

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA982413**

Filing date: **06/20/2019**

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

Proceeding	91246431
Party	Defendant Hongkong Yinghui International Trading Co., Limited
Correspondence Address	FRANCIS JOHN CIARAMELLA RICK RUZ PLLC 7355 SW 87TH AVE SUITE 200 MIAMI, FL 28202 UNITED STATES francis@ruzlaw.com 305-921-9326
Submission	Answer
Filer's Name	Francis John Ciaramella, Esquire
Filer's email	francis@ruzlaw.com
Signature	/Francis John Ciaramella/
Date	06/20/2019
Attachments	Answer to Amended Notice of Opposition.pdf(102485 bytes)

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

LULU’S FASHION LOUNGE LLC,

Opposer,

v.

Opposition No. 91246431

HONGKONG YINGHUI INTERNATIONAL
TRADING CO, LIMITED,

Applicant.

APPLICANT’S ANSWER TO AMENDED NOTICE OF OPPOSITION

In response to the Amended Notice of Opposition (hereafter “Notice”) filed by LULU’S FASHION LOUNGE LLC (hereafter “Opposer”) on May 31, 2019, the Applicant, HONGKONG YINGHUI INTERNATIONAL TRADING CO, LIMITED (hereafter “Applicant”), answers the Notice identified above as follows:

1. In response to the allegations of paragraph 1 of the Notice, the Applicant is without knowledge.
2. In response to the allegations of paragraph 2 of the Notice, the Applicant is without knowledge.
3. In response to the allegations of paragraph 3 of the Notice, the Applicant is without knowledge.
4. In response to the allegations of paragraph 4 of the Notice, the Applicant is without knowledge.
5. In response to the allegations of paragraph 5 of the Notice, the Applicant is without knowledge.

6. In response to the allegations of paragraph 6 of the Notice, the Applicant is without knowledge.
7. In response to the allegations of paragraph 7 of the Notice, the Applicant is without knowledge.
8. In response to the allegations of paragraph 8 of the Notice, the Applicant is without knowledge.
9. Applicant admits it filed Application Serial No. 88/053,110 for the composite mark LULUGAL on July 25, 2018, claiming a date of first use of at least as early as April 25, 2018. Applicant admits that Application Serial No. 88/053,110 was published on January 15, 2019. Any and all other allegations contained within paragraph 9 are denied.
10. Applicant admits that it seeks registration for “Aprons; Babies' trousers; Baby layettes for clothing; Baby tops; Bathrobes; Bikinis; Blazers; Blouses; Boots; Bras; Bustiers; Camisoles; Capes; Clothing for babies, toddlers and children, treated with fire and heat retardants, namely, pajamas, jackets, shirts, pants, jumpers; Coats; Costumes for use in children's dress up play; Dresses; Footwear; Footwear, namely, pumps; Gloves; Hats; Heels; Jackets; Jumpers; Jumpsuits; Kimonos; Knitwear, namely, knit tops, knit bottoms; Leggings; Lingerie; Negligees; Night gowns; Pajamas; Pants; Parkas; Rainwear; Sandals; Scarves; Shawls; Shirts; Shoes; Shorts; Socks; Sweaters; Sweatshirts; Swimwear; T-shirts; Tank tops; Trousers; Vests; Women's shoes, namely, foldable flats; Belts for clothing; Platform shoes.” Any and all other allegations contained within paragraph 10 are denied.
11. Applicant denies the allegations of paragraph 11 of the Notice.
12. Applicant denies the allegations of paragraph 12 of the Notice.
13. Applicant denies the allegations of paragraph 13 of the Notice.

14. Applicant denies the allegations of paragraph 14 of the Notice.
15. Applicant denies the allegations of paragraph 15 of the Notice.
16. Applicant denies the allegations of paragraph 16 of the Notice.
17. Applicant denies the allegations of paragraph 17 of the Notice.
18. Applicant denies the allegations of paragraph 18 of the Notice.
19. In response to the allegations of paragraph 19 of the Notice, the Applicant is without knowledge.
20. In response to the allegations of paragraph 20 of the Notice, the Applicant is without knowledge.
21. In response to the allegations of paragraph 21 of the Notice, the Applicant is without knowledge.
22. In response to the allegations of paragraph 22 of the Notice, the Applicant is without knowledge.
23. In response to the allegations of paragraph 23 of the Notice, the Applicant is without knowledge.
24. In response to the allegations of paragraph 24 of the Notice, the Applicant is without knowledge.
25. In response to the allegations of paragraph 25 of the Notice, the Applicant is without knowledge.
26. In response to the allegations of paragraph 26 of the Notice, the Applicant is without knowledge.
27. In response to the allegations of paragraph 27 of the Notice, the Applicant is without knowledge.

28. In response to the allegations of paragraph 28 of the Notice, the Applicant is without knowledge.

29. Applicant denies the allegations of paragraph 29 of the Notice.

30. Applicant denies the allegations of paragraph 30 of the Notice.

31. Applicant denies the allegations of paragraph 31 of the Notice.

32. Applicant denies the allegations of paragraph 32 of the Notice.

33. Applicant denies the allegations of paragraph 33 of the Notice

34. In response to the allegations of paragraph 34 of the Notice, the Applicant is without knowledge.

Affirmative Defenses

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

First Affirmative Defense

35. Upon information and belief, Opposer has no priority of use to the LULUGAL mark.

Second Affirmative Defense

36. There is no similarity between Applicant's mark and Opposer's mark as to appearance.

Specifically, the Applicant's mark is for the words LULUGAL, whereas the Opposer's marks are for LULUS. Each respective mark contains different wording.

Third Affirmative Defense

37. The Opposer's marks do not sound like the Applicant's Mark. Specifically, the Applicant's Mark requires the pronunciation of the additional word GAL.

Fourth Affirmative Defense

38. Purchasers of goods sold along with the relevant marks are careful and sophisticated, thus making any confusion or mistake amongst potential overlapping consumers highly unlikely.

Fifth Affirmative Defense

39. The respective trademarks, as appears on each party's respective goods and services, do not create the same or overall commercial impression when viewed separately by the ordinary consumer.

Sixth Affirmative Defense

40. Ordinary Consumers would not confuse or conclude that the parties' products share a common source or affiliation or connection.

Seventh Affirmative Defense

41. On information and belief, Opposer's goods are more expensive than that of the Applicant; thus, Consumers are unlikely to purchase Opposer's goods supposing they derive from Applicant or vice versa.

Eighth Affirmative Defense

42. Opposer has no examples of any actual confusion amongst consumers with regards to Applicant's Mark and Opposer's marks.

Ninth Affirmative Defense

43. No executed contractual agreement exists between Applicant and Opposer regarding Applicant's use of the mark LULUGAL.

Applicant reserves the right to amend this Answer to assert any additional affirmative defenses arising from any applicable facts or law that may be revealed during discovery.

Relief Requested

WHEREFORE, the Applicant asks that this Opposition proceeding be dismissed forthwith.

By: Francis John Ciaramella/
Francis John Ciaramella, Esq.
Florida Bar No. 111927

Rick Ruz, PLLC
Counsel for the Applicant
7355 SW 87th Avenue, Suite 200
Miami, Florida 33173
Telephone No. (305) 921-9326
Facsimile No. (888) 506-2833

Dated: June 20, 2019

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and complete copy of the foregoing Answer to Notice of Opposition has been served on the following via email:

Jennifer Lee Taylor
Morrison & Foerster LLP
425 Market Street
San Francisco, CA 94105
UNITED STATES
jtaylor@mof.com

By: /Francis John Ciaramella/
Francis John Ciaramella, Esq.
Florida Bar No. 111927

Dated: June 20, 2019