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

Baxley

Mailed: May 30, 2008

Opposition No. **91176838**
Opposition No. **91176844**
Opposition No. **91176845**
Opposition No. **91176856**
Opposition No. **91176952**
Opposition No. **91176953**
Opposition No. **91176971**
Opposition No. **91176976**

SKF USA Inc.

v.

RBC Bearings Inc.

(as consolidated)

Andrew P. Baxley, Interlocutory Attorney:

Because the above-captioned proceedings involve common questions of law or fact, the Board, by its own initiative, hereby orders their consolidation.[1] *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a); *Regatta Sport Ltd. v. Telux-Pioneer Inc.*, 20 USPQ2d 1154 (TTAB 1991); *Estate of Biro v. Bic Corp.*, 18 USPQ2d

[1] The Board notes that these proceedings became ripe for consolidation nearly a year ago, i.e., when applicant filed its answers in these cases. See TBMP Section 511 (2d ed. rev. 2004). However, neither party notified the Board that they were involved in multiple proceedings until May 29, 2008, when one of opposer's attorneys contacted the a Board attorney to inquire as to the status of the consented motion to suspend in Opposition No. 91176844. Earlier consolidation of these proceedings could have considerably reduced redundancy in both motion practice and discovery herein and saved time, effort, and expense for both the parties and the Board.

1382 (TTAB 1991); TBMP Section 511 (2d ed. rev. 2004). The consolidated cases may be presented on the same record and briefs. See *Helene Curtis Industries Inc. v. Suave Shoe Corp.*, 13 USPQ2d 1618 (TTAB 1989) and *Hilson Research Inc. v. Society for Human Resource Management*, 26 USPQ2d 1423 (TTAB 1993).

The Board file will be maintained in Opposition No. 91176838 as the "parent" case. As a general rule, from this point onward, the parties should file only a single copy of any submission herein, but that copy should include all of the proceeding numbers set forth above in its caption. Exceptions to the general rule, however, involve the remaining briefing in connection with the motions for leave to file an amended notice of opposition that opposer filed in each of these cases on May 28, 2008 and any answers to the amended notices of opposition. Those submissions should be filed in each file at issue.

Despite being consolidated, each proceeding retains its separate character. The decision on the consolidated cases shall take into account any differences in the issues raised by the respective pleading; a copy of the decision shall be placed in each proceeding file.

Proceedings herein are suspended pending disposition of opposer's motions for leave to file an amended notice of opposition. See Trademark Rule 2.117(c); *SDT Inc. v.*

Patterson Dental Co., 30 USPQ2d 1707 (TTAB 1994). Any paper filed during the pendency of this motion which is not relevant thereto will be given no consideration.