

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA365662**

Filing date: **08/30/2010**

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

Proceeding	92052784
Party	Defendant Robin Caller
Correspondence Address	ROBIN CALLER 7 BRAYFIELD TERRACE LONDON N1 1HZ, UNITED KINGDOM
Submission	Answer
Filer's Name	Jeffrey B. Sladkus
Filer's e-mail	jeff@sladlaw.com
Signature	/Jeffrey B. Sladkus/
Date	08/30/2010
Attachments	Answer UBM IP Luxembourg SARL Petition for Cancellation v2 0.pdf ( 5 pages ) (26823 bytes )

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

Trademark: GAO

UBM IP Luxembourg SARL	)	
	)	
Petitioner,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Cancellation No. 92052784
	)	Registration Serial No. 3,258,835
Robin Caller	)	
	)	
Registrant	)	

**ANSWER TO PETITION FOR CANCELLATION**

Registrant, Robin Caller (“Registrant”), by and through its undersigned attorney of record answers the Petition for Cancellation of UBM IP Luxembourg SARL (“Petitioner”), as follows:

First Unnumbered Paragraph: Registrant is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of Petitioner’s address or country of incorporation. Registrant denies the remaining allegations in the first unnumbered paragraph of the Petition for Cancellation.

1. Registrant lacks sufficient information or knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 1 of the Petition for Cancellation, and on that basis denies the allegations in Paragraph 1.

2. Registrant lacks sufficient information or knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 2 of the Petition for Cancellation, and on that basis denies the allegations in Paragraph 2.

3. Registrant denies the allegations in Paragraph 3 of the Petition for Cancellation.

4. Registrant denies the allegations in Paragraph 4 of the Petition for Cancellation.

5. Registrant denies the allegations in Paragraph 5 of the Petition for Cancellation.

6. Registrant lacks sufficient information or knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 6 of the Petition for Cancellation, and on that basis denies the allegations in Paragraph 6.

7. Registrant lacks sufficient information or knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraph 7 of the Petition for Cancellation, and on that basis denies the allegations in Paragraph 7.

8. Registrant denies the allegations in Paragraph 8 of the Petition for Cancellation.

9. Registrant denies the allegations in Paragraph 9 of the Petition for Cancellation.

9 (10). Registrant admits the allegations in the second Paragraph 9 of the Petition for Cancellation.

Second Unnumbered Paragraph: Registrant denies that Petitioner is entitled to the relief prayed for in the second unnumbered paragraph of the Petition for Cancellation.

## AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

In further answer to the Petition for Cancellation, and without waiver of any objection or an admission of sufficiency of the Petition for Cancellation, Registrant asserts upon information and belief that:

1. Petitioner's Petition for Cancellation fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, and in particular, fails to state legally sufficient grounds for sustaining the Petition for Cancellation.

2. Petitioner's claims are barred by the doctrine of unclean hands.

3. Registrant's mark, when used in connection with Registrant's goods, is not likely to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive as to the affiliation, connection or association of Registrant with Petitioner, or as to the origin, sponsorship, or approval of Registrant's goods by Petitioner.

4. Registrant's mark, when used in connection with Registrant's goods, is not likely to cause confusion with Petitioner's mark because of the differences in the channels of trade for each party's respective products.

5. Registrant's mark, when used in connection with Registrant's goods, is not likely to cause confusion with Petitioner's mark because the target consumer for each respective party is distinct.

WHEREFORE, Registrant respectfully prays that the Cancellation of Registration No. 3,258,835 be denied and that the instant Petition for Cancellation be dismissed forthwith.

Dated this 30<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2010.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jeffrey Sladkus".

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

Jeffrey B. Sladkus, Esq.  
The Sladkus Law Group  
1827 Powers Ferry Road  
Building 6, Suite 200  
Atlanta, GA 30339  
Tel: (404) 252-0900  
Fax: (404) 252-0970  
Attorney for Registrant

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned hereby certifies that a true and complete copy of the Answer to the Petition for Cancellation was served on opposing counsel by depositing such copy with United States Postal Service on August 30, 2010 by first class postage prepaid mail addressed to:

Monica B. Richman, Esq.  
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
1221 Avenue of the Americas  
New York, NY 10020



---

Jeffrey B. Sladkus

Dated: August 30, 2010  
Atlanta, GA