REPRWT COPY

June 12, 2002

To:
Assistant Commission for Trademarks
Trademark Trial & Appeal Board
2900 Crystal Drive
Arlington, VA 22202-3513
via courier (signature-on-delivery)
sent June 13th, 2002
proof of delivery & receipt on file

CC:
Molly Buck Richard
Thompson & Knight LLP
1700 Pacific Ave., Suite 3300
Dallas, TX 75201-4693
via courier (signature-on-delivery)
sent June 13th, 2002
proof of delivery & receipt on file

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE TRADEMARK TRIAL & APPEAL BOARD

Hewlett-Packard Company (Opposer)
v.
HopOne Internet Corporation (Applicant)

Re: Opposition No.: 121,759
Re: Trademark Application No.: 75/858,178

APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO OPPOSER'S AMENDED NOTICE OF OPPOSITION

Response to Opposer's Notice of Opposition, dated June 7th, 2002, follows.
Note: each numeral refers to the allegation in the aforementioned Notice of Opposition numbered the same.

1. All parts except the last sentence are admitted. The last sentence is denied. As earlier explained and plainly obvious, the letters H and P are never used consecutively, nor in a format similar to HP. The letters are always used in the following order: HopOne. There is an O between the H and the P (both in the typed Mark as well as in the Design – there is an O between the H and the P, and, in the Design, the P rests one full line higher than the H, while in the Opposer's Designs, the H and the P are consecutive, lower case, and at the same height/level; it is obvious that the marks bear no resemblance, other than containing the alphabet letters H and P – as do millions of other marks and words in the English as well as other Latin alphabet-based languages). As earlier outlined, it is frivolous for the Opposer to attempt to claim two letters of the alphabet as its trademark.
2. Denied. The mark has been used in connection with our services as of September, 1999.
3. Admitted.
4. Admitted.
5. Admitted.
6. Admitted.
7. Admitted.
8. Admitted.
9. Admitted.
10. Admitted.
11. Admitted.
12. Admitted.
13. Admitted.
14. Admitted.

15. Admitted.
16. Admitted.
17. Admitted.
18. Admitted.
19. Admitted
20. Admitted.
21. Admitted.
22. Admitted.
23. Admitted.
24. Admitted.
25. Admitted.
26. Admitted.
27. Admitted.
28. Denied, as earlier outlined and detailed.
29. Denied, as earlier outlined and detailed.
30. Denied, as earlier outlined and detailed.
31. Denied, since we believe that the registration of our unique Mark would cause no harm to the Opposer.
32. Denied, as earlier outlined and detailed, as we believe that the registration of our unique Mark would not dilute the Opposer's marks, given no real or noticeable similarity between our Mark and those of the Opposer.

If any further details regarding the admissions and denials above are required, please advise us accordingly.

We thank the Board in advance for its anticipated prompt attention to this matter and trust that the case will be dismissed and the Opposer will not be allowed to further delay the registration of our Mark.

Sincerely,

Haralds Jass
President

TTAB

HOPONE INTERNET CORPORATION
1010 Wisconsin Avenue NW, Suite 303 • Washington, DC 20007-3603
Tel: (202) 298-6520 • Fax: (202) 298-6522 • E-mail: info@hopone.net • Web: www.hopone.net

The foundation of Internet success.™ [redacted]

August 13, 2002

08-19-2002
U.S. Patent & TMOfc/TM Mail Rcpt Dt. #10

To:
Assistant Commission for Trademarks
Trademark Trial & Appeal Board
2900 Crystal Drive
Arlington, VA 22202-3513
sent August 13th, 2002

CC:
Molly Buck Richard
Thompson & Knight LLP
1700 Pacific Ave., Suite 3300
Dallas, TX 75201-4693
sent August 13th, 2002

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE TRADEMARK TRIAL & APPEAL BOARD

Hewlett-Packard Company (Opposer)
v.
HopOne Internet Corporation (Applicant)

Re: Opposition No.: 121,759
Re: Trademark Application No.: 75/858,178

APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO BOARD'S CORRESPONDENCE DATED JULY 30, 2002

As the Board must have been already aware before sending its correspondence dated July 30, 2002, we have responded to the Applicant's Amended Notice of Opposition on June 12th, 2002 (reprint copy of the initial response is attached herewith).

It should be noted that all of Opposer's claims have been answered fully. The frivolous discovery requests, for non-existent information (or information that has been already provided), have been also answered earlier and in our response of June 12th, 2002. Therefore, we consider that a full response has been served to show the lack of ground for the Opposer's case.

If any further details regarding our responses are required, please advise us accordingly.

We thank the Board in advance for its anticipated prompt attention to this matter and trust that the case will be dismissed and the Opposer will not be allowed to further delay the registration of our Mark.

Sincerely,

Haralds Jass
President

TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD
02 AUG 26 AM 12: 16

4