

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
Trademark Trial and Appeal Board
P.O. Box 1451
Alexandria, VA 22313-1451

CME

Mailed: March 21, 2014

Cancellation No. 92057413

William Jones

v.

Ellie Nahum

Christen M. English, Interlocutory Attorney:

On March 19, 2014, pursuant to petitioner's request, the Board held a telephone conference in the above-captioned cancellation proceeding to discuss communication issues between the parties.

During the conference, respondent indicated that his correspondence address of record is incorrect. Each party has a duty to ensure that the Board has his current correspondence address, including e-mail address. TBMP § 117.07 (3d ed. rev.2 2013). Accordingly, respondent is allowed until **TEN DAYS** from the mailing date of this order to file a change of correspondence address with the Board.¹

During the conference, the parties also indicated that they have not completed the discovery conference mandated

¹ Respondent is encouraged to file his change of address online using the Board's Electronic System for Trademark Trials and Appeals ("ESTTA") at <http://estta.uspto.gov/>.

under Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f) and Trademark Rule 2.120(a)(1) and (a)(2), notwithstanding the February 15, 2014 deadline to do so. Accordingly, the Board orders the parties to participate in the mandatory discovery conference, with Board participation, on **Thursday, March 27, 2014 at 1:00 p.m. Eastern Standard Time.** The Board will e-mail the parties a call-in number for the discovery conference using the e-mail addresses of record in this proceeding. If either party fails to participate in the discovery conference as ordered herein, that party may be subject to a motion for sanctions under Trademark Rule 2.120(g).

In preparation for the discovery conference, the parties should familiarize themselves with the Board's Accelerated Case Resolution ("ACR") procedure by reviewing the following:

1. General description of ACR:

<http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/process/appeal/Accelerated Case Resolution ACR notice from TTAB webpage 12 2 2 11.pdf>;

2. FAQs on ACR:

[http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/process/appeal/Accelerated Case Resolution \(ACR\) FAQ updates 12 22 11.doc](http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/process/appeal/Accelerated Case Resolution (ACR) FAQ updates 12 22 11.doc);

3. List of cases employing ACR-like efficiencies:

[http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/process/appeal/ACR_Case_List_\(10-23-12\).doc](http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/process/appeal/ACR_Case_List_(10-23-12).doc);²

4. The Board's decision in *Chanel, Inc. v. Makarczyk*, 106 USPQ2d 1774 (TTAB 2013); and

5. Potential ACR schedules:

http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/process/appeal/TTAB_ACR_Options.jsp.

² It may be helpful for the parties to review the docket entries and filings for these cases (accessible through TTABVue at <http://ttabvue.uspto.gov/ttabvue/>) to see the types of ACR and ACR-like efficiencies that parties have utilized in Board proceedings.