TTAB

OIPE IAP45
MAY 03 2006
PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

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

MGI LUXURY GROUP S.S., Opposer, v. INNODIS, Applicant.	Opposition No. 91169246

ANSWER TO NOTICE OF OPPOSITION

In Answer to the Notice of Opposition, Applicant, Innodis denies that the Opposer would in any way be damaged by the registration of Applicant's mark here sought to be registered. Applicant has no direct knowledge of the corporate status and address of the Opposer as set forth in the preamble of the Notice and therefor demands strict proof thereof.

With respect to the stated grounds for the Opposition, Applicant responds to each numbered paragraph as follows:

LAW OFFICES
DENNISON, SCHULTZ, DOUGHERTY & MACDONALD
SUITE 105
1727 KING STREET
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22314-2700
703 837-9600

05-03-2006
U.S. Patent & TMOfc/TM Mail Rcpt Dt. #3

1 Applicant admits the existence of the registrations noted in paragraph1, namely, 2,360,853 and 2,540,808 as well as the dates of filing, dates of registration, dates of alleged use in commerce and the listing of the goods but has insufficient information concerning the present ownership of these registrations as alleged in Paragraph 1 of the Notice of Opposition to form a belief as to the truth or falsity thereof and therefor denies the same.

2. Applicant admits the allegations of Paragraph 2 of the Notice of Opposition.

3. Applicant admits the allegations of Paragraph 3 of the Notice of Opposition, but has no knowledge of the present ownership in the Opposer of the pleaded registrations.

4. Applicant denies the allegations of Paragraph 4 of the Notice of Opposition.

5. Applicant admits that some of the goods in its application, but not all, are similar or identical to the goods in the registrations noted in the Opposition Notice.

6. Applicant denies the allegations of Paragraph 6 of the Notice of Opposition.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

In further answer to the Notice of Opposition, the Applicant asserts the following Affirmative Defenses:

1. The Opposer has failed to allege grounds sufficient to establish its standing to maintain the present Opposition.

2. There is no likelihood of confusion, mistake or deception because, *inter alia*, Applicant's mark and the pleaded mark of Opposer, when applied to the respective goods of the parties, are not confusingly similar to the consumer.

Accordingly, Applicant prays that the Notice of Opposition be dismissed and the application of Innodis be permitted to register.

Respectfully submitted,
INNODIS

May 3, 2006

By

Donald L. Dennison
Dennison, Schultz,& Macdonald
Attorneys for Applicant
1727 King Street
Suite 105
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703)837-9600 Ext. 15

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

This is to certify that a copy of the foregoing Answer was sent by first class mail with proper postage affixed, this third day of May, 2006, to counsel for Opposer, Glenn A. Gundersen, Esq., c/o Dechert LLP, 2929 Arch Street, Cira Centre, Philadelphia, PA 19104-2808

Donald L. Dennison