

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

Mailed: March 20, 2009

Opposition No. 91187465

Davis Industries, Inc.

v.

LIBERTY PETROLEUM, LLC

Karl Kochersperger, Paralegal

Applicant's consented motion filed March 19, 2009 to suspend and extend trial dates, including the deadline for discovery conference is noted.<sup>1</sup>

In applicant's motion, applicant seeks, with an allegation of opposer's consent, time for the parties to negotiate settlement. The parties are reminded that the trademark rules place on the parties a shared responsibility to conference to discuss the scope of the pleadings, the possibility of settlement and planning for disclosures and discovery, as explained in the notice of institution. The Board does not find in applicant's motion good cause to delay the parties' required conference to allow for settlement talks when the parties are required to discuss settlement in the conference. See "Miscellaneous Changes to

---

<sup>1</sup> Applicant's motion does not indicate proof of service of a copy of same on counsel for opposer as required by Trademark Rule 2.119. Future filings must comply with the service requirements in

Trademark Trial and Appeal Board Rules," 72 Fed. Reg. 42242, 42245 (Aug. 1, 2007):

if a motion to extend or suspend for settlement talks, arbitration or mediation is not filed prior to answer, then the parties will have to proceed, after the answer is filed, to their discovery conference, one point of which is to discuss settlement. It is unlikely the Board will find good cause for a motion to extend or suspend for settlement if the motion is filed after answer but prior to the discovery conference, precisely because the discovery conference itself provides an opportunity to discuss settlement.

Inasmuch as the circumstances recited in the extension request are not deemed to be extraordinary in nature, the request is denied. Conferencing, disclosure, discovery and trial dates remain as set. See Trademark Rule 2.120(a)(2).

**NEWS FROM THE TTAB:**

The USPTO published a notice of final rulemaking in the Federal Register on August 1, 2007, at 72 F.R. 42242. By this notice, various rules governing Trademark Trial and Appeal Board inter partes proceedings are amended. Certain amendments have an effective date of August 31, 2007, while most have an effective date of November 1, 2007. For further information, the parties are referred to a reprint of the final rule and a chart summarizing the affected rules, their changes, and effective dates, both viewable on the USPTO website via these web addresses:

<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/com/sol/notices/72fr42242.pdf>  
[http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/com/sol/notices/72fr42242\\_FinalRuleChart.pdf](http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/com/sol/notices/72fr42242_FinalRuleChart.pdf)

By one rule change effective August 31, 2007, the Board's standard protective order is made applicable to all TTAB inter partes cases, whether already pending or commenced on or after that date. However, as explained in the final rule and chart, this change will not affect any case in which any protective order has already been approved or imposed by the

---

Trademark Rule 2.119 and TBMP Section 113 (2d ed. rev. 2004). The Board may decline to consider future non-compliant filings.

Board. Further, as explained in the final rule, parties are free to agree to a substitute protective order or to supplement or amend the standard order even after August 31, 2007, subject to Board approval. The standard protective order can be viewed using the following web address:  
<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/dcom/ttab/tbmp/stndagmnt.htm>