

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
Trademark Trial and Appeal Board
2900 Crystal Drive
Arlington, Virginia 22202-3513

Mailed: September 17, 2003

Opposition No. 91-156,040
91-156,192
91-157,195

Carlos A. Arrendondo, Trustee
of the 2000 Trust for the
Grandchildren of Carlos A.
Arredondo and Mari V.
Arredondo, General Partner of
Arredondo Properties Ltd.

v.

Arredondo & Company, LLC

Peter Cataldo, Interlocutory Attorney

Opposer's consented motion (filed on August 22, 2003)
for consolidation and suspension of the above referenced
proceedings is granted as indicated below.

Opposition No. 157,195 Consolidated with Previously
Consolidated Opposition Nos. 156,040 and 156,192

When cases involving common questions of law or fact
are pending before the Board, the Board may order the
consolidation of the cases. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a);
Regatta Sport Ltd. v. Telux-Pioneer Inc., 20 USPQ2d 1154
(TTAB 1991); and *Estate of Biro v. Bic Corp.*, 18 USPQ2d 1382
(TTAB 1991). In determining whether to consolidate
proceedings, the Board will weigh the savings in time,
effort, and expense which may be gained from consolidation,

against any prejudice or inconvenience which may be caused thereby. *See, for example, Wright & Miller, Federal Practice and Procedure: Civil 2d §2383 (1999); and Lever Brothers Co. v. Shaklee Corp., 214 USPQ 654 (TTAB 1982).* Consolidation is discretionary with the Board, and may be ordered upon motion granted by the Board, or upon stipulation of the parties approved by the Board, or upon the Board's own initiative. *See, for example, Hilson Research Inc. v. Society for Human Resource Management, 27 USPQ2d 1423 (TTAB 1993); and Regatta Sport Ltd. v. Telux-Pioneer Inc., 20 USPQ2d 1154 (TTAB 1991).*

Inasmuch as the parties to the instant proceedings are identical and the issues are substantially the same, Opposition No. 157,195 is hereby consolidated with Opposition Nos. 156,040 and 156,192.

The consolidated cases may be presented on the same record and briefs. *See Hilson Research Inc. v. Society for Human Resource Management, supra; and Helene Curtis Industries Inc. v. Suave Shoe Corp., 13 USPQ2d 1618 (TTAB 1989).*

The Board file will be maintained in Opposition No. 156,040 as the "parent" case. As a general rule, from this point on only a single copy of any paper or motion should be filed herein; but that copy should bear all three proceeding

numbers in its caption. Exceptions to the general rule involve stipulated extensions of the discovery and trial dates, and briefs on the case. See Trademark Rules 2.121(d) and 2.128.

Despite being consolidated, each proceeding retains its separate character and requires entry of a separate judgment. See Wright & Miller, *Federal Practice and Procedure, supra*. The decision on the consolidated cases shall take into account any differences in the issues raised by the respective pleadings; a copy of the decision shall be placed in each proceeding file.

Consolidated Proceedings Suspended

Opposer's consented motion to suspend the proceeding pending final determination of a civil action between the parties is hereby granted as conceded. See Trademark Rules 2.127(a) and 2.117(a).

Accordingly, proceedings are suspended pending final disposition of the civil action between the parties.

Within twenty days after the final determination of the civil action, the interested party should notify the Board so that this case may be called up for appropriate action. During the suspension period the Board should be notified of any address changes for the parties or their attorneys.

* * * * *