

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA621759**

Filing date: **08/15/2014**

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

Proceeding	92057500
Party	Defendant BeeNaturals, Inc.
Correspondence Address	NELSON D NOLTE POLSTER LIEDER WOODRUFF & LUCCHESI LC 12412 POWERSCOURT DR, STE 200 ST LOUIS, MO 63131 UNITED STATES nnolte@polsterlieder.com, mlucchesi@polsterlieder.com
Submission	Other Motions/Papers
Filer's Name	Nelson D. Nolte
Filer's e-mail	nnolte@polsterlieder.com
Signature	/Nelson D. Nolte/
Date	08/15/2014
Attachments	response to motion for reconsideration.pdf(75911 bytes )

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

ORBIS DISTRIBUTION, INC.	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	Cancellation No. 92057500
v.	)	
	)	Reg. No. 3197276
BEE NATURALS, INC.	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**RESPONSE TO MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF UNSPECIFIED ORDERS**

Comes now Defendant Bee Naturals, Inc. through undersigned counsel and submits this paper as its response to Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration.

As a first major defect of Plaintiff's motion for reconsideration, it fails to identify the ruling(s) for which it seeks reconsideration. In Section I, the Plaintiff makes a nonsensical ranting that the Interlocutory Attorney has exceeded her authority without identifying any particular order where excessive authority was exercised. It is impossible for Defendant to respond to such a vague assertion.

In Section II, the Plaintiff complains that Defendant's section 8 & 15 declarations were accepted when, in Plaintiff's opinion, they should not have been denied. Though styled as a motion for reconsideration, the Board has not yet even ruled on the propriety of Defendant's declarations. Obviously, then, Plaintiff again identifies no particular ruling for which it seeks reconsideration. It is difficult for Defendant to respond in a meaningful way to a motion for reconsideration of an order that will issue on a future date. Plaintiff's sensing that its argument will be rejected is not a basis for reconsideration. Plaintiff must actually wait for a ruling to be issued in due course before it can complain the ruling is incorrect.

Plaintiff's pleading is completely deficient to request reconsideration of any particular order. It falls far short in specificity of the ruling for which it seeks reconsideration. It should be denied summarily.

Respectfully Submitted,

By: /Nelson D. Nolte/

Nelson D. Nolte, Reg. No. 42,938  
Polster, Lieder, Woodruff & Lucchesi, L.C.  
12412 Powerscourt Drive, Suite 200  
St. Louis, Missouri 63131  
(314) 238-2400 Phone  
(314) 238-2401 Fax  
Attorneys for Defendant BEE NATURALS, INC.

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the forgoing is being served via first class U.S. mail postage pre-paid this 15th day of August 2014 upon the following:

John M Bolger  
Bolger Legal Group LLC  
Po Box 170616  
Whitefish Bay, WI 53217  
Attorney for Plaintiff

/Nelson D. Nolte/