

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA159418**

Filing date: **08/28/2007**

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

Proceeding	91177185
Party	Plaintiff Bristol-Myers Squibb Company
Correspondence Address	Ulana Holubec Quinn Emanuel Urquhart Oliver & Hedges, LLP 51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor New York, NY 10010 UNITED STATES ulanaholubec@quinnemanuel.com, claudiabogdanos@quinnemanuel.com
Submission	Answer to Counterclaim
Filer's Name	ULANA HOLUBEC
Filer's e-mail	ulanaholubec@quinnemanuel.com
Signature	/ulanaholubec/
Date	08/28/2007
Attachments	BMS-Renovo-CounterclaimAnswer.pdf ( 3 pages )(35717 bytes )

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

In the Matter of Application Serial No. 78/565,997  
Published in the Official Gazette on January 9, 2007  
Mark: JUVIDEX

BRISTOL-MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY,

Opposer,

-against-

RENOVO LIMITED COMPANY,

Applicant.

Opposition No. 91177185

**ANSWER TO COUNTERCLAIM**

Opposer, through its attorneys, as its answer to the Counterclaim of Applicant, in the above-captioned matter, alleges as follows:

1. Opposer admits that it is the owner of U.S. Registration No. 1,597,127 for the mark VIDEX, for "anti-viral preparations" and U.S. Registration No. 2,904,718, for the mark VIDEX EC, for "antiviral pharmaceutical preparation".

2. Opposer avers that the first sentence of Paragraph 2 of the Counterclaim states legal conclusions to which no answer is required. Opposer admits that it uses the marks VIDEX and VIDEX EC in commerce in connection with antiviral pharmaceutical preparations used in the treatment of Human Immunodeficiency Virus ("HIV").

3. Opposer admits that it does not currently use the marks VIDEX and VIDEX EC in commerce in connection with antiviral pharmaceutical preparations other than those used in the treatment of HIV.

4. Opposer avers that the first sentence of Paragraph 4 of the Counterclaim states legal conclusions to which no answer is required. Opposer avers that the second sentence of Paragraph 4 of the Counterclaim does not contain any allegations that require a response. To the extent that the second sentence of Paragraph 4 is deemed to include allegations, Opposer denies same.

5. Opposer avers that the WHEREFORE paragraph of the Counterclaim does not contain any allegations that require a response. To the extent that the WHEREFORE paragraph is deemed to include allegations, Opposer denies same.

6. Opposer denies each and every other allegation in the Counterclaim.

Dated: New York, New York  
August 28, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

Quinn Emanuel Urquhart Oliver & Hedges

By:  \_\_\_\_\_

Robert L. Raskopf  
Claudia T. Bogdanos  
Ulana Holubec  
51 Madison Ave  
New York, New York 10010  
Phone: (212) 849-7255  
Fax: (212) 849-7100  
Email: ulanaholubec@quinnemanuel.com

ATTORNEYS FOR OPPOSER BRISTOL-  
MYERS SQUIBB COMPANY

**Certificate of Service**

I hereby certify that a true and complete copy of the foregoing ANSWER TO COUNTERCLAIM has been served on Applicant by mailing said copy on August 28, 2007, via First Class Mail, postage prepaid, to:

William C. Wright  
EPSTEIN DRANGEL BAZERMAN & JAMES, LLP  
60 East 42nd Street  
Suite 820  
New York, NY 10165

By: Maria DiDomenico  
Maria DiDomenico