UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
Trademark Trial and Appeal Board
P.O. Box 1451
Alexandria, VA 22313-1451
General Contact Number: 571-272-8500

CME

Mailed: January 12, 2016

Cancellation No. 92058543

Edge Games Inc.

v.

Razer (Asia-Pacific) Pte Ltd.

Christen M. English, Interlocutory Attorney:

On January 11, 2016, Petitioner's Chief Executive Officer sent an email to the Board and counsel for Respondent requesting a telephone conference to discuss the possibility of Petitioner filing a combined motion to compel and for sanctions. *See* Exhibit A, attached. Because proceedings are suspended pending Petitioner's response to the Board's show cause order of January 11, 2016 and the disposition of Respondent's motion for sanctions, or in the alternative, to compel, filed November 17, 2015, Petitioner's request for a telephone conference is **DENIED**. **The Board will not entertain any further motions at this time**.

***

Exhibit A

From: Tim [mailto:tim@edgegames.com]
Sent: Monday, January 11, 2016 9:49 AM
To: English, Christen; Keith Barritt
Subject: Re: Cancellation No 92058543 - Request to file motions to compel and for judgment

Dear Ms English and Mr Barritt

My apologies, Mr Barritt, for not copying you with the below on Friday. I had meant to do so. Per the Board's order of January 30, 2015, my email below, and this email, are a request to set a mutually agreeable date for a telephone conference so that we may discuss Petitioner's request for permission to file a motion to compel Registrant's discovery responses, together with a motion for sanctions. It is Petitioner's belief that this request is proper not only since it complies with the Board's prior order on how Petitioner should go about asking for permission to file a motion, but also since its request to file a motion is directly related to Registrant's current motions as consideration of Petitioner's motion will be necessary for the Board to gain full appreciation of all the pertinent facts in order to rule fairly on Registrant's motions.

WITHDRAWAL OF DECEMBER 8, 2015 FILING
Petitioner notes that its filing of December 8, 2015 (being an addendum to its Response to motion) is hereby withdrawn. Petitioner further notes that it was filed out of time and if it had been considered it would have taken the page length of Petitioner's Response over the 25 page limit. Thus, the Board should have given no consideration to that filing (not even, please, to criticize Petitioner for filing it), but in any event, to be clear, Petitioner has formally withdrawn that filing.

Kind regards,
Dr Tim Langdell
CEO, Edge Games Inc
Petitioner in pro se

------ Original Message ------
From: "Tim" <tim@edgegames.com>
To: christen.english@uspto.gov
Sent: 1/8/2016 10:26:40 AM
Subject: Cancellation No 92058543 - Request to file motions to compel and for judgment

Dear Ms English

I appreciate that you asked that we make all requests to file a motion via telephone, but I did make the request some weeks ago and have not heard from you. I just left two new phone messages for you, but hope you may please be understanding that given the urgency of our request, that you consider this in writing this one time, too.
The other side (Razer) have not yet produced a single document by the valid method of production per TMBP. Our discovery requests on Razer were served on them in, I believe, August 2014, some six-seven months before, I believe, they first filed any discovery requests on us in or about February 2015.

Razer have been permitted to file a motion to compel us to produce documents whereas we have proven in the moving papers that we have already produced every document they requested of us (and we have noted that we believe the true intent of their motion was just to get an extension of time that they otherwise would not have been granted). We, however, have not been permitted to file our valid motions against Razer that would not be fair or proper to be filed and heard only after Razer's motions have been ruled on.

The Board has asked that no document be filed that is not pertinent to Razer's motions, however since Razer has never validly produced a single document to us, despite our requests being 7 months older than theirs, it would only be fair and equitable for us to be permitted to file our motion to compel their discovery production. And that the Board consider their motions along side our motion, so that the Board can see the entire true picture of discovery in this case -- rather than the extremely biased version of events Mr Barritt is trying to convince the Board of.

In particular, Mr Barritt is two-facedly trying to argue that because we have not produced documents (when in fact we have produced every document) Razer should thus be granted judgment. However, he fails to add that Razer has yet to produce any document by a valid means of production (whereas we have produced over 850 pages of documents by the method they demanded we produce them), and it is they who are in dire breach of their discovery obligations, not Edge Games. Indeed, for this reason, I believe that we have the right to ask for summary judgment in our favor, and thus I also ask for permission to file a motion for judgment against Razer, too, please. And that this motion, also, be considered along side Razer's motions, in fairness and equity since it is all on the exact same topic of each party's performance on and adherence to the requirements of production and discovery.

Thank you

Rev Dr Tim Langdell, MDiv PhD
CEO, Edge Games Inc
Petitioner in pro se

530 South Lake Avenue 171
Pasadena, CA 91101
T: 626 449 4EDGE
F: 626 844 4EDGE
Direct: 626 824 0097