

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA629668**

Filing date: **09/29/2014**

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

Proceeding.	92059538
Applicant	Defendant Sterling Jewelers Inc.
Other Party	Plaintiff Artistry, Ltd.
Have the parties held their discovery conference as required under Trademark Rules 2.120(a)(1) and (a)(2)?	No

### **Motion for Suspension in View of Civil Proceeding With Consent**

The parties are engaged in a civil action which may have a bearing on this proceeding. Accordingly, Sterling Jewelers Inc. hereby requests suspension of this proceeding pending a final determination of the civil action. Trademark Rule 2.117.

Sterling Jewelers Inc. has secured the express consent of all other parties to this proceeding for the suspension and resetting of dates requested herein.

Sterling Jewelers Inc. has provided an e-mail address herewith for itself and for the opposing party so that any order on this motion may be issued electronically by the Board.

### **Certificate of Service**

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of this paper has been served upon all parties, at their address record by First Class Mail on this date.

Respectfully submitted,  
/Michael J. Garvin/  
Michael J. Garvin  
mjgarvin@vorys.com  
bbaber@kslaw.com  
09/29/2014

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

In re Registration Nos.: 3644234 and 3644235

For the marks: ARTISTRY DIAMOND COLLECTION and  
ARTISTRY DIAMOND COLLECTION A & design

ARTISTRY, LTD.,

Petitioner,

v.

STERLING JEWELERS INC.,

Registrant.

Cancellation No. 92059538

**CONSENTED MOTION TO SUSPEND**

Pursuant to Rule 2.117 of the Trademark Rules of Practice, 37 C.F.R. § 2.117, and Trademark Board Manual of Practice § 510.02(a), Registrant Sterling Jewelers Inc. (“Sterling”) hereby moves the Board for entry of an Order suspending proceedings in the above-captioned matter until termination of the civil action between the parties that is pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio, captioned *Sterling Jewelers Inc. v. Artistry Ltd.*, No. 5:14-cv-01369-SL, filed June 23, 2014 (the “Civil Action”). Petitioner Artistry, Ltd. has consented to this motion.

Rule 2.117 provides that the Board may suspend proceedings in a pending case whenever it becomes aware that the parties are also engaged in a civil action that may have a bearing on the case.

A copy of the Complaint in the Civil Action is attached hereto as Exhibit A. As the Complaint confirms, Sterling requests in the Civil Action declaratory judgments of non-

infringement and validity of the trademark registrations that are the subject of this case.  
Resolution of the Civil Action may therefore have a bearing on and/or be dispositive of the  
issues in this case.

Accordingly, Respondent Sterling, with the consent of Petitioner Artistry, Ltd., requests  
that proceedings herein be suspended until termination of the Civil Action.

This 29th day of September, 2014.

Respectfully submitted,

**VORYS, SATER, SEYMOUR AND PEASE LLP**



---

Michael J. Garvin (0025394)  
2100 One Cleveland Center  
1375 East Ninth Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-1724  
Phone: 216-479-6100  
Fax: 216-479-6060  
[mjgarvin@vorys.com](mailto:mjgarvin@vorys.com)

Mark A. Watkins (0040519)  
First National Tower  
106 South Main Street, Suite 1100  
Akron, Ohio 44308  
Phone: 330-208-1000  
Fax: 330-208-1001  
[mswatkins@vorys.com](mailto:mswatkins@vorys.com)

*Attorneys for Registrant  
Sterling Jewelers Inc.*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing Consented Motion to Suspend was served on September 29, 2014, by first-class United States Mail, postage prepaid, on:

Bruce W. Baber, Esq.  
KING & SPALDING LLP  
1180 Peachtree Street  
Atlanta, Georgia 30309

*Attorney for Petitioner  
Artistry, Ltd.*

**VORYS, SATER, SEYMOUR AND PEASE LLP**



---

Michael J. Garvin

*Attorney for Registrant  
Sterling Jewelers Inc.*

**EXHIBIT A**

## **Exhibit A**

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO  
EASTERN DIVISION**

STERLING JEWELERS INC., a Delaware corporation,

*Plaintiff,*

v.

ARTISTRY LTD., an Illinois corporation,

*Defendant.*

Civil Action No:

Judge:

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY  
JUDGMENT AND RELIEF AND  
DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

**COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY JUDGMENT OF NON-INFRINGEMENT**

For its complaint against Defendant Artistry, Ltd., Plaintiff Sterling Jewelers Inc. (“Sterling”), alleges and states as follows:

**Preliminary Statement**

This is an action seeking a declaration that Plaintiff Sterling’s use of its federally registered and unregistered trademarks that include the term “Artistry,” as used in connection with a line of its jewelry sold in consumer retail stores, does not infringe any rights of Defendant. Sterling’s claims arise under the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-2202, and the Trademark Act of 1946, as amended, commonly known as the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1051, *et. seq.* Defendant has wrongly asserted that Sterling’s use of its federally registered and unregistered trademarks that include the term “Artistry” in connection with its line of jewelry is likely to cause consumer confusion. As a result, a declaratory ruling is necessary to clarify Sterling’s rights in its trademarks that include the term “Artistry” for use with jewelry going forward.

## **PARTIES**

1. Plaintiff Sterling Jewelers Inc. is a Delaware corporation having a business address at 375 Ghent Road, Akron, Ohio 44333.

2. Defendant Artistry, Ltd. is an Illinois corporation having its principal place of business at 8272 Lincoln Avenue, Skokie, Illinois 60077.

## **JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

3. This action arises and is brought under the Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-2202, and the Trademark Act of 1946, as amended, commonly known as the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1051, *et. seq.*

4. This Court has subject matter jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338, 1367, 2201-2201, and 15 U.S.C. § 1121.

5. This Court has personal jurisdiction over Defendant pursuant to the provisions of the Ohio Long Arm Statute, O.R.C. § 2307.382, and the laws of the United States. Upon information and belief, Defendant sells and distributes merchandise in the State of Ohio, which includes the Northern District of Ohio.

6. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b).

## **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS AND BACKGROUND**

### **A. Sterling's "Artistry" Trademarks**

7. Sterling or its predecessors have provided retail jewelry services under the Kay Jewelers® ("Kay") brand since 1916, the Jared® The Galleria Of Jewelry ("Jared") brand since 1993, the Belden® Jewelers ("Belden") brand since 1910, and the J. B. Robinson® Jewelers ("JBR") brand since 1929. Under the Kay, Jared, Belden, JBR, and other regional brands,

Sterling operates approximately 1,300 stores in all fifty states in the United States, including in this judicial district.

8. Sterling distributes and sells an extensive assortment of high-quality jewelry products, including a line of diamond jewelry sold under various trademarks that include the term “Artistry” as outlined below. Sterling first filed for trademark protection for and began selling jewelry under the trademark “Artistry Diamond Collection” in fall 2007, and has subsequently launched additional products under the “Artistry” name. Sterling has obtained U.S. federal trademark registrations and/or has pending federal trademark applications for the following trademarks for use with diamond jewelry that are the subject of this Complaint, summarized in the table below, and true and correct copies are attached as *Exhibit 1* (the “Sterling ‘Artistry’ Trademarks”):

<b>Trademark</b>	<b>Registration/ Application Number</b>	<b>Filing Date</b>	<b>Registration Date</b>	<b>Date of First Use</b>
ARTISTRY DIAMOND COLLECTION	3,644,234	September 7, 2007	June 23, 2009	October 29, 2007
ARTISTRY DIAMOND COLLECTION A & design	3,644,235	September 7, 2007	June 23, 2009	October 29, 2007
ARTISTRY BLUE DIAMONDS	4,377,727	September 21, 2012	July 30, 2013	November 1, 2012
ARTISTRY BLACK DIAMONDS	4,377,728	September 21, 2012	July 30, 2013	November 1, 2012
ARTISTRY DIAMONDS	4,389,571	September 21, 2012	August 20, 2013	January 1, 2013
ARTISTRY YELLOW DIAMONDS	4,552,829	March 21, 2013	June 17, 2014	January 28, 2013
ARTISTRY GREEN DIAMONDS	4,552,830	March 21, 2013	June 17, 2014	January 28, 2013
ARTISTRY PURPLE DIAMONDS	86/071,894	September 23, 2013	(Allowed February 25, 2014)	n/a

9. Each of the federal trademark registrations and applications as set out above are valid and subsisting.

10. Sterling markets its merchandise through national cable and network television advertising, in addition to national print and network radio advertising, catalogues, direct mailing, telephone marketing, point-of-sale signage, in-store displays, and through e-commerce via the Internet.

11. Sterling's "Artistry" Trademarks are used to promote a line of diamond jewelry sold directly to retail consumers through Sterling's retail stores. Examples of Sterling's advertisements for its jewelry products sold using the Sterling "Artistry" Trademarks are attached as *Exhibit 2*, and are true and correct copies of advertisements printed from Sterling's [www.kay.com](http://www.kay.com) website and the website [www.ispot.tv](http://www.ispot.tv) on June 23, 2014.

12. Sterling has expended substantial money to promote, advertise and expand its Sterling "Artistry" Trademarks that are used in connection with a line of diamond jewelry that is sold throughout the United States.

13. As a result of Sterling's marketing efforts and significant financial investment, Sterling's "Artistry" Trademarks have become valuable assets to Sterling as Sterling has developed substantial goodwill in these trademarks. Loss of the ability to use the Sterling "Artistry" Trademarks would have an adverse effect on Sterling's current and future operations.

**B. Artistry Ltd. And Its Claims That It Will Be Damaged By Sterling's Use Of The Sterling "Artistry" Trademarks**

14. Upon information and belief, Defendant purports to have been engaged in the manufacture and wholesale distribution of jewelry throughout the United States since the mid-

1980s, and claims to have maintained an internet website located at [www.artistrylimited.com](http://www.artistrylimited.com) since 2001.

15. Upon information and belief, Defendant claims to advertise its jewelry to independent jewelry store buyers on a private label basis through industry trade journals and appearances at trade shows. See *Exhibit 3*, true and correct copies of advertisements printed from “JCK,” an industry trade journal, and *Exhibit 4*, true and correct copies of pages downloaded from Defendant’s website located at [www.artistrylimited.com](http://www.artistrylimited.com) on June 23, 2014.

16. After having used the “Artistry” mark for jewelry for nearly seven years with no notice of any conflicts with that mark, Sterling received a cease and desist letter from Defendant on June 10, 2014. In that letter, Defendant advised Sterling of its claimed trademark use in the wholesale jewelry market since 1982 and that it believed that Sterling’s use of its Sterling “Artistry” Trademarks was infringing Defendant’s common-law trademark rights, as Defendant does not have a U.S. federal trademark registration. A true and correct copy of the letter dated June 10, 2014 from Defendant’s counsel is attached as *Exhibit 5*.

17. In its letter of June 10, 2014, Defendant demanded that Sterling cease all use of the term “Artistry” in connection with jewelry by September 30, 2014, assign its U.S. trademark registrations for “ARTISTRY DIAMOND COLLECTION,” “ARTISTRY DIAMONDS,” “ARTISTRY BLUE DIAMONDS,” and “ARTISTRY BLACK DIAMONDS” to Defendant, and abandon its remaining Sterling “Artistry” Trademarks. Defendant also demanded an accounting of Sterling’s sales and advertising expenditures so that it could calculate monetary damages. See *Exhibit 5*.

18. On June 20, 2014, Defendant filed a Petition to Cancel Sterling’s U.S. federal trademark registrations for “ARTISTRY DIAMOND COLLECTION” and “ARTISTRY

DIAMOND COLLECTION A & design” (U.S. Reg. Nos. 3644234 and 3644235, respectively) with the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board (TTAB) of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”). A true and correct copy of the Petition to Cancel dated June 20, 2014 is attached as *Exhibit 6*.

19. Defendant alleges in its Petition to Cancel that it has “received from individuals who are familiar with Artistry Ltd. and its business numerous inquiries regarding whether Petitioner Artistry Ltd. is associated or affiliated in some way with Registrant Sterling.” See *Exhibit 6 at ¶ 18*.

20. Defendant has asked the USPTO to cancel Sterling’s U.S. federal trademark registrations for “ARTISTRY DIAMOND COLLECTION” and “ARTISTRY DIAMOND COLLECTION A & design” because these trademarks “so resemble the ARTISTRY LTD. Marks as to be likely to cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive with respect to the source or origin of Registrant Sterling’s diamond jewelry products, with respect to Petitioner Artistry Ltd.’s sponsorship thereof or connection or affiliation therewith, and/or in other ways.” See *Exhibit 6 at ¶ 19*.

21. Defendant has had at least “constructive notice” of Plaintiff and its Sterling “Artistry” Trademarks since at least as early as September 9, 2008, when Sterling’s first federal trademark application for “Artistry Diamond Collection” was published in the USPTO’s “Official Gazette.”

22. Sterling first began using the “Artistry Diamond Collection” brand on or about October 29, 2007, nearly one (1) year prior to the USPTO publication date. Clearly, with Sterling’s prominence in the market, Defendant either did discover or should have discovered Sterling’s use of the “Artistry” brand soon thereafter, or at the very latest, by the USPTO

publication date, if Defendant had been actively policing its trademarks as part of a diligent trademark owner's duty.

23. Since the nearly seven (7) years that have elapsed since Sterling first launched its Sterling "Artistry" Trademarks, Sterling has invested significantly in its Sterling "Artistry" Trademarks, and introduced additional product names in 2012, such as "ARTISTRY BLUE DIAMONDS," filing a new U.S. federal trademark application for this brand expansion almost two (2) years ago.

24. There is no likelihood of confusion between Sterling's use of the "Artistry" marks in certain of its products and Plaintiff's use of "Artistry" as a business name. Both companies' uses of "Artistry" co-existed for nearly seven years with no known instances of confusion. Critically, Plaintiff Sterling sells its products to different and distinct classes of consumers and through different trade channels than Defendant. Specifically, Sterling sells certain of its jewelry products under the "Artistry" name directly to consumers through stores like Kay Jewelers. By contrast, Defendant does not sell jewelry products to end consumers. Rather, Defendant sells its jewelry products at wholesale on a private label basis to buyers for independent jewelry stores. Further, while Defendant uses "Artistry" in its name, it does not use "Artistry" as a brand, product name, source identifier or any part thereof.

25. The actions by Defendant, demanding that Sterling cease use of its Sterling "Artistry" Trademarks, requesting cancellation of certain Sterling "Artistry" Trademarks, requesting that Sterling transfer ownership of certain trademarks to Defendant, and requesting monetary damages based on past alleged infringement, have created a concrete dispute between the parties regarding their respective rights in the term "Artistry" for use in connection with jewelry that warrants resolution by declaratory action.

26. Here, declaratory relief will serve the useful purpose of clarifying and settling the legal rights between the parties with respect to the “Artistry” term as used in connection with jewelry.

27. Under the circumstances, a controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality exists with respect to Sterling’s use of its Sterling “Artistry” Trademarks to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment.

28. Therefore, there exists an actual and justiciable controversy between Sterling and Defendant regarding whether Sterling is violating the alleged trademark rights claimed by Defendant.

29. Since 2007, Sterling has made a substantial monetary investment and has developed significant goodwill in its Sterling “Artistry” Trademarks. Sterling’s right to use its Sterling “Artistry” Trademarks is now clouded as a result of Defendant’s actions, and Defendant’s allegations will continue to impede and interfere with Sterling’s legitimate business interests and objectives, thereby constituting actual harm and injury to Plaintiff Sterling. Further, it is inequitable for Defendant to fail to police its claimed trademarks and now seek to enforce its alleged rights seven (7) years after Sterling began using the Sterling “Artistry” Trademarks, constituting further harm and prejudice to Sterling as it has built its brand upon reliance in its right to use its Sterling “Artistry” Trademarks.

## COUNT I

### **(Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement)**

30. Sterling incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs 1-29, as though fully set forth herein.

31. Sterling's use of its Sterling "Artistry" Trademarks, both federally registered and unregistered, does not infringe any existing and valid trademark right of Defendant under the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)).

## COUNT II

**(Declaratory Judgment That Sterling's U.S. Trademark Registration Nos. 3,644,234; 3,644,235; 4,377,727; 4,377,728; 4,389,571; 4,552,829; and 4,552,830 For Its Sterling "Artistry" Marks Are Valid And Subsisting)**

32. Sterling incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in the preceding paragraphs 1-31, as though fully set forth herein.

33. Sterling's federally registered trademarks, U.S. Reg. Nos. 3,644,234; 3,644,235; 4,377,727; 4,377,728; 4,389,571; 4,552,829; and 4,552,830 are not adversely impacted by any claimed right of Defendant, are valid and subsisting, and as a result, should not be cancelled.

## **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

**WHEREFORE**, Plaintiff Sterling Jewelers Inc. prays for the following relief:

- a) That the Court declare that Sterling's use of its Sterling "Artistry" Trademarks, both federally registered and unregistered, does not infringe any existing and valid trademark right of Defendant under the Lanham Act (15 U.S.C. § 1125(a));
- b) That the Court declare that Sterling's federally registered trademarks, U.S. Reg. Nos. 3,644,234; 3,644,235; 4,377,727; 4,377,728; 4,389,571; 4,552,829; and 4,552,830, are not adversely impacted by any claimed right of Defendant, are valid and subsisting, and as a result, should not be cancelled;
- c) That the Court order Defendant Artistry Ltd., its officers, directors, employees, servant, attorneys, agents, representatives, distributors, licensees, and all persons in

active concert or participation with them, be enjoined and restrained permanently from interfering with Sterling's use and registration of its Sterling "Artistry" Trademarks, and from opposing, seeking to cancel, or otherwise objecting to any federal registration applications for Sterling's "Artistry" Trademarks;

d) That Sterling be awarded its reasonable attorneys' fees and costs;

and

e) That the Court grants such other and further relief as it deems just

and proper.

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 38(b), Plaintiffs request a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Michael J. Garvin (0025394)  
[mjgarvin@hahnlaw.com](mailto:mjgarvin@hahnlaw.com)  
Mark A. Watkins (0040519)  
[mawatkins@hahnlaw.com](mailto:mawatkins@hahnlaw.com)  
Amanda H. Wilcox (0073832)  
[awilcox@hahnlaw.com](mailto:awilcox@hahnlaw.com)  
HAHN LOESER & PARKS LLP  
200 Public Square, Suite 2800  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Phone: (216) 621-0150  
Fax: (216) 241-2824  
*Attorneys for Plaintiff*

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

Sterling Jewelers, Inc.

DEFENDANTS

Artistry Ltd.

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Summit (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant Cook (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number) Hahn Loeser & Parks LLP 200 Public Square, Suite 2800 Cleveland, OH 44114 phone 216-621-0150

Attorneys (If Known)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff, 2 U.S. Government Defendant, 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party), 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

Table with columns for Plaintiff (PTF) and Defendant (DEF) citizenship: Citizen of This State, Citizen of Another State, Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country, Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State, Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State, Foreign Nation.

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

Large table with categories: CONTRACT, REAL PROPERTY, TORTS, CIVIL RIGHTS, PRISONER PETITIONS, FORFEITURE/PENALTY, LABOR, IMMIGRATION, BANKRUPTCY, SOCIAL SECURITY, FEDERAL TAX SUITS, OTHER STATUTES. Includes various sub-categories like Personal Injury, Property Damage, etc.

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- 1 Original Proceeding, 2 Removed from State Court, 3 Remanded from Appellate Court, 4 Reinstated or Reopened, 5 Transferred from Another District (specify), 6 Multidistrict Litigation

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity): 28 U.S.C §§ 2201-2202 and 15 U.S.C. § 1051. Brief description of cause: Declaratory Judgment of Non-Infringement

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P. DEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: X Yes [ ] No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER

DATE 06/23/2014 SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD /s/ Michael J. Garvin

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # AMOUNT APPLYING IFP JUDGE MAG. JUDGE

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

I. Civil Categories: (Please check one category only).

- 1.  General Civil
- 2.  Administrative Review/Social Security
- 3.  Habeas Corpus Death Penalty

\*If under Title 28, §2255, name the SENTENCING JUDGE: \_\_\_\_\_

CASE NUMBER: \_\_\_\_\_

II. **RELATED OR REFILED CASES.** See LR 3.1 which provides in pertinent part: "If an action is filed or removed to this Court and assigned to a District Judge after which it is discontinued, dismissed or remanded to a State court, and subsequently refiled, it shall be assigned to the same Judge who received the initial case assignment without regard for the place of holding court in which the case was refiled. Counsel or a party without counsel shall be responsible for bringing such cases to the attention of the Court by responding to the questions included on the Civil Cover Sheet."

This action is  RELATED to another PENDING civil case. This action is  REFILED pursuant to LR 3.1.

If applicable, please indicate on page 1 in section VIII, the name of the Judge and case number.

III. In accordance with Local Civil Rule 3.8, actions involving counties in the Eastern Division shall be filed at any of the divisional offices therein. Actions involving counties in the Western Division shall be filed at the Toledo office. For the purpose of determining the proper division, and for statistical reasons, the following information is requested.

ANSWER ONE PARAGRAPH ONLY. ANSWER PARAGRAPHS 1 THRU 3 IN ORDER. UPON FINDING WHICH PARAGRAPH APPLIES TO YOUR CASE, ANSWER IT AND STOP.

(1) **Resident defendant.** If the defendant resides in a county within this district, please set forth the name of such county

COUNTY:

Corporation For the purpose of answering the above, a corporation is deemed to be a resident of that county in which it has its principal place of business in that district.

(2) **Non-Resident defendant.** If no defendant is a resident of a county in this district, please set forth the county wherein the cause of action arose or the event complained of occurred.

COUNTY: SUMMIT

(3) **Other Cases.** If no defendant is a resident of this district, or if the defendant is a corporation not having a principle place of business within the district, and the cause of action arose or the event complained of occurred outside this district, please set forth the county of the plaintiff's residence.

COUNTY:

IV. The Counties in the Northern District of Ohio are divided into divisions as shown below. After the county is determined in Section III, please check the appropriate division.

**EASTERN DIVISION**

- AKRON (Counties: Carroll, Holmes, Portage, Stark, Summit, Tuscarawas and Wayne)
- CLEVELAND (Counties: Ashland, Ashtabula, Crawford, Cuyahoga, Geauga, Lake, Lorain, Medina and Richland)
- YOUNGSTOWN (Counties: Columbiana, Mahoning and Trumbull)

**WESTERN DIVISION**

- TOLEDO (Counties: Allen, Auglaize, Defiance, Erie, Fulton, Hancock, Hardin, Henry, Huron, Lucas, Marion, Mercer, Ottawa, Paulding, Putnam, Sandusky, Seneca VanWert, Williams, Wood and Wyandot)

AO 440 (Rev. 12/09) Summons in a Civil Action

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

for the

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO

STERLING JEWELERS INC.

Plaintiff

v.

ARTISTRY LTD.

Defendant

Civil Action No. 5:14cv1369

Judge Sara Lioi

Magistrate Judge Kathleen B. Burke

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL ACTION

To: (Defendant's name and address) Artistry Ltd. 8272 Lincoln Avenue, Skokie, Il. 60077

A lawsuit has been filed against you.

Within 21 days after service of this summons on you (not counting the day you received it) — or 60 days if you are the United States or a United States agency, or an officer or employee of the United States described in Fed. R. Civ. P. 12 (a)(2) or (3) — you must serve on the plaintiff an answer to the attached complaint or a motion under Rule 12 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. The answer or motion must be served on the plaintiff or plaintiff's attorney, whose name and address are:

Michael Garvin, Esq., Mark A. Watkins, Esq., and Amanda H. Wilcox, Esq.  
Hahn Loeser & Parks, LLP  
200 Public Square, Suite 2800  
Cleveland, OH 44114  
phone 216-621-0150

If you fail to respond, judgment by default will be entered against you for the relief demanded in the complaint. You also must file your answer or motion with the court.

GERI M. SMITH  
CLERK OF COURT

s/ Heather R. Sherer

Signature of Clerk or Deputy Clerk

Date: 6/24/2014



Civil Action No. 5:14cv1369

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

*(This section should not be filed with the court unless required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 4 (l))*

This summons for *(name of individual and title, if any)* \_\_\_\_\_  
was received by me on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_.

I personally served the summons on the individual at *(place)* \_\_\_\_\_  
on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_ ; or

I left the summons at the individual's residence or usual place of abode with *(name)* \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_, a person of suitable age and discretion who resides there,  
on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_, and mailed a copy to the individual's last known address; or

I served the summons on *(name of individual)* \_\_\_\_\_, who is  
designated by law to accept service of process on behalf of *(name of organization)* \_\_\_\_\_  
on *(date)* \_\_\_\_\_ ; or


I returned the summons unexecuted because \_\_\_\_\_ ; or

Other *(specify)*: I served Defendant's counsel Bruce W. Baber via email per consent on August 25, 2014.

My fees are \$ \_\_\_\_\_ for travel and \$ \_\_\_\_\_ for services, for a total of \$ \_\_\_\_\_ 0.00.

I declare under penalty of perjury that this information is true.

Date: August 25, 2014



*Server's signature*

Michael J. Garvin, Attorney for Plaintiff

*Printed name and title*

1375 E. 9th Street, Ste. 2100, Cleveland, Ohio 44114

*Server's address*

Additional information regarding attempted service, etc: