

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA1003843**

Filing date: **09/23/2019**

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

Proceeding	87882281
Applicant	James Kelleher
Applied for Mark	ASK JIM FIRST
Correspondence Address	CHRISTOPHER P. BUSSERT KILPATRICK TOWNSEND & STOCKTON LLP MAILSTOP: IP DOCKETING - 22 1100 PEACHTREE STREET, SUITE 2800 ATLANTA, GA 30309-4528 UNITED STATES tadmin@kilpatricktownsend.com, cbussert@kilpatricktownsend.com 404-815-6500
Submission	Appeal Brief
Attachments	2019.09.23 Ex Parte Appeal Brief of Applicant James Kelleher.pdf(250760 bytes)
Filer's Name	Christopher P. Bussert
Filer's email	tadmin@kilpatricktownsend.com, cbussert@kilpatricktownsend.com, kteilhaber@ktslaw.com
Signature	/Christopher P. Bussert/
Date	09/23/2019

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

APPLICANT: James Kelleher
MARK: ASK JIM FIRST
SERIAL NO.: 87/882,281
CLASS: 35

EX PARTE APPEAL BRIEF OF APPLICANT JAMES KELLEHER

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION1

PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND.....1

ARGUMENT AND CITATION OF AUTHORITIES.....2

I. LEGAL STANDARDS2

 A. Applicant’s Services Are Distinguishable from the Services Offered Under the Cited Registration and Are Offered to a Different Class of Consumer in a Different Field of Use.....4

 B. The Final Office Action and Request for Reconsideration.....7

 C. Denial.....9

 D. Applicant’s Mark and the Cited Registration Are Distinguishable in Sound, Sight and Overall Commercial Impression.....16

 E. The Coexistence of Numerous Relevant Third Party Filings Weighs Against A Finding of Likelihood of Confusion.....18

 F. Applicant Adopted the ASK JIM FIRST Mark in Good Faith.....20

 G. Under an Application of All the Relevant Factors, Confusion Is Highly Unlikely.....20

CONCLUSION.....21

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

7-Eleven, Inc. v. Wechsler,
83 U.S.P.Q.2d 1715 (T.T.A.B. 1998) 9, 16

Armstrong Cork Co. v. World Carpets, Inc.,
597 F.2d 496 (5th Cir. 1979) 5

AT&T Wireless Servs., Inc. v. Wright,
2004 WL 1195622 (T.T.A.B. 2004) 17

Buitoni Foods Corp. v. Gio. Buton & C.S.p.A.,
680 F.2d 290, 216 U.S.P.Q. 558 (2d Cir. 1982) 5

Coach Services, Inc. v. Triumph Learning LLC,
668 F.3d 1356 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 9

Consol. Cigar Co. v. RJR Tobacco Co.,
491 F.2d 1265, 181 U.S.P.Q. 44 (C.C.P.A. 1974) 19

Consolidated Cigar Co. v. RJR Tobacco Co.,
491 F.2d 1265 (C.C.P.A. 1974) 17

Elec. Design & Sales, Inc. v. Elec. Data Sys. Co.,
954 F.2d 713, 21 U.S.P.Q.2d 1388 (Fed. Cir. 1992) 5

Freedom Savings & Loan Ass’n v. Way,
757 F.2d 1176 (11th Cir. 1995) 17

Gen. Mills, Inc. v. Kellogg Co.,
824 F.2d 622, 3 U.S.P.Q.2d 1442 (8th Cir. 1987) 19

H. D. T. Co. Factors, Inc. v. Sinclair,
288 F.2d 947, 129 U.S.P.Q. 283 (C.C.P.A. 1961) 16

In re British Bulldog, Ltd.,
224 U.S.P.Q. 854 (T.T.A.B. 1984) 5

In re Broadway Chicken, Inc.,
38 U.S.P.Q.2d 1559 (T.T.A.B. 1996) 18

In re Christian Des. Garets,
2004 WL 1195610 (T.T.A.B. 2004) 17

In re Davey Prods. Pty Ltd.,
92 U.S.P.Q.2d 1198 (T.T.A.B. 2009) 6, 15

<i>In re Digirard Corp.</i> , 45 U.S.P.Q.2d 1841 (T.T.A.B. 1998)	6
<i>In re Du Pont de Nemours & Co.</i> , 476 F.2d 1357, 177 U.S.P.Q. 563 (C.C.P.A. 1973).....	2, 4, 21
<i>In re Mars</i> , 741 F.2d 395, 222 U.S.P.Q. 938 (Fed. Cir. 1984)	2, 21
<i>In re Toshiba Medical Systems Corp.</i> , 91 U.S.P.Q.2d 1266 (T.T.A.B. 2009)	15
<i>In re White Rock Distilleries, Inc.</i> , 92 U.S.P.Q.2d 1282 (T.T.A.B. 2009)	6
<i>Interstate Brands Corp. v. Celestial Seasonings, Inc.</i> , 576 F.2d 926, 198 U.S.P.Q. 151 (C.C.P.A. 1978).....	5
<i>Keebler Co. v. Assoc. Biscuits, Ltd.</i> , 207 U.S.P.Q. 1034 (T.T.A.B. 1980)	18
<i>Nat'l Motor Bearing Co. v. James-Pond-Clark</i> , 266 F.2d 799, 121 U.S.P.Q. 515 (C.C.P.A. 1959).....	18
<i>Omaha Nat'l Bank v. Citibank (S.D.), N.A.</i> , 633 F. Supp. 231, 229 U.S.P.Q. 51 (D. Neb. 1986).....	2, 20
<i>Plough, Inc. v. Kreis Laboratories</i> , 314 F.2d 635 (9th Cir. 1963)	17
<i>Recot, Inc. v. Becton</i> , 214 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	9
<i>Shoe Corp. of Am. v. Juvenile Shoe Corp.</i> , 266 F.2d 793, 121 U.S.P.Q. 510 (C.C.P.A. 1959).....	18
<i>Sports Auth. Mich., Inc. v. PC Auth., Inc.</i> , 63 U.S.P.Q.2d 1782 (T.T.A.B. 2002)	9
<i>Sweats Fashions, Inc. v. Pannill Knitting Co.</i> , 833 F.2d 1560, 4 U.S.P.Q.2d 1793 (Fed. Cir. 1987)	19
<i>Vitarroz Corp. v. Borden, Inc.</i> , 644 F.2d 960 (2d Cir. 1981)	6
<u>Statutes</u>	
15 U.S.C. § 1052(d)	2

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.