ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA992065**

Filing date: **08/01/2019**

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

Proceeding	91233046
Party	Defendant Sesderma, S.L.
Correspondence Address	CHRISTIAN SANCHELIMA SANCHELIMA & ASSOCIATES PA 235 SW LE JEUNE ROAD MIAMI, FL 33134 UNITED STATES chris@sanchelima.com, tm@sanchelima.com, jesus@sanchelima.com, legal@sanchelima.com, paralegal@sanchelima.com 305-447-1617
Submission	Other Motions/Papers
Filer's Name	Christian Sanchelima
Filer's email	chris@sanchelima.com, legal@sanchelima.com
Signature	/cs/
Date	08/01/2019
Attachments	190801le.NoticeStatusFedLitSesderma370166.pdf(949329 bytes)

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

MEDIDERM LABORATORIES, LLC,

Opposer/Counter-Respondent,

v. Opposition No. 91233046

SESDERMA, S.L.,

Applicant/Counter-Petitioner,

_____)

NOTICE OF STATUS OF FEDERAL LITIGATION

Pursuant to the Board's order (26 TTABVUE), Petitioner files this notice to apprise the Board of the status of the federal litigation in the Southern District of Florida involving U.S. Reg No. 4257206.

The federal litigation (Case No 1:17-cv-24635-CMA), for which this proceeding was originally suspended, was dismissed by the Court without prejudice. Subsequently, Petitioner initiated a new civil action (Case No. 1:19-cv-22333-DPG), curing any defects of the initial proceeding, for substantially the same causes of action based on trademark infringement involving the marks at issue in this TTAB proceeding. Petitioner attaches a copy of the Complaint [ECF No. 1].

As the civil matter is ongoing, Petitioner asks for this matter to be re-suspended pending the disposition of the federal litigation pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 2.117(a).

Dated: August 1, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Christian Sanchelima
Christian Sanchelima, Esq. (Fla. Bar No. 107751)
chris@sanchelima.com
Jesus Sanchelima, Esq. (Fla. Bar No. 231207)
Sanchelima & Associates, P.A.
235 S.W. Le Jeune Road
Miami, Florida 33134
Telephone: (305) 447-1617
Facsimile: (305) 445-8484

Attorneys for Applicant/Counter-Petitioner

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing was served via email on this 1st day of August 2019 to:

W Randall Sgro
Fruchter & Sgro APC
1623 Cravens Avenue
Torrance, Ca 90501-3203
United States
Email: wrsgro@fslawgroup.com
Phone: 310-787-8446

Sanchelima & Associates, P.A.
235 S.W. Le Jeune Rd.,
Miami, FL 33134-1762
Telephone: (305) 447-1617
Facsimile: (305) 445-8484
chris@sanchelima.com
Attorneys for Applicant

By: /s/ Christian Sanchelima
Christian Sanchelima

Exhibit 1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA

CASE NO.

SESDERMA, S.L.,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MEDIDERM LABORATORIES, LLC.,
and **LINA TWAIAN**,

Defendants.
_____/

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff Sesderma, S.L. (hereinafter "Plaintiff"), sues Mediderm Laboratories, LLC. (hereinafter "Defendant Mediderm") and Lina Twaian (hereinafter "Defendant Twaian" or collectively as "Defendants"), and makes the following allegations:

PARTIES, JURISDICTION, AND VENUE

1. Plaintiff is a limited liability company of Spain, with its principal place of business at Masamagrell nº 3. Pol. Ind. Rafelbunyol, Valencia 46138, Spain.
2. Defendant Mediderm is a limited liability company organized under the laws of California having a business address at 15350 Texaco Ave, Paramount, CA 90723 and does business in the Southern District of Florida.
3. Defendant Twaian is a moving, conscious, and active force behind Defendant Mediderm. Based on corporate records in the California Division of Corporations, Defendant Twaian is the sole member of Defendant Mediderm. Defendant Twaian also signed the declaration of use in the U.S. trademark application for MEDIDERM.

4. This is an action for false designations of origin under the Lanham Act, Title 15, United States Code, § 1125(a), cancellation under § 37 of the Lanham Act, Title 15, United States Code, § 1119, and the ancillary state causes of action of common law trademark infringement and unfair competition.
5. Jurisdiction of this Court arises under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, 28 U.S.C. § 1338, and under the doctrine of pendent jurisdiction over state claims arising from a common nucleus of operative facts.
6. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391(b) and (c) and §1400(b) because Defendants do business in this District, and/or a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred in this District.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

7. Plaintiff was incorporated in Spain in 1989 by Dr. Gabriel Serrano, as the sole shareholder and controlling force of the company at all times since its formation through the present day. Plaintiff has been in the cosmetics business since its formation.
8. Plaintiff is the owner of the marks MEDIDERMA and MEDI+DERMA for cosmetics and dermatological products and for wholesale and retail store services featuring cosmetics and dermatological products (hereinafter "Plaintiff's marks").
9. Plaintiff, through Dr. Gabriel Serrano's common ownership and control of Plaintiff and all other entities formed by Dr. Serrano including Mediderma S.L., controlled and continues to control the specifications and quality of the products bearing the marks MEDIDERMA and MEDI+DERMA.
10. The control exerted by Dr. Serrano over Plaintiff and the related entities formed to distribute Plaintiff's products in the stream of commerce with and within the United

States and Puerto Rico and such common control, constitutes an implied license for the use of Plaintiff's Marks.

11. Plaintiff has also registered its dermatological regulated products commercialized in the US and bearing the MEDIDERMA and MEDI+DERMA marks with the Food and Drug Administration.

12. In controlling the specifications and quality of its products marked with Plaintiff's marks, Plaintiff's quality management system has been in full compliance with ISO Certification 9001 since at least 2005.

13. The mark MEDIDERMA was originally adopted by Plaintiff in 1993 to address the needs of the dermatologist professional practice worldwide.

14. Plaintiff's first use anywhere of the marks MEDIDERMA and MEDI+DERMA for cosmetics and dermatological products and for wholesale and retail store services featuring cosmetics occurred at least as early as 1993 with sales in Spain, Portugal, Poland, and Russia.

15. Plaintiff owns registrations for MEDIDERMA and/or MEDI+DERMA in the following countries: Costa Rica, Taiwan, Colombia, and the European Union.

16. To commercialize its MEDIDERMA and MEDI+DERMA products in the United States and Puerto Rico, Dr. Serrano formed several companies and corporations that he has continuously owned and controlled during their existence, including Mediderma S.L., a Spanish corporation; Sesderma Inc., a dissolved Georgia corporation; Sesderma USA Inc., a dissolved Georgia corporation; Sesvalia USA LLC, a dissolved Georgia limited liability company; Sesvalia USA LLC, a dissolved Florida limited liability company; Sesderma USA LLC, a Florida limited liability company; and Sesderma PR Inc., a

Puerto Rican corporation, for the distribution of Plaintiff's cosmetics and dermatological products including those bearing the marks MEDIDERMA and MEDI+DERMA.

17. Mediderma S.L. was formed in Spain in 1993 to distribute Plaintiff's MEDIDERMA and MEDI+DERMA products in different countries including the United States. Mediderma S.L. was originally named SES Equipos Medicos S.L. and changed its name to Mediderma S.L. in 1997.

18. Plaintiff has used, and continues to use, in commerce in the United States the marks MEDIDERMA and MEDI+DERMA for cosmetics and dermatological products and for wholesale and retail store services featuring cosmetics and dermatological products since at least as early as 1997.

19. Since 1993, Plaintiff has intended to expand its products bearing Plaintiff's marks to the United States market and informally referred to this commercialization operation as "Sesderma USA". The expansion intent was realized in 1997 with Plaintiff's first shipment of MEDIDERMA products to the United States, including Georgia.

20. In 1997, Plaintiff shipped products bearing Plaintiff's marks to Dr. Gabriel Serrano's sister, Cecilia Ryle (aka Cecilia Serrano), who then resided in Georgia. Ms. Ryle sold and shipped MEDIDERMA products in 1997 to third party customers residing in other U.S. states outside of Georgia.

21. In 1999, Dr. Serrano, as the sole shareholder at all times, incorporated Sesderma, Inc. in Georgia, and continued the distribution of MEDIDERMA products in the United States through the present date.

22. In 2003, Dr. Serrano incorporated with Cecilia Serrano, Sesderma USA Inc., a Georgia corporation as the successor of Sesderma Inc. Dr. Serrano was, at all times, the controlling shareholder of Sesderma USA, Inc. until its dissolution in 2011.
23. Sesderma USA, Inc. had offices in Georgia and subsequently expanded to offices in Florida. Sesderma USA, Inc. was a sub-distributor of Mediderma, S.L.
24. In 2007, Dr. Serrano, as the sole equity owner at all times, formed Sesvalia USA LLC, a Georgia company as the successor for Sesderma Inc. Sesvalia USA LLC was dissolved on August 20, 2011.
25. In 2010, Dr. Serrano, as the sole equity owner at all times, formed Sesvalia USA LLC, a Florida company with an effective date of January 25, 2010. This company was dissolved in 2016.
26. In 2014, Dr. Serrano, the sole equity owner at all times, formed Sesderma USA, LLC, a Florida company as the successor for Plaintiff's US operation to the present.
27. Plaintiff has earned millions of dollars for sales of products bearing Plaintiff's marks to customers in the United States since 1997.
28. Based on recent calculations, approximately $10,000 of inventory of products bearing Plaintiff's marks is shipped from Spain to the United States each month. Shipments of products bearing Plaintiff's marks began at least as early as 1997.
29. Beginning in 1997, Plaintiff has advertised its MEDIDERMA products in the United States.
30. Since at least as early as 1997, Plaintiff advertised its products in the United States by attending trade shows and promoting its MEDIDERMA products at various venuses, including the Mart in the Radisson Mart Plaza Hotel and Convention Center in Miami,

Florida.

31. From 2000 to the present, Plaintiff has attended the American Academy of Dermatology's "Annual Meetings" trade shows on an annual basis to promote its MEDIDERMA products.

32. Beginning in about 2001, Ms. Ryle as well as other representatives working with and for Plaintiff have led many workshops in the United States demonstrating MEDIDERMA products. Workshops have been offered frequently through the present date in different locations throughout the United States led by other employees, representatives and/or distributors authorized by Plaintiff.

33. From 2004 to 2006, Plaintiff conducted and/or authorized representatives to conduct seminars in venues such as hotels to teach medical professionals about and how to use its MEDIDERMA products.

34. Since at least as early as 2001, Plaintiff has also advertised its MEDIDERMA products through its printed publications distributed to the relevant public including doctors' offices.

35. Since at least as early as 2001 the publications through which Plaintiff has promoted its MEDIDERMA products include *Dermascope*, *Les Nouvelles Esthétiques*, *The Aesthetic Guide*, *Medical Insight*, *Dermis*, *Piel,* and *PRIME* among others.

36. Since at least as early as 2006, Plaintiff's catalogs of its MEDIDERMA products have been offered in spas, such as Soleil Spa, to relevant consumers such as aestheticians.

37. Plaintiff has spent millions of dollars promoting its marks including MEDIDERMA and MEDI+DERMA throughout the United States since 1997 and through the present date.

38. Plaintiff, particularly through Dr. Gabriel Serrano, communicates constantly with

Plaintiff's sales staff and distributors including those in the United States. Dr. Serrano also participates in the daily operation of Plaintiff including manufacturing, distribution, marketing and sales of MEDIDERMA and MEDI+DERMA products worldwide.

39. At all times, Plaintiff has controlled the nature and quality of the goods and services using the marks MEDIDERMA and MEDI+DERMA.

40. Plaintiff is the owner of the valid marks MEDI+DERMA and MEDIDERMA through its prior, continuous use of the marks and control of the nature and quality of the goods and services offered under said marks, including those offered by its distributors and related companies including Mediderma S.L. and Sesderma USA Inc.

41. The use of the mark in commerce by Plaintiff's distributors and related companies, including Mediderma S.L. and Sesderma USA Inc. inures to the benefit of Plaintiff.

42. Plaintiff and Defendants are direct competitors as both are active in the cosmetics field in Florida and throughout the United States.

43. Plaintiff has suffered reputational and economic injury, including the diversion of its profits to Defendants and goodwill damages, through Defendants' use in commerce of confusingly similar designations including MEDIDERM as a service mark and trade name.

44. Plaintiff has been continuously offering its services and selling its products, using Plaintiff's marks, through advertising and promotional activities thus creating valuable goodwill for Plaintiff's marks.

45. The consuming public in Florida and throughout the United States, associates the MEDIDERMA and MEDI+DERMA marks with Plaintiff. Defendant Mediderm has used in commerce in the United States the mark MEDIDERM for cosmetics and

dermatological products.

46. Defendants have advertised, or cause to advertise, cosmetic products using the confusingly similar designation "MEDIDERM" in the internet, printed media, and with other promotional materials.

47. Defendants' mark MEDIDERM, when used for cosmetics, is likely to cause confusion or mistake in the market with relevant purchasers with Plaintiff's marks MEDI+DERMA and MEDIDERMA.

48. On April 21, 2012, Defendant Mediderm filed an application to register the mark MEDIDERM for cosmetics in international class 003 in the United States Patent and Trademark Office, which matured as registration No. 4,257,206.

49. Defendants did not use in commerce the mark MEDIDERM for cosmetics prior to 1999.

50. Plaintiff has owned the domain "mediderm.com" since February 15, 1997. See Exhibit 1, corresponding to a screen capture of the domain registration information.

51. Defendants first use of the mark MEDIDERM for cosmetics occurred after February 15, 1997.

52. Upon information and belief, Defendants' use in commerce of the MEDIDERM mark in the United States did not begin until a date after Plaintiff's use in commerce of its marks in the United States.

53. Plaintiff has used in commerce MEDIDERMA and/or MEDI+DERMA with and in the United States for cosmetics and dermatological products and for wholesale and retail store services featuring cosmetics and dermatological products from a date prior to April 21, 2012, the filing date of the application that matured into Defendant's registration No. 4,257,206, and prior to Defendants' adoption of the mark MEDIDERM.

54. The parties both assert that Plaintiff's mark MEDI+DERMA and Defendants' mark MEDIDERM, so resemble each other as to be likely to cause confusion, mistake, or deception as to the origin, source, or sponsorship of their respective goods and/or services. See Exhibit 2 at ¶11, corresponding to Defendant Mediderm's assertion in their Notice of Opposition and ¶ 30 of this Amended Complaint.

55. Defendants continue to use the offending marks after receiving actual notice of Plaintiff's claims.

56. Defendants have willfully infringed Plaintiff's marks.

57. MEDIDERMA and MEDI+DERMA are inherently distinctive marks; in the alternative, even if the marks MEDIDERMA and MEDI+DERMA are not inherently distinctive, they have gained distinctiveness through the acquisition of secondary meaning due to its longstanding use and extensive advertising among other factors.

58. MEDIDERMA and MEDI+DERMA are valid, protectable trademarks for cosmetics and dermatological products and for wholesale and retail store services featuring cosmetics and dermatological products.

59. Plaintiff has been, and will continue to be, damaged by the acts of Defendants.

60. Moreover, the goodwill of Plaintiff has been damaged and will continue to be irreparably damaged unless Defendants are enjoined.

61. There is no adequate remedy at law for this irreparable harm unless an injunction is issued.

COUNT I
VIOLATION OF SECTION 43(a) OF THE LANHAM ACT (15 U.S.C. § 1125(a))

Plaintiff realleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 61, inclusive.

62. The above referenced acts constitute misrepresentations under Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act 15 U.S.C § 1125, that are likely to cause confusion as to the source of the cosmetics goods sold by Defendants bearing the infringing designation MEDIDERM and/or sponsorship of its services as if originating from the Plaintiff based on Plaintiff's prior rights over the MEDIDERMA mark.

63. As described above Plaintiff is the owner of the mark MEDIDERMA for cosmetics and dermatological products and for wholesale and retail store services featuring cosmetics and dermatological products and has at all times controlled the nature and quality of its goods and services.

64. Plaintiff has continuously used in commerce the mark MEDIDERMA for cosmetic products and retail services related to cosmetic products since at least as early as 1997, which is prior to Defendants' first use of the mark MEDIDERM.

65. Defendants' actions have willfully violated, and continue to willfully violate, Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests this Honorable Court to grant the remedies provided under Sections 34 and 35 of the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. §§ 1116 and 1117) including preliminary and permanent injunctive relief, compensatory damages, treble damages, attorney's fees, costs, and any other relief the Court deems just and proper.

COUNT II
VIOLATION OF SECTION 43(a) OF THE LANHAM ACT (15 U.S.C. 1125(a))

Plaintiff realleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 61 inclusive.

66. The above referenced acts constitute misrepresentations under Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act 15 U.S.C § 1125, that are likely to cause confusion as to the source of the cosmetics goods sold by Defendants bearing the infringing designation MEDIDERM

and/or sponsor of its goods as if originating from the Plaintiff based on Plaintiff's prior rights over the MEDI+DERMA mark.

67. As described above Plaintiff is the owner of the mark MEDI+DERMA for cosmetics and dermatological products and for wholesale and retail store services featuring cosmetics and dermatological products and has at all times controlled the nature and quality of its goods and services.

68. Plaintiff has continuously used in commerce the mark MEDI+DERMA for cosmetics and dermatological products and for wholesale and retail store services featuring cosmetics and dermatological products since at least as early as 1997, which is prior to Defendants' first use of the mark MEDIDERM.

69. Defendants' actions have willfully violated, and continue to willfully violate, Section 43(a) of the Lanham Act.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests this Honorable Court to grant the remedies provided under Sections 34 and 35 of the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. §§ 1116 and 1117) including preliminary and permanent injunctive relief, compensatory damages, treble damages, attorney's fees, costs, and any other relief the Court deems just and proper.

COUNT III
CANCELLATION UNDER SECTION 37 OF THE LANHAM ACT (15 U.S.C. § 1119)

Plaintiff realleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1-6; 40-61 inclusive.

70. This Count is for cancellation of Defendant Mediderm's federal registration No. 4,257,206 for the mark MEDIDERM under 15 U.S.C. § 1119 based on Defendants' lack of bona fide use of Defendants' mark MEDIDERM prior to the filing of the use-based application for registration under 15 U.S.C. § 1051(a); and/or under 15 U.S.C. § 1064(3) for Defendants' commitment of fraud in the procurement of its registration.

71. Defendants have admitted to not having used the designation MEDIDERM for numerous goods included in their federal registration No. 4,257,206 as of the filing date of the application. See Exhibit 3, attached, corresponding to Defendant Mediderm's Response to Plaintiff's Requests for Admissions from a proceeding before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

72. Defendants did not use, on or prior to April 21, 2012 (the registration's application filing date), the MEDIDERM designation in commerce for the following goods:

    a. after-sun milks - Requests for Admission (RFA) # 3; 103
    b. after-sun oils - RFA # 4; 108
    c. aromatic body care products, namely, shower gel - RFA # 5; 109
    d. aromatic body care products, namely shampoo - RFA # 8; 112
    e. aromatic body care products, namely, conditioner - RFA # 9; 113
    f. aromatic body care products, namely non-medicated lip balm - RFA # 10; 114
    g. bath oils for cosmetic purposes - RFA # 15; 119
    h. cosmetic oils - RFA # 27; 131
    i. cosmetic products in the form of aerosols for skin care - RFA # 33; 137
    j. cosmetic sun oils - RFA # 37; 141
    k. cosmetic suntan lotions - RFA # 41; 145
    l. non-medicated cosmetic skin care preparations consisting of organic coconut virgin oil - RFA # 49; 153
    m. non-medicated herbal body care products, namely, body oils - RFA # 50; 154
    n. non-medicated herbal body care products, namely, salves - RFA # 51; 155
    o. non-medicated herbal body care products, namely lip balms - RFA # 52; 156
    p. non-medicated lip care preparations - RFA # 53; 157
    q. non-medicated preparations for the care of hair and scalp - RFA # 54; 158
    r. non-medicated skin care preparation, namely, body mist - RFA # 56; 160
    s. non-medicated skin cream for general skin rash and irritation resulting from skin shingles - RFA # 64; 168
    t. seawater-based skin care preparations for skin renewal - RFA # 67; 171
    u. skin bronzer - RFA # 70; 174
    v. skin gels for accelerating, enhancing or extending tans RFA # 89; 193
    w. wipes impregnated with a skin cleanser - RFA # 105; 209

73. Upon information and belief, Defendants have knowingly made false, material representations of fact with intent to deceive the United States Patent and Trademark Office in connection with the procurement of registration No. 4,257,206. Defendants'

false representations relating to use of the mark MEDIDERM in commerce with the goods listed therein when such use had not in fact taken place on or prior to the filing date of the application for all the goods listed in said registration. The examiner in the U.S. Patent and Trademark relied on these false representations of use for all the goods listed in the application that eventually matured as registration No. 4,257,206 and would not have approved said application had it known that the material use declarations were false.

74. Plaintiff has been damaged by the diversion of its profits to Defendants and damaged as to the distinctiveness of Plaintiff's marks as well as the goodwill of Plaintiff's Marks and its business reputation.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests this Honorable Court to grant the remedies provided under Sections 37 of the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. § 1119) including cancellation of registration No. 4,257,206 and any other relief the Court deems just and proper.

COUNT IV
COMMON LAW MARK INFRINGEMENT (MEDIDERMA)

Plaintiff realleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 61, inclusive.

75. Defendants' conduct as described above constitutes trademark infringement and passing off in violation of the common law of the State of Florida and Fla. Stat. § 495.161.

76. Plaintiff has used in commerce the mark MEDIDERMA with and in the United States for cosmetics and dermatological products and for wholesale and retail store services featuring cosmetics and dermatological products from a date prior to April 21, 2012, the filing of the application for Defendant's registration No. 4,257,206, and prior to Defendants' adoption of the mark MEDIDERM.

77. The use and/or advertising of the infringing designation MEDIDERM by Defendants of Plaintiff's mark is likely to cause confusion or mistake among purchasers as to the source of the cosmetic goods and retail services with those of Plaintiff.

78. Defendants' deliberate and willful use and/or advertising of infringing designation MEDIDERM to identify the same, or related, goods and services is likely to cause confusion or mistake among purchasers as to the source and sponsorship of the goods and such acts of said Defendants constitutes common law infringement of Plaintiff's mark MEDIDERMA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests this Honorable Court to grant preliminary and permanent injunctive relief, compensatory damages and punitive damages, accounting and lost profits, and any other relief the Court deems just and proper.

COUNT V
COMMON LAW MARK INFRINGEMENT (MEDI+DERMA)

Plaintiff realleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 61, inclusive.

79. Defendants' conduct as described above constitutes trademark infringement and passing off in violation of the common law of the State of Florida and Fla. Stat. § 495.161.

80. Plaintiff has used in commerce the mark MEDI+DERMA with and in the United States for cosmetics and dermatological products and for wholesale and retail store services featuring cosmetics and dermatological products from a date prior to April 21, 2012, the filing of the application for Defendant's registration No. 4,257,206, and prior to Defendants' adoption of the mark MEDIDERM

81. The use and/or advertising of the infringing designation MEDIDERM by Defendants of Plaintiff's mark is likely to cause confusion or mistake among purchasers as to the source of the cosmetics goods and retail services with those of Plaintiff.

82. Defendants' deliberate and willful use and/or advertising of infringing designation MEDIDERM to identify the same, or related, goods and services is likely to cause confusion or mistake among purchasers as to the source and sponsorship of the goods and such acts of said Defendants constitutes common law infringement of Plaintiff's mark MEDI+DERMA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests this Honorable Court to grant preliminary and permanent injunctive relief, compensatory damages and punitive damages, accounting and lost profits, and any other relief the Court deems just and proper.

COUNT VI
COMMON LAW UNFAIR COMPETITION

Plaintiff realleges the allegations in Paragraphs 1 through 61, inclusive, as if fully set forth herein.

83. The conduct of Defendants, as described above, violates Florida's common law unfair competition laws.

84. Plaintiff is active in the cosmetics and retail service featuring cosmetics fields and adopted the marks MEDIDERMA and MEDI+DERMA prior to Defendants' adoption of the MEDIDERM mark and has continuously used in Florida and throughout the United States, its trademarks MEDIDERMA and MEDI+DERMA since at least 1997, prior to Defendants' first use of MEDIDERM in the same mark.

85. Defendants are using infringing MEDIDERM designation in connection with a competing business in Florida, which is likely to result in consumer confusion.

86. Upon information and belief, Defendants have knowingly made false, material representations of fact with intent to deceive the United States Patent and Trademark Office in connection with the procurement of registration No. 4,257,206. Defendants'

false representations relating to use of the mark MEDIDERM in commerce with the goods listed therein when such use had not in fact taken place on or prior to the filing date of the application for all the goods listed in said registration.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests this Honorable Court to grant preliminary and permanent injunctive relief, compensatory damages and punitive damages, accounting and lost profits, and any other relief the Court deems just and proper.

JURY DEMAND

Plaintiff Sesderma S.L. requests trial by jury for all issues so triable.

Dated: June 6, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

s/Christian Sanchelima
Christian Sanchelima, Esq. (Fla. Bar No. 107751)
Email: chris@sanchelima.com
Jesus Sanchelima, Esq. (Fla. Bar No. 231207)
Email: jesus@sanchelima.com
Sanchelima & Associates, P.A.
235 S.W. Le Jeune Road
Miami, Florida 33134
Telephone: (305) 447-1617
Facsimile: (305) 445-8484

Attorneys for Plaintiff

VERIFICATION

I, Gabriel Serrano, declare as follows:

I am the founder, sole shareholder, and chairman of Sesderma S.L. and I am authorized to make this verification on its behalf.

I have read the foregoing COMPLAINT and I am familiar with its contents. The matters stated therein are true to the best of my knowledge, information, and belief.

Executed on June 4, 2019 at Beijing, China.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States and the State of Florida that the foregoing is true and correct.

Gabriel Serrano