

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
Trademark Trial and Appeal Board  
P.O. Box 1451  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1451

Mailed: September 25, 2009

Opposition No. 91177036

Nationstar Mortgage LLC

v.

Mujahid Ahmad

**Robert H. Coggins,  
Interlocutory Attorney:**

On September 18, 2009, applicant filed an "opposition to opposer's motion for summary judgment as untimely and response to opposer's motion for summary judgment."

To the extent that applicant's filing responds to opposer's motion for summary judgment on either procedural grounds or its merits, applicant is advised that inasmuch as the Board previously (and twice) denied consideration of the motion for summary judgment, applicant's response thereto is unnecessary and will be given no further consideration.

To the extent that applicant's filing is a request for reconsideration of the Board's September 9, 2009 order resetting the trial schedule, the Board exercises its discretion to determine the motion prior to the time allowed

for opposer to file a brief in opposition thereto.<sup>1</sup>

Applicant has provided no evidence that, based on the facts before it and the prevailing authorities, the Board erred in resetting the trial schedule. Accordingly, the motion is denied. Applicant is advised that the Board has the inherent authority to control the disposition of the cases on its docket, which includes the authority to schedule testimony periods. See Trademark Rule 2.121(c).

Dates remain as set in the Board's September 9, 2009 order.

---

<sup>1</sup> In the filing, applicant states that it "objects to such scheduling as an abuse of the Board's discretion." (Filing, p. 3.) The statement is embedded in applicant's discussion of why opposer's motion for summary judgment should be dismissed as untimely.