

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA404406**

Filing date: **04/19/2011**

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

Proceeding	91198852
Party	Defendant Big Score Entertainment, LLC dba BSE Recordings
Correspondence Address	BRIAN C ROCHE ROCHE PIA LLC TWO CORPORATE DRIVE, SUITE 248 SHELTON, CT 06484 UNITED STATES broche@rochepia.comm gpia@rochepia.com
Submission	Reply in Support of Motion
Filer's Name	Brian C. Roche
Filer's e-mail	broche@rochepia.com
Signature	/BCR/
Date	04/19/2011
Attachments	Reply Brief Motion to Suspend - FINAL.pdf ( 4 pages )(33647 bytes ) Ex A - Chriswells Motion to Dismiss - DConn.pdf ( 20 pages )(411134 bytes ) Ex B - NDIL Chriswells Complaint.pdf ( 2 pages )(42824 bytes ) Ex C - DConn Docket Report 4-19-11.pdf ( 3 pages )(92364 bytes )

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

In the matter of Application Serial No.: 77751586  
Date of Application: June 3, 2009  
Trademark: ARIKA KANE

_____ )	
ERICA M. CHRISWELL, )	
Opposer, )	
v. )	
BIG SCORE ENTERTAINMENT, LLC, )	Opposition No. 91198852
Applicant. )	
_____ )	

**REPLY BRIEF IN FURTHER SUPPORT OF MOTION TO SUSPEND PROCEEDING  
IN VIEW OF PENDING CIVIL ACTION PURSUANT TO TRADEMARK RULE 2.117(a)**

Respondent, Big Score Entertainment, LLC (“Applicant” or “BSE”), by its attorneys Roche Pia LLC, hereby submits this reply brief in further support of its motion for suspension of these proceedings pursuant to Trademark Rule 2.117(a), 37 C.F.R. § 2.117(a). The purpose of this reply brief is to address the questionable and inaccurate statements articulated in “Opposer’s Response to Applicant’s Motion to Suspend the Proceedings Pending Civil Litigation” dated April 14, 2011.

The Opposer, Erica M. Chriswell through counsel, represents to the Trial and Appeal Board that there is no active ongoing litigation in the District of Connecticut and that the “Opposer has not received notice of such litigation.” The Opposer’s statement is simply not true. ***In fact, the Opposer has filed pleadings in the ongoing litigation as demonstrated by Exhibit A, attached hereto.*** How the Opposer, whose motion is

currently pending before the U.S. District Court, can make this claim in light of the fact that she is actively involved in the District of Connecticut action is puzzling at best. What is even more disturbing is that the Opposer has attempted to commence a similar lawsuit in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois and has failed to advise TTAB of **that litigation** in her most recent submission. See Exhibit B, attached hereto.

The Opposer is aware of the ongoing litigation in the District of Connecticut. A true and accurate copy of the online docket sheet related to that action is attached as Exhibit C. This online docket sheet – like any docket regarding any action pending in a United States federal court – is readily available to the Opposer and her counsel, and of course to the TTAB, which can take judicial notice of the pending litigation.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Opposer also makes reference to the failure to submit “proof of service” to the TTAB. This is a barely-veiled attempt to re-argue what Opposer has now argued (1) in her original opposition to the TTAB, (2) in the U.S. District Court for the District of Connecticut, and (3) even before the Connecticut Grievance Committee, in a baseless grievance action – namely, her belief that no proof of service exists. As has been explained to Opposer on numerous occasions, and to Opposer’s counsel personally, proof of service in accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 and Conn. Gen. Stat. § 52-59b is on file in the District of Connecticut – and publicly accessible to Opposer, Opposer’s counsel, and the TTAB. The continued belief (or at least continued representation) that proof of service does not exist, and Opposer’s counsel’s implicit suggestion of same to the TTAB, is inexplicable given that such proof has always been on file with the Court *and has been served on Opposer* in the District of Connecticut litigation.

For all those reasons set forth above, as well as in Respondent's original motion, Respondent respectfully requests that its motion to suspend be granted.

Respectfully Submitted,

By:



---

Brian C. Roche  
Gerald C. Pia, Jr.  
Roche Pia LLC  
Two Corporate Dr., Suite 248  
Shelton, CT 06484  
203.944.0235 (telephone)  
203.567.8033 (facsimile)  
broche@rochepia.com  
gpia@rochepia.com

*Attorneys for Applicant  
Big Score Entertainment, LLC*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing was filed electronically and served on counsel for Opposer, on this 19<sup>th</sup> day of April, 2011, by sending same via Federal Express to:

Evan Anderson  
Patel & Alunit, P.C.  
16830 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 360  
Encino, CA 91436



---

Brian C. Roche  
Gerald C. Pia


*Attorneys for Applicant*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

BIG SCORE ENTERTAINMENT, LLC. )  
PLAINTIFF, )

CIVIL ACTION  
3:10cv1993(CFD)

VS.



ERICA CHRISWELL  
DEFENDANT,

Feb. 18, 2011

Notice of Motion/ANSWER

TO: JUDGE DRONEY OR PRESIDING JUDGE  
TO: BIG SCORE ENTERTAINMENT % BRIAN ROCHE ESQ.

You are hereby notified that on N/A,  
at N/A or as soon as counsel may be heard I  
have answered to the court with regard to the  
above CIVIL ACTION BY ENTERING THE ATTACHED MOTION  
TO DISMISS ON BASIS OF NOT FOLLOWING PROCEDURE  
TO SERVE PARTIES INVOLVED IN SAID ACTION AS REQUIRED  
BY THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT.

Erica M. Chriswell  
ERICA CHRISWELL  
8046 Narragansett  
Burbank, IL 60459  
(312) 656-1319

PROOF OF SERVICE

I, ERICA CHRISWELL HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I MAILED A COPY OF THE ABOVE  
NOTICE TOGETHER WITH THE DOCUMENTS REFERENCED HEREIN, TO THOSE  
LISTED ABOVE ON \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_ at or before 5:00p.  
WITH PROPER POSTAGE PRE PAID.

ERICA CHRISWELL

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

BIG SCORE ENTERTAINMENT, LLC.	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	CIVIL ACTION
vs.	)	3:10cv1993 (CFD)
	)	
ERICA CHRISWELL	)	
Defendant,	)	FEBRUARY 18, 2011
_____	)	

**MOTION TO DISMISS**  
**ON BASIS OF INVALID SERVICE**  
**NECESSARY TO GIVE THE COURT JURISDICTION**

NOW COMES The Defendant ERICA CHRISWELL as a pro se litigant to state "valid service is necessary to give the court jurisdiction of [the] person." White-Bowman Plumbing & Heating, Inc. v. Biafore, 182 Conn. 14, 16-17, 437 A.2d 833 (1980). "There is no substitute for 'in hand' or abode service . . . where jurisdiction over the person of a resident individual is sought unless a statute provides otherwise." (Internal quotation marks omitted.) Tarnopol v. Connecticut Siting Council, 212 Conn. 157, 163, 561 A.2d 931 (1989); see also Hyde v. Richard, 145 Conn. 24, 25, 138 A.2d 527 (1958) ("unless service of process is made as the statute prescribes, the court to which it is returnable does not acquire jurisdiction").

**INTRODUCTION**

On or about Nov of 2010, Erica Chriswell received notification from the USTPO that her mark "Eryka Kane" couldn't be approved due to a similar mark "Arika Kane" which was also pending registration due to a likelihood of confusion. The USTPO said Erica would have to oppose the "Arika Kane" mark sighting my common law use of the name and produce exhibits showing first use.

## ARGUMENT

1. Dec 9<sup>th</sup> 2010, Erica filed a notice for extension to file opposition with the USPTO on. The final date to oppose the Arika Kane Mark is 3/9/2011. Erica also contacted the owner of the "Arika Kane" mark by way of their Attorney of Record Brian Roche. Erica asked Brian who he was and who was the person he represented that was trying to trademark a name I'd first used in the marketplace as early as 1999. I then contacted Alan the who was sited as being an agent of Big Score Entertainment the Corporation applying to register the "Arika Kane" mark. I asked him to cease to use the mark as it was causing confusion in the marketplace. He said he thought his use of the mark was legitimate because he spelled it differently and my brand is no longer as popular as it was so he feels he has rights to take the mark.
2. Alan of Big Score Entertainment then began to use malicious tactics by sending me text messages promoting his artist Arika Kane. I called him and told him I would be filing suit against him in court for malicious infringement.
3. Some two weeks later around early January I received a call from a guy named Larry who told me he was a Process Server for Big Score Entertainment. I then told Larry that I was not in town and would contact him when I arrived back at my place of residence.
4. On Jan 28<sup>th</sup> 2011 A Notice for Entry of Default was Filed by Brian Roche for Big Score Entertainment
5. On Feb 2, 2011 I was presented a copy of the Notice of Entry of Default by way of regular US Mail **Exhibit 1 Notice of Entry Of Default with copy of envelope it was delivered in**
6. On Feb 2, 2011 I filed a complaint with the Statewide Bar Counsel regarding Roche not abiding by the Supreme Court Rules Regarding Proof Of Service. **Exhibit 2 Complaint sent to Grievance Counsel Copy of Certified Mail Receipt**
7. On Feb 4, 2011 Roche mailed me a response by way of priority mail with regard to a voice mail message I'd left for him stating I was reporting him to the Grievance Committee for not following proper proof of service procedures **Exhibit 3 Letter from Roche Pia To Erica Copy of Priority Mail Label**
8. On Feb 14<sup>th</sup> 2011 I mailed Roche a letter back stating I'd never received any documents regarding the complaint allegedly filed against me. I told him in


the letter I had received no information what so ever on the details of the case as provided by way of personal service to my place of residence.

**Exhibit 4 Letter I wrote to Roche Pia and Certified Mail Receipt**

CONCLUSION

The actions of Big Score Entertainment's Counsel to certify he served me under the rules of the Supreme Court are untrue. As soon as I saw the notice of default I was thrown aback and in question as to what I was in default for. A person must be served at their place of residence and counsel must retain proof of service and be able to furnish it upon the request of the court. I move to dismiss the case 3:10cv1993 (CFD) on the grounds of counsel for plaintiff not properly following service procedure set forth by the rules of the United States Supreme Court.

Wherefore, we pray the court dismisses this case with prejudice.



Erica Chriswell      Date  
8046 Narragansett  
Burbank, Il. 60459

# EXHIBIT 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT

BIG SCORE ENTERTAINMENT, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

ERICA M. CHRISWELL,

Defendant.

CIVIL ACTION NO.  
3:10cv1993 (CFD)

JANUARY 28, 2011

MOTION FOR ENTRY OF DEFAULT

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 55(a), the plaintiff, Big Score Entertainment, LLC ("BSE"), moves for entry of default against the defendant, Erica M. Chriswell ("Chriswell" or "Defendant"). In support of this Motion, BSE would show that:

1. BSE commenced this action against Defendant on or about December 20, 2010, raising, among other things, claims of trademark infringement.
2. On January 6, 2011, BSE served Defendant consistent with Conn. Gen. Stat. § 52-59b(c). See also Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(e) ("an individual ... may be served in a judicial district of the United States by: (1) following state law for serving a summons in an action brought in courts of general jurisdiction in the state where the district court is located...").
3. BSE filed the executed return of service on January 11, 2011. [Doc. # 11.]
4. On January 13, 2011, counsel for BSE provided additional notice of the pending litigation to Defendant, in the form of an email sent to the email address submitted by Defendant to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office in 2010.



CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that, on the date hereon, a copy of the foregoing was filed electronically and served by mail on anyone unable to accept electronic filing. Notice of this filing will be sent by e-mail to all parties by operation of the Court's electronic filing system or by mail to anyone unable to accept electronic filing as indicated on the Notice of Electronic Filing. Parties may access this filing through the Court's CM/ECF System.

*Courtesy copy to be mailed to Defendant via First Class Mail*

/s/

Brian C. Roche - (ct 17975)


Gerald C. Pia (ct 21296)

**ROCHE PIA** LLC  
Lawyers for the 21st Century

Two Corporate Drive, Suite 248  
Shelton, CT 06484

Barbara M. Chittenden  
8066 Munro Road  
Fairfield, CT 06424

8045311410



# EXHIBIT 2

Erica M. Chriswell  
8046 Narragansett  
Burbank, IL. 60459  
312-656-1319

2/2/2011

Statewide Bar Counsel  
287 Main Street Suite 2 Second Floor  
East Hartford, CT. 06118-1885

Enclosed please find Grievance for Review:

Citizen Filing Complaint: Erica Chriswell  
Case Number: 3:10cv1993 (CFD)

Attorney(s) to which complaint is being filed against: Brian Roche/Gerald Pia  
Address of Record: Roche Pia LLC  
Brian Roche ct-17975  
Gerald Pia Jr. ct-21296  
Two Corporate Drive, Suite 248  
Shelton, CT. 06484

Phone: 203-944-0235

I am writing to report unethical behavior by the above law firm.  
On Feb 2<sup>nd</sup> 2011, I received by way of US postal mail a MOTION FOR ENTRY OF DEFAULT. I was never served any document by this law firm in order to give them the right to seek a motion for entry of default. I would like the review board to follow up on this grievance and ask the attorney to produce proof of service.

Further more, this attorney has taken up a frivolous lawsuit, he did no research to find out if his client has legal basis to pursue a lawsuit. If he'd simply in this information age done a hour's worth of research he would clearly see that his client is blatantly infringing on my common law trademark which I have been using in the market place consistently since 1999, while his client alleges first use of a similar mark in 2008. This attorney is stringing along his client with false promises and legally misadvising his client for the sake of making a buck. If a lawyer files a lawsuit 1<sup>st</sup> he should have a legal basis on which to do so and have done proper research to conclude that he is taking an appropriate action. Secondly, a lawyer must follow the proper service procedures. This attorney has done none of the above.


When dealing with a company's intellectual property or trademarks I would think an ethical lawyer would follow the law to the letter to ensure he does not become liable himself and at risk to be sued but this attorney seems to believe he is above the laws set forth by the Supreme Court regarding proof of service. He also believes he can take cases without determining if they have any merit. A 5 minute Google search would have

determined that his client has committed trademark infringement. Also his client admitted to me that they thought using my mark was fine "because they spelled it differently". This case is being reviewed by the United States Trademark Office and my attorneys have began actions to oppose their mark for registration citing my common law use of the name since 1999. After speaking with the attorney's client and informing them that I was going to sue for malicious infringement Roche LLC then hurried into court and filed some suit against me, which I have never received any doc's as to what the suit involves.

This law firm has clearly behaved unethically and I would like this matter reviewed.

See Attached Exhibit A THE MOTION FOR ENTRY OF DEFAULT

Thank you,



Erica Chriswell  
312. 656.1319

**SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION**

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Also complete item 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

**COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY**

A. Signature  X *D. Coossein*  Agent

B. Received by (Printed Name)  Addressee

C. Date of Delivery

D. Is delivery address different from item 1?  Yes  No  
 If YES, enter delivery address below: **RI**

1. Article Addressed to:  
 Statewide Bar Counsel  
 287 Main Street 2nd Fl #2  
 East Hartford, CT.  
 06118-1885  
 RE: Complaint Roche LLC

**GHIE**

3. Service Type
- Certified Mail
  - Registered
  - Insured Mail
  - Express Mail
  - Return Receipt for Merchandise
  - C.O.D.

4. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee)  Yes

2. Article Number: 7010 1060 0002 1810 2044

(Transfer from seal)

PS Form 3811, February 2004 Domestic Return Receipt 102595-02-M-1540

# EXHIBIT 3

# ROCHE PIA LLC

Lawyers for the 21st Century

CYBERLAW  
INTERNET PIRACY  
DOMAIN NAME DISPUTES  
COMPUTER CRIMES  
TRADE SECRETS  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY  
LITIGATION

Email replies to:  
[gpia@rochepia.com](mailto:gpia@rochepia.com)

## VIA PRIORITY MAIL

February 4, 2011

Ms. Erica M. Chriswell  
8046 Narragansett  
Burbank, IL 60459

**Re: Big Score Entertainment, LLC v. Erica M. Chriswell  
Case No. 3:10cv1993(CFD) - District of Connecticut**


Dear Ms. Chriswell:

We have received two voicemails left by you at our office. In those voicemails, you indicated that you dispute the sufficiency of service of process in this case and dispute the claims alleged by the Plaintiff in the Complaint. These are not matters that can be handled by voicemail or on the telephone. Those are issues that may be addressed in the context of this litigation.

With respect to the remainder of your voicemails, please be advised that personal threats against our firm will not cause us to act in a manner inconsistent with our client's best interest. Suffice it to say, we refute your allegations.

BSE intends to alert the court to the contents of your voicemails in the context of its next pleading. Thank you for confirming that you are on actual notice of the pendency of this litigation.

Sincerely,



Gerald C. Pia, Jr., Esq.

GCP/lr

ine - Go to usps.com/postageonline

FIRMLY

PLEASE PRESS FIRMLY

TY®

# Flat Rate Mailing Envelope

For Domestic and International Use

CE



 <b>UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE®</b> <b>Click-N-Ship®</b>	usps.com 9405 5036 9930 0495 3563 77 0047 5000 0156 0459 <b>\$4.75</b> <b>US-POSTAGE</b> Flat Rate™ 02/04/11 0 lb 1.0 oz Commercial Base Pricing Mailed from 06+84 071V00552023	 <b>USPS PRIORITY MAIL®</b>	Ref#: 150003 <b>0006</b>  GERALD C PIA ROCHE PIA LLC 2 CORPORATE DR STE 248 SHELTON CT 06484-6213  SHIP TO: ERICA CHRISWELL 8046 NARRAGANSETT AVE BURBANK IL 60459-1810	<b>ZIP - e/ USPS DELIVERY CONFIRMATION™</b>  <b>420 60459 9405 5036 9930 0495 3563 77</b>	Electronic Rate Approved #038555749
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	-------------------------------------



# EXHIBIT 4

Erica Chriswell  
8046 Narragansett  
Burbank, IL 60459  
(312)6561319


Roche Pia LLC  
Two Corporate Drive Suite 248  
Shelton, CT. 06484

Feb 12, 2011

To Whom It May Concern:

You received a voice mail from me which stated I'd received a notice of default in the mail. Unfortunately, I am unaware of what the notice of Default details because I was never properly served as required by law. Therefore because I left you a message informing you that I was going to report you to the Statewide Grievance Committee due to you not following proper service procedure's—still does not inform me of what your meritless lawsuit is or the complaint set forth therein. Therefore I have no idea of the court room, judge, date of court, what the complaint is ---nothing. You did not do your job as a lawyer and you are being reported as a result. I hope you can produce the return of service document which prompted you to provide a statement and affidavit to the court stating that I was properly served. You should therefore be able to produce the proof of service you allegedly served on me. I myself as well as The Statewide Grievance Committee would like to see it.

Thank you for being an unethical lawyer,

  
Erica Chriswell

7010 2780 0000 7251 0963

**U.S. Postal Service<sup>TM</sup>**  
**CERTIFIED MAIL<sup>®</sup> RECEIPT**  
(Domestic Mail Only; No Insurance Coverage Provided)

For delivery information visit our website at [www.usps.com](http://www.usps.com)

**OFFICIAL USE**

Postage	\$ 04.44	0455
Certified Fee	\$2.80	13
Return Receipt Fee (Endorsement Required)	\$2.30	Postmark Here
Restricted Delivery Fee (Endorsement Required)	\$0.00	
Total Postage & Fees	\$ 05.54	02/14/2011

Sent To: Rocke PIA LLC  
 Street, Apt. No. or PO Box No.: 100 Corporate Drive # 248  
 City, State, ZIP+4: Stelton, CT, 06484

PS Form 3800, August 2006 See Reverse for Instructions

# Affidavit of Verification

I, ERICA Chriswell certify under oath and any state penalties provided by law that the facts alleged in this document are true and correct.

Erica M. Chriswell

ERICA M. Chriswell Feb 18, 2011

ERICA CHRISWELL )

Plaintiff )

v. )

BIG SCORE Entertainment )

Defendant )

United States District Court  
Northern District of Illinois

1:11-cv-00861

Judge Edmond E. Chang

Magistrate Judge Sidney I. Schenkier

COMPLAINT

See Attached


RECEIVED

FEB - 8 2011

FEB 8 2011

MICHAEL W. DOBBINS

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT



Attorney No Pro Se 99500



Erica Chriswell	)
Plaintiffs,	)NO: _____
	)
vs.	)
	) CALENDAR: _____
	)
BIG SCORE ENTERTAINMENT LLC	)
Defendants,	)

**COMPLAINT**

Erica Chriswell DBA Eryka Kane has been in use of the trademark "ERYKA KANE" in digital and sound recordings since 1999. Big Score Entertainment has infringed upon her mark by promoting an artist called Arika Kane in digital and sound recordings as well. It has caused confusion in the marketplace and deceived the public. Erica Chriswell is seeking damages of \$600,000.00 for malicious trademark infringement. On or around Dec 15<sup>th</sup>, 2010 Erica Chriswell contacted an agent of the company by the name of Alan, and spoke with him about the infringement. Erica asked that they please refrain from continuing to infringe upon her mark. At that time Alan stated that they felt it was okay to continue to use the mark because they are spelled differently. Any sound business person knows that a different spelling does not change the phonetic pronunciation. Instead of pulling back all promotional activity, Big Score Entertainment, went out and did more marketing in an attempt to maliciously promote their artist and further confuse my fan base. I have sold over 1,750,000 records using the trademark(s) Ms. Kane, Eryika Kane, Eryka Kane and Ms. Eryka Kane.

*Erica M. Chriswell 2/7/2011*

EricaChriswell Pro Se 99500  
8046 Narragansett  
Burbank, Illinois 60459  
(312) 656-1319

EFILE

**U.S. District Court**  
**United States District Court for the District of Connecticut (New Haven)**  
**CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 3:10-cv-01993-CFD**

Big Score Entertainment, LLC v. Chriswell  
Assigned to: Judge Christopher F. Droney  
Demand: \$75,000  
Cause: 15:1125 Trademark Infringement (Lanham Act)

Date Filed: 12/20/2010  
Jury Demand: Plaintiff  
Nature of Suit: 840 Trademark  
Jurisdiction: Federal Question

**Plaintiff****Big Score Entertainment, LLC**

represented by **Brian C. Roche**  
Roche Pia LLC  
Two Corporate Dr., Suite 248  
Shelton, CT 06484  
203-944-0235  
Email: broche@rochepia.com  
**LEAD ATTORNEY**  
**ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED**

**Gerald C. Pia , Jr.**  
Roche Pia LLC  
Two Corporate Dr., Suite 248  
Shelton, CT 06484  
203-944-0235  
Fax: 203-567-8033  
Email: gpia@rochepia.com  
**LEAD ATTORNEY**  
**ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED**

V.

**Defendant****Erica M. Chriswell**

<b>Date Filed</b>	<b>#</b>	<b>Docket Text</b>
12/20/2010	<a href="#"><u>1</u></a>	COMPLAINT against Erica M. Chriswell, filed by Big Score Entertainment, LLC.(Payton, R.) (Entered: 12/21/2010)
12/20/2010		Filing fee received from Roche Pia LLC: \$ 350.00, receipt number CTXB00000087 (Payton, R.) (Entered: 12/21/2010)
12/20/2010	<a href="#"><u>2</u></a>	Order on Pretrial Deadlines: Motions to Dismiss due on 3/20/2011. Amended Pleadings due by 2/18/2011 Discovery due by 6/21/2011 Dispositive Motions due by 7/21/2011. Signed by Clerk on 12/20/2010. (Payton, R.) (Entered: 12/21/2010)

12/20/2010	<a href="#">3</a>	ELECTRONIC FILING ORDER - PLEASE ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH COURTESY COPY REQUIREMENTS IN THIS ORDER. Signed by Judge Christopher F. Droney on 12/20/2010. (Payton, R.) (Entered: 12/21/2010)
12/20/2010	<a href="#">4</a>	NOTICE of Appearance by Brian C. Roche on behalf of Big Score Entertainment, LLC (Payton, R.) (Entered: 12/21/2010)
12/20/2010	<a href="#">5</a>	NOTICE of Appearance by Gerald C. Pia, Jr on behalf of Big Score Entertainment, LLC (Payton, R.) (Entered: 12/21/2010)
12/20/2010	<a href="#">6</a>	Corporate Disclosure Statement by Big Score Entertainment, LLC. (Payton, R.) (Entered: 12/21/2010)
12/20/2010	<a href="#">7</a>	AO 120 Report on the Filing of An Action re: Patent or Trademark Form Completed (Attachments: # <a href="#">1</a> Complaint) (Payton, R.) (Entered: 12/21/2010)
12/20/2010	<a href="#">8</a>	Summons Issued as to Erica M. Chriswell. Counsel receiving this electronic notice should download the attached summons for service in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 4 and LR 4. (Payton, R.) (Entered: 12/21/2010)
12/20/2010	<a href="#">9</a>	NOTICE TO COUNSEL: Counsel initiating or removing this action is responsible for serving all parties with attached documents and copies of <a href="#">3</a> Electronic Filing Order, <a href="#">4</a> Notice of Appearance filed by Big Score Entertainment, LLC, <a href="#">2</a> Order on Pretrial Deadlines, <a href="#">6</a> Corporate Disclosure Statement filed by Big Score Entertainment, LLC, <a href="#">1</a> Complaint filed by Big Score Entertainment, LLC, <a href="#">5</a> Notice of Appearance filed by Big Score Entertainment, LLC. Signed by Clerk on 12/20/2010. (Payton, R.) (Entered: 12/21/2010)
12/21/2010	<a href="#">10</a>	DEMAND for Trial by Jury by Big Score Entertainment, LLC. (Pia, Gerald) (Entered: 12/21/2010)
01/11/2011	<a href="#">11</a>	SUMMONS Returned Executed by Big Score Entertainment, LLC. Erica M. Chriswell served on 1/6/2011, answer due 1/27/2011. (Pia, Gerald) (Entered: 01/11/2011)
01/28/2011	<a href="#">12</a>	MOTION for Default Entry 55(a) as to Erica M. Chriswell by Big Score Entertainment, LLC. (Pia, Gerald) (Entered: 01/28/2011)
01/28/2011	13	ORDER granting <a href="#">12</a> Motion for Default Entry 55(a) Motion for default judgment due by 2/27/2011. A Motion for Default Judgment pursuant to FRCP 55(b) shall be filed or this action will be dismissed by the Clerk pursuant to Rule 41(b) FRCP.. Signed by Clerk on 2/8/11. (Johnson, D.) (Entered: 02/08/2011)
02/17/2011	<a href="#">14</a>	Supplemental SUMMONS Returned Executed by Big Score Entertainment, LLC. (Pia, Gerald) (Entered: 02/17/2011)
02/17/2011	<a href="#">15</a>	MOTION for Default Judgment as to Erica M. Chriswell by Big Score Entertainment, LLC. (Attachments: # <a href="#">1</a> Affidavit, # <a href="#">2</a> Text of Proposed Order)(Pia, Gerald) (Entered: 02/17/2011)
02/17/2011	<a href="#">16</a>	Memorandum in Support re <a href="#">15</a> MOTION for Default Judgment as to Erica M. Chriswell filed by Big Score Entertainment, LLC. (Attachments: # <a href="#">1</a> Exhibit 1 - Affidavit of Process Server, # <a href="#">2</a> Exhibit 2 - Summons Returned Executed, # <a href="#">3</a> Exhibit 3 - USPS Delivery Confirmation, # <a href="#">4</a> Exhibit 4 - Complaint (Illinois Action))(Pia, Gerald) (Entered: 02/17/2011)

02/22/2011	<a href="#">17</a>	Notice & MOTION to Dismiss on Basis of Invalid Service Necessary to Give the Court Jurisdiction by Erica M. Chriswell.Responses due by 3/15/2011 (Gothers, M.) (Entered: 02/24/2011)
02/25/2011	18	NOTICE TO COUNSEL OF E-FILE CALENDAR: <b>DEFAULT JUDGMENT HEARING is set for 3/14/2011 at 10:00 AM</b> in North Courtroom, 2nd Floor, 450 Main St., Hartford, CT before Judge Christopher F. Droney. Each side will have 20 minutes for argument. ALL PERSONS ENTERING THE COURTHOUSE MUST PRESENT PHOTO IDENTIFICATION. (Szczygiel, G.) (Entered: 02/25/2011)
03/11/2011	19	ORDER continuing default judgment hearing for March 14, 2011, to a date in the future in light of Defendant's filing of Docket number 17. Docket number 17 shall be interpreted as a motion to reopen the default, and Plaintiff shall have 21 days in which to respond to it. Signed by Judge Christopher F. Droney on 3/11/11. (Droney, Christopher) (Entered: 03/11/2011)
03/31/2011	<a href="#">20</a>	Memorandum in Opposition to Motion to Reopen, or, in the alternative, Objection to Motion to Dismiss re <a href="#">17</a> MOTION to Dismiss filed by Big Score Entertainment, LLC. (Pia, Gerald) (Entered: 03/31/2011)

**PACER Service Center**

**Transaction Receipt**

04/19/2011 10:37:29

<b>PACER Login:</b>	rp1889	<b>Client Code:</b>	160.001
<b>Description:</b>	Docket Report	<b>Search Criteria:</b>	3:10-cv-01993-CFD
<b>Billable Pages:</b>	2	<b>Cost:</b>	0.16