

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA207439**

Filing date: **04/26/2008**

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

Proceeding	92049029
Party	Plaintiff Mr. David J. Long, Jr.
Correspondence Address	Mr. David J Long Jr. Taste of South Jersey 2050 Delsea Drive Sewell, NJ 08080 UNITED STATES pr@foodpresswire.com, editor@homeandtowne.com
Submission	Other Motions/Papers
Filer's Name	/david j long jr/
Filer's e-mail	pr@foodpresswire.com, editor@tasteofsj.com
Signature	/david j long jr/
Date	04/26/2008
Attachments	MemotoTTAB.pdf ( 2 pages )(79831 bytes )

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

In the matter of trademark Registration No. 2969604.....  
For the mark.....TASTE OF SOUTH JERSEY.....  
Date registered....July 19, 2005.....

(Name of petitioner) David J. Long Jr.

v.

(Name of registrant) Review Publishing

**Memorandum to the USPTO TTAB**

I, David Johnson Long Jr., attest that Attorney Glen A. Gundersen of the law office of Dechert LLP, attorneys for defendant, Review Publishing, did agree to receive notification by email and materials in opposition to the registration mark 296904 prior to my filing the petition to cancel on 3/18/08.

I, David J. Long Jr., the petitioner, have sought to peacefully resolve the invalidity of the the registered mark 2969604 by the registrant, Review Publishing for over one year prior to my petition to cancel.

I believe the defendant's statement of use and classification of goods to be virtually identical to my trade name and product—a periodical in the field of restaurants and dining, titled, Taste of South Jersey.

Moreover, I, David J. Long Jr., first used the trade name, Taste of South Jersey in commerce in 1999 and continue to use the name, Taste of South Jersey as a trade name and print periodical in the field of restaurants and dining.

The defendant's law firm's Motion to Dismiss on the grounds of Insufficient Notification is not accurate.

My understanding of the law is that: Although lawyers have a responsibility to be an advocate for their client, a lawyer is not allowed to knowingly mis-

lead the Court with documentations he or she know have been misrepresented for the purpose of obtaining a favorable judgement by manipulation and questionable practices.

I, the petitioner, David J. Long Jr. wish to inquire from the United States Patent and Trademark Office Trademark Trial and Appeal Board whether or not a Motion for Summary Judgement would be appropriate at this time— given the papers and attachments filed by me electronically, and the defendant's legal representatives tactics?

Respectively submitted,

David J. Long Jr., pro se

2050 Delsea Drive

Sewell, NJ 08080

(856) 232-2299

<http://www.tasteofsouthjersey.com>

April 26, 2008