

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA582573**

Filing date: **01/17/2014**

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

Proceeding	91210274
Party	Defendant Sprout Social, Inc.
Correspondence Address	JEFFREY A PINE DYKEMA GOSSETT PLLC 10 S WACKER DR , STE 2300 CHICAGO, IL 60606-7439 UNITED STATES jpine@dykema.com, jsalajka@dykema.com, dbielanska@dykema.com
Submission	Motion to Extend
Filer's Name	Jeffrey A. Pine
Filer's e-mail	jpine@dykema.com, jsalajka@dykema.com, dbielanska@dykema.com
Signature	/jap/
Date	01/17/2014
Attachments	Motion for an Extension of Discovery .pdf(114275 bytes)

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

SproutLoud Media Networks, LLC,
Opposer,

v.

Sprout Social, Inc.,
Applicant.

Opposition No. 91210274

Serial No. 85/613,523

**APPLICANT’S MOTION FOR AN EXTENSION OF DISCOVERY
WITHOUT CONSENT**

The Close of Discovery is currently set to close on January 22, 2014. Sprout Social, Inc. (“Applicant”) requests that such date be extended for thirty (30) days from the date of the Board’s ruling on the motion, and that all subsequent dates be reset accordingly.

Applicant requested consent for this motion from Opposer, SproutLoud Media Networks, LLC (“Opposer”), but Opposer has denied Applicant’s request.

Applicant requests a thirty-day extension for discovery based on settlement negotiations between Applicant’s CEO and Opposer’s CEO which continued until January 10, 2014. On that date, Opposer’s CEO Jared Shusterman informed Applicant’s CEO Justyn Howard that Opposer was going to proceed with the opposition. Opposer then sent a 30(b)(6) deposition notice requesting a deposition with 23 categories set for 10 days later (five business days) and on a national holiday (January 20, 2014).

Applicant’s counsel requested that Opposer immediately produce documents that were overdue. During discussions this week, Applicant’s counsel explained that Opposer’s failure to produce documents severely prejudiced Applicant, especially since Opposer was requesting Applicant’s deposition prior to producing any documents. Further, without seeing documents before the close of discovery, Applicant was prejudiced in that it could not determine what other

