

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA798095**

Filing date: **01/30/2017**

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

Proceeding	91230741
Party	Defendant Indio Products, Inc.
Correspondence Address	DORNE J. MCKINNON-RYBICKI BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C. 1000 TOWN CENTER, 22ND FLOOR SOUTHFIELD, MI 48075-1238 ccarswell@brookskushman.com, drybicki@brookskushman.com, ejbrooks@brookskushman.com
Submission	Answer
Filer's Name	Chanille Carswell
Filer's e-mail	ccarswell@brookskushman.com, drybicki@brookskushman.com, ejbrooks@brookskushman.com
Signature	/Chanille Carswell/
Date	01/30/2017
Attachments	Answer to NOO.pdf(265308 bytes)

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

Reed Candle Company,)	
)	
Opposer,)	
)	
v.)	
)	Opposition No. 91230741
Indio Products, Inc.,)	
)	
Applicant.)	

**APPLICANT’S ANSWER TO
NOTICE OF OPPOSITION**

1. Upon information and belief, Applicant, Indio Products, Inc., with an address at 5331 E. Slauson Ave., Commerce, CA, on March 31, 2016 filed the above-identified application for the alleged trademark shown above (the “Applicant’s Mark”) in connection with “candles” in the above-identified class.

ANSWER: Admitted.

2. Opposer is a candle making company specializing in religious and mystical prayer candles. After seventy-six years in operation, Opposer now makes over three hundred fifty different candle products, employs over two hundred employees in the San Antonio, TX area and has become a leader in the religious and mystical prayer candle industry throughout the United States.

ANSWER: Applicant lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in this paragraph and, therefore, denies them.

3. Opposer has used the words REVERSIBLE (“Opposer’s Mark”) in interstate commerce in the United States continuously since before the year 1990 in connection with the manufacture, distribution, provision, sale, marketing, advertising and promotion of mystical candles.

ANSWER: Applicant lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in this paragraph and, therefore, denies them.

4. Exhibit 1 (attached hereto and made a part hereof for all purposes) is a screen capture of Opposer’s website showing use of the Opposer’s Mark in connection with mystical candles.

ANSWER: Applicant lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in this paragraph and, therefore, denies them.

5. The goods Opposer offers under the Opposer’s Mark are of high quality mystical candles in glass vessels. The user purchases and lights the candle to activate the mystical “spell” associated with the candle.

ANSWER: Applicant lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in this paragraph and, therefore, denies them.

FIRST GROUND FOR OPPOSITION - GENERICNESS

6. The Applicant’s Mark is barred from registration because it consists of words which, when used in connection with the alleged goods of Applicant, are incapable of distinguishing the source of the goods pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1052.

ANSWER: Denied.

7. The relevant category of goods is “reversible” candles.

ANSWER: Denied.

8. The relevant public, here, the hoodoo or esoterica communities (such as the Santefia community), primarily understands the Mark as referring to that category of goods.

ANSWER: Denied.

9. The word comprising the Mark provide a common name for the goods with which Applicant associates the Mark. In particular, the word “reversible” in this context commonly refers to a mystical formula said to be embodied in such goods. Here, the “spell” is believed to reverse other spells and send away bad vibrations and energy.

ANSWER: Denied.

10. Registration of Applicant’s Mark on the Class 004 goods set forth in Appln. No. 86960186, will restrict Opposer Reed’s ability to use Opposer’s Mark to properly identify Opposer Reed’s goods, thereby damaging Opposer Reed.

ANSWER: Denied.

SECOND GROUND FOR OPPOSITION - DESCRIPTIVENESS

11. In the alternative, the Applicant’s Mark is barred from registration because it consists of words that describe and provide the function or purpose of the goods within the meaning of 15 U.S.C. §1052(e).

ANSWER: Denied.

12. Applicant's candle goods use the Applicant's Mark to explain and provide the function or purpose of the candle, namely, the mystical "spell" that use of the candle will activate.

ANSWER: Denied.

13. The term "reversible" in this context refers to a "spell" commonly attached to a candle or other item of mysticism (also known as hoodoo or esoterica) such as incense, crystal, and bath salts. The purpose of lighting a "reversible" candle is to reverse other spells and send away bad vibrations or energy.

ANSWER: Denied.

14. Registration of Applicant's Mark on the Class 004 goods set forth in Appln. No. 86960186 will restrict Opposer Reed's ability to use Opposer's Mark descriptively in its business, thereby damaging Opposer Reed.

ANSWER: Denied.

THIRD GROUND FOR OPPOSITION – LIKELIHOOD OF CONFUSION

15. In the alternative, the Applicant's Mark is barred from registration because it consists of or comprises a mark which so resembles Opposer's Mark as to be likely, when used in connection with the alleged goods of Applicant, to cause confusion, mistake, or deception within the meaning of Section 2(d) of the Trademark Act, 15 U.S.C. §1052(d).

ANSWER: Denied.

16. Opposer has expended substantial time, money and resources marketing, advertising, and promoting the goods sold under the Opposer's Mark including through trade shows, distributors and retail stores throughout the United States.

ANSWER: Applicant lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in this paragraph and, therefore, denies them.

17. As a result of its widespread and continuous use of the Opposer's Mark to identify certain of its mystical candles and Opposer as their source, Opposer owns valid and subsisting common law rights to the Opposer's Mark.

ANSWER: Applicant lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in this paragraph and, therefore, denies them.

18. Applicant allegedly began using the Applicant's Mark on January 1, 1992, several years after Opposer began using Opposer's Mark.

ANSWER: Applicant admits that it began using Applicant's Mark at least as early as January 1, 1992. Applicant lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the remaining allegations in this paragraph and, therefore, denies them.

19. Opposer's Mark has priority over Applicant's Mark throughout the United States because Opposer's use date predates the Applicant's filing date, alleged date of first use, and/or any other date on which the Applicant may rely for purposes of priority.

ANSWER: Applicant lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in this paragraph and, therefore, denies them.

20. Applicant's Mark is identical or nearly identical to Opposer's Mark. Both consist of the word REVERSIBLE, though the font or degree of stylization may vary.

ANSWER: Applicant lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in this paragraph and, therefore, denies them.

21. The Class 004 goods on which Applicant claims it has used in conjunction with Applicant's Marks include and are used for the same purposes, and are or will be advertised and promoted to and directed at the same trade channels, the same purchasers, and or will be used in the same environment as Opposer Reed's goods. Opposer and Applicant both make and sell mystical candles in glass vessels.

ANSWER: Applicant lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief about the truth of the allegations in this paragraph and, therefore, denies them.

22. Simultaneous use of Applicant's Marks in the Class 004 goods set forth in Appln. No. 86960186 and Opposer Reed's Mark on its goods, as set forth above, is likely to cause confusion, mistake or deception among purchasers, users, and the public, thereby damaging Opposer.

ANSWER: Denied.

23. As set forth above, Applicant's Mark is likely to cause confusion with Opposer's prior REVERSIBLE Mark, in violation of §2(d) of the Trademark Act, 15 U.S.C. §1052(d).

ANSWER: Denied.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

Indio asserts the following affirmative defenses:

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Opposer has failed to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Opposer's claims are barred by the doctrine of laches.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Opposer's claims are barred by the doctrines of waiver, estoppel and acquiescence.

Applicant reserves the right to assert further affirmative defenses as they become known or available.

Respectfully submitted,

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.

/s/ Chanille Carswell

Chanille Carswell

Dorne J. McKinnon-Rybicki

Linda Mettes

Attorneys for Applicant

Date: January 30, 2017

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.

Ser. No. 86/960,186

1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor

Southfield, Michigan 48075

Tel: (248) 358-4400

Fax: (248) 358-3351

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that I served:

APPLICANT'S ANSWER TO NOTICE OF OPPOSITION

on January 30, 2017 by:

_____ delivering
 X email

a copy to counsel of record for Opposer:

Derrick A. Pizarro
The Pizarro Firm
3619 Paesanos Parkway, Suite 102
San Antonio, TX 78231
Tel: (210) 941-1274
derrick.pizarro@pizarrofirm.com

Chanille Carswell
Chanille Carswell