

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA50151**

Filing date: **10/24/2005**

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

<b>Proceeding</b>	91154398
<b>Party</b>	Plaintiff Drowning Pool LLC Drowning Pool LLC Serling Rooks & Ferrara, LLP 254 West 54th Street New York, NY 10019
<b>Correspondence Address</b>	J. RODGERS LUNSFORD III SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP 1230 PEACHTREE, ST., N.E., SUITE 3100 PROMENADE II ATLANTA, GA 30309-3592
<b>Submission</b>	Opposer's Reply Brief
<b>Filer's Name</b>	J. Rodgers Lunsford III
<b>Filer's e-mail</b>	RLUNSFORD@SGRLAW.COM, MBEDSOLE@SGRLAW.COM
<b>Signature</b>	/J. Rodgers Lunsford III/
<b>Date</b>	10/24/2005
<b>Attachments</b>	Drowning - Opposer's Reply Brief.pdf ( 30 pages )



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.....	1
II.	ARGUMENT AND CITATION OF AUTHORITY.....	1
A.	OPPOSER OWNS THE DROWNING POOL MARK AND HAS STANDING TO BRING THIS OPPOSITION.....	1
B.	OPPOSER HAS PROVED APPLICANT'S ABANDONMENT OF THE DROWNING POOL MARK BY A PREPONDERANCE OF THE EVIDENCE.....	8
1.	Applicant has Affirmatively Abandoned the Drowning Pool Mark Based on Applicant's Announcement and Implementation of a Change in Name.....	9
2.	Applicant Has Presumptively Abandoned the Drowning Pool Mark Based on a Lack of Bona Fide Use of the Mark for Various Three Year Periods.....	16
a.	To Maintain Trademark Rights, the Trademark Owner Must Demonstrate Deliberate and Continuous Use, Not Sporadic, Nominal or Residual Use of the Mark.....	16
b.	Applicant's Rebuttal Evidence of Alleged Use Is Insufficient to Avoid a Finding of Presumptive Abandonment.....	17
c.	Applicant Has Not Proved an Intent to Resume Use of the Drowning Pool Mark.....	23
C.	OPPOSER HAS MADE EXTENSIVE USE OF THE DROWNING POOL MARK.....	24
III.	CONCLUSION.....	25

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### CASES

<i>Cerveceria Centroamericana, S.A. v. Cerveceria India, Inc.</i> , 892 F.2d 1021, 13 U.S.P.Q.2d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 1989) .....	21
<i>Citicorp v. Morley Cos.</i> , 2004 WL 838401 (T.T.A.B. Sept. 16, 2003) .....	7
<i>Gaia Techs., Inc. v. Reconversion Techs., Inc.</i> , 93 F.3d 774, 39 U.S.P.Q.2d 1826 (Fed. Cir. 1996) .....	5
<i>Hiland Potato Chip Co. v. Culbro Snack Foods, Inc.</i> , 720 F.2d 981,222 U.S.P.Q. 790 (8th Cir. 1983) .....	9, 11, 14, 15
<i>Hylo Co. v. Jean Patou, Inc.</i> , 215 F.2d 282, 103 U.S.P.Q. 52 (C.C.P.A. 1954) .....	5
<i>IntraWest Fin. Corp. v. Western Nat'l Bank</i> , 610 F. Supp. 950, 227 U.S.P.Q. 27 (D. Colo. 1985) .....	8, 9, 10, 14, 15, 23
<i>Kingsmen v. K-Tel Int'l Ltd.</i> , 557 F. Supp. 178, 220 U.S.P.Q. 1045 (S.D.N.Y. 1983) .....	4, 15, 16, 19, 20, 22
<i>Kusek v. Family Circle, Inc.</i> , 894 F. Supp. 522 (D. Mass. 1995) .....	16, 19, 20, 21, 22
<i>MB Fin. Bank, N.A. v. MB Real Estate Servs., L.L.C.</i> , 2003 WL 22765022 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 21, 2003) .....	9, 11, 12, 14, 15
<i>Marshak v. Treadwell</i> , 240 F.3d 184, 57 U.S.P.Q.2d 1764 (3d Cir. 2001) .....	15, 16, 19, 20, 22
<i>Media Techs. Licensing, LLC v. Upper Deck Co.</i> , 334 F.3d 1366, 67 U.S.P.Q.2d 1374 (Fed. Cir. 2003) .....	7
<i>On-Line Careline, Inc. v. America Online, Inc.</i> , 229 F.3d 1080, 56 U.S.P.Q.2d 1471 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	8
<i>Parklane Hosiery Co. v. Shore</i> , 439 U.S. 322 (1979) .....	7, 8
<i>Person's Co., Ltd. v. Christman</i> , 900 F.2d 1565, 14 U.S.P.Q.2d 1477 (Fed. Cir. 1990). .....	21

<i>Procter &amp; Gamble Co. v. Paragon Trade Brands, Inc.</i> , 917 F. Supp. 305, 38 U.S.P.Q.2d 1678 (D. Del. 1995) .....	7
<i>Ritchie v. Simpson</i> , 170 F.3d 1092, 50 U.S.P.Q.2d 1023 (Fed. Cir. 1999) .....	1, 2
<i>Salem Trust Co v. Federal Nat'l Bank</i> , 11 F. Supp. 105 (D. Mass. 1934) .....	6
<i>Speier Tire Co. v. Tom Benson Chevyway Rental &amp; Leasing, Inc.</i> , 643 S.W.2d 772 (Tex. App. 1982) .....	5-6
<i>Universal Oil Prods. Co v. Rexall Drug &amp; Chem. Co.</i> , 463 F.2d 1122, 174 U.S.P.Q. 458 (C.C.P.A. 1972) .....	1, 6

**STATUTES AND RULES**

15 U.S.C. § 1063 .....	1
15 U.S.C. § 1127 .....	16
FED. R. CIV. P. 17(a) .....	7

**OTHER AUTHORITIES**

Christopher T. Micheletti, " <i>Preventing Loss of Trademark Rights: Quantitative and Qualitative Assessments of "Use" and Their Impact on Abandonment Determinations</i> ," 94 TRADEMARK REP. 634 (2004).....	21
--	----

# 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.