

THIS OPINION  
IS NOT A PRECEDENT OF  
THE T.T.A.B.

Mailed:  
December 22, 2011

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Trademark Trial and Appeal Board

In re Luby's Fuddruckers Restaurants, LLC

Serial No. 77878646

Pamela B. Huff of Cox Smith Matthew Incorporated for Luby's Fuddruckers Restaurants, LLC.

Ronald McMorro, Trademark Examining Attorney, Law Office 105 (Thomas G. Howell, Managing Attorney).

Before Rogers, Bergsman and Shaw,  
Administrative Trademark Judges.

Opinion by Bergsman, Administrative Trademark Judge:

Magic Brands, LLC ("applicant") filed a use based application to register the mark BETTER BEEF. BETTER BURGER., in standard character form, for "restaurant services."<sup>1</sup> Applicant disclaimed the exclusive right to use the term "Better Burger."

<sup>1</sup> During the prosecution of the application Magic Brands, LLC assigned its entire right, interest and goodwill in the mark and to the application to Luby's Fuddruckers Restaurants, LLC. The assignment was recorded on August 13, 2010, at reel 4260, frame 0567.

The trademark examining attorney refused registration under Section 2(e)(1) of the Trademark Act of 1946, 15 U.S.C. §1052(e)(1), on the ground that applicant's mark, proposed for use in connection with applicant's restaurant services, is merely descriptive. The examining attorney maintains that applicant's mark "very clearly and directly attributes superior quality to two significant features of its services, BEEF and BURGERS."<sup>2</sup>

Applicant argues that its mark is suggestive of the services because consumers may believe that applicant's mark is associated with numerous goods and services in the context of restaurant-related services and, therefore, no immediate connection would be formed between the mark and the services, or, in the alternative, consumers might associate the word "Beef" with an "argumentative wait staff" or "scantily clad male employees."<sup>3</sup> Moreover, applicant argues its mark is not descriptive because it is "catchy, clever, alliterative and has a unique aural cadence" which makes the mark more than descriptive. Furthermore, because there are no similar marks registered or in use, competitors do not have a need to use applicant's mark. Finally, applicant asserts that its mark

---

<sup>2</sup> Examining Attorney's Brief, unnumbered page 2.

<sup>3</sup> Applicant's Brief, p. 10.

is not laudatory because its use of the word "Better" identifies a vague standard as opposed to a definite grade or standard. Applicant concludes by stating that any doubts about mere descriptiveness must be resolved in favor of publication of the mark.

A term is deemed to be merely descriptive of goods or services, within the meaning of Section 2(e)(1), if it forthwith conveys an immediate idea of an ingredient, quality, characteristic, feature, function, purpose or use of the goods or services. *In re Bayer Aktiengesellschaft*, 488 F.3d 960, 82 USPQ2d 1828, 1831 (Fed. Cir. 2007); and *In re Abcor Development*, 588 F.2d 811, 200 USPQ 215, 217-18 (CCPA 1978). A term need not immediately convey an idea of each and every specific feature of the applicant's goods or services in order to be considered merely descriptive; rather, it is sufficient that the term describes one significant attribute, function or property of the goods or services. *In re H.U.D.D.L.E.*, 216 USPQ 358, 359 (TTAB 1982); and *In re MBAssociates*, 180 USPQ 338, 339 (TTAB 1973). Whether a term is merely descriptive is determined not in the abstract, but in relation to the goods or services for which registration is sought, the context in which it is being used on or in connection with the goods or services, and the possible significance that the term

Serial No. 77878646

would have to the average purchaser of the goods or services because of the manner of its use. *In re Bright-Crest, Ltd.*, 204 USPQ 591, 593 (TTAB 1979). It is settled that "[t]he question is not whether someone presented with only the mark could guess what the goods or services are. Rather, the question is whether someone who knows what the goods or services are will understand the mark to convey information about them." *In re Tower Tech Inc.*, 64 USPQ2d 1314, 1316-17 (TTAB 2002). The "average" or "ordinary" consumer for a particular applicant's goods or services defines the class or classes of actual or prospective customers for such goods or services. *In re Omaha National Corporation*, 819 F.2d 1117, 2 USPQ2d 1859, 1861 (Fed. Cir. 1987). In this case, the general restaurant going public comprises the class of actual or prospective customers for applicant's services.

According to the *MSN ENCARTA DICTIONARY* definition (encarta.msn.com) attached to the March 1, 2010 Office action, the "core meaning" of the word "better" is defined as "indicating that somebody, something, or an action is superior in some way to something or somebody else or is an improvement upon a situation." The word "beef" is defined as "meat from cattle: meat from a cow, heifer, bull or

Serial No. 77878646

steer." Finally, the word "burger" is defined as a "Food: Same as hamburger."

In the March 1, 2010 Office action, the examining attorney also submitted the following registrations:

1. Registration No. 2034067 for the mark SIMPLY BETTER BEEF for meat. The registrant disclaimed the exclusive right to use the term "Better Beef."

2. Registration No. 2808462 for the mark SUPREME VALU SIMPLY BETTER BEEF SIMPLY BETTER VALUE for "beef." The registrant disclaimed the exclusive right to use the terms "Better Beef" and "Better Value."

3. Registration No. 3410034 for the mark GRIMPA STEAKHOUSE PREMIUM BEEF. PREMIUM TASTE. for "restaurant services." Registrant disclaimed the exclusive right to use "Steakhouse" and "Premium Beef. Premium Taste."

We found the following internet evidence submitted by the examining attorney in his September 15, 2010 Office action to be relevant:

1. An excerpt from the South St. Burger Co. (southstburger.com) advertising "YOUR BURGER is better with OVER 25 TOPPINGS" and advertising "Better Sides."

2. An article posted on *The Detroit News* website (detnews.com) (July 20, 2010) entitled "Sales sizzling for 'better burgers.'" The caption under the photograph

Serial No. 77878646

displayed with the article reads as follows: "Higher-grade beef, fresher or more creative toppings and better buns are luring customers at Five Guys and other hamburger restaurants."<sup>4</sup>

3. An article posted on the *Restaurant News Resource* website (restaurantnewsresource.com) (October 12, 2009) reporting on Denny's new "Better Burger" noted that the new hamburger features a "Better Bun," "Better Burger" (ground beef), "Better Cheese," and "Better Toppings."

4. An article posted on the *Drovers* website (drovers.com) (September 16, 2009) entitled "Better beef makes a better burger." The first sentence reads as follows: "Better beef makes a better burger, and consumers are willing to pay more for it ..."

5. An article posted on the *Rapid City Journal* website (rapidcityjournal.com) (July 7, 2010) entitled "Better beef makes better burgers."

6. An advertisement for the Blues Burger Bar posted on the *Seneca Niagara Casino & Hotel* website (senecaniagracasino.com) stating that "Better Beef builds better burgers."

---

<sup>4</sup> A similar article with the identical statement appears in an article posted on the *Richmond Times-Dispatch* website (timesdispatch.com) (July 12, 2010).

7. A review of the Labriola Bakery Café posted on the *a ham **burger** today* website (aht.seriousseats.com) (December 3, 2009) entitled "Great Burgers, Better Buns at Labriola Bakery Café in Oak Brook, Illinois."

8. Excerpts from the Byron Burger Shack website (byronhamburgers.com) one of which advertised that "We've found that small farms produce better beef than big farms. So we source our beef from small farms."

In his April 4, 2011 Office action, the examining attorney submitted copies of three "Better Ingredients. Better Pizza." registrations owned by Papa John's International, Inc. The most relevant being Registration No. 2158076 for the mark BETTER INGREDIENTS. BETTER PIZZA. for, *inter alia*, restaurant services registered under the provisions of Section 2(f).<sup>5</sup>

Applicant describes its mark as "a distinguishing slogan."<sup>6</sup> A slogan can be merely descriptive if it directly

---

<sup>5</sup> The April 4, 2011 Office action was the response to applicant's request for reconsideration filed after the notice of appeal was filed. Applicant objected to this evidence on the ground that evidence submitted after a notice of appeal is untimely. (Applicant's Brief, p. 15). However, evidence attached to a request for reconsideration submitted with a notice of appeal, and evidence attached to a denial of the request for reconsideration, are considered to have been filed prior to appeal, and are part of the application record on appeal. *See In re Davey Products Pty Ltd.*, 92 USPQ2d 1198, 1200-01 (TTAB 2009), citing TBMP §§ 1204 and 1207.04 (3<sup>rd</sup> ed. 2011). In view of the foregoing, applicant's objection is overruled.

<sup>6</sup> Applicant's Brief, p. 11.

Serial No. 77878646

refers to a quality or characteristic of the goods or services. See *In re Boston Beer Co.*, 198 F.3d 1370, 53 USPQ2d 1056, 1058 (Fed. Cir. 1999) (THE BEST BEER IN AMERICA so highly laudatory and descriptive as applied to beer and ale that it is incapable of acquiring distinctiveness); *In re David Crystal, Inc.*, 145 USPQ 95, 95 (TTAB 1965) (slogan is registrable on the Principal Register unless it is merely descriptive).

Furthermore, a term that identifies a food item prepared and sold in restaurants may be descriptive of restaurant services. See *In re Pencils Inc.*, 9 USPQ2d 1410, 1412 (TTAB 1988) (PENCILS held merely descriptive of office supply store services); *In re The Paint Products Co.*, 8 USPQ2d 1863, 1866 (TTAB 1988) ("PAINT PRODUCTS CO." is no more registrable for goods emanating from a company that sells paint products than it would be as a service mark for the retail paint store services offered by such a company"). See also *In re Tires, Tires, Tires, Inc.*, 94 USPQ2d 1153 (TTAB 2009) (TIRES TIRES TIRES generic for retail tire store services); *In re Lens.com, Inc.*, 83 USPQ2d 1444 (TTAB 2007) (LENS generic for "retail store services featuring contact eyewear products rendered via a global computer network"); *In re Eddie Z's Blinds & Drapery, Inc.*, 74 USPQ2d 1037 (TTAB 2005)



Serial No. 77878646

(BLINDSANDDRAPERY.COM generic for retail store services featuring blinds, draperies, and other wall coverings, conducted via the Internet).

In view of the foregoing, we find that the slogan BETTER BEEF. BETTER BURGER. is merely descriptive of restaurant services because it is a laudatory term that directly conveys to consumers that applicant's restaurant services feature high quality hamburgers made from high quality beef. The Federal Circuit has held that "[l]audatory marks that describe the alleged merit of the goods are descriptive because they simply describe the characteristics or quality of the goods in a condensed form." *In re Nett Designs Inc.*, 236 F.3d 1339, 57 USPQ2d 1564, 1566 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (THE ULTIMATE BIKE RACK is a laudatory descriptive phrase). *See also Burmel Handkerchief Corp. v. Cluett, Peabody & Co., Inc.*, 127 F.2d 318, 53 USPQ 369, 372 (CCPA 1942) (HANDKERCHIEFS OF THE YEAR is a laudatory descriptive phrase). Thus, we find the term BETTER BEEF. BETTER BURGER. to be an expression of high quality that immediately describes, without the need for any imagination, conjecture or speculation, a food item of outstanding quality featured in applicant's restaurants. *See In re Best Software Inc.*, 58 USPQ2d 1314 (TTAB 2001)

Serial No. 77878646

(the words "best" and "premier" are merely descriptive laudatory words that indicate high quality or importance).

In this regard, we note that applicant's specimen displaying use of its mark touts the superior quality of applicant's hamburgers because applicant uses high quality beef.

INTRODUCING ...

FUDDS PRIME  
100% ALL-AMERICAN PREMIUM BEEF

BETTER BEEF.

BETTER BURGER.

We disagree with applicant's argument that the word "Better" is vague. Applicant likens its use of "Better" to the word "Super" which the Board found to be suggestive when used in the mark RALSTON SUPER SLUSH for a concentrate used to make a slush type soft drink. *In re Ralston Purina Co.*, 191 USPQ 237 (TTAB 1976). The Board held that the word "Super" is not merely descriptive when it is used as mere puffery and not to describe size or other attributes of the product. In *Ralston*, the Board found that "Super" did not describe "any real or specific item or characteristic or quality and is therefore not merely descriptive." 191 USPQ at 238. However, when supported by relevant evidence of use, commonly used words such as

"premium," "royal," and "best" have been found to be descriptive laudatory terms. *In re Belanger, Inc.*, 218 USPQ 742, 743 (TTAB 1983). See also *In re Duvernoy & Sons, Inc.*, 212 F.2d 202, 101 USPQ 288, 289 (CCPA 1954) ("CONSISTENTLY SUPERIOR" is a laudatory statement used to indicate that applicant's goods are always superior in quality). In this regard, the terms "better" and "best" are readily understood comparative terms. The Random House Dictionary of the English Language (Unabridged), p. 200 (2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 1987) ("**better**" ... *adj.*, *compar.* of **good** with **best** as *suprl.*") and p. 198 ("**best**" *adj.* *superl.* of **good** with **better** as *compar.*") (emphasis in the original).<sup>7</sup> Based on the record before us, we find that the mark BETTER BEEF. BETTER BURGER. in its entirety is a definite statement of superior quality and it is not vague or nebulous. Unlike applicant, we decline to analyze the word "Better" as a separate and distinct element rather than as a part of the entire mark.

Further, we disagree that the use of the word "BEEF" in applicant's mark might be associated with restaurants "featuring obnoxious, argumentative wait staff ... scantily clad male employees ... or in proximity to a skate park or

---

<sup>7</sup> "Compar." is the abbreviation for "comparative" and "suprl." is the abbreviation for "superlative." *Id.* at xxxix.

Serial No. 77878646

snowboarding venue.”<sup>8</sup> Applicant’s evidence does not demonstrate that consumers associate the word “Beef” with an obnoxious wait staff, scantily clad male employees, or skate parks or snowboard venues. These arguments stretch credulity.

Also, we disagree with applicant’s assertion that its mark is not descriptive because it is “catchy, clever, alliterative and has a unique aural cadence.” The Papa John’s International BETTER INGREDIENTS. BETTER PIZZA. registrations under Section 2(f), the GRIMPA STEAKHOUSE PREMIUM BEEF. PREMIUM TASTE. and SUPREME VALU SIMPLY BETTER BEEF SIMPLY BETTER VALUE registrations have the same structure as applicant’s mark. In addition, the articles regarding hamburgers show that the purported “catchy, clever, alliterative ... unique aural cadence” is a common way to refer to the quality of the hamburgers (e.g., “Better beef makes a better burger,” “Better Beef builds better burgers,” and “Great Burgers, Better Buns”). From this evidence we infer that there is a competitive need to use the term sought to be registered.

Finally, applicant points to the existence of its recently registered marks with the same structure: BETTER VALUE, BETTER BURGER. (Registration No. 4009984), BETTER

---

<sup>8</sup> Applicant’s Brief, p. 10.

Serial No. 77878646

TIME, BETTER BURGER. (Registration No. 4009985), BETTER VARIETY, BETTER BURGER. (Registration No. 4009986) and BETTER EVERYTHING, BETTER BURGER. (Registration No. 4013052). Although we have considered these registrations, the Board is not bound by the actions of the examining attorney based on records that are not before us. See *In re Nett Designs Inc.*, 57 USPQ2d at 1566 ("Even if some prior registrations had some characteristics similar to [applicant's] application, the PTO's allowance of such prior registrations does not bind the board or this court."). Each case must stand on its own record, and we find that, in this case, the examining attorney has established that applicant's mark is merely descriptive of applicant's services.

When we view the proposed mark in its entirety, we conclude that BETTER BEEF. BETTER BURGER. is merely descriptive of applicant's restaurant services. The mark immediately informs prospective customers that applicant's restaurant services feature hamburgers made from beef that are of superior quality. No imagination is required to discern this feature of applicant's restaurant services.

**Decision:** The refusal to register is affirmed.