Trademark Trial and Appeal Board Electronic Filing System. http://estta.uspto.gov

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA662814**

Filing date: **03/24/2015**

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

Proceeding	92060526
Party	Defendant Richline Group, Inc
Correspondence Address	RICHLINE GROUP INC 115 SOUTH MACQUESTEN PARKWAY MOUNT VERNON, NY 10550 UNITED STATES jlinowitz@LLBL.com
Submission	Answer
Filer's Name	Jane Linowitz
Filer's e-mail	jlinowitz@llbl.com, jberger@llbl.com, wruggiera@llbl.com
Signature	/Jane Linowitz/
Date	03/24/2015
Attachments	No.92060526.Answer.pdf(78576 bytes)

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

SCOTT JEWELERS LTD.,	)	
Petitioner	)	
v.	)	Cancellation No: 92060526
RICHLINE GROUP, INC.,	)	
Respondent.	)	

ANSWER TO PETITION TO CANCEL

Respondent Richline Group, Inc. ("Respondent"), by and through its attorneys Levisohn Berger LLP, for its Answer to "Petition to Cancel" ("Notice of Petition to Cancel) filed by Petitioner Scott Jewelers Ltd. ("Petitioner"), states as follows:

1. Respondent denies knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 1 of the Petition to Cancel.
2. Respondent denies knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations, in part due to vagueness, in Paragraph 2 of the Petition to Cancel.
3. Respondent denies knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 3 of the Petition to Cancel.
4. Respondent admits the allegations in Paragraph 4 of the Petition to Cancel.
5. Respondent admits the allegations in Paragraph 5 of the Petition to Cancel.
6. Respondent denies knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 6 of the Petition to Cancel.
7. Respondent admits the allegations in Paragraph 7 of the Petition to Cancel.

8. Respondent denies the allegations in Paragraph 8 of the Petition to Cancel.

9. Respondent denies the allegations in Paragraph 9 of the Petition to Cancel.

10. Respondent denies the allegations in Paragraph 10 of the Petition to Cancel.

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

11. Upon information and belief, Petitioner has unreasonably and inexcusably delayed in asserting its alleged claim of rights in the TWO BY LONDON mark against Respondent.

12. As a result of Petitioner's unreasonable delay, Respondent has built up rights in its registered trademark, such that Respondent would be prejudiced if Petitioner were now permitted to exercise its alleged claim of rights to stop Respondent's use of its registered trademark.

13. Thus, Petitioner's claims, as set forth in the Petition for Cancellation, are barred by the equitable doctrine of laches.

WHEREFORE, Respondent demands judgment dismissing the Petition for Cancellation with prejudice and granting to Respondent such other and further relief as the Board may deem fit and proper.

Dated: March 24, 2015

LEVISOHN BERGER LLP

By: Jane Linowitz

Jane Linowitz
jlinowitz@llbl.com
Jonathan Berger
jberger@llbl.com
11 Broadway, Suite 615
New York, New York 10004
Tel: (212) 486-7272
Attorneys for Registrant
Richline Group, Inc.