

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA967648**

Filing date: **04/17/2019**

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

Proceeding	92071067
Party	Defendant Scoyni, Nicholas
Correspondence Address	SCOYNI, NICHOLAS 7486 COLE RD. 1701 BLAINE ST. CALDWELL, ID 83605 Kaplanstudent2@hotmail.com no phone number provided
Submission	Stipulation of Facts
Filer's Name	Nicholas D Scoyni
Filer's email	Kaplanstudent2@hotmail.com
Signature	/Nicholas D Scoyni/
Date	04/17/2019
Attachments	needtoknowuspto.pdf(291450 bytes )

**To:** OFF-SPEC SOLUTIONS, LLC ([williamwardwell@varinwardwell.com](mailto:williamwardwell@varinwardwell.com))  
**Subject:** U.S. TRADEMARK APPLICATION NO. 87571196 - OFFSPEC SOLUTIONS - N/A  
**Sent:** 1/28/2019 7:23:13 PM  
**Sent As:** ECOM122@USPTO.GOV  
**Attachments:** [Attachment - 1](#)  
[Attachment - 2](#)

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (USPTO)  
OFFICE ACTION (OFFICIAL LETTER) ABOUT APPLICANT'S TRADEMARK APPLICATION**

**U.S. APPLICATION SERIAL NO.**  
87571196

**MARK:** OFFSPEC SOLUTIONS

**\*87571196\***

**CORRESPONDENT ADDRESS:**  
WILLIAM WARDWELL  
VARIN WARDWELL LLC  
242 N 8TH ST STE 220  
BOISE, ID 83702

**CLICK HERE TO RESPOND TO THIS  
LETTER:**  
[http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/teas/response\\_forms.jsp](http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/teas/response_forms.jsp)

[VIEW YOUR APPLICATION FILE](#)

**APPLICANT:** OFF-SPEC  
SOLUTIONS, LLC

**CORRESPONDENT'S  
REFERENCE/DOCKET NO:**  
N/A  
**CORRESPONDENT E-MAIL  
ADDRESS:**

[williamwardwell@varinwardwell.com](mailto:williamwardwell@varinwardwell.com)

**OFFICE ACTION**

**STRICT DEADLINE TO RESPOND TO THIS LETTER**

TO AVOID ABANDONMENT OF APPLICANT'S TRADEMARK APPLICATION, THE USPTO MUST RECEIVE APPLICANT'S COMPLETE RESPONSE TO THIS LETTER **WITHIN 6 MONTHS** OF THE ISSUE/MAILING DATE BELOW. A RESPONSE TRANSMITTED THROUGH THE TRADEMARK ELECTRONIC APPLICATION SYSTEM (TEAS) MUST BE RECEIVED BEFORE MIDNIGHT **EASTERN TIME** OF THE LAST DAY OF THE RESPONSE PERIOD.

**ISSUE/MAILING DATE: 1/28/2019**

**INTRODUCTION**

This action supersedes the previous action, the Examining Attorney failed to attach the cited registration and apologizes for any inconvenience.

On 06/25/2018, action on this application was suspended pending the disposition of U.S. Application Serial No. 87286017. The referenced priorpending application has since registered. Therefore, registration is refused as follows.

SUMMARY OF ISSUES that applicant must address:

• SECTION 2(d) REFUSAL – LIKELIHOOD OF CONFUSION

SECTION 2(d) REFUSAL – LIKELIHOOD OF CONFUSION

Registration of the applied-for mark is refused because of a likelihood of confusion with the mark in U.S. Registration No. 5603439 (OFFSPEC SOLUTIONS S.E.). Trademark Act Section 2(d), 15 U.S.C. §1052(d); see TMEP §§1207.01 *et seq.* See the attached registration.

Trademark Act Section 2(d) bars registration of an applied-for mark that is so similar to a registered mark that it is likely consumers would be confused, mistaken, or deceived as to the commercial source of the services of the parties. See 15 U.S.C. §1052(d). Likelihood of confusion is determined on a case-by-case basis by applying the factors set forth in *In re E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 476 F.2d 1357, 1361, 177 USPQ 563, 567 (C.C.P.A. 1973) (called the “*du Pont* factors”). *In re i.am.symbolic, llc*, 866 F.3d 1315, 1322, 123 USPQ2d 1744, 1747 (Fed. Cir. 2017). Only those factors that are “relevant and of record” need be considered. *M2 Software, Inc. v. M2 Commc’ns, Inc.*, 450 F.3d 1378, 1382, 78 USPQ2d 1944, 1947 (Fed. Cir. 2006) (citing *Shen Mfg. Co. v. Ritz Hotel Ltd.*, 393 F.3d 1238, 1241, 73 USPQ2d 1350, 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2004)); see *In re Inn at St. John’s, LLC*, 126 USPQ2d 1742, 1744 (TTAB 2018).

Although not all *du Pont* factors may be relevant, there are generally two key considerations in any likelihood of confusion analysis: (1) the similarities between the compared marks and (2) the relatedness of the compared services. See *In re i.am.symbolic, llc*, 866 F.3d at 1322, 123 USPQ2d at 1747 (quoting *Herbko Int’l, Inc. v. Kappa Books, Inc.*, 308 F.3d 1156, 1164-65, 64 USPQ2d 1375, 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2002)); *Federated Foods, Inc. v. Fort Howard Paper Co.*, 544 F.2d 1098, 1103, 192 USPQ 24, 29 (C.C.P.A. 1976) (“The fundamental inquiry mandated by [Section] 2(d) goes to the cumulative effect of differences in the essential characteristics of the goods [or services] and differences in the marks.”); TMEP §1207.01.

Comparison of the Marks

The applied-for mark is: OFFSPEC SOLUTIONS

The registered mark is: OFFSPEC SOLUTIONS S.E.

Notably, applicant’s mark and registrant’s mark share the similar wording “OFFSPEC SOLUTIONS” in each of their respective marks. Although marks are compared in their entireties, one feature of a mark may be more significant or dominant in creating a commercial impression. See *In re Detroit Athletic Co.*, 903 F.3d 1297, 1305, 128 USPQ2d 1047, 1050 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (citing *In re Dixie Rests.*, 105 F.3d 1405, 1407, 41 USPQ2d 1531, 1533-34 (Fed. Cir. 1997)); TMEP §1207.01(b)(viii), (c)(ii). Greater weight is often given to this dominant feature when determining whether marks are confusingly similar. See *In re Detroit Athletic Co.*, 903 F.3d at 1305, 128 USPQ2d at 1050 (citing *In re Dixie Rests.*, 105 F.3d at 1407, 41 USPQ2d at 1533-34).

Consumers are generally more inclined to focus on the first word, prefix, or syllable in any trademark or service mark. See *Palm Bay Imps., Inc. v. Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin Maison Fondee En 1772*, 396 F.3d 1369, 1372, 73 USPQ2d 1689, 1692 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (finding similarity between VEUVE ROYALE and two VEUVE CLICQUOT marks in part because “VEUVE . . . remains a ‘prominent feature’ as the first word in the mark and the first word to appear on the label”); *Century 21 Real Estate Corp. v. Century Life of Am.*, 970 F.2d 874, 876, 23 USPQ2d 1698, 1700 (Fed. Cir. 1992) (finding similarity between CENTURY 21 and CENTURY LIFE OF AMERICA in part because “consumers must first notice th[e] identical lead word”); see also *In re Detroit Athletic Co.*, 903 F.3d 1297, 1303, 128 USPQ2d 1047, 1049 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (finding “the identity of the marks’ two initial words is particularly significant because consumers typically notice those words first”). In this case the first wording in the applied-for mark and the cited registration is the wording OFFSPEC SOLUTIONS therefore, it is the dominant wording in both marks and it is identical.

Further, matter that is descriptive of or generic for a party’s services is typically less significant or less dominant in relation to other wording in a mark. See *Anheuser-Busch, LLC v. Innvopak Sys. Pty Ltd.*, 115 USPQ2d 1816, 1824-25 (TTAB 2015) (citing *In re Chatam Int’l Inc.*, 380 F.3d 1340, 1342-43, 71 USPQ2d 1944, 1946 (Fed. Cir. 2004)). In the present case, the evidence in the cited registrant’s record shows that the wording “S.E.” in the registered mark is merely descriptive of or generic for the registrant’s services. Thus, this wording is less significant in terms of affecting the mark’s commercial impression, and renders the wording OFFSPEC SOLUTIONS the more dominant element of the mark.

In sum, for the foregoing reasons, the marks are confusingly similar.

Comparison of the Services

The compared services need not be identical or even competitive to find a likelihood of confusion. See *On-line Careline Inc. v. Am. Online Inc.*, 229 F.3d 1080, 1086, 56 USPQ2d 1471, 1475 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Recot, Inc. v. Becton*, 214 F.3d 1322, 1329, 54 USPQ2d 1894, 1898 (Fed. Cir.

2000); TMEP §1207.01(a)(i). They need only be “related in some manner and/or if the circumstances surrounding their marketing are such that they could give rise to the mistaken belief that [the services] emanate from the same source.” *Coach Servs., Inc. v. Triumph Learning LLC*, 668 F.3d 1356, 1369, 101 USPQ2d 1713, 1722 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (quoting *7-Eleven Inc. v. Wechsler*, 83 USPQ2d 1715, 1724 (TTAB 2007)); TMEP §1207.01(a)(i).

The applicant’s identified services are: “Transportation services, namely, freight transportation by truck”

The registrant’s identified services are: “Transportation of goods”

Determining likelihood of confusion is based on the description of the services stated in the application and registration at issue, not on extrinsic evidence of actual use. *See In re Detroit Athletic Co.*, 903 F.3d 1297, 1307, 128 USPQ2d 1047, 1052 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (citing *In re i.am.symbolic, llc*, 866 F.3d 1315, 1325, 123 USPQ2d 1744, 1749 (Fed. Cir. 2017)).

In this case, the registration uses broad wording to describe “Transportation of goods”, which presumably encompasses all services of the type described, including applicant’s more narrow “Transportation services, namely, freight transportation by truck”. *See, e.g., In re Solid State Design Inc.*, 125 USPQ2d 1409, 1412-15 (TTAB 2018); *Sw. Mgmt., Inc. v. Ocinomled, Ltd.*, 115 USPQ2d 1007, 1025 (TTAB 2015). Thus, applicant’s and registrant’s services are legally identical. *See, e.g., In re i.am.symbolic, llc*, 127 USPQ2d 1627, 1629 (TTAB 2018) (citing *Tuxedo Monopoly, Inc. v. Gen. Mills Fun Grp., Inc.*, 648 F.2d 1335, 1336, 209 USPQ 986, 988 (C.C.P.A. 1981); *Inter IKEA Sys. B.V. v. Akea, LLC*, 110 USPQ2d 1734, 1745 (TTAB 2014); *Baseball Am. Inc. v. Powerplay Sports Ltd.*, 71 USPQ2d 1844, 1847 n.9 (TTAB 2004)).

Additionally, the services of the parties have no restrictions as to nature, type, channels of trade, or classes of purchasers and are “presumed to travel in the same channels of trade to the same class of purchasers.” *In re Viterra Inc.*, 671 F.3d 1358, 1362, 101 USPQ2d 1905, 1908 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (quoting *Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Packard Press, Inc.*, 281 F.3d 1261, 1268, 62 USPQ2d 1001, 1005 (Fed. Cir. 2002)). Thus, applicant’s and registrant’s services are related.

The foregoing demonstrates that a consumer familiar with registrant’s mark used on registrant’s services, upon encountering applicant’s mark used on applicant’s services would likely be confused and mistakenly believe that the services emanate from a common source. Therefore, registration is refused under Section 2(d) of the Lanham Act.

Although applicant’s mark has been refused registration, applicant may respond to the refusal by submitting evidence and arguments in support of registration.

## **RESPONSE GUIDELINES**

Please call or email the assigned trademark examining attorney with questions about this Office action. Although the trademark examining attorney cannot provide legal advice or statements about applicant’s rights, the trademark examining attorney can provide applicant with additional explanation about the refusal(s) and/or requirement(s) in this Office action. *See* TMEP §§705.02, 709.06. Although the USPTO does not accept emails as responses to Office actions, emails can be used for informal communications and will be included in the application record. *See* 37 C.F.R. §2.62(c), 2.191; TMEP §§304.01-.02, 709.04-.05.

**TEAS PLUS OR TEAS REDUCED FEE (TEAS RF) APPLICANTS – TO MAINTAIN LOWER FEE, ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS MUST BE MET, INCLUDING SUBMITTING DOCUMENTS ONLINE:** Applicants who filed their application online using the lower-fee TEAS Plus or TEAS RF application form must (1) file certain documents online using TEAS, including responses to Office actions (see TMEP §§819.02(b), 820.02(b) for a complete list of these documents); (2) maintain a valid e-mail correspondence address; and (3) agree to receive correspondence from the USPTO by e-mail throughout the prosecution of the application. *See* 37 C.F.R. §§2.22(b), 2.23(b); TMEP §§819, 820. TEAS Plus or TEAS RF applicants who do not meet these requirements must submit an additional processing fee of \$125 per class of goods and/or services. 37 C.F.R. §§2.6(a)(1)(v), 2.22(c), 2.23(c); TMEP §§819.04, 820.04. However, in certain situations, TEAS Plus or TEAS RF applicants may respond to an Office action by authorizing an examiner’s amendment by telephone or e-mail without incurring this additional fee.

/John Salcido/  
Examining Attorney  
Law Office 122  
571-272-7549  
John.Salcido@uspto.gov

**TO RESPOND TO THIS LETTER:** Go to [http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/teas/response\\_forms.jsp](http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/teas/response_forms.jsp). Please wait 48-72 hours from the issue/ mailing date before using the Trademark Electronic Application System (TEAS), to allow for necessary system updates of the application. For *technical* assistance with online forms, e-mail [TEAS@uspto.gov](mailto:TEAS@uspto.gov). For questions about the Office action itself, please contact the assigned trademark examining attorney. **E-mail communications will not be accepted as responses to Office actions; therefore, do not respond to this Office action by e-mail.**

**All informal e-mail communications relevant to this application will be placed in the official application record.**

**WHO MUST SIGN THE RESPONSE:** It must be personally signed by an individual applicant or someone with legal authority to bind an applicant (i.e., a corporate officer, a general partner, all joint applicants). If an applicant is represented by an attorney, the attorney must sign the response.

**PERIODICALLY CHECK THE STATUS OF THE APPLICATION:** To ensure that applicant does not miss crucial deadlines or official notices, check the status of the application every three to four months using the Trademark Status and Document Retrieval (TSDR) system at <http://tsdr.uspto.gov/>. Please keep a copy of the TSDR status screen. If the status shows no change for more than six months, contact the Trademark Assistance Center by e-mail at [TrademarkAssistanceCenter@uspto.gov](mailto:TrademarkAssistanceCenter@uspto.gov) or call 1-800-786-9199. For more information on checking status, see <http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/process/status/>.

**TO UPDATE CORRESPONDENCE/E-MAIL ADDRESS:** Use the TEAS form at <http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/teas/correspondence.jsp>.

**DESIGN MARK**

**Serial Number**

87286017

**Status**

REGISTERED

**Word Mark**

OFFSPEC SOLUTIONS S.E.

**Standard Character Mark**

Yes

**Registration Number**

5603439

**Date Registered**

2018/11/06

**Type of Mark**

SERVICE MARK

**Register**

SUPPLEMENTAL

**Mark Drawing Code**

(4) STANDARD CHARACTER MARK

**Owner**

Scoyni, Nicholas DBA OffSpec Solutions INDIVIDUAL UNITED STATES 7486  
Cole Rd. 1701 Blaine St. Caldwell IDAHO 83605

**Goods/Services**

Class Status -- ACTIVE. IC 039. US 100 105. G & S: Transportation  
of goods. First Use: 2001/01/01. First Use In Commerce: 2006/04/07.

**Filing Date**

2016/12/30

**Amended Register Date**

2017/09/05

**Examining Attorney**

PAPALE, LISA

**OFFSPEC SOLUTIONS S.E.**

**To:** OFF-SPEC SOLUTIONS, LLC ([williamwardwell@varinwardwell.com](mailto:williamwardwell@varinwardwell.com))  
**Subject:** U.S. TRADEMARK APPLICATION NO. 87571196 - OFFSPEC SOLUTIONS - N/A  
**Sent:** 1/28/2019 7:23:14 PM  
**Sent As:** ECOM122@USPTO.GOV  
**Attachments:**

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (USPTO)

**IMPORTANT NOTICE REGARDING YOUR U.S. TRADEMARK APPLICATION**

USPTO OFFICE ACTION (OFFICIAL LETTER) HAS ISSUED  
ON **1/28/2019** FOR U.S. APPLICATION SERIAL NO. 87571196

Please follow the instructions below:

(1) **TO READ THE LETTER:** Click on this [link](#) or go to <http://tsdr.uspto.gov>, enter the U.S. application serial number, and click on “Documents.”

The Office action may not be immediately viewable, to allow for necessary system updates of the application, but will be available within 24 hours of this e-mail notification.

(2) **TIMELY RESPONSE IS REQUIRED:** Please carefully review the Office action to determine (1) how to respond, and (2) the applicable response time period. Your response deadline will be calculated from **1/28/2019** (or sooner if specified in the Office action). A response transmitted through the Trademark Electronic Application System (TEAS) must be received before midnight **Eastern Time** of the last day of the response period. For information regarding response time periods, see <http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/process/status/responsetime.jsp>.

**Do NOT hit “Reply” to this e-mail notification, or otherwise e-mail your response** because the USPTO does NOT accept e-mails as responses to Office actions. Instead, the USPTO recommends that you respond online using the TEAS response form located at [http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/teas/response\\_forms.jsp](http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/teas/response_forms.jsp).

(3) **QUESTIONS:** For questions about the contents of the Office action itself, please contact the assigned trademark examining attorney. For *technical* assistance in accessing or viewing the Office action in the Trademark Status and Document Retrieval (TSDR) system, please e-mail [TSDR@uspto.gov](mailto:TSDR@uspto.gov).

**WARNING**

**Failure to file the required response by the applicable response deadline will result in the ABANDONMENT of your application.** For more information regarding abandonment, see <http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/basics/abandon.jsp>.

**PRIVATE COMPANY SOLICITATIONS REGARDING YOUR APPLICATION:** Private companies **not** associated with the USPTO are using information provided in trademark applications to mail or e-mail trademark-related solicitations. These companies often use names that closely resemble the USPTO and their solicitations may look like an official government document. Many solicitations require that you pay “fees.”

Please carefully review all correspondence you receive regarding this application to make sure that you are responding to an official document from the USPTO rather than a private company solicitation. All official USPTO correspondence will be mailed only from the “United States Patent and Trademark Office” in Alexandria, VA; or sent by e-mail from the domain “@uspto.gov.” For more information on how to handle private company solicitations, see [http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/solicitation\\_warnings.jsp](http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/solicitation_warnings.jsp).