

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

THE PEP BOYS MANNY, MOE
& JACK OF CALIFORNIA

Opposer,

v.

KENT G. ANDERSON

Applicant

Opposition No. 91158509

Mark: FUTURE

Serial No. 76 - 247,198



03-12-2004

U.S. Patent & TMO/TM Mail Report #2

RESPONSE TO SHOW CAUSE ORDER

On March 4, 2004, the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board issued an order allowing Applicant 30 days to show cause why judgment should not be entered against him. The order indicates an answer was due on December 29, 2003 and that it appeared as if no answer had been filed.

Applicant did file an answer to the Notice of Opposition, on December 29, 2003. A copy thereof is attached hereto. In view of the fact that Applicant timely filed an answer, it is respectfully suggested that a default judgment should not be entered against Applicant.

Respectfully submitted,

KENT G. ANDERSON

March 10, 2004
Date

By:

Paul E. Fahrenkopf
Law Offices of Paul E. Fahrenkopf
1717 K Street, NW, Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036

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

THE PEP BOYS MANNY, MOE
& JACK OF CALIFORNIA

Opposer,

v.

KENT G. ANDERSON

Applicant

Opposition No. 91158509

Mark: FUTURE

Serial No. 76 - 247,198

ANSWER TO NOTICE OF OPPOSITION

Applicant, Kent G. Anderson, hereby answers the Notice of Opposition as follows:

1. Applicant is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations of paragraph 1 of the Notice, and hereby denies the same.
2. Applicant is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations of paragraph 2 of the Notice, and hereby denies the same
3. Applicant is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations of paragraph 3 of the Notice, and hereby denies the same.
4. Applicant is without knowledge sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations of paragraph 4 of the Notice, and hereby denies the same.

5. Applicant admits that he filed an application for registration of the mark FUTURE on April 27, 2001 for the services referenced in the Notice. Applicant denies the other allegations of paragraph 5.

6. Denied.

7. Denied.

8. Denied.

9. Denied.

10. Denied.

WHEREFORE, the Notice of Opposition should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

KENT G. ANDERSON

Dec. 29, 2003
Date

By: 
Paul E. Fahrenkopf
Law Offices of Paul E. Fahrenkopf
1717 K Street, NW
Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20036
202-466-0994
202-466-0997 (fax)

Attorney for Applicant

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing document was served on Marsha G. Gentner, Jacobson Holman PLLC, 400 Seventh Street, NW, Washington, DC 20004, on this 29th day of December, 2003, by first class mail, postage prepaid.


