

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA691056**

Filing date: **08/21/2015**

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

Proceeding	91222790
Party	Defendant Xedoc Luxembourg S.A.
Correspondence Address	JON K PERALA PERALA LAW OFFICE 332 S MICHIGAN AVE, STE 1032 CHICAGO, IL 60604-4366 UNITED STATES jkperala@peralaw.com
Submission	Answer
Filer's Name	Anna M. Vradenburgh
Filer's e-mail	tmdocketing@apogeelawgroup.com, anna@apogeelawgroup.com, ptauger@apogeelawgroup.com
Signature	/anna m vradenburgh/
Date	08/21/2015
Attachments	2015-08-21 Answer.pdf(122009 bytes)

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

<hr/>		:
		:
Life Before Us, Inc.		:
		:
Opposer,		: Marks: YO!
		: YO! LET’S CONNECT
		:
v.		: Serial Nos. 86/315,415, 86/315,400
		:
Xedoc Luxembourg SA,		: Opposition No. 91/222,790
Applicant		:
<hr/>		:

ANSWER TO NOTICE OF OPPOSITION

Trademark Trial and Appeal Board
P.O. Box 1451
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1451

Dear Sir/Madam:

Applicant Xedoc Luxenbourg SA, (“Applicant”) hereby pleads as follows in answer to the Notice of Opposition filed herein by Life Before Us, Inc. (“Opposer”):

1. Applicant is without information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of the introductory paragraph of the Notice of Opposition, and therefore, denies the same.
2. Applicant admits the filing particulars of Trademark Application Serial No. 86/315,415, and contends that the document speaks for itself.
3. Applicant admits the filing particulars of Trademark Application Serial No. 86/315,400, and contends that the document speaks for itself.
4. Applicant admits the allegations in Paragraph 3 of the Notice of Opposition.
5. Applicant is without information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 4 of the Notice of Opposition regarding the filings of the Extension of Time to Oppose, and therefore, denies the same. Applicant admits only that the records of the

USPTO reflect that an extension was granted on or about February 11, 2015.

6. Applicant is without information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 5 of the Notice of Opposition regarding the filings of the Extension of Time to Oppose, and therefore, denies the same. Applicant admits only that the records of the USPTO reflect that an extension was granted on or about May 11, 2015.

7. Applicant is without information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 6 of the Notice of Opposition, and therefore, denies the same.

8. Applicant is without information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 7 of the Notice of Opposition, and therefore, denies the same.

9. Applicant is without information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 8 of the Notice of Opposition, and therefore, denies the same.

10. Applicant is without information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 9 of the Notice of Opposition, and therefore, denies the same.

11. Applicant is without information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 10 of the Notice of Opposition, and therefore, denies the same.

12. Applicant is without information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 11 of the Notice of Opposition, and therefore, denies the same.

13. Applicant is without information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 12 of the Notice of Opposition, and therefore, denies the same.

14. Applicant denies the allegations in Paragraph 13 of the Notice of Opposition.

15. Applicant is without information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 14 of the Notice of Opposition, and therefore, denies the same.

16. Applicant is without information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 15 of the Notice of Opposition, and therefore, denies the same.

17. Applicant is without information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 16 of the Notice of Opposition, and therefore, denies the same.

18. Applicant is without information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 17 of the Notice of Opposition, and therefore, denies the same.

19. Applicant is without information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 18 of the Notice of Opposition, and therefore, denies the same.

Affirmative Defenses

1. Opposer's is barred by unclean hands.
2. Opposer has acquiesced to Applicant's use of the mark.
3. Applicant is the senior user of the mark.
4. Due to numerous third party uses of the mark, no likelihood of confusion will result from the registration of Applicant's marks.
5. Opposer will not suffer any damage from the registration of the Applicant's mark.

WHEREFORE, Applicant requests that Opposer's Notice of Opposition be dismissed with prejudice and that registration be granted on Applicant's applications.

Respectfully submitted,
Applicant Xedoc Luxembourg SA



Anna M. Vradenburgh
Paul N. Tauger
Apogee Law Group
2801 Townsgate Road, Suite 320
Westlake Village, California 91361
Telephone: 818-946-2300

Attorneys for Applicant Xedoc Luxembourg SA

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF VENTURA

I am employed in the County of Ventura, State of California. I am over the age of 18 years and am not a party to the within action. My business address is 2815 Townsgate Road, Suite 320, Westlake Village, California 91361.

On August 21, 2015 I served the following document(s) described as **ANSWER TO NOTICE OF OPPOSITION** on the interested parties in this action by placing the original a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope addressed as follows:

Jennifer Kovalcik
Mari-Elise Taube
Stites & Harbison PLLC
401 Commerce St., Suite 800
Nashville, Tennessee 37219

- BY MAIL:** I caused such envelope to be deposited in the mail at Westlake Village, California. I am “readily familiar” with the office’s practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Correspondence so collected and processed is deposited with the United States Postal Service that same day in the ordinary course of business.
- BY PERSONAL SERVICE:** I delivered such envelope by hand to the offices of the addressee(s) listed above.
- BY FACSIMILE:** I caused the above document(s) to be transmitted to the office of the addressee(s) listed above.
- BY EXPRESS MAIL:** I caused the document(s) to be delivered by overnight Express Mail via the United States Postal Service “Express Mail Post Office to Addressee” to the addressee(s) listed above.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on August 21, 2015, County of Ventura, California.

/s/ Stacey Messina
Stacey Messina