

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
Trademark Trial and Appeal Board
P.O. Box 1451
Alexandria, VA 22313-1451
General Contact Number: 571-272-8500

DUNN

Mailed: June 18, 2014

Cancellation No. 92057500

Orbis Distribution, Inc.

v.

Bee Naturals, Inc.

By the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board:

This case comes up on respondent's combined response to the Board's May 9, 2014 show cause order and motion to accept its late response to the Board's March 31, 2014 order, and respondent's supplement to its motion, filed January 5, 2014, to amend Registration No. 3197276 to correct the clerical error in respondent's name.

As noted in the Board's December 16, 2013 order, respondent identified itself incorrectly in the application which issued as Registration No. 3197276, listing its name as "Bee Naturals, Inc." (space between first two words) instead of "BeeNaturals Inc." (no space between first two words). Where a mistake in a registration occurs in good faith through the fault of the owner of the registration, the Director may correct the error upon written request

Cancellation No. 92057500

and payment of the fee required by Trademark Rule 2.6. See Trademark Act Sec. 7(h). The Board allowed respondent time to request correction of its name.

In view of respondent's deficient request filed January 5, 2014, the Board's March 31, 2014 order allowed respondent time to supplement its request. On May 9, 2014, following respondent's failure to respond, the Board ordered respondent to show cause why judgment default should not be entered based on its apparent loss of interest in the case.

SHOW CAUSE ORDER DISCHARGED

Respondent's combined response and motion demonstrate that respondent has not lost interest in this case, but remains interested in defending its registration. Accordingly, the show cause order is discharged.

LATE RESPONSE ACCEPTED

Respondent's combined response and motion to accept its late response to the Board's March 31, 2014 order is accompanied by two declarations from employees of respondent's attorney averring that they handle the law firm's mail and docketing, and that the Board's March 31, 2014 order was never received. The present circumstances rebut the presumption that the Board's order reached respondent. Absent circumstances which would cast doubt on the statement, the Board takes at face value a party's assertion that it did not receive a paper. See *Interpayment Svcs. Ltd. v. Docters & Thiede*, 66 USPQ2d 1463, 1464 fn 1 (TTAB 2003) ("respondent moved to reopen ... on the

Cancellation No. 92057500

basis that respondent did not receive a copy (despite the certificate of service shown thereon) ... Petitioners are ordered to send respondent a copy of petitioners' motion ..."); *Old Nutfield Brewing Co., v. Hudson Valley Brewing Co.*, 65 USPQ2d 1701, 1704 fn 8 (TTAB 2002)("[W]e take petitioner at its word ... that no answer [with a certificate of service] was in fact received"); *Jack Lenor Larsen, Inc. v. Chas. O. Larson, Co.*, 44 USPQ2d 1950, 1954 (TTAB 1997) ("it would not be a great leap of faith to conclude that one of these orders was either not mailed or, if mailed, not delivered.").

The Board also notes that respondent has provided an email address. However, because the address apparently was not entered by the Board into the Board's electronic record, respondent has not been receiving the electronic copies of the Board's orders to which it is entitled. See Trademark Trial and Appeal Board Manual of Procedure (TBMP) §117.01 (3rd ed. 2013). The Board's records have been corrected, and respondent now will receive email copies of the Board orders.

The Board accepts respondent's late response to the Board's March 31, 2014 order, and will address the supplemented motion to amend the registration to correct the clerical error in respondent's name. aqz

CORRECTION TO REGISTRATION GRANTED

On June 9, 2014, respondent filed a supplemental written request specifying that the attorney filing the underlying application made a typographical error which resulted in respondent's name appearing as three

Cancellation No. 92057500

words instead of two words; that this error occurred in good faith; and that correction of the error by elimination of the space in respondent's name does not require republication of the mark.¹ Respondent has supported its request with the required declaration and the fee for amendment of the registration.

Inasmuch as the request for correction of the inadvertent error, as recently supplemented, complies with the requirements of Trademark Rule 2.175(b)(1), the correction is approved. The amendment will be forwarded to the Post Registration Branch of this Office for entry of the amendment in accordance with Section 7(e) of the Trademark Act.

AUTHORITY TO FILE ON BEHALF OF RESPONDENT

Petitioner has objected to the Board's consideration of various papers filed on behalf of respondent on the grounds that Bee Naturals, Inc. does not exist; that BeeNaturals Inc. no longer exists inasmuch as there was a corporate dissolution; and that the attorney filing the paper is not authorized to do so. With the correction of respondent's registration to omit the inadvertently-included space, the record now supports respondent's contention that there has been only one owner of the registration and it is properly party to this proceeding. The Board will not consider further arguments regarding "Bee Naturals, Inc."

Petitioner's attachment of the page indicating the corporate dissolution of BeeNaturals Inc. is insufficient to support its argument that BeeNaturals

¹ As explained earlier in this proceeding, while such requests usually are made to the USPTO Director, in this instance the Board has jurisdiction.

Cancellation No. 92057500

Inc. does not exist and therefore no papers may be filed on its behalf. The Board has held that a corporation which has been suspended for failure to pay taxes and file returns may, upon revival, proceed with the prosecution or defense of a Board proceeding. *See WMA Group, Inc. v. Western International Media*, 29 USPQ2d 1478 (TTAB 1993). The Board is not finding that such revival has occurred here. However, the Board will not consider further arguments that the evidence of corporate dissolution warrants denying consideration to any papers filed by BeeNaturals Inc.

Petitioner presents no support for its argument that the attorney filing papers on behalf of respondent is not the attorney of record. Filing an appearance is sufficient for recognition for representation. Trademark Rule 2.17(b)(2).

In sum, the papers filed on behalf of respondent were properly filed and will be considered.

MOTION TO EXTEND TIME TO FILE ANSWER GRANTED

On August 21, 2013, the day the answer was due, respondent filed a motion for a 30-day extension of time in which to file its answer on the grounds that counsel had been retained recently; that counsel was busy with other business; and counsel required time to research and prepare the response. Notwithstanding petitioner's opposition alleging that respondent failed to demonstrate good cause, the Board finds that the press of other litigation matters may constitute good cause for granting an extension. *See*

Cancellation No. 92057500

Societa Per Azioni Chianti Ruffino Esportazione Vinicola Toscana v. Colli Spolentini Spoletoducale SCRL, 59 USPQ2d 1383, 1384 (TTAB 2001).

MOTION TO STRIKE ANSWER DENIED

At the end of the requested extension period, respondent filed its answer. Respondent moves to strike the answer as untimely, and because it is not germane to the motion for default judgment. Inasmuch as the Board found good cause for extension, the answer is timely. Moreover, an answer is germane to the issue of default. The motion to strike the answer is DENIED. The answer is accepted.

MOTION TO ACCORD FILING DATE GRANTED

The certificate of mailing procedure permits certain types of correspondence to be sent to the Office by first-class mail, even on the due date for the correspondence and still be considered timely, notwithstanding the fact that the mailed correspondence will not be received in the Office until after the due date. Trademark Rule 2.197(a); *In re LS Bedding*, 16 USPQ2d 1451, 1452-53 (Comm'r 1990) (certificate of mailing procedure is used to determine timeliness, while the actual receipt date is used for all other purposes, such as an application filing date). Notwithstanding petitioner's unsupported accusations of false certification, respondent's motion to accord the filing date of the date listed in the certificate of mailing for its response to the motion for default judgment is GRANTED. Petitioner's motion to strike those documents is DENIED.

Cancellation No. 92057500

MOTION FOR DEFAULT JUDGMENT IS DENIED

Inasmuch as the Board found good cause for extension, the answer is timely, and petitioner's motion for default judgment, filed the day after the original answer was due, is DENIED.

MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT IS DENIED

RESPONDENT'S TIME TO RESPOND TO MOTION FOR JUDGMENT ON THE PLEADINGS RESET

Proceedings herein remain suspended pending the board's disposition of the motion for judgment on the pleadings.