

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA441925**

Filing date: **11/18/2011**

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

Proceeding	91202575
Party	Defendant Motorola Trademark Holdings, LLC
Correspondence Address	WILLIAM R ANDERSON MOTOROLA TRADEMARK HOLDINGS LLC 600 NORTH US HIGHWAY 45 LIBERTYVILLE, IL 60048-5343 UNITED STATES
Submission	Motion to Suspend for Civil Action
Filer's Name	Cathay Y. N. Smith
Filer's e-mail	kristin.achterhof@kattenlaw.com, cathay.smith@kattenlaw.com
Signature	/s/
Date	11/18/2011
Attachments	MOTOROLA XOOM TTAB Action - Notice of Related Civil Action.pdf (43 pages) (689862 bytes)

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

XOOM CORPORATION,)	
)	
Opposer,)	Opposition No. 91202575
)	
v.)	
)	
MOTOROLA TRADEMARK HOLDINGS, LLC,)	
)	
Applicant.)	
)	

**NOTICE OF RELATED CIVIL ACTION
AND REQUEST TO SUSPEND PROCEEDING**

In accordance with the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board’s (“Board”) November 16, 2011 order (Docket No. 2), 37 CFR § 2.117(a), and TBMP 510.02(a), Applicant Motorola Trademark Holdings, LLC (“Applicant”) hereby notifies the Board that the parties in this Opposition No. 91202575 (the “Board Proceeding”) are parties in a civil action involving the same marks and similar issues of law and fact that overlap with the Board Proceeding, and Applicant further requests that the Board suspend the Board Proceeding pending resolution of the Civil Action. Specifically, Applicant states as follows:

1. On February 23, 2011, Opposer Xoom Corporation (“Opposer”) filed a complaint in the United States District Court for the Northern District of California against Applicant for trademark infringement, unfair competition, false designation of origin, false advertising and unfair business practices arising from Applicant’s alleged adoption and/or use of the XOOM or MOTOROLA XOOM brand for Applicant’s mobile computer and related accessories (the “Civil Action”). A copy of the Complaint filed by Opposer in the Civil Action is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**, and a copy of the Answer and Affirmative Defenses filed by Applicant in the Civil Action is attached hereto as **Exhibit B**.

2. In the Civil Action, Opposer, as plaintiff, requests that Applicant, as defendant, be enjoined from using "XOOM" or "MOTOROLA XOOM," and alleges that Applicant's use of XOOM or MOTOROLA XOOM for its mobile computer and related accessories is likely to cause confusion with Opposer's XOOM brand and services. Similarly, in the Board Proceeding, Opposer has opposed Applicant's application for the mark MOTOROLA XOOM for "mobile computers and related accessories" based on an alleged likelihood of confusion with Opposer's XOOM marks and registrations.

3. Pursuant to 37 CFR § 2.117(a), whenever it shall come to the attention of the Board that a party or parties to a pending case are engaged in a civil action which may have a bearing on the case, proceedings before the Board may be suspended until termination of the civil action. It is the policy of the Board to suspend proceedings when the parties are involved in a civil action which may be dispositive of or have a bearing on the Board proceeding. *See, e.g., Dallas C. Brown Jr. v. Courtney L. Bishop*, Can. No. 92050965, 2010 WL 2946844, at *3 (TTAB 2010); *George Vais v. Vais Arms, Inc.*, Opposition No. 91154485, 2004 WL 390936, at *1 (TTAB 2004). Suspension of a Board proceeding is appropriate even if the civil case may not be dispositive of the Board proceeding, so long as the ruling will have a bearing on the rights of the parties in the Board proceeding. *See Society of Mexican American*, Opp. No. 121723, 2002 WL 31488947, at *4 (TTAB 2002) (citing *Martin Beverage Co. Inc. v. Colita Beverage Company*, 169 USPQ 568, 570 (TTAB 1971)).


4. The Civil Action involves issues in common with those in the Proceeding before the Board, and the final resolution of the Civil Action may be dispositive of all of the issues involved in the Board Proceeding.

5. Accordingly, in accordance with 37 CFR § 2.117(a), in the interest of judicial economy and to prevent the potential for inconsistent rulings on issues similar in the Board Proceeding and the Civil Action, and because the decision of the District Court would be binding on this Board, Applicant respectfully requests that the Board suspend the Board Proceeding (Opposition No. 91202575) pending outcome of the Civil Action.

Date: November 18, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicant Motorola Trademark Holdings, LLC



Kristin J. Achterhof
Cathay Y. N. Smith
KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP
525 West Monroe Street
Chicago, Illinois 60661-3693
Telephone: (312) 902-5200
Facsimile: (312) 902-1061

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have caused a true and correct copy of the Notice of Related Proceedings and Request to Suspend to be served upon:

Rochelle D. Alpert
Morgan Lewis & Bockius LLP
One Market, Spear Street Tower
San Francisco, CA 94105

by First Class Mail, postage prepaid, this 18th day of November, 2011.


Cathay Y. N. Smith

Exhibit A

Xoom Corporation v. Motorola Trademark Holdings, LLC
Opposition No. 91202575

Applicant's Exhibit

1 ROCHELLE D. ALPERT, State Bar No. 065037
2 LEIGHA E. WILBUR, State Bar No. 251795
3 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
4 One Market, Spear Street Tower
5 San Francisco, CA 94105-1126
6 Tel: 415.442.1326
7 Fax: 415.442.1001
8 E-mail: ralpert@morganlewis.com
9 lwilbur@morganlewis.com

FILED
2011 FEB 23 P 3:27
RICHARD W. WILKINSON
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
E-filing
⑨
RSS
φ

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff
7 XOOM CORPORATION

8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JCS

10 XOOM CORPORATION, a California Corporation,
11 Corporation,

CV11 Case No. 0848

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

COMPLAINT FOR TRADEMARK AND
TRADE NAME INFRINGEMENT,
UNFAIR COMPETITION, FALSE
DESIGNATION OF ORIGIN, FALSE
ADVERTISING AND UNFAIR BUSINESS
PRACTICES

14 MOTOROLA TRADEMARK
15 HOLDINGS, LLC, a Delaware limited
16 liability company, MOTOROLA
17 MOBILITY, INC., a Delaware corporation,
18 and MOTOROLA MOBILITY
19 HOLDINGS, INC., a Delaware
20 corporation, and DOES 1 through 10
21 inclusive

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

22 Defendants.

20 Plaintiff Xoom Corporation ("Xoom") for its Complaint against Defendants alleges as
21 follows:

22 1. Xoom brings this action against Defendants Motorola Trademark Holdings, LLC,
23 Motorola Mobility, Inc. and Motorola Mobility Holdings, Inc. and DOES 1 through 10
24 (collectively "Defendants" or "Motorola") for trademark infringement, false designation of
25 origin, unfair competition, false advertising and unfair business practices in violation of the
26 Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1114(1), and 1125(a)(1), California Business and Professions Code
27 §§ 17200 *et seq.*, and § 14335, and common law, arising from Defendants' adoption and/or use of
28 the identical XOOM brand for Defendants' mobile computer and related products and services

1 offered to consumers via the Internet, which products and services are directly related to the
2 products Xoom has long offered using its federally registered, incontestable XOOM® mark and
3 its Xoom trade name to consumers via the Internet and accessible on computers and mobile
4 devices over the Internet. Defendants' adoption and/or use of the XOOM and MOTOROLA
5 XOOM brand has caused and is likely to continue to cause confusion with Xoom's long held and
6 incontestable XOOM® mark and Xoom's Xoom trade name.

7 PARTIES

8 2. Xoom Corporation is a California corporation, with its principal place of business
9 at 100 Bush Street, San Francisco, California 94104, doing business in San Francisco, throughout
10 the United States and in foreign countries, since at least as early as 2003 under the Xoom trade
11 name and the federally registered and incontestable XOOM® trademark.

12 3. Motorola Trademark Holdings, LLC is a Delaware limited liability company, with
13 its principal place of business at 600 North U.S. Highway 45, Libertyville, Illinois 60048.

14 4. Motorola Mobility, Inc. is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of
15 business at 600 North U.S. Highway 45, Libertyville, Illinois 60048.

16 5. Motorola Mobility Holdings, Inc. is a Delaware corporation with its principal
17 place of business at 600 North U.S. Highway 45, Libertyville, Illinois 60048.

18 6. Xoom is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Motorola
19 Trademark Holdings, LLC, Motorola Mobility, Inc. and Motorola Mobility Holdings, Inc. acted
20 together or in connection with DOES 1 through 10 in engaging in the acts giving rise to these
21 claims and that they are liable for the acts of each other as agents, conspirators, principals or alter
22 egos of each other in committing the acts described herein.

23 7. The true names and capacities of DOES 1 through 10 are unknown to Xoom,
24 which therefore sues such defendants by fictitious names. Xoom will seek leave to amend this
25 Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of such DOE defendants when the same are
26 ascertained. Xoom is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that each of the fictitiously
27 named defendants is responsible in some manner for the conduct, injuries and damages alleged in
28 this Complaint.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1
2 8. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over Xoom's federal, state and common
3 law claims of trademark infringement and unfair competition pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1121 and
4 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338(a)-(b), and 1367(a).

5 9. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Motorola, and venue is proper in this
6 district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 (b)-(c), because on information and belief, Motorola has a
7 presence in the state of California and in this District, and conducts regular and systematic
8 business in California and in this District, has purposefully availed itself of conducting business
9 in California and in this District, and/or the events giving rise to the claims alleged in this
10 complaint have a substantial effect in California and a substantial part of such events occurred in
11 this District. Xoom is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Motorola is qualified
12 to do business in California; Motorola sells, promotes and advertises its products and services in
13 California, including its XOOM mobile computer and related product offerings; and has offices
14 within California and in this District.

15 10. Xoom has its principal place of business in San Francisco, California, which is
16 located within this District and has suffered and will continue to suffer injury and harm in this
17 District as a result of Defendants' adoption and/or use of the Xoom designation without
18 authorization from Xoom.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

19
20 11. Xoom has long owned and prominently used the trade name Xoom and the
21 federally registered, incontestable trademark XOOM® for its online business. Since at least as
22 early as 2003, Xoom has offered consumers access to its remittance software services through its
23 www.xoom.com web site using its distinctive XOOM® mark and trade name. Through this long
24 online use accessible via computer and mobile devices, Xoom's trade name and the XOOM®
25 products have become associated exclusively with Xoom. Until Defendants' adoption of the
26 Xoom brand without authorization from Xoom, Xoom to its knowledge was the only entity
27 currently using the name or mark Xoom for online product offerings. Xoom secured the
28 www.xoom.com domain name in 2003 and has used it for its online product offerings.

1 12. At the website, xoom.com, and elsewhere on the Internet, Xoom features and
2 promotes Xoom's computer accessible, secure, fast and inexpensive remittance services, which
3 allow users to transmit monies through the xoom.com web site to more than 30 different
4 countries. The Xoom website and the XOOM® product offerings are available for use through
5 computers and mobile devices, including mobile or tablet computers.

6 13. As a result of its exclusive use since at least as early as 2003, the XOOM® mark
7 has become exclusively associated by consumers as a designation of source for Xoom's online
8 products, including its provision of online access to XOOM® product offerings.

9 14. Xoom owns an incontestable United States trademark registration for XOOM®,
10 Federal Registration No. 2,909,931, covering "providing business information, namely, on money
11 transfer services," and "money transfer services; electronic funds transfer services; bill payment
12 remittance services; electronic payment, namely, electronic processing and transmission of bill
13 payment data." The mark registered on December 14, 2004 and became incontestable with the
14 filing (and acceptance) of Xoom's Section 8 and 15 affidavits demonstrating continuous use of
15 the XOOM® mark for five years after registration. A true and correct copy of the registration
16 certificate is attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein as if fully set forth.

17 15. In an effort to exploit and improperly trade on Xoom's goodwill, to otherwise
18 diminish the value of the Xoom trade name and the XOOM® mark, and to confuse and mislead
19 consumers, Motorola without authorization deliberately and unlawfully appropriated Xoom's
20 trade name and trademark rights through its adoption and/or use of the XOOM and/or
21 MOTOROLA XOOM designations, and its intent-to-use application to register an identical
22 XOOM designation for mobile computers and related accessories, U.S. Application No.
23 85161358.

24 16. Motorola filed its intent-to-use trademark application for the XOOM designation
25 on October 26, 2010, well after Xoom adopted its trade name in 2003, well after Xoom began
26 offering its products under its XOOM® mark and name in 2003, well after the XOOM® mark
27 registered to Xoom, and well after the XOOM® federal trademark registration became
28 incontestable.

1 17. Xoom is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendants have
 2 promoted, advertised and marketed, and offered for sale in interstate commerce a mobile
 3 computer and related product offerings using Xoom's XOOM® mark. Defendants display the
 4 Xoom trademark alone and in lettering much larger than the Motorola wording on their website
 5 and in other advertisements, all of which are the subject of this Complaint.


6 18. By way of example, Defendants, on their website at motorola.com, allow users to
 7 view a commercial for their Xoom product offering, in which Defendants use Xoom's XOOM®
 8 mark on the screen of the device screen, very much like the XOOM® mark and name would
 9 appear on the screen if the xoom.com site was accessed online through the Defendants' Xoom
 10 device:



21 19. Defendants also have purchased the XOOM keyword on online search engines.
 22 Thus, when users conduct an online search for "Xoom" using the Google search engine,
 23 Defendants' advertisements for XOOM product offerings are featured, sometimes as the first
 24 result, and are listed before any of Xoom's own advertisements or links to Xoom's website. The
 25 outcome is similar on other search engines.

26 20. Resellers of Defendants' Xoom product offerings also have begun to purchase and
 27 use Xoom as a keyword and in headlines for the ads that they run on the Internet, all without any
 28 apparent objection from the Defendants.

21. Defendants' advertisements on the Internet also represent that they constitute the Xoom "Official Site," when that is not the case. For example, the following advertisement appeared after entering "xoom" as a search term using the Google search engine:



Indeed, Xoom has long used the wording "Official Site" in conjunction with its website at xoom.com and the products and services that it offers on the site, all of which increase the likelihood that consumers will be confused and misled as a result of Defendants' unauthorized use of Xoom's name and mark on the Internet, particularly with the wording "Official."

22. By engaging in this willful and deliberate conduct, Defendants have willfully infringed Xoom's trade name and federally registered trademark, creating a false association between Defendants and Xoom, when there is no association, and otherwise falsely and fraudulently representing the Xoom product offerings of Defendants to the public, and engaging in false advertising that is materially false and misleading to the public.

23. As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, the public is misled as to an association with Xoom, when there is none, and thereby Xoom has suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable injury and be otherwise harmed, along with consumers who are confused and misled. Such injury and harm will continue unless Defendants' conduct is enjoined.

FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF
(TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT – 15 U.S.C. § 1114(1))

24. Xoom incorporates by reference and realleges as though fully set forth herein the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 23, inclusive.

25. The above acts of Defendants constitute trademark infringement of Xoom's

1 XOOM® mark in violation of section 32(1) of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1114(1).

2 26. Motorola has applied for and sworn under penalty of perjury that it intends to use
3 the identical XOOM designation for mobile computer product offerings, including on the
4 Internet, without any authorization from Xoom. In furtherance of its Application, Defendants
5 have used, promoted and offered for sale, their product offerings under an identical XOOM
6 designation, without any authorization from Xoom, causing confusion in the marketplace, which
7 is harming consumers and Xoom. Further, Defendants have used, promoted and offered for sale,
8 their product offerings under the confusingly similar MOTOROLA XOOM designation, without
9 any authorization from Xoom, causing confusion in the marketplace, which is harming consumers
10 and Xoom.

11 27. Defendants' proposed use and use of the identical XOOM designation for its
12 mobile computer and related product offerings has caused confusion and is likely to continue
13 cause confusion, mistake and deception among the general consuming public as to the identity of
14 the XOOM product offerings, whether those of Defendants or Xoom.

15 28. Defendants' use of XOOM and/or MOTOROLA XOOM is without the permission
16 of Xoom.

17 29. Xoom is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendants'
18 conduct has been knowing, deliberate and willful.

19 30. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Xoom has been,
20 and will continue to be, irreparably harmed, injured and/or damaged by Defendants' wrongful
21 acts, and such harm, injury and/or damage will continue unless Defendants' conduct is enjoined
22 by the Court.

23 31. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Xoom has
24 suffered and is entitled to monetary damages in an amount not yet determined.

25 32. Xoom is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendants' acts
26 were in conscious and willful disregard of Xoom's federal trademark rights, and the resulting
27 damage to Xoom warrants treble damages and the recovery of attorney's fees and costs.

SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF
(FALSE DESIGNATION OF ORIGIN AND UNFAIR COMPETITION —
15 U.S.C. § 1125(a))

1
2
3 33. Xoom incorporates by reference and realleges as though fully set forth herein the
4 allegations of paragraphs 1 through 32, inclusive.

5 34. The above acts of Defendants constitute unfair competition and false designation
6 of origin in violation of Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a).

7 35. Defendants are unfairly competing with Xoom by virtue of its unauthorized use of
8 Xoom's XOOM® trademark and trade name in interstate commerce to sell, offer for sale,
9 distribute and advertise a mobile computer and related product offerings, which falsely leads
10 consumers to believe that Defendants' products and services are affiliated or associated with,
11 originate from, or are sponsored, or approved by Xoom.

12 36. Xoom is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendants have in
13 effect informed the marketplace that Defendants' XOOM and MOTOROLA XOOM product
14 offerings are the products and services of Xoom or that Xoom's XOOM® product offerings are
15 affiliated or associated with Motorola. These misrepresentations were made in commercial
16 advertising or promotion of Defendants' products, and are false and/or misleading and do not
17 properly represent the nature or characteristics of Defendants' mobile computer or related
18 products.

19 37. Defendants' false and/or misleading statements, which Defendants have made or
20 caused to be made in interstate commerce, have actually deceived, and/or have the tendency to
21 deceive a substantial segment of the consuming public and the marketplace.

22 38. Xoom is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendants' actions
23 were done with full knowledge, and with the intent to cause confusion and to mislead and deceive
24 the purchasing public and that these statements have actually deceived or have a tendency to
25 deceive a substantial segment of the purchasing public.

26 39. Xoom has been injured and damaged by Defendants' conduct.

27 40. Xoom has no adequate remedy at law. Defendants' conduct, as described herein,

1 has caused and, if not enjoined, will continue to cause irreparable damage to Xoom. As a result
2 of Defendants' conduct, Xoom is entitled to injunctive relief and damages.

3 41. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Xoom has
4 suffered and is entitled to monetary damages in an amount not yet determined.

5 42. Xoom is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendants' acts
6 were in conscious and willful disregard of Xoom's trademark and trade name, and the resulting
7 damage to Xoom warrants treble damages and attorneys' fees and costs.

8 **THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF**
9 **(FALSE ADVERTISING—15 U.S.C. § 1125)**

10 43. Xoom incorporates by reference and realleges as though fully set forth herein the
11 allegations of paragraphs 1 through 42, inclusive.

12 44. The above acts of Defendants constitute false advertising under Section 43 of the
13 Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1125.

14 45. Defendants are falsely advertising XOOM product offerings as emanating from
15 Motorola by such acts as buying the keyword "Xoom" to place ads on Google for the Xoom
16 product offerings of Defendants, and by claiming to be the "Xoom — Official Site." Such acts
17 falsely lead consumers to believe that Defendants' product offerings are affiliated or associated
18 with, originate from, or are sponsored, or approved by Xoom or that Xoom is affiliated or
19 associated with Motorola, when that is not the case.

20 46. Xoom is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendants inform
21 the marketplace that Defendants offer Official Xoom product offerings. These misrepresentations
22 were made in commercial advertising or promotion of Defendants' products, are false and/or
23 misleading and do not properly represent the nature or characteristics of Defendants' product
24 offerings.

25 47. Defendants' false and/or misleading statements, which Defendants have made or
26 caused to be made in interstate commerce, have actually deceived, and/or have the tendency to
27 deceive a substantial segment of the consuming public and the marketplace.

28 48. Defendants' deception is material, in that it is likely to influence the purchasing

1 decisions of the consuming public and the marketplace.

2 49. Defendants' false and/or misleading statements made in connection with the
3 distribution, advertising and/or sale of its products constitutes false advertising in violation of 15
4 U.S.C. § 1125.

5 50. Xoom is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendants' actions
6 were done with full knowledge, and with the intent to deceive the purchasing public and that
7 these statements have actually deceived or have a tendency to deceive a substantial segment of
8 the purchasing public.

9 51. Xoom has been injured and damaged by Defendants' conduct.

10 52. Xoom has no adequate remedy at law. Defendants' conduct, as described herein,
11 has caused and, if not enjoined, will continue to cause irreparable damage to Xoom. As a result
12 of Defendants' conduct, Xoom is entitled to injunctive relief and damages.

13 53. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Xoom has
14 suffered and is entitled to monetary damages in an amount not yet determined and is entitled to
15 Defendants' profits. Xoom is also entitled to its attorneys' fees and costs.

16 54. Xoom is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendants' acts
17 were in conscious and willful disregard of Xoom's trademark and trade name, and the resulting
18 damage to Xoom warrants treble damages.

19 **FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**
20 **(UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES — CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 17200 ET SEQ.)**

21 55. Xoom incorporates by reference and realleges as though fully set forth herein the
22 allegations of paragraphs 1 through 54, inclusive.

23 56. The above acts and practices of Defendants are likely to mislead the general public
24 and, thereby, constitute unfair and fraudulent business practices and unfair, deceptive, untrue and
25 misleading advertising in violation of California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*
26 Defendants' conduct caused injury to Xoom resulting in loss of money or property and caused
27 injury in fact to Xoom resulting in loss of money or property.

28 57. Xoom is entitled to relief against Defendants, including full restitution and/or

1 disgorgement of all profits and benefits that may have been obtained by Defendants as a result of
2 such unfair, deceptive and/or fraudulent business practices and unfair, deceptive, untrue and
3 misleading advertising.

4 58. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Xoom has been,
5 and will continue to be, harmed, injured and/or damaged by Defendants' wrongful acts, and such
6 harm, injury and/or damage will continue unless Defendants' conduct is enjoined by the Court.

7 **FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**
8 **(TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT — CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §14335)**

9 59. Xoom incorporates by reference and realleges as though fully set forth herein the
10 allegations of paragraphs 1 through 58, inclusive.

11 60. Xoom is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that, Defendants have
12 used, and continue to use, the confusingly similar XOOM designation to promote their mobile
13 computer and related products and services for the purpose of enhancing the commercial value of,
14 or selling or soliciting purchases of, Defendants' products and services.

15 61. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Xoom has been,
16 and will continue to be, harmed, injured and/or damaged by Defendants' wrongful acts, and such
17 harm, injury and/or damage will continue unless Defendants' conduct is enjoined by the Court.

18 **SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**
19 **(COMMON LAW UNFAIR COMPETITION)**

20 62. Xoom incorporates by reference and realleges as though fully set forth herein the
21 allegations of paragraphs 1 through 61, inclusive.

22 63. In addition to its rights under the Lanham Act and state statutory law, Xoom also
23 has valid and existing common law rights with respect to its XOOM mark and name.

24 64. The above acts of Defendants constitute unfair competition under common law.

25 65. Defendants' use of Xoom's XOOM mark and name in connection with the
26 distribution, advertising, promotion, offering for sale and/or sale of XOOM mobile computer and
27 related product offerings, are likely to cause confusion and, on information and belief, have
28 caused confusion as to the source of Defendants' and Xoom's product offerings in that customers

1 will be likely to associate or have associated the product offerings of Xoom and Defendants when
2 no such association or affiliation exists, all to the detriment of Xoom.

3 66. Xoom is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that, the above acts of
4 Defendants were and continue to be willful and malicious and undertaken with the deliberate
5 intent to mislead the public and injure the business of Xoom. Xoom thereby should be awarded
6 exemplary damages based upon common law unfair competition principles.

7 67. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Xoom has been,
8 and will continue to be, harmed, injured and/or damaged by Defendants wrongful acts, and such
9 harm, injury and/or damage will continue unless Defendants conduct is enjoined by the Court.

10 68. Xoom is entitled to relief against Defendants, including full restitution and/or
11 disgorgement of all profits and benefits that may have been obtained by Defendants as a result of
12 such unfair competition.

13 69. Xoom is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendants'
14 conduct is willful, wanton, malicious, oppressive, and in conscious disregard of Xoom's rights in
15 its XOOM mark and trade name, justifying punitive and exemplary damages under California
16 Civil Code § 3294.

17 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

18 WHEREFORE, Xoom respectfully requests:

19 1. That the Court issue a temporary restraining order and/or preliminary injunction,
20 pending trial of this action, enjoining Defendants, their successors, officers, agents and
21 employees, and anyone acting in concert with or at the behest or direction of Defendants, from
22 using Xoom's XOOM® mark and trade name, or any designation that is confusingly similar to
23 Xoom's XOOM® mark and trade name, or any designation that is likely to cause confusion,
24 mistake, deception or public misunderstanding as to the identity or origin of Xoom's products and
25 services or their connection to or affiliation with Defendants.

26 2. That following trial of this action, the Court enter final judgment as follows:

27 a. permanently enjoining Defendants, their successors, officers, agents and

1 employees, and anyone acting in concert with or at the behest or direction of Defendants, from
2 using a confusingly similar designation to Xoom's XOOM® mark and trade name, or any
3 designation that is likely to cause confusion, mistake, deception or public misunderstanding at the
4 identity or origin of Xoom's product offerings or their connection to or affiliation with
5 Defendants;

6 b. ordering that all labels, packaging, wrappers, signs, prints, banners, posters,
7 brochures, or other advertising, marketing, or other promotional materials bearing a confusingly
8 similar designation to Xoom's XOOM® mark or name, be disabled, removed and destroyed,
9 along with the means for making the same, and that all Internet websites, online advertising,
10 marketing, promotions or other online materials bearing the XOOM designation in any form or
11 manner by Defendants be disabled, removed and destroyed;

12 c. permanently enjoining Defendants, their successors, officers, agents and
13 employees, and anyone acting in concert with or at the behest or direction of Defendants, from
14 seeking to register the XOOM designation for Defendants' mobile computer and related products
15 and services or any designation that is likely to cause confusion, mistake, deception or public
16 misunderstanding as to the identity or origin of Xoom, the Xoom product offerings, or their
17 connection to or affiliation with Defendants;

18 d. ordering Defendants to file with the Court and serve on Xoom's counsel
19 within 30 days after service of the injunction, a written report, sworn under oath, setting forth in
20 detail the manner and form in which Defendants have complied with the injunction;

21 e. declaring that Defendants' unauthorized use of the XOOM and
22 MOTOROLA XOOM designations used in connection with Defendants' mobile computer and
23 other product offerings infringes Xoom's XOOM® mark and trade name;

24 f. declaring that Defendants' have engaged in false advertising by buying the
25 keyword "Xoom," claiming that they own the Xoom Official Site, and otherwise by
26 misrepresenting Defendants' and Xoom's product offerings;

27 g. declaring that Defendants' infringement, unfair competition and false
28 advertising was knowing, intentional, and willful;

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

h. awarding Xoom compensation for any and all damages, injury or harm incurred as a result of Defendants wrongful conduct;

i. ordering full restitution and/or disgorgement of all profits and benefits that may have been obtained by Defendants as a result of their wrongful conduct;

j. awarding Xoom treble damages resulting from Defendants' willful and intentional conduct;

k. awarding Xoom punitive and exemplary damages;

l. awarding Xoom its costs of this action and reasonable attorneys' fees against Defendants; and,

m. awarding any other such relief the Court deems just and proper or to which Xoom may be entitled.

Dated: February 23, 2011

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
ROCHELLE D. ALPERT
LEIGHA E. WILBUR

By 
Rochelle D. Alpert

Attorneys for Plaintiff
XOOM CORPORATION

Exhibit B

Xoom Corporation v. Motorola Trademark Holdings, LLC
Opposition No. 91202575

Applicant's Exhibit

1 Kristin J. Achterhof (IL 6206476) (*admitted pro hac vice*)
Cathay Y. N. Smith (IL 6290784) (*admitted pro hac vice*)
2 KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP
525 West Monroe Street
3 Chicago, IL 60661
Telephone: 312.902.5200
4 Facsimile: 312.902.1061
kristin.achterhof@kattenlaw.com
5 cathay.smith@kattenlaw.com

6 Dennis B. Kass (SBN 137263)
Richard Garcia (SBN 198185)
7 MANNING & KASS, ELLROD, RAMIREZ, TRESTER LLP
One California Street, Suite 1100
8 San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: 415.217.6990
9 Facsimile: 415.217.6999
dbk@manningllp.com
10 rgg@manningllp.com

11 Attorneys for Defendants
MOTOROLA TRADEMARK HOLDINGS, LLC,
12 MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC.,
and MOTOROLA MOBILITY HOLDINGS, INC.

13 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
14 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
15 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

17 XOOM CORPORATION, a California corporation,) Case No.: 11-CV-0848-CRB
18 Plaintiff,) **ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE**
19 vs.) **DEFENSES TO COMPLAINT**
20) **SEEKING DAMAGES AND**
21) **INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**
22 MOTOROLA TRADEMARK HOLDINGS, LLC, a)
Delaware limited liability company, MOTOROLA)
23 MOBILITY, INC., a Delaware corporation, and)
MOTOROLA MOBILITY HOLDINGS, INC., a)
24 Delaware corporation, and DOES 1 through 10)
inclusive,)
Defendants.)

25 Defendants Motorola Trademark Holdings, LLC, Motorola Mobility, Inc., and Motorola
26 Mobility Holdings, Inc. (collectively, "Motorola"), by and through their undersigned counsel,
27 hereby answer Plaintiff Xoom Corporation's allegations set forth in its Complaint as follows:
28

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Complaint No. 1

Xoom brings this action against Defendants Motorola Trademark Holdings, LLC, Motorola Mobility, Inc. and Motorola Mobility Holdings, Inc. and DOES 1 through 10 (collectively “Defendants” or “Motorola”) for trademark infringement, false designation of origin, unfair competition, false advertising and unfair business practices in violation of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. §§ 1114(1), and 1125(a)(1), California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*, and § 14335, and common law, arising from Defendants’ adoption and/or use of the identical XOOM brand for Defendants’ mobile computer and related products and services offered to consumers via the Internet, which products and services are directly related to the products Xoom has long offered using its federally registered, incontestable XOOM® mark and its Xoom trade name to consumers via the Internet and accessible on computers and mobile devices over the Internet. Defendants’ adoption and/or use of the XOOM and MOTOROLA XOOM brand has caused and is likely to continue to cause confusion with Xoom’s long held and incontestable XOOM® mark and Xoom’s Xoom trade name.

Answer No. 1

Motorola admits that Plaintiff has brought this action against Motorola. Motorola denies that Plaintiff offers “products,” and denies each and every remaining allegation in Paragraph 1.

PARTIES

Complaint No. 2

Xoom Corporation is a California corporation, with its principal place of business at 100 Bush Street, San Francisco, California 94104, doing business in San Francisco, throughout the United States and in foreign countries, since at least as early as 2003 under the Xoom trade name and the federally registered and incontestable XOOM® trademark.

Answer No.2

Motorola is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 2 and, therefore, denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 2.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Complaint No. 3

Motorola Trademark Holdings, LLC is a Delaware limited liability company, with its principal place of business at 600 North U.S. Highway 45, Libertyville, Illinois 60048.

Answer No. 3

Motorola admits the allegations in Paragraph 3.

Complaint No. 4

Motorola Mobility, Inc. is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 600 North U.S. Highway 45, Libertyville, Illinois 60048.

Answer No.4

Motorola admits the allegations in Paragraph 4.

Complaint No. 5

Motorola Mobility Holdings, Inc. is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business at 600 North U.S. Highway 45, Libertyville, Illinois 60048.

Answer No.5

Motorola admits the allegations in Paragraph 5.

Complaint No. 6

Xoom is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Motorola Trademark Holdings, LLC, Motorola Mobility, Inc. and Motorola Mobility Holdings, Inc. acted together or in connection with DOES 1 through 10 in engaging in the acts giving rise to these claims and that they are liable for the acts of each other as agents, conspirators, principals or alter egos of each other in committing the acts described herein.

Answer No. 6

Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 6.

Complaint No. 7

The true names and capacities of DOES 1 through 10 are unknown to Xoom, which therefore sues such defendants by fictitious names. Xoom will seek leave to amend this Complaint to allege the true names and capacities of such DOE defendants when the same are ascertained. Xoom is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that each of the fictitiously named

1 defendants is responsible in some manner for the conduct, injuries and damages alleged in this
2 Complaint.

3 **Answer No. 7**

4 Motorola is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of
5 the allegations in Paragraph 7 and, therefore, denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 7.

6 **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

7 **Complaint No. 8**

8 This Court has subject matter jurisdiction over Xoom's federal, state and common law
9 claims of trademark infringement and unfair competition pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1121 and 28
10 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338(a)-(b), and 1367(a).

11 **Answer No. 8**

12 Motorola admits the allegations in Paragraph 8 as to jurisdiction, but denies that Plaintiff is
13 entitled to any of its requested relief.

14 **Complaint No. 9**

15 This Court has personal jurisdiction over Motorola, and venue is proper in this district
16 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391 (b)-(c), because on information and belief, Motorola has a presence in
17 the state of California and in this District, and conducts regular and systematic business in
18 California and in this District, has purposefully availed itself of conducting business in California
19 and in this District, and/or the events giving rise to the claims alleged in this complaint have a
20 substantial effect in California and a substantial part of such events occurred in this District. Xoom
21 is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Motorola is qualified to do business in
22 California; Motorola sells, promotes and advertises its products and services in California, including
23 its XOOM mobile computer and related product offerings; and has offices within California and in
24 this District.

25 **Answer No. 9**

26 Motorola admits the allegations in Paragraph 9 as to personal jurisdiction, but denies that
27 Plaintiff is entitled to any of its requested relief.

1 **Complaint No. 10**

2 Xoom has its principal place of business in San Francisco, California, which is located
3 within this District and has suffered and will continue to suffer injury and harm in this District as a
4 result of Defendants' adoption and/or use of the Xoom designation without authorization from
5 Xoom.

6 **Answer No. 10**

7 Motorola denies that Plaintiff has suffered or will suffer any injury or harm as a result of
8 Motorola's actions. Motorola is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to
9 the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 10 and, therefore, denies each and every
10 remaining allegation in Paragraph 10.

11 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

12 **Complaint No. 11**

13 Xoom has long owned and prominently used the trade name Xoom and the federally
14 registered, incontestable trademark XOOM® for its online business. Since at least as early as 2003,
15 Xoom has offered consumers access to its remittance software services through its www.xoom.com
16 web site using its distinctive XOOM® mark and trade name. Through this long online use
17 accessible via computer and mobile devices, Xoom's trade name and the XOOM® products have
18 become associated exclusively with Xoom. Until Defendants' adoption of the Xoom brand without
19 authorization from Xoom, Xoom to its knowledge was the only entity currently using the name or
20 mark Xoom for online product offerings. Xoom secured the www.xoom.com domain name in 2003
21 and has used it for its online product offerings.

22 **Answer No. 11**

23 Motorola denies that Plaintiff offers "products," denies that the XOOM mark is associated
24 exclusively with Plaintiff, and denies that Plaintiff was the only entity using the name or mark
25 XOOM for online product offerings. Motorola is without sufficient knowledge or information to
26 form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 11 and, therefore, denies each
27 and every remaining allegation in Paragraph 11.

1 **Complaint No. 12**

2 At the website, xoom.com, and elsewhere on the Internet, Xoom features and promotes
3 Xoom’s computer accessible, secure, fast and inexpensive remittance services, which allow users to
4 transmit monies through the xoom.com web site to more than 30 different countries. The Xoom
5 website and the XOOM® product offerings are available for use through computers and mobile
6 devices, including mobile or tablet computers.

7 **Answer No. 12**

8 Motorola denies that Plaintiff offers “products.” Motorola is without sufficient knowledge
9 or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 12 and,
10 therefore, denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 12.

11 **Complaint No. 13**

12 As a result of its exclusive use since at least as early as 2003, the XOOM® mark has
13 become exclusively associated by consumers as a designation of source for Xoom’s online
14 products, including its provision of online access to XOOM® product offerings.

15 **Answer No. 13**

16 Motorola denies that Plaintiff offers “products,” and denies each and every remaining
17 allegation in Paragraph 13.

18 **Complaint No. 14**

19 Xoom owns an incontestable United States trademark registration for XOOM®, Federal
20 Registration No. 2,909,931, covering “providing business information, namely, on money transfer
21 services,” and “money transfer services; electronic funds transfer services; bill payment remittance
22 services; electronic payment, namely, electronic processing and transmission of bill payment data.”
23 The mark registered on December 14, 2004 and became incontestable with the filing (and
24 acceptance) of Xoom’s Section 8 and 15 affidavits demonstrating continuous use of the XOOM®
25 mark for five years after registration. A true and correct copy of the registration certificate is
26 attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated herein as if fully set forth.

Answer No. 14

1
2 Motorola admits that Plaintiff owns a United States trademark registration for the mark
3 XOOM, Federal Registration No. 2,909,931 covering “providing business information, namely, on
4 money transfer services,” and “money transfer services; electronic funds transfer services; bill
5 payment remittance services; electronic payment, namely, electronic processing and transmission of
6 bill payment data,” which registered on December 14, 2004. Motorola is without sufficient
7 knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph
8 14 and, therefore, denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 14.

Complaint No. 15

9
10 In an effort to exploit and improperly trade on Xoom’s goodwill, to otherwise diminish the
11 value of the Xoom trade name and the XOOM mark, and to confuse and mislead consumers,
12 Motorola without authorization deliberately and unlawfully appropriated Xoom’s trade name and
13 trademark rights through its adoption and/or use of the XOOM and/or MOTOROLA XOOM
14 designations, and its intent-to-use application to register an identical XOOM designation for mobile
15 computers and related accessories, U.S. Application No. 85161358.

Answer No. 15

16
17 Motorola admits that it filed for a trademark application in the U.S. Patent and Trademark
18 Office, U.S. Application No. 85161358, for the mark XOOM for “[m]obile computers and related
19 accessories, namely, mobile computer docking stations, cradles for holding mobile computers,
20 mounts for holding mobile computers, holders for holding mobile computers, stands for mobile
21 computers, carrying cases for mobile computers, stands for mobile computers, protective covers for
22 mobile computers, protective or decorative skins, namely, fitted or plastic films known as skins for
23 covering and protecting mobile computers, batteries, power adaptors, computer cables, cable
24 connectors, headsets and speakers for use with mobile computers.” Motorola denies each and every
25 remaining allegation in Paragraph 15.

Complaint No. 16

26
27 Motorola filed its intent-to-use trademark application for the XOOM designation on October
28 26, 2010, well after Xoom adopted its trade name in 2003, well after Xoom began offering its

1 products under its XOOM® mark and name in 2003, well after the XOOM® mark registered to
2 Xoom, and well after the XOOM® federal trademark registration became incontestable.

3 **Answer No. 16**

4 Motorola admits that it filed an intent-to-use trademark application for XOOM on October
5 26, 2010. Motorola denies that Xoom offers “products,” and denies each and every remaining
6 allegation in Paragraph 16.

7 **Complaint No. 17**


8 Xoom is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendants have promoted,
9 advertised and marketed, and offered for sale in interstate commerce a mobile computer and related
10 product offerings using Xoom’s XOOM® mark, Defendants display the Xoom trademark alone and
11 in lettering much larger than the Motorola wording on their website and in other advertisements, all
12 of which are the subject of this Complaint.

13 **Answer No. 17**

14 Motorola admits that it has promoted, advertised and marketed, and offered for sale in
15 interstate commerce its MOTOROLA XOOM mobile computers and related accessories. Motorola
16 denies that the XOOM mark is associated exclusively with Plaintiff, and denies each and every
17 remaining allegation in Paragraph 17.

18 **Complaint No. 18**

19 By way of example, Defendants, on their website at motorola.com, allow users to view a
20 commercial for their Xoom product offering, in which Defendants use Xoom’s XOOM® mark on
21 the screen of the device screen, very much like the XOOM® mark and name would appear on the
22 screen if the xoom.com site was accessed online through the Defendants’ Xoom device:
23
24
25
26
27
28



Answer No. 18

Motorola is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to whether the image in Paragraph 18 is a true and correct image of what Plaintiff purports it to be. Motorola admits that users could, at one point, view a commercial for the MOTOROLA XOOM product on Motorola's website. Motorola denies each and every remaining allegation in Paragraph 18.

Complaint No. 19

Defendants also have purchased the XOOM keyword on online search engines. Thus, when users conduct an online search for "Xoom" using the Google search engine, Defendants' advertisements for XOOM product offerings are featured, sometimes as the first result, and are listed before any of Xoom's own advertisements or links to Xoom's website. The outcome is similar on other search engines.

Answer No. 19

Motorola admits that it has legally purchased "XOOM" as a keyword on at least one online search engine. Motorola is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 19 and, therefore, denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 19.

Complaint No. 20


Resellers of Defendants' Xoom product offerings also have begun to purchase and use Xoom as a keyword and in headlines for the ads that they run on the Internet, all without any apparent objection from the Defendants.

Answer No. 20

Motorola is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 20 and, therefore, denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 20.

Complaint No. 21

Defendants' advertisements on the Internet also represent that they constitute the Xoom "Official Site," when that is not the case. For example, the following advertisement appeared after entering "xoom" as a search term using the Google search engine:



Indeed, Xoom has long used the wording "Official Site" in conjunction with its website at xoom.com and the products and services that it offers on the site, all of which increase the likelihood that consumers will be confused and misled as a result of Defendants' unauthorized use of Xoom's name and mark on the Internet, particularly with the wording "Official."

Answer No. 21

Motorola is without sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to whether the image in Paragraph 21 is a true and correct image of what Plaintiff purports it to be. Motorola denies that Plaintiff offers "products," and denies that there is any likelihood that consumers will be confused or misled by Motorola's actions. Motorola is without sufficient knowledge or information

1 to form a belief as to the truth of the remaining allegations in Paragraph 21 and, therefore, denies
2 each and every remaining allegation in Paragraph 21.

3 **Complaint No. 22**

4 By engaging in this willful and deliberate conduct, Defendants have willfully infringed
5 Xoom's trade name and federally registered trademark, creating a false association between
6 Defendants and Xoom, when there is no association, and otherwise falsely and fraudulently
7 representing the Xoom product offerings of Defendants to the public, and engaging in false
8 advertising that is materially false and misleading to the public.

9 **Answer No. 22**

10 Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 22.

11 **Complaint No. 23**

12 As a result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, the public is misled as to an association with
13 Xoom, when there is none, and thereby Xoom has suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable
14 injury and be otherwise harmed, along with consumers who are confused and misled. Such injury
15 and harm will continue unless Defendants' conduct is enjoined.

16 **Answer No. 23**

17 Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 23.

18 **FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**
19 **(TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT – 15 U.S.C. § 1114(1))**

20 **Complaint No. 24**

21 Xoom incorporates by reference and realleges as though fully set forth herein the allegations
22 of paragraphs 1 through 23, inclusive.

23 **Answer No. 24**

24 Motorola repeats and incorporates by reference its responses to Paragraphs 1 through 23 as
25 its response to Paragraph 24.

26 **Complaint No. 25**

27 The above acts of Defendants constitute trademark infringement of Xoom's XOOM® mark
28 in violation of section 32(1) of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1114(1).

Answer No. 25

Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 25.

Complaint No. 26

Motorola has applied for and sworn under penalty of perjury that it intends to use the identical XOOM designation for mobile computer product offerings, including on the Internet, without any authorization from Xoom. In furtherance of its Application, Defendants have used, promoted and offered for sale, their product offerings under an identical XOOM designation, without any authorization from Xoom, causing confusion in the marketplace, which is harming consumers and Xoom. Further, Defendants have used, promoted and offered for sale, their product offerings under the confusingly similar MOTOROLA XOOM designation, without any authorization from Xoom, causing confusion in the marketplace, which is harming consumers and Xoom.

Answer No. 26

Motorola admits that it has applied for a trademark application for the mark XOOM for “[m]obile computers and related accessories, namely, mobile computer docking stations, cradles for holding mobile computers, mounts for holding mobile computers, holders for holding mobile computers, stands for mobile computers, carrying cases for mobile computers, stands for mobile computers, protective covers for mobile computers, protective or decorative skins, namely, fitted or plastic films known as skins for covering and protecting mobile computers, batteries, power adaptors, computer cables, cable connectors, headsets and speakers for use with mobile computers,” and admits that it has used, promoted and offered for sale MOTOROLA XOOM mobile computers and related accessories. Motorola denies each and every remaining allegation in Paragraph 26.

Complaint No. 27

Defendants’ proposed use and use of the identical XOOM designation for its mobile computer and related product offerings has caused confusion and is likely to continue cause confusion, mistake and deception among the general consuming public as to the identity of the XOOM product offerings, whether those of Defendants or Xoom.

1 Answer No. 27

2 Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 27.

3 Complaint No. 28

4 Defendants' use of XOOM and/or MOTOROLA XOOM is without the permission of
5 Xoom.

6 Answer No. 28

7 Motorola admits that it did not obtain permission from Plaintiff to use MOTOROLA
8 XOOM, but affirmatively avers that no such permission was necessary. Motorola denies each and
9 every remaining allegation in Paragraph 28.

10 Complaint No. 29

11 Xoom is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendants' conduct has been
12 knowing, deliberate and willful.

13 Answer No. 29

14 Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 29.

15 Complaint No. 30

16 As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Xoom has been, and will
17 continue to be, irreparably harmed, injured and/or damaged by Defendants' wrongful acts, and such
18 harm, injury and/or damage will continue unless Defendants' conduct is enjoined by the Court.

19 Answer No. 30

20 Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 30.

21 Complaint No. 31

22 As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Xoom has suffered and is
23 entitled to monetary damages in an amount not yet determined.

24 Answer No. 31

25 Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 31.

1 **Complaint No. 32**

2 Xoom is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendants' acts were in
3 conscious and willful disregard of Xoom's federal trademark rights, and the resulting damage to
4 Xoom warrants treble damages and the recovery of attorney's fees and costs.

5 **Answer No. 32**

6 Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 32.

7
8 **SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**
9 **(FALSE DESIGNATION OF ORIGIN AND UNFAIR COMPETITION—**
10 **15 U.S.C. § 1125(a))**

11 **Complaint No. 33**

12 Xoom incorporates by reference and realleges as though fully set forth herein the allegations
13 of paragraphs 1 through 32, inclusive.

14 **Answer No. 33**

15 Motorola repeats and incorporates by reference its responses to Paragraphs 1 through 32 as
16 its response to Paragraph 33.

17 **Complaint No. 34**

18 The above acts of Defendants constitute unfair competition and false designation of origin in
19 violation of Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a).

20 **Answer No. 34**

21 Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 34.

22 **Complaint No. 35**

23 Defendants are unfairly competing with Xoom by virtue of its unauthorized use of Xoom's
24 XOOM® trademark and trade name in interstate commerce to sell, offer for sale, distribute and
25 advertise a mobile computer and related product offerings, which falsely leads consumers to believe
26 that Defendants' products and services are affiliated or associated with, originate from, or are
27 sponsored, or approved by Xoom.

28 **Answer No. 35**

Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 35.

1 **Complaint No. 36**

2 Xoom is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendants have in effect
3 informed the marketplace that Defendants' XOOM and MOTOROLA XOOM product offerings are
4 the products and services of Xoom or that Xoom's XOOM® product offerings are affiliated or
5 associated with Motorola. These misrepresentations were made in commercial advertising or
6 promotion of Defendants' products, and are false and/or misleading and do not properly represent
7 the nature or characteristics of Defendants' mobile computer or related products.

8 **Answer No. 36**

9 Motorola denies that Plaintiff offers "products," and denies each and every remaining
10 allegation in Paragraph 36.

11 **Complaint No. 37**

12 Defendants' false and/or misleading statements, which Defendants have made or caused to
13 be made in interstate commerce, have actually deceived, and/or have the tendency to deceive a
14 substantial segment of the consuming public and the marketplace.

15 **Answer No. 37**

16 Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 37.

17 **Complaint No. 38**

18 Xoom is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendants' actions were
19 done with full knowledge, and with the intent to cause confusion and to mislead and deceive the
20 purchasing public and that these statements have actually deceived or have a tendency to deceive a
21 substantial segment of the purchasing public.

22 **Answer No. 38**

23 Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 38.

24 **Complaint No. 39**

25 Xoom has been injured and damaged by Defendants' conduct.

26 **Answer No. 39**

27 Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 39.

1 **Complaint No. 40**

2 Xoom has no adequate remedy at law. Defendants' conduct, as described herein, has caused
3 and, if not enjoined, will continue to cause irreparable damage to Xoom. As a result of Defendants'
4 conduct, Xoom is entitled to injunctive relief and damages.

5 **Answer No. 40**

6 Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 40.

7 **Complaint No. 41**

8 As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Xoom has suffered and is
9 entitled to monetary damages in an amount not yet determined.

10 **Answer No. 41**

11 Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 41.

12 **Complaint No. 42**

13 Xoom is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendants' acts were in
14 conscious and willful disregard of Xoom's trademark and trade name, and the resulting damage to
15 Xoom warrants treble damages and attorneys' fees and costs.

16 **Answer No. 42**

17 Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 42.

18 **THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF**
19 **(FALSE ADVERTISING – 15 U.S.C. § 1125)**

20 **Complaint No. 43**

21 Xoom incorporates by reference and realleges as though fully set forth herein the allegations
22 of paragraphs 1 through 42, inclusive.

23 **Answer No. 43**

24 Motorola repeats and incorporates by reference its responses to Paragraphs 1 through 42 as
25 its response to Paragraph 43.

26 **Complaint No. 44**

27 The above acts of Defendants constitute false advertising under Section 43 of the Lanham
28 Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1125.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Answer No. 44

Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 44.

Complaint No. 45

Defendants are falsely advertising XOOM product offerings as emanating from Motorola by such acts as buying the keyword “Xoom” to place ads on Google for the Xoom product offerings of Defendants, and by claiming to be the “Xoom — Official Site.” Such acts falsely lead consumers to believe that Defendants’ product offerings are affiliated or associated with, originate from, or are sponsored, or approved by Xoom or that Xoom is affiliated or associated with Motorola, when that is not the case.

Answer No. 45

Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 45.

Complaint No. 46

Xoom is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendants inform the marketplace that Defendants offer Official Xoom product offerings. These misrepresentations were made in commercial advertising or promotion of Defendants’ products, are false and/or misleading and do not properly represent the nature or characteristics of Defendants’ product offerings.

Answer No. 46

Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 46.

Complaint No. 47

Defendants’ false and/or misleading statements, which Defendants have made or caused to be made in interstate commerce, have actually deceived, and/or have the tendency to deceive a substantial segment of the consuming public and the marketplace.

Answer No. 47

Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 47.

//

Complaint No. 48

Defendants’ deception is material, in that it is likely to influence the purchasing decisions of the consuming public and the marketplace.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Answer No. 48

Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 48.

Complaint No. 49

Defendants' false and/or misleading statements made in connection with the distribution, advertising and/or sale of its products constitutes false advertising in violation of 15 U.S.C. § 1125.

Answer No. 49

Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 49.

Complaint No. 50

Xoom is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendants' actions were done with full knowledge, and with the intent to deceive the purchasing public and that these statements have actually deceived or have a tendency to deceive a substantial segment of the purchasing public.

Answer No. 50

Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 50.

Complaint No. 51

Xoom has been injured and damaged by Defendants' conduct.

Answer No. 51

Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 51.

Complaint No. 52

Xoom has no adequate remedy at law. Defendants' conduct, as described herein, has caused and, if not enjoined, will continue to cause irreparable damage to Xoom. As a result of Defendants' conduct, Xoom is entitled to injunctive relief and damages.

Answer No. 52

Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 52.

Complaint No. 53

As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Xoom has suffered and is entitled to monetary damages in an amount not yet determined and is entitled to Defendants' profits. Xoom is also entitled to its attorneys' fees and costs.

1 **Answer No. 53**

2 Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 53.

3 **Complaint No. 54**

4 Xoom is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendants' acts were in
5 conscious and willful disregard of Xoom's trademark and trade name, and the resulting damage to
6 Xoom warrants treble damages.

7 **Answer No. 54**

8 Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 54.

9
10 **FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**
(UNFAIR BUSINESS PRACTICES—CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §§ 17200 ET SEQ.)

11 **Complaint No. 55**

12 Xoom incorporates by reference and realleges as though fully set forth herein the allegations
13 of paragraphs 1 through 54, inclusive.

14 **Answer No. 55**

15 Motorola repeats and incorporates by reference its responses to Paragraphs 1 through 54 as
16 its response to Paragraph 55.

17 **Complaint No. 56**

18 The above acts and practices of Defendants are likely to mislead the general public and,
19 thereby, constitute unfair and fraudulent business practices and unfair, deceptive, untrue and
20 misleading advertising in violation of California Business and Professions Code §§ 17200 *et seq.*
21 Defendants' conduct caused injury to Xoom resulting in loss of money or property and caused
22 injury in fact to Xoom resulting in loss of money or property.

23 **Answer No. 56**

24 Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 56.

25 **Complaint No. 57**

26 Xoom is entitled to relief against Defendants, including full restitution and/or disgorgement
27 of all profits and benefits that may have been obtained by Defendants as a result of such unfair,
28

1 deceptive and/or fraudulent business practices and unfair, deceptive, untrue and misleading
2 advertising.

3 **Answer No. 57**

4 Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 57.

5 **Complaint No. 58**

6 As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Xoom has been, and will
7 continue to be, harmed, injured and/or damaged by Defendants' wrongful acts, and such harm,
8 injury and/or damage will continue unless Defendants' conduct is enjoined by the Court.

9 **Answer No. 58**

10 Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 58.

11 **FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**
12 **(TRADEMARK INFRINGEMENT—CAL. BUS. & PROF. CODE §14335)**

13 **Complaint No. 59**

14 Xoom incorporates by reference and realleges as though fully set forth herein the allegations
15 of paragraphs 1 through 58, inclusive.

16 **Answer No. 59**

17 Motorola repeats and incorporates by reference its responses to Paragraphs 1 through 58 as
18 its response to Paragraph 59.

19 **Complaint No. 60**

20 Xoom is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that, Defendants have used, and
21 continue to use, the confusingly similar XOOM designation to promote their mobile computer and
22 related products and services for the purpose of enhancing the commercial value of, or selling or
23 soliciting purchases of, Defendants' products and services.

24 **Answer No. 60**

25 Motorola denies each an every allegation in Paragraph 60.
26
27
28

1 **Complaint No. 61**

2 As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Xoom has been, and will
3 continue to be, harmed, injured and/or damaged by Defendants' wrongful acts, and such harm,
4 injury and/or damage will continue unless Defendants' conduct is enjoined by the Court.

5 **Answer No. 61**

6 Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 61.

7 **SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**
8 **(COMMON LAW UNFAIR COMPETITION)**

9 **Complaint No. 62**

10 Xoom incorporates by reference and realleges as though fully set forth herein the allegations
11 of paragraphs 1 through 61, inclusive.

12 **Answer No. 62**

13 Motorola repeats and incorporates by reference its responses to Paragraphs 1 through 61 as
14 its response to Paragraph 62.

15 **Complaint No. 63**

16 In addition to its rights under the Lanham Act and state statutory law, Xoom also has valid
17 and existing common law rights with respect to its XOOM mark and name.

18 **Answer No. 63**

19 Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 63.

20 **Complaint No. 64**

21 The above acts of Defendants constitute unfair competition under common law.

22 **Answer No. 64**

23 Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 64.

24 **Complaint No. 65**

25 Defendants' use of Xoom's XOOM mark and name in connection with the distribution,
26 advertising, promotion, offering for sale and/or sale of XOOM mobile computer and related product
27 offerings, are likely to cause confusion and, on information and belief, have caused confusion as to
28 the source of Defendants' and Xoom's product offerings in that customers will be likely to associate

1 or have associated the product offerings of Xoom and Defendants when no such association or
2 affiliation exists, all to the detriment of Xoom.

3 **Answer No. 65**

4 Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 65.

5 **Complaint No. 66**

6 Xoom is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges that, the above acts of Defendants
7 were and continue to be willful and malicious and undertaken with the deliberate intent to mislead
8 the public and injure the business of Xoom. Xoom thereby should be awarded exemplary damages
9 based upon common law unfair competition principles.

10 **Answer No. 66**

11 Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 66.

12 **Complaint No. 67**

13 As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' unlawful conduct, Xoom has been, and will
14 continue to be, harmed, injured and/or damaged by Defendants wrongful acts, and such harm, injury
15 and/or damage will continue unless Defendants conduct is enjoined by the Court.

16 **Answer No. 67**

17 Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 67.

18 **Complaint No. 68**

19 Xoom is entitled to relief against Defendants, including full restitution and/or disgorgement
20 of all profits and benefits that may have been obtained by Defendants as a result of such unfair
21 competition.

22 **Answer No. 68**

23 Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 68.

24 **Complaint No. 69**

25 Xoom is informed and believes, and on that basis alleges, that Defendants' conduct is
26 willful, wanton, malicious, oppressive, and in conscious disregard of Xoom's rights in its XOOM
27 mark and trade name, justifying punitive and exemplary damages under California Civil Code §
28 3294.

1 **Answer No. 69**

2 Motorola denies each and every allegation in Paragraph 69.

3
4 **AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES**

5 **First Affirmative Defense**

6 Plaintiff's Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

7 **Second Affirmative Defense**

8 Any rights owned by Plaintiff are extremely weak, as the term XOOM is highly-diluted
9 because it has been used for many years by many third-parties. As such, any rights owned by
10 Plaintiff are too narrow to stop the complained of use here.

11 **Third Affirmative Defense**

12 Motorola uses its famous house mark MOTOROLA with the word XOOM for Motorola's
13 mobile computer and related accessories, and, therefore, there is no likelihood that consumers
14 would be confused.

15 **Fourth Affirmative Defense**

16 Plaintiff's claims are barred under the equitable doctrine of laches, estoppel, waiver and
17 acquiescence.

18 **Fifth Affirmative Defense**

19 Plaintiff's claims are barred by unclean hands. Specifically, Plaintiff has applied for an
20 intent-to-use trademark in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (Serial No. 85225008) for XOOM
21 covering "computer software for facilitating money transfer services, electronic funds transfer
22 services, bill payment remittance services, electronic processing and transmission of payments and
23 payment data" for the sole purpose of interfering with Motorola, even though Plaintiff does not
24 have a bona fide intent to use the mark XOOM for those goods. Furthermore, Plaintiff falsely
25 alleges in the Complaint that it offers "products" under the XOOM mark, even though it offers no
26 products, but only money transfer services. Plaintiff's money transfer services are dissimilar to the
27 products Motorola offers, which are mobile computers and related accessories.

1 Motorola gives notice that it intends to rely on other affirmative defenses as they may
2 become available or apparent during the course of discovery and reserves the right to amend its
3 Answer to assert those defenses.
4

5 WHEREFORE, Defendants Motorola Trademark Holdings, LLC, Motorola Mobility, Inc.
6 and Motorola Mobility Holdings, Inc. pray for dismissal of all claims against them, for judgment in
7 their favor, and for an award of attorneys' fees as the prevailing party pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1117.
8

9 Dated: November 18, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

10 MOTOROLA TRADEMARK HOLDINGS, LLC,
11 MOTOROLA MOBILITY, INC.,
and MOTOROLA MOBILITY HOLDINGS, INC.

12 By: Cathay Y. N. Smith
13 One of their attorneys

14 Kristin J. Achterhof (IL 6206476)
15 Cathay Y. N. Smith (IL 6290784)
KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP
16 525 West Monroe Street
Chicago, IL 60661
17 Telephone: 312.902.5200
Facsimile: 312.902.1061
18 kristin.achterhof@kattenlaw.com
cathay.smith@kattenlaw.com

19 Dennis B. Kass (SBN 137263)
20 Richard Garcia (SBN 198185)
MANNING & KASS, ELLROD, RAMIREZ,
21 TRESTER LLP
One California Street, Suite 1100
22 San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: 415.217.6990
23 Facsimile: 415.217.6999
dbk@manningllp.com
24 rgg@manningllp.com
25
26
27
28