

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA697951**

Filing date: **09/24/2015**

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

Proceeding	91221141
Party	Defendant JS Products, Inc.
Correspondence Address	PAUL G JUETTNER GREER BURNS & CRAIN LTD 300 S WACKER DR , SUITE 2500 CHICAGO, IL 60606 UNITED STATES pjuettner@gbclaw.net, tproehl@gbclaw.net, tmdocket@gbclaw.net
Submission	Reply in Support of Motion
Filer's Name	Tanja Proehl
Filer's e-mail	tproehl@gbclaw.net, tmdocket@gbclaw.net
Signature	/Tanja Proehl/
Date	09/24/2015
Attachments	Reply 91221141.pdf(466806 bytes )

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

Stanley Logistics, LLC,	)	
	)	
Opposer,	)	Opposition No. 91221141
	)	
v.	)	Serial No. 86/321,980
	)	
JS Products Inc.,	)	
	)	
Applicant.	)	
	)	

**APPLICANT’S REPLY TO OPPOSER’S OPPOSITION TO  
APPLICANT’S MOTION TO DISMISS THE AMENDED  
NOTICE OF OPPOSITION FOR FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM  
UNDER RULE 12(b)(6) WITH RESPECT TO OPPOSER’S COUNT II**

Applicant JS Products Inc., (“Applicant”) submits this reply in response to Stanley Logistics, LLC’s (“Opposer”) opposition to Applicant’s Motion to Dismiss the Amended Notice of Opposition for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted with respect to Count II.

As an initial matter, clarification is required. In its motions to dismiss, Applicant correctly asserted that Opposer’s Count II pleading in its recently filed Notice of Opposition in Proceeding No. 91223439 (filed on August 20, 2015) is the same as in its Amended Notice of Opposition in Proceeding Nos. 91221141 and 91221566 (filed on March 18, 2015 and April 16, 2015) and vice versa. Opposer apparently misread Applicant’s motions and mistakenly argues that “Applicant’s motion is premised on the utterly false claim that Count II of the Amended Notice of Opposition and Count II of the subject Notice of Opposition are identical.” Quite to contrary, Applicant accurately

quoted Opposer's new allegations in its motion. The only thing that is "utterly false" is Opposer's baseless attack.

In its Motion to Dismiss, Applicant argued that

- (1) Opposer has not (and cannot) sufficiently plead deceptiveness under Section 2(a) of the Trademark Act because Applicant's Mark "PROTOCOL" is incapable of misdescribing the character, quality, function, composition or use of the recited goods ("deceptiveness claim"), and
- (2) Opposer has not (and cannot) sufficiently plead a ground of false suggestion of a connection under Section 2(a) of the Trademark Act ("false suggestion claim").

In its Response, Opposer did not address the deficiency in its deceptiveness claim, and accordingly concedes that that Applicant's Mark cannot misdescribe the recited goods. Thus, the Board at a minimum must strike paragraph 20 of the Amended Notice of Opposition that is directed to the deceptiveness claim.

In its Response on the false suggestion claim, Opposer does not proffer any new allegations from which one could infer that PROTO is anything more than a trademark of Opposer, as distinguished from Opposer's name or identity. Opposer has instead rested on its conclusory allegations which are insufficient. Accordingly, the remainder of Count II must be stricken.

Leave to further amend should not be granted because the Board previously granted Opposer an opportunity to amend and Opposer has not shown that it has a viable Section 2(a) claim. Opposer's request for another bite at the apple should be denied.

WHEREFORE, Applicant prays that its motion be granted and the Amended Notice of Opposition be dismissed with respect to Count II.

Respectfully submitted,

By:     /s/ Tanja Proehl      
Paul G. Juettner  
Tanja Proehl  
Attorneys for APPLICANT

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.  
300 South Wacker Drive  
Suite 2500  
Chicago, Illinois  
Telephone: (312) 360-0080  
Facsimile: (312) 360-9315

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a true and complete copy of the foregoing APPLICANT'S  
REPLY TO OPPOSER'S OPPOSITION TO APPLICANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS  
THE AMENDED NOTICE OF OPPOSITION FOR FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM  
UNDER RULE 12(b)(6) WITH RESPECT TO OPPOSER'S COUNT II has been served  
upon the following counsel for Opposer:

James R. Davis, II  
Arent Fox LLP  
1717 K Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20006-5344  
[davis.jim@arentfox.com](mailto:davis.jim@arentfox.com)  
[mitchell.justine@arentfox.com](mailto:mitchell.justine@arentfox.com)  
[TMdocket@arentfox.com](mailto:TMdocket@arentfox.com)

by email as agreed upon, on this 24 day of September, 2015.

By:           /s/ Tanja Proehl            
Tanja Proehl  
Attorney for APPLICANT