Shell Oil Co.*, 992 F.2d 1204, 1208, 26 USPQ2d 1687, 1689 (Fed. Cir. 1993); TMEP §1207.01.

Accordingly, the refusal to register the mark under Section 2(d) is made **FINAL**.

## **OPTIONS**

Applicant must respond within six months of the date of issuance of this final Office action or the application will be abandoned. 15 U.S.C. §1062(b); 37 C.F.R. §2.65(a). Applicant may respond by providing one or both of the following:

- (1) A response that fully satisfies all outstanding requirements and/or resolves all outstanding refusals.
- (2) An appeal to the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board, with the appeal fee of \$100 per class.

37 C.F.R. §2.63(b)(1)-(2); TMEP §714.04; *see* 37 C.F.R. §2.6(a)(18); TBMP ch. 1200.

In certain rare circumstances, an applicant may respond by filing a petition to the Director pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §2.63(b)(2) to review procedural issues. TMEP §714.04; *see* 37 C.F.R. §2.146(b); TBMP §1201.05; TMEP §1704 (explaining petitionable matters). The petition fee is \$100. 37 C.F.R. §2.6(a)(15).

**TEAS PLUS OR TEAS REDUCED FEE (TEAS RF) APPLICANTS – TO MAINTAIN LOWER FEE, ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS MUST BE MET, INCLUDING SUBMITTING DOCUMENTS ONLINE:** Applicants who filed their application online using the lower-fee TEAS Plus or TEAS RF application form must (1) file certain documents online using TEAS, including responses to Office actions (see TMEP §§819.02(b), 820.02(b) for a complete list of these documents); (2) maintain a valid e-mail correspondence address; and (3) agree to receive correspondence from the USPTO by e-mail throughout the prosecution of the application. *See* 37 C.F.R. §§2.22(b), 2.23(b); TMEP §§819, 820. TEAS Plus or TEAS RF applicants who do not meet these requirements must submit an additional processing fee of \$50 per international class of goods and/or services. 37 C.F.R. §§2.6(a)(1)(v), 2.22(c), 2.23(c); TMEP §§819.04, 820.04. However, in certain situations, TEAS Plus or TEAS RF applicants may respond to an Office action by authorizing an examiner’s amendment by telephone without incurring this additional fee.

/Alice Benmaman/  
Examining Attorney  
Law Office 116  
(571) 272-9126  
alice.benmaman@uspto.gov

**TO RESPOND TO THIS LETTER:** Go to [http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/teas/response\\_forms.jsp](http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/teas/response_forms.jsp). Please wait 48-72 hours from the issue/mailing date before using the Trademark Electronic Application System (TEAS), to allow for necessary system updates of the application. For *technical* assistance with online forms, e-mail [TEAS@uspto.gov](mailto:TEAS@uspto.gov). For questions about the Office action itself, please contact the assigned trademark examining attorney. **E-mail communications will not be accepted as responses to Office actions; therefore, do not respond to this Office action by e-mail.**

**All informal e-mail communications relevant to this application will be placed in the official application record.**

**WHO MUST SIGN THE RESPONSE:** It must be personally signed by an individual applicant or someone with legal authority to bind an applicant (i.e., a corporate officer, a general partner, all joint applicants). If an applicant is represented by an attorney, the attorney must sign the response.

**PERIODICALLY CHECK THE STATUS OF THE APPLICATION:** To ensure that applicant does not miss crucial deadlines or official notices, check the status of the application every three to four months using the Trademark Status and Document Retrieval (TSDR) system at <http://tsdr.uspto.gov/>. Please keep a copy of the TSDR status screen. If the status shows no change for more than six months, contact the Trademark Assistance Center by e-mail at [TrademarkAssistanceCenter@uspto.gov](mailto:TrademarkAssistanceCenter@uspto.gov) or call 1-800-786-9199. For more information on checking status, see <http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/process/status/>.

**TO UPDATE CORRESPONDENCE/E-MAIL ADDRESS:** Use the TEAS form at <http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/teas/correspondence.jsp>.



**To:** ETONIC Holdings, LLC ([wcox@gordonherlands.com](mailto:wcox@gordonherlands.com))  
**Subject:** U.S. TRADEMARK APPLICATION NO. 86227093 - DRX - 5215.01  
**Sent:** 6/20/2016 11:02:22 AM  
**Sent As:** ECOM116@USPTO.GOV  
**Attachments:**

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (USPTO)**

**IMPORTANT NOTICE REGARDING YOUR  
U.S. TRADEMARK APPLICATION**

USPTO OFFICE ACTION (OFFICIAL LETTER) HAS ISSUED  
ON **6/20/2016** FOR U.S. APPLICATION SERIAL NO. 86227093

Please follow the instructions below:

**(1) TO READ THE LETTER:** Click on this [link](#) or go to <http://tsdr.uspto.gov>, enter the U.S. application serial number, and click on "Documents."

The Office action may not be immediately viewable, to allow for necessary system updates of the application, but will be available within 24 hours of this e-mail notification.

**(2) TIMELY RESPONSE IS REQUIRED:** Please carefully review the Office action to determine (1) how to respond, and (2) the applicable response time period. Your response deadline will be calculated from **6/20/2016** (or sooner if specified in the Office action). For information regarding response time periods, see <http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/process/status/responsetime.jsp>.

**Do NOT hit "Reply" to this e-mail notification, or otherwise e-mail your response** because the USPTO does NOT accept e-mails as responses to Office actions. Instead, the USPTO recommends that you respond online using the Trademark Electronic Application System (TEAS) response form located at [http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/teas/response\\_forms.jsp](http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/teas/response_forms.jsp).

**(3) QUESTIONS:** For questions about the contents of the Office action itself, please contact the assigned trademark examining attorney. For *technical* assistance in accessing or viewing the Office action in the Trademark Status and Document Retrieval (TSDR) system, please e-mail [TSDR@uspto.gov](mailto:TSDR@uspto.gov).

**WARNING**

**Failure to file the required response by the applicable response deadline will result in the ABANDONMENT of your application.** For more information regarding abandonment, see <http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/basics/abandon.jsp>.

**PRIVATE COMPANY SOLICITATIONS REGARDING YOUR APPLICATION:** Private companies **not** associated with the USPTO are using information provided in trademark applications to mail or e-mail trademark-related solicitations. These companies often use names that closely resemble the USPTO and their solicitations may look like an official government document. Many solicitations require that you pay

“fees.”

Please carefully review all correspondence you receive regarding this application to make sure that you are responding to an official document from the USPTO rather than a private company solicitation. All official USPTO correspondence will be mailed only from the “United States Patent and Trademark Office” in Alexandria, VA; or sent by e-mail from the domain “@uspto.gov.” For more information on how to handle private company solicitations, see [http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/solicitation\\_warnings.jsp](http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/solicitation_warnings.jsp).