

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA964105**

Filing date: **04/02/2019**

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

Proceeding	87285383
Applicant	Reelex Packaging Solutions, Inc.
Correspondence Address	DAVID P. GORDON GORDON & JACOBSON, P.C. 60 LONG RIDGE ROAD, SUITE 407 STAMFORD, CT 06902 UNITED STATES pto@gordonjacobson.com 203-323-1800
Submission	Appeal Brief
Attachments	REE-TM-012 APPEAL BRIEF.pdf(187951 bytes )
Filer's Name	Christian Mannino
Filer's email	pto@gordonjacobson.com
Signature	/Christian Mannino/
Date	04/02/2019

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

Appellant: REELEX PACKAGING  
SOLUTIONS, INC.

Serial No.: 87/285383

Examining Attorney: Suzanne Blane

Filed: December 30, 2016

Attorney Docket: REE-TM-012

APPELLANT'S BRIEF ON APPEAL

A Notice of Appeal to the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board was filed on April 2, 2019, in which Appellant appealed from the final refusal in the Office Action dated November 8, 2018.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(1) INDEX OF CASES..... 2  
(2) DESCRIPTION OF THE RECORD..... 2  
(3) STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES..... 3  
(4) RECITATION OF THE FACTS..... 4  
(5) ARGUMENTS..... 8  
(6) CONCLUSION..... 24

(1) INDEX OF CASES

*In re Charles N. Van Valkenburgh*, Serial No. 77025789 (TTAB, January 7, 2011).

*In re Morton-Norwich Prods., Inc.*, 671 F.2d 1332, 213 USPQ 9 (C.C.P.A. 1982).

*TrafFix Devices, Inc. v. Mktg. Displays, Inc.*, 532 U.S. 23, 58 USPQ2d 1001 (2001).

*In re Becton, Dickinson & Co.*, 675 F.3d 1368, 1374, 102 USPQ2d 1372, 1376 (Fed. Cir. 2012). *In re R.M. Smith, Inc.*, 734 F.2d 1482, 1484, 222 USPQ 1, 3 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

(2) DESCRIPTION OF THE RECORD

All references to the TSDR will be with respect to the relevant document downloaded as a pdf file.

Appellant filed its application on December 30, 2016. On April 5, 2017 the Examining Attorney issued a non-final Office Action (“the first Office Action”) refusing registration on two grounds, functionality and non-distinctiveness. See Apr. 5, 2017 Office Action TSDR. The Appellant responded to the first Office Action on October 3, 2017. See Oct. 3, 2017 Response to Office Action TSDR.

In response to Appellant’s response, on November 1, 2017, the Examining Attorney approved the applied-for mark for publication on the principle register. Later, after approving the mark for publication, the Examining Attorney withdrew the mark from publication, and issued another non-final Office Action dated December 30, 2017 (“the second Office Action”). See Dec. 30, 2017 Office Action TSDR. As

noted in the second Office Action, the reason for withdrawing the application from publication was that “it was found the mark fails to function as an identification of source,” which was a new ground of refusal. Also, the Examining Attorney stated that the identification of goods required further clarification and that the specimen does not show the mark in use with the identified goods. Appellant notes that in the second Office Action, the Examining Attorney did not base refusal on grounds of functionality and Appellant considered the issue of functionality settled based on the evidence of record. Nonetheless, the Examining Attorney maintained the refusal on the ground of non-distinctiveness and added the new ground of refusal, i.e., failure to function as a trademark.

Appellant responded to the second Office Action on May 24, 2018. See May 24, 2018 Response to Office Action TSDR. In Appellant’s response, Appellant amended the mark description to clarify that the goods are identified as electric cables and wire in class 9, as suggested by the Examining Attorney in the second Office Action. On June 29, 2018 the Examining Attorney issued another non-final Office Action (“the third Office Action”). See June 29, 2018 Office Action TSDR. In the third Office Action, the Examining Attorney maintained all of the refusals in the second Office Action, and, additionally, reintroduced the functionality refusal that was raised in the first Office Action.

Appellant responded to the third Office Action on September 26, 2018. See Sep. 26, 2018 Response to Office Action TSDR. On November 11, 2018, the Examining Attorney issued a fourth, final Office Action, which maintains all of the rejections raised in the third Office Action. See Nov. 11, 2018 Office Action TSDR.

### (3) STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES

- A. Whether the applied-for mark for trade dress is functional.
- B. Whether the applied-for mark has acquired distinctiveness.
- C. Whether the applied-for mark functions as an indication of source of the identified goods.

#### (4) RECITATION OF THE FACTS

- A. The Appellant is the developer and licensor of Reelex Licensed Packaging System, hereinafter referred to as the “Reelex System”. The Reelex System is used by cable and wire manufacturers around the world to package their cable and wire into what are known as “Reelex Packages”. Those manufacturers use proprietary winding machines that are designed, manufactured, and patented by Reelex, and Reelex knowhow to wind the cable and wire into finished coils of cable and wire. See Oct. 3, 2017 Response to Office Action, TSDR p. 33.
- B. A Reelex Package, otherwise known as a Reelex Box, includes a wound coil of cable or wire inside a box. See Oct. 3, 2017 Response to Office Action, TSDR p. 33, and 37-41.
- C. Appellant’s proprietary winding process winds cable in a figure-eight pattern that allows the cable and wire to be “paid out” from a box without kinking and tangling. See Nov. 8, 2018 Office Action, TSDR p. 34.
- D. The applied-for trade dress is trade dress for electric cable and wire in class 9. See May 24, 2018 Response to Office Action, TSDR pp. 5 and 8.
- E. The Appellant owns U.S. Patents 5,810,272; 6,086,012; 6,341,741; 4,160,533; and 7,156,334, which relate to various aspects of manufacturing coils of cable and wire that can be packaged. See Oct. 3, 2017 Response to Office Action, TSDR pp. 4-5. See Sep. 26, 2018 Response to Office Action, TSDR p. 11.
- F. None of Appellant’s patents require the features of the box described in Appellant’s applied-for trade dress. Indeed, at least U.S. Patent 6,086,012 actually teaches at least three shapes (oval, elliptical, and diamond) of the payout hole that differ from the circular hole of the applied-for trade dress. See Oct. 3, 2017 Response to Office Action, TSDR pp. 4-5.
- G. The applied-for trade dress incorporates many design elements – shape and aspect ratio of the box, as well as the shape, size, and location of the hole – which were selected for their ornamentality and distinctiveness. See Oct. 3, 2017 Response to Office Action, TSDR pp. 21-23.

# 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.