



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

ASTRAZENECA AB,

OPPOSER,

PARADIGM, INC.,

APPLICANT.

OPPOSITION NO.

91178696

77/006,953

**APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO OPPOSER'S**  
**MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

Applicant, Paradigm, Inc., respectfully submits its response to Opposer's Motion for Summary Judgment, pursuant to Rule 2.116 of the Trademark Rules of Practice, 37 C.F.R. § 2.127(e) and Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Procedure. This response is supported by the accompanying Memorandum and the attached exhibits.

Respectfully submitted,

By:

Mark B. Harrison

**Venable LLP**

575 7<sup>th</sup> St. NW

Washington, D.C. 20004

Telephone: (202) 344-4000

Fax: (202) 344-8300

Attorneys for Applicant

Date: November 12, 2008



11-12-2008

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

ASTRAZENECA AB,	)	
	)	
OPPOSER,	)	<b>OPPOSITION NO.</b>
	)	91178696
PARADIGM, INC.,	)	
	)	
APPLICANT.	)	

**MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO OPPOSER'S  
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

Applicant, Paradigm, Inc, respectfully submits its Memorandum in Support of its Response to Opposer's Motion for Summary Judgment, pursuant to Rule 2.116 of the Trademark Rules of Practice, 37 C.F.R. § 2.127(e) and Rule 56 of the Federal Rules of Procedure.

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

- I. INTRODUCTION
- II. STATEMENT OF DISPUTED FACTS
- III. ARGUMENT
  - A. There Is No Likelihood of Confusion Between AstraZeneca and Paradigm's Marks
    - 1. The Degree of Similarity in Sight, Sound, and Connotation Between AstraZeneca and Paradigm's Marks Is Small
    - 2. Other Marks Coexist with AstraZeneca's Mark That Are As Similar As Paradigm's Mark Or More So
    - 3. The Fame of AstraZeneca's Mark Eliminates the Likelihood of Confusion
      - i. The Extent of Possible Confusion Is Small
      - ii. The Condition Under Which Sales Are Made Is One Of Awareness
      - iii. The Relatedness of the Goods and Channels of Trade Is Minimal
- IV. CONCLUSION

## I. INTRODUCTION

Summary judgment is a “salutory method of disposition ‘designed to secure [the] just, speedy and inexpensive determination of every action.’” Sweats Fashions, Inc. v. Pannill Knitting Co., Inc., 4 USPQ 2d 1793, 1795 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (quoting Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 327 (1986)). Summary judgment is appropriate where the moving party establishes that there are no genuine issues of material fact which require resolution at trial and that it is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. FED. R. CIV. PRO. 56 (c). A fact is genuinely in dispute if the evidence is such that a reasonable factfinder could find in favor of the non-moving party. Salacuse v. Ginger Spirits, Inc., 44 U.S.P.Q.2d 1415, 1418 (TTAB 1997) (citing Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 248 (1986)). “The non-moving party must be given the benefit of all reasonable doubt as to whether genuine issues of material fact exist, and the evidentiary record on summary judgment, and all inferences to be drawn from the undisputed facts, must be viewed in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party.” Salacuse, 44 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1418.

In this case, there is a genuine issue of material fact with respect to the degree of similarity between AstraZeneca and Paradigm's marks. There is also a genuine issue of material fact regarding whether the fame of AstraZeneca's mark will serve to increase or decrease the likelihood of confusion. Paradigm asserts that these facts present sufficient evidence to raise genuine issues of material fact such that summary judgment in favor of the AstraZeneca is not warranted.

## II. STATEMENT OF DISPUTED FACTS

1. AstraZeneca's mark is not similar in sight, sound, and connotation to Paradigm's mark.
2. The parties' goods and channels of trade are not identical.
3. The fame of AstraZeneca's mark serves to eliminate any likelihood of confusion.

## III. ARGUMENT

Summary judgment is appropriate where the moving party establishes that there are no genuine issues of material fact which require resolution at trial and that it is entitled to judgment as a matter of law. FED. R. CIV. PRO. 56 (c). A fact is genuinely in dispute if the evidence is such that a reasonable factfinder could find in favor of the non-moving party. See Salacuse v. Ginger Spirits, Inc., 44 U.S.P.Q.2d 1415, 1418 (TTAB 1997) (citing Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc., 477 U.S. 242, 248 (1986)).

The moving party bears the burden of showing that no material fact exists. See Celotex Corp. v. Catrett, 477 U.S. 317, 323-25 (1986). The burden then shifts to the non-moving party to show that a triable issue of facts still exists. See id. "The non-moving party must be given the benefit of all reasonable doubt as to whether genuine issues of material fact exist, and the evidentiary record on summary judgment, and all inferences to be drawn from the undisputed facts, must be viewed in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party." Salacuse, 44 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1418.

### A. There Is No Likelihood of Confusion Between AstraZeneca and Paradigm's Marks

When determining if there is a likelihood of confusion between marks, the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board (hereafter "the Board") considers the factors



# 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.