

From: Tierney, Margery

Sent: 2/24/2015 8:00:22 AM

To: TTAB E Filing

CC:

Subject: U.S. TRADEMARK APPLICATION NO. 85967716 - MORINGA SKIN - 6597.002-02 - EXAMINER BRIEF

Attachment Information:

Count: 1

Files: 85967716.doc

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (USPTO)

U.S. APPLICATION SERIAL NO. 85967716

MARK: MORINGA SKIN



CORRESPONDENT ADDRESS:

THOMAS D FOSTER

TDFOSTER - INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW

11622 EL CAMINO REAL SUITE 100

SAN DIEGO, CA 92130

GENERAL TRADEMARK INFORMATION:

<http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/index.jsp>

TTAB INFORMATION:

<http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/process/appeal/index.jsp>

APPLICANT: j. debeaute

CORRESPONDENT'S REFERENCE/DOCKET NO:

6597.002-02

CORRESPONDENT E-MAIL ADDRESS:

foster@tdfoster.com

EXAMINING ATTORNEY'S APPEAL BRIEF

1. PROSECUTION HISTORY

On June 24, 2013, applicant filed an application to register MORINGA SKIN for “lotions for face and body care. On October 8, 2013, the Examining Attorney refused registration of the mark because it describes a feature of applicant’s goods. Trademark Act Section 2(e)(1), 15 U.S.C. §1052(e)(1); see TMEP §§1209.01(b), 1209.03 et seq. Applicant responded on March 29, 2014 and argued against the refusal of registration. On April 21, 2014, the Examining Attorney issued a final refusal. This appeal followed.

2. MORINGA SKIN DESCRIBES A FEATURE OF LOTIONS FOR FACE AND BODY CARE

A term is merely descriptive of goods or services within the meaning of Section 2(e)(1) if it forthwith conveys an immediate idea of an ingredient, quality, characteristic, feature, function, purpose or use of the goods or services. *In re Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.*, 675 F.3d 1297, 102 USPQ2d 1217, 1219 (Fed. Cir. 2012). *See also, In re Gyulay*, 820 F.2d 1216, 3 USPQ2d 1009 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Whether a mark or a component of a mark is merely descriptive is determined in relation to the goods or services for which registration is sought and the context in which the term is used, not in the abstract or on the basis of guesswork. *In re Abcor Development Corp.*, 588 F.2d 811, 200 USPQ 215, 218 (CCPA 1978); *In re Remacle*, 66 USPQ2d 1222, 1224 (TTAB 2002). A term need not immediately convey an idea of each and every specific feature of the goods or services in order to be considered merely descriptive; it is enough if it describes one significant attribute, function or property of them. *See In re Gyulay*, 3 USPQ2d at 1010; *In re H.U.D.D.L.E.*, 216

USPQ 358 (TTAB 1982); *In re MBAssociates*, 180 USPQ 338 (TTAB 1973). This requires consideration of the context in which the mark is used or intended to be used in connection with those goods or services, and the possible significance that the mark would have to the average purchaser of the goods or services in the marketplace. See *In re Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.*, 102 USPQ2d at 1219; *In re Bayer Aktiengesellschaft*, 488 F.3d 960, 82 USPQ2d 1828, 1831 (Fed. Cir. 2007); *In re Abcor Dev. Corp.*, 200 USPQ at 218; *In re Venture Lending Assocs.*, 226 USPQ 285 (TTAB 1985). The question is not whether someone presented only with the mark could guess the products or activities listed in the description of goods or services. Rather, the question is whether someone who knows what the products or services are will understand the mark to convey information about them. *In re Tower Tech, Inc.*, 64 USPQ2d 1314, 1316-1317 (TTAB 2002); *In re Patent & Trademark Services Inc.*, 49 USPQ2d 1537, 1539 (TTAB 1998); *In re Home Builders Association of Greenville*, 18 USPQ2d 1313, 1317 (TTAB 1990); *In re American Greetings Corp.*, 226 USPQ 365, 366 (TTAB 1985).

When two or more merely descriptive terms are combined, the determination of whether the composite mark also has a merely descriptive significance turns on the question of whether the combination of terms evokes a new and unique commercial impression. If each component retains its merely descriptive significance in relation to the goods or services, the combination results in a composite that is itself merely descriptive. *In re Oppedahl & Larson LLP*, 373 F.3d 1171, 71 USPQ2d 1370, 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2004), quoting, *Estate of P.D. Beckwith, Inc. v. Commissioner*, 252 U.S.

538, 543 (1920). *See also In re Tower Tech, Inc.*, 64 USPQ2d at 1318 (SMARTTOWER merely descriptive of commercial and industrial cooling towers); *In re Sun Microsystems Inc.*, 59 USPQ2d 1084 (TTAB 2001) (AGENTBEANS merely descriptive of computer programs for use in developing and deploying application programs); *In re Putman Publishing Co.*, 39 USPQ2d 2021 (TTAB 1996) (FOOD & BEVERAGE ONLINE merely descriptive of news and information services in the food processing industry). However, a mark comprising a combination of merely descriptive components is registrable if the combination of terms creates a unitary mark with a unique, non-descriptive meaning, or if the composite has a bizarre or incongruous meaning as applied to the goods or services. *See In re Colonial Stores Inc.*, 394 F.2d 549, 157 USPQ 382 (CCPA 1968) (SUGAR & SPICE for “bakery products”); *In re Shutts*, 217 USPQ 363 (TTAB 1983) (SNO-RAKE for “a snow removal hand tool having a handle with a snow-removing head at one end, the head being of solid uninterrupted construction without prongs”). Thus, we must consider the issue of descriptiveness by looking at the mark in its entirety.

“On the other hand, if one must exercise mature thought or follow a multi-stage reasoning process in order to determine what product or service characteristics the term indicates, the term is suggestive rather than merely descriptive.” *In re Tennis in the Round, Inc.*, 199 USPQ 496, 498 (TTAB 1978). *See also, In re Shutts*, 217 USPQ at 364-65; *In re Universal Water Systems, Inc.*, 209 USPQ 165, 166 (TTAB 1980). In this regard, “incongruity is one of the accepted guideposts in the evolved set of legal principles for discriminating the suggestive from the descriptive mark.”

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.