

From: Farrell, Anne

Sent: 11/26/2018 9:55:42 AM

To: TTAB EFiling

CC:

Subject: U.S. TRADEMARK APPLICATION NO. 86394529 - NEXBANK - N/A - Request for Reconsideration Denied - Return to TTAB

Attachment Information:

Count: 1

Files: 86394529.doc

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (USPTO)
OFFICE ACTION (OFFICIAL LETTER) ABOUT APPLICANT'S TRADEMARK APPLICATION**

U.S. APPLICATION SERIAL NO. 86394529

MARK: NEXBANK



CORRESPONDENT ADDRESS:

MICHAEL PEGUES

POLSINELLI PC

2501 N. HARWOOD STREET, SUITE 1900

SAINT ANN COURT

DALLAS, TX 75201

GENERAL TRADEMARK INFORMATION:

<http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/index.jsp>

[VIEW YOUR APPLICATION FILE](#)

APPLICANT: NexBank Capital, Inc.

CORRESPONDENT'S REFERENCE/DOCKET NO:

N/A

CORRESPONDENT E-MAIL ADDRESS:

uspt@polsinelli.com

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION DENIED

ISSUE/MAILING DATE: 11/26/2018

The trademark examining attorney has carefully reviewed applicant's request for reconsideration and is denying the request for the reasons stated below. *See* 37 C.F.R. §2.63(b)(3); TMEP §§715.03(a)(ii)(B), 715.04(a). The following refusals made final in the Office action dated April 30, 2018 are maintained and continue to be final: Section 2(d) refusals as to U.S. Registration Nos. 4380835 and 4978333. *See* TMEP §§715.03(a)(ii)(B), 715.04(a).

In the present case, applicant's request has not resolved all the outstanding issues, nor does it raise a new issue or provide any new or compelling evidence with regard to the outstanding issues in the final

Office action. In addition, applicant's analysis and arguments are not persuasive nor do they shed new light on the issues. Accordingly, the request is denied.

Applicant has attached third-party registrations for allegedly similar marks for allegedly similar services. The attached third-party registrations are for different services and/or for marks with different overall commercial impressions. Third-party registrations are entitled to little weight on the issue of confusing similarity because the registrations are "not evidence that the registered marks are actually in use or that the public is familiar with them." *In re Midwest Gaming & Entm't LLC*, 106 USPQ2d 1163, 1167 n.5 (TTAB 2013) (citing *In re Mighty Leaf Tea*, 601 F.3d 1342, 1346, 94 USPQ2d 1257, 1259 (Fed. Cir. 2010)); see TMEP §1207.01(d)(iii). Moreover, the existence on the register of other seemingly similar marks does not provide a basis for registrability for the applied-for mark. *AMF Inc. v. Am. Leisure Prods., Inc.*, 474 F.2d 1403, 1406, 177 USPQ 268, 269 (C.C.P.A. 1973); *In re Total Quality Grp., Inc.*, 51 USPQ2d 1474, 1477 (TTAB 1999).

Prior decisions and actions of other trademark examining attorneys in registering other marks have little evidentiary value and are not binding upon the USPTO or the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board. TMEP §1207.01(d)(vi); see *In re USA Warriors Ice Hockey Program, Inc.*, 122 USPQ2d 1790, 1793 n.10 (TTAB 2017). Each case is decided on its own facts, and each mark stands on its own merits. *In re USA Warriors Ice Hockey Program, Inc.*, 122 USPQ2d at 1793 n.10 (quoting *In re Boulevard Entm't*, 334 F.3d 1336, 1343, 67 USPQ2d 1475, 1480 (Fed. Cir. 2003)).

Moreover, where the services of an applicant and registrant are "similar in kind and/or closely related," the degree of similarity between the marks required to support a finding of likelihood of confusion is not as great as in the case of diverse services. *In re J.M. Originals Inc.*, 6 USPQ2d 1393, 1394 (TTAB 1987); see *Shen Mfg. Co. v. Ritz Hotel Ltd.*, 393 F.3d 1238, 1242, 73 USPQ2d 1350, 1354 (Fed. Cir. 2004); TMEP §1207.01(b).

Finally, where the services of an applicant and registrant are identical or virtually identical, the degree of similarity between the marks required to support a finding that confusion is likely declines. See *Cai v. Diamond Hong, Inc.*, ___ F.3d ___, 127 USPQ2d 1797, 1801 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (quoting *In re Viterra Inc.*, 671 F.3d 1358, 1363, 101 USPQ2d 1905, 1908 (Fed. Cir. 2012)); TMEP §1207.01(b).

If applicant has already filed a timely notice of appeal with the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board, the Board will be notified to resume the appeal. See TMEP §715.04(a).

If no appeal has been filed and time remains in the six-month response period to the final Office action, applicant has the remainder of the response period to (1) comply with and/or overcome any outstanding final requirement(s) and/or refusal(s), and/or (2) file a notice of appeal to the Board. TMEP

§715.03(a)(ii)(B); *see* 37 C.F.R. §2.63(b)(1)-(3). The filing of a request for reconsideration does not stay or extend the time for filing an appeal. 37 C.F.R. §2.63(b)(3); *see* TMEP §§715.03, 715.03(a)(ii)(B), (c).

/Anne M. Farrell/

Examining Attorney

Law Office 118

571-272-9709

anne.farrell@uspto.gov