

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA292315**

Filing date: **06/29/2009**

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

Proceeding	91190326
Party	Defendant SecurLinx Holding Corporation
Correspondence Address	MICHAEL B. PALLAY STEPTOE & JOHNSON PLLC PO BOX 2190 CLARKSBURG, WV 26302-2190 trademarks@steptoe-johnson.com
Submission	Answer
Filer's Name	Michael B. Pallay
Filer's e-mail	trademarks@steptoe-johnson.com,mike.pallay@steptoe-johnson.com
Signature	/Michael B. Pallay/
Date	06/29/2009
Attachments	Answer.pdf (4 pages)(15807 bytes)

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

TeleTracking Technologies, Inc.,

Opposer,

Opposition No. 91190326

v.

SecurLinx Holding Corporation,

Applicant.

ANSWER TO NOTICE OF OPPOSITION

Applicant SecurLinx Holding Corporation (“Applicant”) answers the Notice of Opposition filed by Opposer TeleTracking Technologies, Inc. (“Opposer”) as follows:

In response to the introductory unnumbered paragraph, Applicant lacks sufficient information to either admit or deny Opposer’s allegations that Opposer is organized under the laws of the State of Delaware with its principal place of business at The Times Building, 336 Fourth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15222, and therefore denies such allegations.

Applicant denies Opposer’s allegation that it may be damaged by the registration of the mark shown in the trademark application Serial Number 77/561,677 (“Applicant’s mark”).

1. Applicant lacks sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in paragraph 1 and therefore denies such allegations.
2. Applicant lacks sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in paragraph 2 and therefore denies such allegations.
3. Applicant lacks sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in paragraph 3 and therefore denies such allegations.

4. Applicant lacks sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in paragraph 4 and therefore denies such allegations.

5. Applicant lacks sufficient information to either admit or deny the allegations in paragraph 5 and therefore denies such allegations.

6. Applicant admits the allegations in paragraph 6.

7. Applicant denies the allegations in paragraph 7.

8. Applicant denies the allegations in paragraph 8.

9. Applicant denies the allegations in paragraph 9.

10. Applicant denies the allegations in paragraph 10.

In response to the WHEREFORE paragraph, Applicant denies Opposer's allegation that it may be damaged by the registration of the mark shown in the trademark application Serial No. 77/561,677.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

In further answer to the Notice of Opposition, Applicant asserts that:

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The Notice of Opposition fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, and in particular, fails to state legally sufficient grounds for sustaining the opposition.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Opposer has not and will not suffer any injury or damage from the registration of Applicant's mark.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Applicant's mark in its entirety is sufficiently distinctively different from Opposer's claimed marks to avoid confusion, deception, or mistake as to the source or sponsorship or association of Applicant's goods.

RELIEF REQUESTED

WHEREFORE, Applicant respectfully requests that the Board enter judgment:

- (a) denying Opposer the relief it seeks;
- (b) dismissing the Opposition proceeding with prejudice; and
- (c) granting Applicant such further relief as the Board deems proper.

Dated: June 29, 2009.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael B. Pallay/
Michael B. Pallay
Michael T. Smith
Steptoe & Johnson PLLC
P.O. Box 2190
Clarksburg, WV 26302-2190
(304) 624-8000

Counsel for Applicant

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

TeleTracking Technologies, Inc.,

Opposer,

Opposition No. 91190326

v.

SecurLinx Holding Corporation,

Applicant.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 29th day of June, 2009, I served the foregoing “Answer to Notice of Opposition” upon the following counsel, by mailing a true and complete copy thereof via First Class Mail, postage prepaid, in an envelope addressed as follows:

Stanley D. Ference III
Ference & Associates LLC
409 Broad Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15143

/Michael B. Pallay/
Michael B. Pallay