

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA272675**

Filing date: **03/17/2009**

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

Proceeding	91170202
Party	Plaintiff Russell G. Weiner
Correspondence Address	Seth I. Appel Harvey Siskind LLP Four Embarcadero Center, 39th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111 UNITED STATES sappel@harveysiskind.com, iboyd@harveysiskind.com, clee@harveysiskind.com
Submission	Other Motions/Papers
Filer's Name	Seth I. Appel
Filer's e-mail	sappel@harveysiskind.com, iboyd@harveysiskind.com, clee@harveysiskind.com
Signature	/Seth I. Appel/
Date	03/17/2009
Attachments	Mot.Judgment.SIAdecl.with exhibits.090317.FINAL.pdf (27 pages)(843579 bytes)

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

3		
4	RUSSELL G. WEINER, an individual,	Opposition No. 91170202
5	Opposer,	Application Serial No. 78976392
6		
7	v.	
8	JMBP, INC., a California corporation,	
9	Applicant.	

10

11 **DECLARATION OF SETH I. APPEL**
12 **IN SUPPORT OF OPPOSER’S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS, NAMELY, JUDGMENT**
13 **[37 CFR § 2.120(g)]**

14 _____
15 I, Seth I. Appel, declare as follows:

- 16 1. I am an attorney at the law firm of Harvey Siskind LLP, counsel for Opposer Russell
17 G. Weiner (“Opposer”). I make this declaration freely and of my own personal knowledge. If I were
18 called as a witness, I could and would competently testify to the matters set forth.
- 19 2. Attached hereto as Exhibit A is a true and correct copy of the Board’s order concerning,
20 among other things, Opposer’s motion to compel, issued on April 1, 2008. The Board ordered
21 Applicant to provide amended discovery responses within 30 days and noted that it may entertain a
22 motion for sanctions, including judgment, in the event that Applicant failed to comply.
- 23 3. Attached hereto as Exhibit B is a true and correct copy of the Board’s order concerning
24 Opposer’s motion for judgment or, in the alternative, to compel, issued on February 5, 2009. The
25 Board imposed sanctions on Applicant for its discovery abuses; threatened that Applicant’s continued
26 failure to comply with its discovery obligations would result in a judgment in Opposer’s favor; and
27 ordered Applicant to serve supplemental responses to Opposer’s interrogatories and to produce
28 documents responsive to Opposer’s document requests, in full and without objections, within 30
days.

1 . 4. Under the Board's February 5 order, the deadline for Applicant to provide supplemental
2 responses to Opposer's interrogatories, and to produce documents responsive to Opposer's document
3 requests, was Monday, March 9, 2009. *Opposer has not received any supplemental discovery*
4 *responses or documents.*

5 5. On March 5, attorney Jane Shay Wald called me on behalf of Applicant. She told me that
6 Applicant planned to withdraw its application. She then emailed me an "express abandonment and
7 withdrawal of application," which she asked me to sign to signify Opposer's consent. I replied that
8 Opposer would not consent to Applicant's withdrawal. A true and correct copy of this email exchange
9 between me and Ms. Wald is attached hereto as Exhibit C.

10 6. On March 11, I called Ms. Wald and inquired whether Applicant had served
11 supplemental discovery responses and documents as required under the Board's February 5 order. Ms.
12 Wald said that Applicant had not done so, and did not plan to do so, given its intention to withdraw its
13 application. Ms. Wald again asked me if Opposer would consent to Applicant's withdrawal. I said that
14 I would respond shortly. Later that day, I sent Ms. Wald an email reiterating that Opposer would not
15 consent. A true and correct copy of my March 11 email to Ms. Wald is attached hereto as Exhibit D.

16 7. During the March 11 call, Ms. Wald unequivocally stated that Applicant would not be
17 providing supplemental discovery responses or documents, since "one way or the other" Applicant
18 would be withdrawing its application.

19 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing
20 is true and correct and that this declaration was executed this 17th day of March, 2009, in San
21 Francisco, California.

22
23 /s/

24 _____
Seth I. Appel

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

CERTIFICATION OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that the attached DECLARATION OF SETH I. APPEL IN SUPPORT OF OPPOSER'S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS, NAMELY, JUDGMENT (Opposition No. 91170202), dated March 17, 2009, is being electronically transmitted to the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board on March 17, 2009.

/s/
Seth I. Appel

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

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that the attached DECLARATION OF SETH I. APPEL IN SUPPORT OF OPPOSER'S MOTION FOR SANCTIONS, NAMELY, JUDGMENT (Opposition No. 91170202), dated March 17, 2009, was served on Applicant by depositing copies thereof with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first-class mail in envelopes addressed to Jodi M. Dueck, JMBP, Inc., 640 N. Sepulveda Boulevard, Los Angeles, CA 90049, and Jane Shay Wald, Esq., Irell & Manella LLP, 1800 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 900, Los Angeles, CA 90067, on March 17, 2009.

/s/
Seth I. Appel

Exhibit A
to Declaration of Seth I. Appel
in Support of
Opposer's Motion for Sanctions, Namely,
Judgment

Offered by Opposer Russell G. Weiner

Russell G. Weiner v. JMBP, Inc.

Opposition No. 91170202
Serial No. 78976392

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
Trademark Trial and Appeal Board
P.O. Box 1451
Alexandria, VA 22313-1451

Lykos

Mailed: April 1, 2008

Opposition No. 91170202

Russell G. Weiner

v.

JMBP, Inc.

Angela Lykos, Interlocutory Attorney

This case now comes before the Board for consideration of (1) opposer's motion (filed December 14, 2006) to compel applicant to provide amended responses to opposer's first set of interrogatories and first set of requests for production of documents; (2) applicant's motion (filed December 29, 2006) to compel opposer to provide amended responses to applicant's first set of interrogatories and first set of requests for production of documents; and (3) applicant's cross-motion (filed January 3, 2007) for protective order.¹ The motions are fully briefed.

The Board has carefully reviewed the parties' respective arguments and accompanying exhibits, although the

¹ Applicant's consented motion (filed January 29, 2007) to extend the discovery and testimony periods in this case is hereby approved. Shortly thereafter, on May 16, 2007, the Board suspended proceedings pending disposition of the outstanding motions filed by both parties.

Board has not repeated the parties' complete arguments in this order.

As a preliminary matter, the Board finds that both parties have made a good-faith effort pursuant to Trademark Rule 2.120(e) by written correspondence and oral communication to resolve the present discovery dispute prior to seeking to Board intervention. Notwithstanding the above, the Board reminds the parties that they are expected to cooperate with another so that the case may proceed in an orderly manner within reasonable time constraints.

I. Opposer's Motion to Compel and Applicant's Cross-Motion for Protective Order

The Board will first consider opposer's motion to compel and applicant's cross-motion for protective order.

In response to opposer's first set of interrogatories, applicant objected to each interrogatory on the grounds that the information sought was "overbroad, unduly burdensome, oppressive" and outside the scope of discovery for an opposition proceeding. Applicant also interposed similar objections to opposer's first set of document production requests as well as objecting to several requests on the basis of attorney-client privilege. Applicant has moved for entry of a protective order pursuant to Trademark Rule 2.120(f) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c) to limit opposer's discovery requests to information regarding applicant's prior actual use of the mark and application at issue in

this opposition proceeding: ROCKSTAR for "beverage glassware, namely glasses and mugs, and beverage accessories namely swizzle sticks" in International Class 21.² Applicant further seeks to bar discovery regarding the use of the mark ROCKSTAR, or any other marks used by applicant on in any other goods and/or services not at issue in this proceeding.

A party need not provide discovery with respect to those of its marks and goods and/or services that are not involved in the proceeding and have no relevance there too. See TBMP § 414(11) (2d ed. rev. 2004). However, this general rule is tempered by the principle that information that a party sells the same goods or services as the propounding party, even if under a different mark, is relevant to the issue of likelihood of confusion. See *TBC Corp. v. Grand Prix Ltd.*, 16 USPQ2d 1399, 1400 (TTAB 1990) (where goods of parties differ, determining whether parties market goods of same type is relevant to establishing relationship between the goods). Thus, to the extent opposer's discovery requests seek information of this type, such information is relevant to opposer's Section 2(d) claim, and applicant's motion for protective order is therefore denied. For this same reason, applicant's

² Application Serial No. 78976392, filed June 7, 2004 alleging a bona fide intent to use the mark in commerce.

objections are overruled.

As to applicant's claim of privilege, Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(5), made applicable to Board proceedings by Trademark Rule 2.116(a), provides that where a claim of privilege is invoked, a party must make the claim expressly and provide a description or privilege log of the documents, communications or things not disclosed in such a manner that will enable other parties to assess the applicability of the privilege or protection. Thus, while applicant may invoke the attorney-client privilege, it must provide a privilege log.

In addition, both applicant and opposer are reminded that effective August 31, 2007, the Board's standardized protective order to govern the disclosure of confidential information is automatically in place in proceedings pending before the Board.³ See Miscellaneous Changes to Trademark Trial and Appeal Board Rules, FR Vol. 72, No. 147 (August 1, 2007).

II. Applicant's Motion To Compel

The Board now turns to applicant's motion to compel opposer to provide amended responses to applicant's first set of requests for production of documents and supplemental

³ The Board has promulgated a standardized protective order for the exchange of confidential information and materials. The Board's standardized order may be used as a template upon which to base a more particularized agreement. See 125 TMOG 70 (June 20, 2000).

responses to applicant's first set of interrogatories Nos. 1-5, 7-8, and 10-11.

As noted above, any objections pertaining to confidentiality are obviated to the extent that the Board's standardized protective order is now in place. In addition, opposer had stated that is has now provided supplemental responses to applicant's document production requests. Lastly, a review of opposer's supplemental responses to applicant's first set of interrogatories Nos. 1-5, 7-8, and 10-11 and document production requests indicates that contrary to applicant's contentions, the responses are sufficient. Thus, applicant's motion to compel is denied in part, and granted in part to the extent that opposer must provide information not previously disclosed as proprietary or confidential or withheld under privilege.

In view of the foregoing, each party's respective motion to compel is granted to the extent that both parties are ordered to provide amended responses THIRTY (30) days from the mailing date of this order consistent with the guidelines noted above. In the event that either party fails to comply with this Board order compelling discovery, the Board may entertain a formal motion for sanctions, including judgment. See Trademark Rule 2.120(g).

Proceedings are resumed, and trial dates are reset as follows:

THE PERIOD FOR DISCOVERY TO CLOSE:	7/7/08
30-day testimony period for party in position of plaintiff to close:	10/5/08
30-day testimony period for party in position of defendant to close:	12/4/08
15-day rebuttal testimony period for plaintiff to close:	1/18/09

In each instance, a copy of the transcript of testimony together with copies of documentary exhibits must be served on the adverse party within thirty days after completion of the taking of testimony. Trademark Rule 2.125.

Briefs shall be filed in accordance with Trademark Rules 2.128(a) and (b).

An oral hearing will be set only upon request filed as provided by Trademark Rule 2.129.

NEWS FROM THE TTAB:

The USPTO published a notice of final rulemaking in the Federal Register on August 1, 2007, at 72 F.R. 42242. By this notice, various rules governing Trademark Trial and Appeal Board inter partes proceedings are amended. Certain amendments have an effective date of August 31, 2007, while most have an effective date of November 1, 2007. For further information, the parties are referred to a reprint of the final rule and a chart summarizing the affected rules, their changes, and effective dates, both viewable on the USPTO website via these web addresses:

<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/com/sol/notices/72fr42242.pdf>

http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/com/sol/notices/72fr42242_FinalRuleChart.pdf

By one rule change effective August 31, 2007, the Board's standard protective order is made applicable to all TTAB inter partes cases, whether already pending or commenced on or after that date. However, as explained in the final rule and chart, this change will not affect any case in which any protective order has already been approved or imposed by the Board. Further, as explained in the final rule, parties are free to agree to a substitute protective order or to supplement or amend the standard order even after August 31, 2007, subject to Board approval. The standard protective order can be viewed using the following web address:

<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/dcom/ttab/tbmp/stndagmnt.htm>

Exhibit B
to Declaration of Seth I. Appel
in Support of
Opposer's Motion for Sanctions, Namely,
Judgment

Offered by Opposer Russell G. Weiner

Russell G. Weiner v. JMBP, Inc.

Opposition No. 91170202
Serial No. 78976392

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
Trademark Trial and Appeal Board
P.O. Box 1451
Alexandria, VA 22313-1451**

Lykos

Mailed: February 5, 2009

Opposition No. 91170202

Russell G. Weiner

v.

JMBP, Inc.

Before Rogers, Cataldo, and Wellington, Administrative
Trademark Judges.

By the Board:

This case now comes before the Board for consideration of opposer's motion (filed September 9, 2008) for discovery sanctions pursuant Trademark Rule 2.120(g)(1), or in the alternative, motion to compel. The motion is fully briefed.

By way of relevant background, on June 9, 2006, opposer served his first set of interrogatories and document production requests. In response to opposer's first set of interrogatories, applicant objected to each interrogatory on the grounds that the information sought was "overbroad, unduly burdensome, oppressive" and outside the scope of discovery for an opposition proceeding. Applicant also interposed similar objections to opposer's first set of document production requests as well as objecting to several requests on the basis of attorney-client privilege. On

December 14, 2006, opposer moved to compel amended responses. Applicant then cross-moved for entry of a protective order pursuant to Trademark Rule 2.120(f) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c) to limit opposer's discovery requests to information regarding applicant's prior actual use of the mark and intent-to-use application at issue in this opposition proceeding: ROCKSTAR for "beverage glassware, namely glasses and mugs, and beverage accessories namely swizzle sticks" in International Class 21.¹ Applicant further sought to bar discovery regarding the use of the mark ROCKSTAR, or any other marks used by applicant on or in connection with any other goods or services not at issue in this proceeding.

On April 1, 2008, the Board granted opposer's motion to compel, denied applicant's motion for protective order, and ordered applicant to provide amended responses consistent with the following principles:

A party need not provide discovery with respect to those of its marks and goods and/or services that are not involved in the proceeding and have no relevance thereto. See TBMP § 414(11) (2d ed. rev. 2004). However, this general rule is tempered by the principle that information that a party sells the same goods or services as the propounding party, even if under a different mark, is relevant to the issue of likelihood of confusion. See *TBC Corp. v. Grand Prix Ltd.*, 16 USPQ2d 1399, 1400 (TTAB 1990) (where goods of parties differ, determining whether parties market goods of same type is relevant to establishing relationship between the goods). Thus, to the

¹ Application Serial No. 78976392, filed June 7, 2004.

extent opposer's discovery requests seek information of this type, such information is relevant to opposer's Section 2(d) claim, and applicant's motion for protective order is therefore denied. For this same reason, applicant's objections are overruled.

On August 8, 2008, over three months after the due date, applicant served amended responses to three of opposer's interrogatories and twelve of opposer's document production requests. Applicant did not provide amended responses to the remaining nine interrogatories and twelve document production requests. Opposer has requested the entry of judgment in his favor as a discovery sanction, arguing that applicant has effectively stalled the proceeding by refusing to cooperate in the discovery process.

Applicant maintains that it is only obligated to provide discovery responses regarding current use of its ROCKSTAR mark in connection with "beverage glassware, namely glasses and mugs, and beverage accessories namely swizzle sticks," and that because it does not currently offer any of these products, it need not provide substantive responses. Applicant further contends that since according to opposer's supplemental responses to applicant's first set of interrogatories, opposer has licensed its ROCKSTAR marks in connection only with energy drinks and alcoholic beverages, insofar as applicant does not use its applied-for ROCKSTAR

mark in connection with energy drinks or alcoholic beverages, it has no further information to provide under the "same goods" principle articulated in *TBC Corp. v. Grand Prix Ltd.*, *supra*.

In reply, opposer maintains that applicant has misconstrued the Board's order.

Pursuant to Trademark Rule 2.120(g)(1), if a party fails to comply with a Board order relating to discovery, the Board may make any appropriate order, including any of the orders provided in Rule 37(b)(2) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, except that the Board will not hold any person in contempt or award expenses to any party. The sanctions which may be entered by the Board include, *inter alia*, striking all or part of the pleadings of the disobedient party; refusing to allow the disobedient party to support or oppose designated claims or defenses; prohibiting the disobedient party from introducing designated matters in evidence; and entering judgment. Default judgment is a harsh remedy but may be justified where no less drastic remedy would be effective and there is a strong showing of willful evasion.

The Board finds that at this juncture in the proceeding, applicant's conduct does not rise to the level

of warranting the imposition of sanctions in the form of judgment.

Nonetheless, based on the record before us, it is clear that applicant's position is inconsistent with the instruction provided by the Board in our prior order. By taking this untenable position, applicant has engaged in conduct which appears to have been pursued solely with delay in mind. For this reason, applicant is warned that any further misconduct will likely lead to entry of judgment. While applicant is not obliged to produce documents not in its possession, it must to produce all relevant documents in its possession as explained by the Board in its previous order. Applicant is reminded that a proper response to a document production request requires either stating that there are responsive documents and they will be produced or withheld on a claim privilege, or stating that it has no responsive documents. See *No Fear Inc. v. Rule*, 54 USPQ2d 1551, 1556 (TTAB 2000), citing 8A Wright, Miller & Marcus, *Federal Practice and Procedure: Civil 2d* Section 2213 (2d ed. 1994). Applicant is further reminded that Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(b)(5), made applicable to Board proceedings by Trademark Rule 2.116(a), provides that where a claim of privilege is invoked, a party must make the claim expressly and provide a description or privilege log of the documents, communications or things not disclosed in such a manner that

will enable other parties to assess the applicability of the privilege or protection.

However, while the Board declines to impose the sanction of judgment at this time, in view of the delay caused by applicant's conduct, the Board finds it necessary to impose an alternate sanction on applicant. Applicant is hereby forbidden from serving any further discovery of its own in this case, in order to obviate the possibility of causing further delay, with the exception that it may take a single discovery deposition pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(b)(6).

Further, and in accordance with the Board's April 1, 2008 order, applicant is hereby ordered to serve supplemental responses to opposer's first set of interrogatories and produce all documents responsive to opposer's first set of document production requests, in full and without objections, **thirty (30) days** from the mailing date of this order, failing which opposer may move for sanctions in the form of judgment, pursuant to Trademark Rule 2.120(g). In addition, with its responses, applicant is also ordered to produce a stipulation that any documents it has, or may yet produce, are genuine and opposer may, at trial, introduce into the record by notice of reliance any documents produced by applicant.

Proceedings herein are resumed and trial dates, including the close of discovery, are reset as follows:

THE PERIOD FOR DISCOVERY TO CLOSE:	3/4/09
30-day testimony period for party in position of plaintiff to close:	6/2/09
30-day testimony period for party in position of defendant to close:	8/1/09
15-day rebuttal testimony period for plaintiff to close:	9/15/09

In each instance, a copy of the transcript of testimony together with copies of documentary exhibits, must be served on the adverse party within thirty days after completion of the taking of testimony. Trademark Rule 2.125.

Briefs shall be filed in accordance with Trademark Rule 2.128(a) and (b).

An oral hearing will be set only upon request filed as provided by Trademark Rule 2.129.

NEWS FROM THE TTAB:

The USPTO published a notice of final rulemaking in the Federal Register on August 1, 2007, at 72 F.R. 42242. By this notice, various rules governing Trademark Trial and Appeal Board inter partes proceedings are amended. Certain amendments have an effective date of August 31, 2007, while most have an effective date of November 1, 2007. For further information, the parties are referred to a reprint of the final rule and a chart summarizing the affected rules, their changes, and effective dates, both viewable on the USPTO website via these web addresses:

<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/com/sol/notices/72fr42242.pdf>

http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/com/sol/notices/72fr42242_FinalRuleChart.pdf

By one rule change effective August 31, 2007, the Board's standard protective order is made applicable to all TTAB inter partes cases, whether already pending or commenced on or after that date. However, as explained in the final rule and chart, this change will not affect any case in which any protective order has already been approved or imposed by the Board. Further, as explained in the final rule, parties are free to agree to a substitute protective order or to supplement or amend the standard order even after August 31, 2007, subject to Board approval. The standard protective order can be viewed using the following web address:
<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/dcom/ttab/tbmp/stndagmnt.htm>

Exhibit C
to Declaration of Seth I. Appel
in Support of
Opposer's Motion for Sanctions, Namely,
Judgment

Offered by Opposer Russell G. Weiner

Russell G. Weiner v. JMBP, Inc.

Opposition No. 91170202
Serial No. 78976392

Seth I. Appel

From: Seth I. Appel
Sent: Sunday, March 08, 2009 9:03 PM
To: JWald@irell.com
Cc: AHarrell@markburnettprod.com; Ian K. Boyd
Subject: RE: Opposition No. 91170202
Attachments: Abandonment-Class 21-App SN 78976392-PE.pdf

Dear Jane,

We will not sign the attached document. We are unwilling to give our consent to the withdrawal. Feel free to call me if you have any questions.

Regards,

Seth I. Appel

Harvey Siskind LLP

4 Embarcadero Center, 39th Floor

San Francisco, CA 94111

Telephone: (415) 354-0100

Facsimile: (415) 391-7124

The contents of this e-mail message and any attachments are confidential and are intended solely for the addressee. The information may be privileged by law. This transmission is sent in trust, for the sole purpose of delivery to the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient and/or have received this transmission in error, any use, reproduction or dissemination of this transmission or its contents is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please immediately notify the sender by reply e-mail or at 415.354.0100 and delete this message and its attachments, if any.

From: Wald, Jane Shay [mailto:JWald@irell.com]
Sent: Thu 3/5/2009 7:10 PM
To: Seth I. Appel
Cc: Amanda Harrell
Subject: Opposition No. 91170202

Dear Seth:

Good speaking with you today. If satisfactory, please sign where indicated and return to me for filing with the PTO.

Regards,

Jane

3/17/2009

Jane Shay Wald, Esq.
Irell & Manella LLP
1800 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 900
Los Angeles, CA 90067
Direct Tel.: (310) 203-7017
Main Fax: (310) 203-7199

ccmailg.irell.com made the following annotations

PLEASE NOTE: This message, including any attachments, may include privileged, confidential and/or inside information. Any distribution or use of this communication by anyone other than the intended recipient(s) is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender by replying to this message and then delete it from your system. Thank you.

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

RUSSELL G. WEINER, an individual,)	Opposition No. 91170202
)	
Opposer,)	Application Serial No. 78/976,392
)	
v.)	
)	
JMBP, INC., a California corporation,)	
)	
Applicant.)	
_____)	

EXPRESS ABANDONMENT AND WITHDRAWAL OF APPLICATION

Trademark Trial and Appeal Board
P.O. Box 1451
Alexandria, VA 22313-1451

Pursuant to TMEP §§ 218 and 602.01, Applicant, JMBP, Inc., hereby expressly abandons the above-cited application with the consent of Opposer by its undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,

JMBP, Inc.
By: 

Dated: March 5, 2009

Amanda Harrell, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant
JMBP, Inc.
640 North Sepulveda Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90049
(310) 903-5400

Dated: March 5, 2009

By: _____
Seth I. Appel, Esq.
Attorney for Opposer
Harvey Siskind LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, 39th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
(415) 354-0100

Exhibit D
to Declaration of Seth I. Appel
in Support of
Opposer's Motion for Sanctions, Namely,
Judgment

Offered by Opposer Russell G. Weiner

Russell G. Weiner v. JMBP, Inc.

Opposition No. 91170202
Serial No. 78976392

Seth I. Appel

From: Seth I. Appel
Sent: Wednesday, March 11, 2009 1:24 PM
To: 'Wald, Jane Shay'
Cc: Amanda Harrell; Ian K. Boyd
Subject: RE: Opposition No. 91170202

Jane,

I write following up on our telephone conversation this morning, in which you again requested that we give our consent to JMBP's withdrawal. However, we still refuse to give our consent.

Please feel free to call me if you wish to discuss this matter further.

Regards,

Seth I. Appel, Esq.
Harvey Siskind LLP
4 Embarcadero Center, 39th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111
Telephone: (415) 354-0100
Facsimile: (415) 391-7124

The contents of this e-mail message and any attachments are confidential and are intended solely for the addressee. The information may be privileged by law. This transmission is sent in trust, for the sole purpose of delivery to the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient and/or have received this transmission in error, any use, reproduction or dissemination of this transmission or its contents is strictly prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please immediately notify the sender by reply e-mail or at 415.354.0100 and delete this message and its attachments, if any.