

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA464524**

Filing date: **03/29/2012**

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

Proceeding	77486441
Applicant	Omega Alpha Pharmaceuticals Inc.
Applied for Mark	OMEGA ALPHA
Correspondence Address	EUGENIA S HANSEN HEMINGWAY & HANSEN LLP 1700 PACIFIC AVENUE, SUITE 4800 DALLAS, TX 75201 UNITED STATES ghansen@hh-iplaw.com
Submission	Reply Brief
Attachments	ReplyBriefFinalWithExhibit.pdf ( 24 pages )(2220495 bytes )
Filer's Name	Eugenia S. Hansen
Filer's e-mail	ghansen@hh-iplaw.com
Signature	/es hansen/
Date	03/29/2012

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

**Applicant:** Omega Alpha Pharmaceuticals Inc.                    )  
**Trademark:** OMEGA ALPHA    ) BEFORE THE  
**Serial No.:** 77486441   ) TRADEMARK TRIAL  
**Filing Date:** May 29, 2008   ) AND  
**Examining Attorney:** Darryl M. Spruill                         ) APPEAL BOARD  
**Address:** Law Office 112   ) ON APPEAL

**REPLY BRIEF OF APPELLANT OMEGA ALPHA PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	4
REPLY TO EXAMINING ATTORNEY'S STATEMENT OF FACTS.....	4
REPLY TO EXAMINING ATTORNEY'S ISSUE ON APPEAL.....	8
REPLY TO EXAMINING ATTORNEY'S ARGUMENT.....	8
A. Neither "OMEGA ALPHA" nor "OMEGA" Misdescribes the Character, Quality, Function, Composition, Or Use of the Dietary, Nutritional, And/Or Herbal Supplement Goods.....	8
B. Prospective Purchasers Are Not Likely to Believe That "OMEGA ALPHA" Actually Describes the Goods, Namely, Dietary, Nutritional, And/Or Herbal Supplements Encompassing Omega Fatty Acids, Nor is the Alleged Misdescription Likely to Affect a Significant Portion Of the Relevant Consumers Decision To Purchase Goods.....	10
C. The Examining Attorney's Rejection of the Greek Letter Significance As Not Being Supported By The Evidence is Clearly Erroneous; The Examining Attorney's Argument in the Brief Regarding Other Greek Letters is Improper and Should be Stricken. ....	13
CONCLUSION .....	19

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>AMF, Inc. v. American Leisure Products</i> , 177 USPQ 278 (CCPA 1973).....	16
<i>Bayer Aktiengesellschaft v. Mouratidis</i> , 2010 TTAB LEXIS 218 (TTAB May 21, 2010).....	15, 15n.7, 16n.8
<i>In re Colonial Stores Inc.</i> 394 F.2d 549, 157 USPQ 382 (CCPA 1968).....	18
<i>In re Int'l Taste, Inc.</i> , 53 USPQ2d 1604, 1606 (TTAB 2000).....	17
<i>In re Nett Designs Inc.</i> , 57 USPQ 1564 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	17
<i>In re Pop Pack</i> , 2011 TTAB LEXIS 107.....	17-18
<i>In re Sunmarks</i> , 32 USPQ2d 1470 (TTAB) 1994).....	17

### Statutes and Regulations

15 U.S.C. §1052(a) .....	4
37 C.F.R. §2.142(2)d.....	7, 15

## INTRODUCTION

Appellant has appealed the trademark Examining Attorney's final refusal dated March 9, 2012. The final refusal of Appellant's application to register the trademark OMEGA ALPHA in connection with dietary, nutritional, and herbal supplements, was made by the Examining Attorney on the grounds that the applied-for mark consists of or includes deceptive matter in relation to the identified goods under Trademark Act §2(a), 15 U.S.C. §1052(a). Appellant filed a Notice of Appeal on November 18, 2011 and duly filed its opening brief on January 17, 2012. The Examining Attorney mailed his opening brief to Appellant on March 9, 2012. This Reply Brief responds to the Examining Attorney's March 9, 2012 opening brief.

## REPLY TO EXAMINING ATTORNEY'S STATEMENT OF FACTS

The Examining Attorney's statement of facts concerning the period from May 29, 2008 to January 6, 2011 omits, or incorrectly characterizes, a few facts which Appellant believes are important. After the application was filed on May 29, 2008, there was active prosecution in the case and written and oral communications with the initial Examining Attorney. The Office mailed two office actions and the applicant (now Appellant) successfully responded to all the issues raised therein.<sup>1</sup> The first time a rejection of Appellant's mark on the grounds of deceptive misdescription was made was

---

<sup>1</sup> Appellant takes issue with the Examining Attorney's characterization of Appellant's goods as a "laundry list of goods." The list of Appellant's goods is not at issue in this appeal. As stated in the Examining Attorney's own fact section, "Next on May 5, 2010, examining attorney accepted applicant's amended identification of goods."

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.