

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA724546**

Filing date: **02/03/2016**

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

Proceeding	92059314
Party	Defendant Merit Medical Systems, Inc.
Correspondence Address	BRENT P LORIMER WORKMAN NYDEGGER 60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE STE 1000 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111 UNITED STATES blorimer@wnlaw.com, thomas.daly@cph.com, pto@cph.com, jhutchison@wnlaw.com, vgarrett@wnlaw.com, orders@wnlaw.com, djohnson@wnlaw.com
Submission	Other Motions/Papers
Filer's Name	Brent Lorimer
Filer's e-mail	BLorimer@WNLaw.com, kfernandez@wnlaw.com, Docketing@WNLaw.com
Signature	/s/Brent P. Lorimer
Date	02/03/2016
Attachments	Status Update Regarding Dismissal of Related Civil Proceeding.pdf(140791 bytes )

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

In the matter of: Trademark Registration Nos. 1,526,710 and 4,413,590  
Marks: MERIT and MERIT MEDICAL  
Dates Registered: February 28, 1989 and October 8, 2013

<p>MERIT HEALTHCARE INTERNATIONAL, INC. dba MERIT PHARMACEUTICAL,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Petitioner,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>MERIT MEDICAL SYSTEMS, INC.,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respondent.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Cancellation No. 92059314</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>STATUS UPDATE REGARDING DISMISSAL OF RELATED CIVIL PROCEEDING</b></p>
---	--

Defendant Merit Medical Systems, Inc. submits this update to inform the Board of recent events in the related civil action that occasioned the suspension of these proceedings. That action is captioned *Merit Healthcare International, Inc. dba Merit Pharmaceutical v. Merit Medical Systems, Inc.*, Case No. 2:14-cv-04280 (the “Litigation”), and is pending in the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California. As previously noted, Merit filed a motion to dismiss the complaint filed by Applicant Merit Healthcare International, Inc. d/b/a/ Merit Pharmaceuticals (“MP”) for lack of a case or controversy. On January 28, 2016, the Honorable Fernando M. Olguin granted Merit’s motion and dismissed the Litigation. Judgment dismissing MP’s complaint was entered the same day. Copies of the Order and Judgment are attached hereto as Exhibits A and B.

DATED this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of February, 2016.

By: /Brent P. Lorimer/  
BRENT P. LORIMER

WORKMAN NYDEGGER  
60 East South Temple, Tenth Floor  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84111  
Telephone: (801) 533-9800  
Facsimile: (801) 328-1707  
Email: [blorimer@wnlaw.com](mailto:blorimer@wnlaw.com)

Attorneys for Respondent  
MERIT MEDICAL SYSTEMS, INC.

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and correct copy of the foregoing **STATUS UPDATE REGARDING DISMISSAL OF RELATED CIVIL PROCEEDING** was served upon Petitioner by emailing true copies thereof to its attorney of record at the address below, with confirmation copies via First Class mail, postage prepaid this 3<sup>rd</sup> day of February, 2016, in an envelope addressed as follows:

THOMAS J. DALY  
LEWIS, ROCA, ROTHBERGER & CHRISTIE  
P.O. BOX 29001  
Glendale, CA 91209-9001

\_\_\_\_\_  
/Brent P. Lorimer/

5367923\_1.doc

# **EXHIBIT A**

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL**

<b>Case No.</b>	<b>CV 14-4280 FMO (SHx)</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>January 28, 2016</b>
<b>Title</b>	<b>Merit Healthcare International, Inc. d/b/a Merit Pharmaceutical v. Merit Medical Systems, Inc.</b>		

<b>Present: The Honorable</b>	<b>Fernando M. Olguin, United States District Judge</b>		
<b>Vanessa Figueroa</b>	<b>None</b>	<b>None</b>	
<b>Deputy Clerk</b>	<b>Court Reporter / Recorder</b>	<b>Tape No.</b>	
<b>Attorney Present for Plaintiff(s):</b>		<b>Attorney Present for Defendant(s):</b>	
<b>None Present</b>		<b>None Present</b>	

**Proceedings: (In Chambers) Order Re: Defendant's Motion to Dismiss**

Having reviewed and considered all the briefing filed with respect to Merit Medical Systems, Inc.'s ("defendant") Motion to Dismiss the Third Amended Complaint for Lack of a Case or Controversy, (Dkt. 85, "Motion"), the court concludes that oral argument is not necessary to resolve it. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 78; Local Rule 7-15; Willis v. Pac. Mar. Ass'n, 244 F.3d 675, 684 n. 2 (9th Cir. 2001).

**INTRODUCTION**

Plaintiff Merit Healthcare International, Inc. ("plaintiff") filed this action on June 3, 2014, seeking: (1) declaratory judgment for non-infringement of trademark; (2) cancellation for fraud; (3) cancellation for falsely suggesting a connection with plaintiff; and (4) cancellation for likelihood of confusion. (See Dkt. 1, Complaint ("Cmpl.") at ¶¶ 33-57). A First Amended Complaint was filed on September 3, 2014, (see Dkt. 15, "FAC"), defendant moved to dismiss, and the court granted that motion, giving plaintiff leave to file an amended complaint. (See Dkt. 30, Court's Order of Oct. 20, 2014, at 2). Plaintiff filed a Second Amended Complaint, (see Dkt. 34, "SAC"), and defendant filed motions to dismiss the SAC. (See Dkts. 35, 44 & 56). While those motions were pending, plaintiff sought leave to amend the SAC, which the court granted. (See Dkt. 83, Court's Order of July 17, 2015).

On July 20, 2015, plaintiff filed the operative Third Amended Complaint, (Dkt. 84, "TAC"), seeking: (1) Declaratory Judgment, 28 U.S.C. § 2201; and (2) partial cancellation of trademark, 15 U.S.C. § 1119. (See id. at ¶¶ 42-58). Defendant seeks to dismiss both claims for lack of subject matter jurisdiction. (See Dkt. 85, Motion).

**ALLEGATIONS IN THE THIRD AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff is the distributor and seller of various professional healthcare products, including pharmaceutical and related medical devices, such as syringes, intravenous administration devices, and various intravenous therapy items. (See Dkt. 84, TAC at ¶ 7). Plaintiff has, since 1977, sold

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL**

Case No.	<b>CV 14-4280 FMO (SHx)</b>	Date	<b>January 28, 2016</b>
Title	<b>Merit Healthcare International, Inc. d/b/a Merit Pharmaceutical v. Merit Medical Systems, Inc.</b>		

pharmaceutical and related medical devices and products under the “MERIT” mark. (See id. at ¶ 8). In addition to the MERIT mark, plaintiff has, since at least the early 1980s, used several related trademarks that incorporate the MERIT mark and a suffix, including Mericaine, Meritate, Merical 10%, Merivite Concentrate, Meritol-A, Meritrex, Merivit IM with Minerals, Meritinic/c and Merizinc. (See id. at ¶ 10).

Between April 22, 2013, and June 16, 2014, plaintiff filed trademark applications for additional marks that use the MERIT mark plus a suffix, including “Meritphlo,” “Meritape,” “Meritderm,” “Meritcath,” “Meritset,” and “Meritquets.” (See Dkt. 84, TAC at ¶¶ 13-19) (“plaintiff’s applications”). The United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”) denied each of plaintiff’s applications, (see id. at ¶¶ 30-36), citing defendant’s registered trademarks, which use the same convention of adding a suffix to defendant’s MERIT mark, including “Merit Medical,” “Merit Advance,” “Merit H2O,” “Merit Medical Endotek,” “Merit Laureate,” “Merit Maestro,” “Meritrans,” “Merit Sensor Systems & Design,” and “Merit Sensor Systems.” (See id. at ¶¶ 20-29). The TAC does not allege that defendant opposed any of plaintiff’s applications before the USPTO. (See, generally, id.).

Although plaintiff’s applications were denied, the TAC indicates that plaintiff has continued to use all of its MERIT marks, including those rejected by the USPTO. (See Dkt. 84, TAC at ¶ 40 (“[p]laintiff’s continued use . . . creates a cloud of controversy regarding this trademark infringement issue”); Dkt. 85, Motion at 10 (“It is likewise undisputed that from the date of the original complaint to the present date, [plaintiff] continues to use ‘MERITSET,’ ‘MERITCATH,’ ‘MERITPHLO,’ ‘MERITDERM,’ ‘MERITAPE,’ and ‘MERITQUETS’” marks)).

On May 7, 2014, plaintiff sent defendant a letter, which noted that the parties had limited communications in February 2014, and no further discussions since February 2014. (See Dkt. 84, TAC at ¶ 37 & Exhibit (“Exh.”) 18 (“May 7, 2014 letter”)). In that letter, plaintiff stated that it was the owner of the MERIT mark based on priority of use. (See Dkt. 84, TAC at Exh. 18). The letter enclosed catalogs from 1977 to 1986 as support for its priority of use claim. (See id.). The letter also inquired about defendant’s amenability to entering into a coexistence agreement, so that both parties could continue using their marks within certain parameters. (See id. at 3). Plaintiff concluded the letter by stating that it was “prepared to seek full, or at least partial, cancellation” of defendant’s marks, and “[i]n view of the urgency,” would initiate cancellation proceedings unless it heard back from defendant by May 21, 2014. (See id. at 3-4). The May 7, 2014 letter did not enclose a term sheet or draft co-existence agreement. (See, generally, id.).

On May 12, 2014, plaintiff spoke via telephone with defendant. (See Dkt. 84, TAC at ¶ 38). Plaintiff alleges that defendant “would not agree, and expressed doubt that” defendant would “consent to Plaintiff’s continued use of the MERIT mark in connection with professional healthcare products.” (Id.).

On May 14, 2014, defendant sent plaintiff an email regarding the May 7, 2014 letter and

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL**

Case No.	CV 14-4280 FMO (SHx)	Date	January 28, 2016
Title	Merit Healthcare International, Inc. d/b/a Merit Pharmaceutical v. Merit Medical Systems, Inc.		

May 12, 2014 telephone call. (See Dkt. 85-2, Declaration of Brent P. Lorimer in Support of [Defendant's] Motion to Dismiss the Third Amended Complaint for a Lack of Case or Controversy ("Lorimer Decl."), Exh. F (Declaration of David Delos Larson in Support of [Defendant's] Motion to Dismiss the Second Amended Complaint for Lack of a Case or Controversy ("Larson Decl.)) at Exh. A ("May 14, 2014 email"). In that email, defendant stated that it understood that plaintiff's proposed coexistence agreement would not "identify[] different classes of goods that each of [the] companies would use the 'Merit' name for," but would rather entail an "agree[ment] that there is no likelihood of confusion between marks because [the parties] operate in different channels[.]" (May 14, 2014 email). As for plaintiff's claim of priority of use of the MERIT mark, defendant requested additional evidence of plaintiff's first use of the MERIT mark in interstate commerce, including specimens. (See *id.*). Defendant's email concluded, "[a]fter we receive your response, we will be in a better position to evaluate your client's assertions. Given your request that this matter be resolved quickly, please provide us the information discussed in this email within the next week." (See *id.*). There are no allegations or evidence as to whether plaintiff followed up on defendant's request for additional information or whether the parties continued negotiations regarding the coexistence agreement. (See, generally, Dkt. 84, TAC; Dkt. 85, Motion). Rather, plaintiff filed its Complaint about three weeks later, on June 3, 2014. (See Dkt. 1, Cmpl.).

**LEGAL STANDARD**

"Federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction. They possess only that power authorized by Constitution and statute[.]" *Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co. of Am.*, 511 U.S. 375, 377, 114 S.Ct. 1673, 1675 (1994). The courts are presumed to lack jurisdiction unless the contrary appears affirmatively from the record. See *DaimlerChrysler Corp. v. Cuno*, 547 U.S. 332, 342 n. 3, 126 S.Ct. 1854, 1861 (2006). Federal courts have a duty to examine jurisdiction *sua sponte* before proceeding to the merits of a case, see *Ruhrgas AG v. Marathon Oil*, 526 U.S. 574, 583, 119 S.Ct. 1563, 1569 (1999), "even in the absence of a challenge from any party." *Arbaugh v. Y&H Corp.*, 546 U.S. 500, 514, 126 S.Ct. 1235, 1244 (2006). The party asserting jurisdiction has the burden of establishing subject matter jurisdiction. See *Kokkonen*, 511 U.S. at 377, 114 S.Ct. at 1675.

A defendant may seek to dismiss a complaint for lack of subject-matter jurisdiction under Rule<sup>1</sup> 12(b)(1) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. "Rule 12(b)(1) jurisdictional attacks can be either facial or factual." *White v. Lee*, 227 F.3d 1214, 1242 (9th Cir. 2000). "In a facial attack, the challenger asserts that the allegations contained in a complaint are insufficient on their face to invoke federal jurisdiction." *Safe Air for Everyone v. Meyer*, 373 F.3d 1035, 1039 (9th Cir. 2004), *cert. denied*, 544 U.S. 1018 (2005). "By contrast, in a factual attack, the challenger disputes the truth of the allegations that, by themselves, would otherwise invoke federal jurisdiction." *Id.* "In resolving a factual attack on jurisdiction, the district court may review evidence beyond the complaint without converting the motion to dismiss into a motion for summary

<sup>1</sup> All further "Rule" references are to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL**

Case No.	<b>CV 14-4280 FMO (SHx)</b>	Date	<b>January 28, 2016</b>
Title	<b>Merit Healthcare International, Inc. d/b/a Merit Pharmaceutical v. Merit Medical Systems, Inc.</b>		

judgment.” Id. “[The court] also need not presume the truthfulness of the plaintiff[’s] allegations.” White, 227 F.3d at 1242. “Once the moving party has converted the motion to dismiss into a factual motion by presenting affidavits or other evidence properly brought before the court, the party opposing the motion must furnish affidavits or other evidence necessary to satisfy its burden of establishing subject matter jurisdiction.” Savage v. Glendale Union High Sch., Dist. No. 205, Maricopa Cnty., 343 F.3d 1036, 1039 n. 2 (9th Cir. 2003), cert. denied, 541 U.S. 1009 (2004).

“[W]hile later events may not create jurisdiction where none existed at the time of filing, the proper focus in determining jurisdiction are the facts existing at the time the complaint under consideration was filed[.]” which in this case would be the TAC. Northstar Fin. Advisors Inc. v. Schwab Invs., 779 F.3d 1036, 1044 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 2015 WL 4555146 (2015) (internal quotation marks and bracket omitted) (treating amended complaint under Rule 15(a) as a supplemental complaint under Rule 15(d), because dismissal for failure to file a supplemental complaint would have “elevate[d] form over substance”).

**DISCUSSION**

I. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT, 28 U.S.C. § 2201.

The Declaratory Judgment Act provides that “[i]n a case of actual controversy within its jurisdiction . . . any court of the United States, upon the filing of an appropriate pleading, may declare the rights and other legal relations of any interested party seeking such declaration, whether or not further relief is or could be sought.” 28 U.S.C. § 2201. “The ‘actual controversy’ requirement of the Act is the same as the ‘case or controversy’ requirement of Article III of the United States Constitution.” Societe de Conditionnement en Aluminium v. Hunter Eng’g Co., 655 F.2d 938, 942 (9th Cir. 1981); see Ass’n for Molecular Pathology v. U.S. Patent & Trademark Office, 689 F.3d 1303, 1317-18 (Fed. Cir. 2012), aff’d in part, rev’d in part on other grounds sub nom., Ass’n for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics, Inc., 133 S.Ct. 2107 (2013) (“The phrase ‘a case of actual controversy’ in the Act refers to the types of ‘cases’ and ‘controversies’ that are justiciable under Article III of the U.S. Constitution.”). The case or controversy requirement under the Declaratory Judgment Act requires that plaintiff’s claim be “‘definite and concrete, touching the legal relations of parties having adverse legal interests’; and that it be ‘real and substantial’ and ‘admi[t] of specific relief through a decree of a conclusive character, as distinguished from an opinion advising what the law would be upon a hypothetical state of facts.” MedImmune, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc., 549 U.S. 118, 127, 127 S.Ct. 764, 771 (2007) (citing Aetna Life Ins. Co. of Hartford, Conn. v. Haworth, 300 U.S. 227, 240-41, 57 S.Ct. 461, 464 (1937)); West v. Sec’y of Dep’t of Transp., 206 F.3d 920, 924 (9th Cir. 2000).

Whether a declaratory judgment claim satisfies the case or controversy requirement is not a bright-line test. See MedImmune, 549 U.S. at 127, 127 S.Ct. at 771 (“Aetna and the cases following it do not draw the brightest of lines between those declaratory-judgment actions that satisfy the case-or-controversy requirement and those that do not.”); Maryland Cas. Co. v. Pac.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL**

Case No.	CV 14-4280 FMO (SHx)	Date	January 28, 2016
Title	Merit Healthcare International, Inc. d/b/a Merit Pharmaceutical v. Merit Medical Systems, Inc.		

Coal & Oil Co., 312 U.S. 270, 273, 61 S.Ct. 510, 512 (1941) (“The difference between an abstract question and a ‘controversy’ contemplated by the Declaratory Judgment Act is necessarily one of degree, and it would be difficult, if it would be possible, to fashion a precise test for determining in every case whether there is such a controversy.”). Rather, plaintiff must allege facts that “under all the circumstances, show that there is a substantial controversy, between parties having adverse legal interests, of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment.” MedImmune, 549 U.S. at 127, 127 S.Ct. at 771; Shell Gulf of Mexico Inc. v. Ctr. for Biological Diversity, Inc., 771 F.3d 632, 635 (9th Cir. 2014) (same); Prasco, LLC v. Medicis Pharm. Corp., 537 F.3d 1329, 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2008) (“[A] case or controversy must be based on a real and immediate injury or threat of future injury that is caused by the defendants – an objective standard that cannot be met by a purely subjective or speculative fear of future harm.”) (emphasis in original).

There are “multiple ways that a declaratory judgment plaintiff can satisfy the more general all-the-circumstances test to establish that an action presents a justiciable Article III controversy.” Prasco, LLC, 537 F.3d at 1336. Here, plaintiff appears to rely on the reasonable apprehension of suit test. (See Dkt. 88, [Plaintiff’s] Opposition to [Defendant’s] Motion to Dismiss the Third Amended Complaint for Lack of a Case or Controversy (“Opp.”) at 14, 16 & 19-20; see also E. & J. Gallo Winery v. Proximo Spirits, Inc., 583 F. App’x 632, 634 (9th Cir. 2014) (“An actual controversy exists if the declaratory action ‘plaintiff has a real and reasonable apprehension that he will be subject [to suit].’”).

Here, considering “all the circumstances,” MedImmune, 549 U.S. at 127, 127 S.Ct. at 771, plaintiff has not alleged a controversy of sufficient “immediacy and reality” to create a justiciable controversy. Plaintiff has not identified any affirmative act by defendant sufficient to cause plaintiff to have a real and reasonable apprehension that it will be subject to suit.<sup>2</sup> Quite the reverse, the facts suggest that plaintiff – not defendant – has been seeking to develop a basis to initiate suit

---

<sup>2</sup> The cases plaintiff cites to argue that there is a real and reasonable apprehension that it will be subject to suit (see Dkt. 88, Opp. at 18-20), are unpersuasive. In E. & J. Gallo Winery, the defendant sent a cease-and-desist letter claiming that plaintiff’s Camarena Tequila infringed plaintiff’s 1800 bottle and threatened pertinent legal action. See 583 F. App’x at 633. In contrast, defendant has never identified which of plaintiff’s MERIT marks infringe defendant’s marks. (See, generally, Dkt. 84, TAC; Dkt. 88, Opp.).

Similarly, in Rhoades v. Avon Products, Inc., 504 F.3d 1151, 1158 (9th Cir. 2007), “[n]ot only did Avon allegedly make three concrete threats of infringement litigation, but it did so on the heels of years of unsuccessful and tense settlement negotiations, and after Avon initiated seven actions in the TTAB.” Finally, in Hansen Beverage Co. v. Cytosport, Inc., 2009 WL 882414, \*2 (C.D. Cal. 2009), defendant filed five contingent oppositions and four unqualified oppositions to plaintiff’s proposed marks before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board (“TTAB”).

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL**

Case No.	<b>CV 14-4280 FMO (SHx)</b>	Date	<b>January 28, 2016</b>
Title	<b>Merit Healthcare International, Inc. d/b/a Merit Pharmaceutical v. Merit Medical Systems, Inc.</b>		

against defendant. Plaintiff first contacted defendant in February 2014. (See May 7, 2014 letter) (referencing previous February 2014 discussions). In its May 7, 2014 letter, plaintiff threatened to cancel defendant's marks. (See id. at 3-4) (stating plaintiff was "prepared to seek full, or at least partial, cancellation" of defendant's marks, and "[i]n view of the urgency," would initiate cancellation proceedings unless it heard back from defendant by May 21, 2014).

In contrast, defendant did not threaten infringement in May 2014; rather, it sought additional information to continue negotiations regarding plaintiff's proposed coexistence agreement prior to plaintiff's filing suit on June 3, 2014. (See May 14, 2014 email; Dkt. 84, TAC at ¶¶ 37-40). Nor did defendant file an opposition to plaintiff's applications before the USPTO. (See, generally, Dkt. 84, TAC); cf. Chesebrough-Pond's, Inc. v. Faberge, Inc., 666 F.2d 393, 396 (9th Cir.), cert. denied, 459 U.S. 967 (1982) (defendant's detailed opposition to plaintiff's marks before the USPTO constituted reasonable apprehension of suit).

Plaintiff references additional facts during the course of this litigation as evidence that it is in reasonable apprehension of suit. (See Dkt. 88, Opp. at 14-17). First, plaintiff claims that defendant's president testified that plaintiff's use of the MERIT mark "would create substantial [consumer] confusion." (See Dkt. 88, Opp. at 15-16). But that is not what defendant's president said. Rather, he testified that "[a]s the products are currently labeled with [plaintiff's] logo, the Merit Pharmaceutical, we don't generally see or compete with it." (Dkt. 88-1, Declaration of Katherine L. Quigley in Support of [Plaintiff's] Opposition to [Defendant's] Motion to Dismiss Third Amended Complaint for Lack of a Case or Controversy, Exh. 5 ("Lampropolous Dep.") at 123). In other words, defendant does not contend that plaintiff's current use of its marks, including plaintiff's use of the marks that the USPTO rejected, infringe defendant's marks. Rather, defendant's president hypothesized that "if [plaintiff] were to go away from that, then [he] believe[s] such use] would create confusion with our customers." (Lampropolous Dep. at 123). But for a case or controversy to exist, the matter must be "definite and concrete," not hypothetical, and the court cannot "advise what the law would be upon a hypothetical state of facts." MedImmune, 549 U.S. at 127, 127 S.Ct. at 771.

Second, plaintiff makes much of the fact that defendant, at the parties' Rule 26(f) conference, stated that it "will" assert counterclaims against plaintiff. (See Dkt. 88, Opp. at 14-15). But defendant has not asserted any claims, nor does the record indicate what claims it could assert against plaintiff. "[T]he lack of clearly delineated, adverse positions by the parties diminishes the 'definite[ness] and concrete[ness]' of any potential controversy and its fitness for current judicial resolution." Prasco, 537 F.3d at 1340 n. 8 (finding no case or controversy because the court "ha[d] no way of knowing which if any of [plaintiff's declaratory relief claims] defendants could or might assert against [plaintiff]").

Finally, plaintiff claims that defendant could divest the court of jurisdiction by entering a covenant not to sue plaintiff. (See Dkt. 88, Opp. at 17). However, this argument presupposes that the court has subject-matter jurisdiction over the declaratory relief claim. "[T]hough a defendant's

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**CIVIL MINUTES - GENERAL**

Case No.	CV 14-4280 FMO (SHx)	Date	January 28, 2016
Title	Merit Healthcare International, Inc. d/b/a Merit Pharmaceutical v. Merit Medical Systems, Inc.		

failure to sign a covenant not to sue is one circumstance to consider in evaluating the totality of the circumstances, it is not sufficient to create an actual controversy – some affirmative actions by the defendant will also generally be necessary.” Prasco, 537 F.3d at 1341 (“A patentee has no obligation to spend the time and money to test a competitors’ product nor to make a definitive determination, at the time and place of the competitors’ choosing, that it will never bring an infringement suit.”). Because plaintiff has not identified any affirmative act by defendant to demonstrate that a case or controversy exists, defendant’s failure to sign a covenant not to sue is insufficient to create an actual controversy under the circumstances of this case.

II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION FOR PARTIAL CANCELLATION OF DEFENDANT’S MARKS, 15 U.S.C. § 1119.

In addition to its claim for declaratory judgment, plaintiff seeks to cancel some of defendant’s marks pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1119. (See Dkt. 84, TAC at ¶¶ 46-58). Cancellation “may only be sought if there is already an ongoing action that involves a registered mark[.]” Airs Aromatics, LLC v. Opinion Victoria’s Secret Stores Brand Mgmt., Inc., 744 F.3d 595, 599 (9th Cir. 2014) (“cancellation is available in ‘any action involving a registered mark.’”) (citing 15 U.S.C. § 1119). This is because cancellation under 15 U.S.C. § 1119 “creates a remedy for trademark infringement rather than an independent basis for federal jurisdiction.” (Id.). Because plaintiff’s declaratory judgment cause of action fails, no ongoing action involving a registered mark remains, thus requiring dismissal of plaintiff’s cancellation claim.

**CONCLUSION**

**This Order is not intended for publication. Nor is it intended to be included in or submitted to any online service such as Westlaw or Lexis.**

Based on the foregoing, IT IS ORDERED THAT:

1. Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss the Third Amended Complaint for Lack of a Case or Controversy (**Document No. 85**) is **granted**. Plaintiff’s Third Amended Complaint is **dismissed without prejudice**. Plaintiff’s and defendant’s motion and cross-motion for summary judgment (**Document No. 89**) are **denied as moot**.

2. Judgment shall be entered accordingly.

Initials of Preparer    vdr

# **EXHIBIT B**

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

JS - 6

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

MERIT HEALTHCARE INTERNATIONAL, INC.,  
Plaintiff,  
v.  
MERIT MEDICAL SYSTEMS, INC.,  
Defendant.

---

) Case No. CV 14-4280 FMO (SHx)

) **JUDGMENT**

IT IS ADJUDGED that the above-captioned action is dismissed without prejudice.

Dated this 28th day of January, 2016.

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/  
Fernando M. Olguin  
United States District Judge