

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA427590**

Filing date: **08/29/2011**

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

Proceeding	91184978
Party	Defendant Walgreen Co.
Correspondence Address	MARK J LISS LEYDIG VOIT & MAYER LTD TWO PRUDENTIAL PLAZA, SUITE 4900 CHICAGO, IL 60601 UNITED STATES cstevens@leydig.com
Submission	Brief on Merits for Defendant
Filer's Name	Michelle L. Calkins
Filer's e-mail	mcalkins@leydig.com
Signature	/Michelle L. Calkins/
Date	08/29/2011
Attachments	2011.08.29 Walgreens' Trial Brief (REDACTED).pdf ( 105 pages )(2630997 bytes )

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

McNEIL-PPC, INC.,	)	
	)	
Opposer,	)	Opposition No. 91184978
	)	Serial No. 76/682,070
v.	)	
	)	
WALGREEN CO.,	)	
	)	
Applicant.	)	

---

---

**TRIAL BRIEF  
OF APPLICANT WALGREEN CO.**

---

Mark J. Liss  
Caroline L. Stevens  
Michelle L. Calkins  
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.  
Two Prudential Plaza, 180 North Stetson Ave.  
Suite 4900  
Chicago, Illinois 60601  
(312) 616-5600

Attorneys for Applicant  
WALGREEN CO.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>I. INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. DESCRIPTION OF EVIDENCE OF RECORD .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>III. STATEMENT OF FACTS.....</b>	<b>9</b>
A. Walgreen Company and Its Efforts to Assist Consumers.....	9
B. The WAL-ZYR Name and Product .....	11
C. Advertising and Selling WAL-ZYR .....	13
D. Sales of WAL-ZYR Products .....	15
E. The ZYRTEC Mark .....	15
F. ZYRTEC at Walgreens .....	17
G. A Lack of Consumer Confusion Despite the Coexistence of the Marks .....	18
1. Walgreens' Records.....	18
2. McNeil's Records .....	19
3. Simonson Survey .....	20
H. Consumer Care.....	21
<b>IV. ARGUMENT.....</b>	<b>22</b>
A. McNeil Does Not Have Priority in This Matter.....	22
B. Even if McNeil Could Establish Priority, There is No Likelihood of Confusion.....	25
1. There are Significant Differences between Applicant's WAL-ZYR mark and Opposer's ZYRTEC.....	26
2. Opposer's Mark is Not Strong .....	29
3. The Goods at Issue Are Purchased With Care and Consideration, and With a Knowledge of Private Label or House Brands .....	33
i. Consumer Care in Purchasing.....	33
ii. Careful Consumers Know the Private Label / Store Brand Marketplace .....	34
4. Despite the Opportunity in the Marketplace, the Absence of Actual Confusion Belies Any Notion of Likelihood of Confusion.....	36
i. There is No Direct Evidence of Confusion.....	37
ii. The Simonson Survey Shows Confusion is Not Likely.....	38
5. Applicant Did Not Act In Bad Faith.....	41
C. McNeil Cannot Succeed On Its Dilution Claim .....	43
1. ZYRTEC Was Not Famous Prior to Walgreens' Priority Date.....	43
2. WAL-ZYR Is Not Likely to Dilute the ZYRTEC Mark.....	45
<b>V. CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>48</b>

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Aloe Cream Labs, Inc. v. Milsan</i> , 165 U.S.P.Q. 37 (5 <sup>th</sup> Cir. 1979) .....	32
<i>American Express Co. v. Payless Cashways, Inc.</i> , 222 U.S.P.Q. 907 (T.T.A.B. 1984).....	28
<i>Anheuser-Busch, Inc. v. Mambo Seafood #1, Inc.</i> , No. 91160250, 2008 WL 4674603 (T.T.A.B. Sept. 22, 2008) .....	39, 40
<i>Blue Man Products Inc. v. Tarmann</i> , 75 U.S.P.Q.2d 1811 (T.T.A.B. 2005).....	32
<i>Carefirst of Maryland Inc. v. FirstHealth of Carolinas Inc.</i> , 77 U.S.P.Q.2d 1492 (T.T.A.B. 2005) .....	30, 44
<i>Chemical N.Y. Corp. v. Conmar Form Sys., Inc.</i> , 1 U.S.P.Q.2d 1139 (T.T.A.B. 1986).....	22
<i>Citigroup Inc. v. Capital City Bank Group, Inc.</i> , 94 U.S.P.Q.2d 1645 (T.T.A.B. 2010) .....	26
<i>Conopco, Inc. v. May Department Stores Co.</i> , 32 U.S.P.Q.2d 1225 (Fed. Cir. 1994) .....	34, 35
<i>Eli Lilly &amp; Co. v. Natural Answers Inc.</i> , 56 U.S.P.Q.2d 1942 (7th Cir. 2000).....	45
<i>Eli Lilly &amp; Co. v. Natural Answers, Inc.</i> , 86 F. Supp. 2d 834 (S.D. Ind. 2000) .....	34, 45
<i>General Motors v. Aristide</i> , 87 U.S.P.Q.2d 1179 (T.T.A.B. 2008) .....	22, 24, 44
<i>Hunt Control Sys. Inc. v. Koninklijke Philips Electronics. N.V.</i> , 98 U.S.P.Q.2d 1558 (T.T.A.B. 2011) .....	23
<i>In re E.I. du Pont de Nemours &amp; Co.</i> , 476 F.2d 1357, 177 U.S.P.Q. 563 (C.C.P.A. 1973) ...	25, 26
<i>Jacobs v. International Multifoods Corp.</i> , 212 U.S.P.Q. 641 (C.C.P.A. 1982).....	27
<i>King-Size, Inc. v. Frank's King Size Clothes, Inc.</i> , 547 F. Supp. 1138, 216 U.S.P.Q. 426 (S.D. Tex. 1982) .....	31
<i>Klein-Becker USA, LLC v. Product. Quest Manufacturing, Inc.</i> , 429 F. Supp. 2d 1248 (D. Utah 2005) .....	27, 36, 41
<i>Leading Jewelers Guild Inc. v. LJOW Holdings LLC</i> , 82 U.S.P.Q.2d 1901 (T.T.A.B. 2007) .....	26
<i>Life Zone Inc. v. Middleman Group Inc.</i> , 87 U.S.P.Q.2d 1953 (T.T.A.B. 2008) .....	22, 25
<i>Magnaflux Corp. v. Sonoflux Corp.</i> , 109 U.S.P.Q. 313 (C.C.P.A. 1956).....	33
<i>Master Builders, Inc. v. Polymerica, Inc.</i> , No. 92030392, 2004 WL 407353 (T.T.A.B. Feb. 24, 2004) .....	37

<i>McNeil Consumer Brands, Inc. v. U.S. Dentek Corp.</i> , 56 U.S.P.Q.2d 1758 (E.D. Pa. 2000) .....	45
<i>McNeil Nutritionals, LLC v. Heartland Sweeteners LLC</i> , No. 06-5336, 2007 WL 1520101 (E.D. Pa. 2007) .....	35
<i>National Pork Board v. Supreme Lobster &amp; Seafood Co.</i> , 96 U.S.P.Q.2d 1479 (T.T.A.B. 2010) .....	43, 44
<i>Nike, Inc. v. Maher</i> , No. 91188789 (T.T.A.B. Aug. 9, 2011).....	44
<i>Palm Bay Imports, Inc. v. Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin Maison Fondée En 1772</i> , 73 U.S.P.Q.2d 1689 (Fed. Cir. 2005) .....	27
<i>Pfizer, Inc. v. Perrigo Co.</i> , 988 F. Supp. 686 (S.D.N.Y. 1997).....	35
<i>Pignons S.A. de Mecanique de Precision v. Polaroid Corp.</i> , 212 U.S.P.Q. 246 (1st Cir. 1981) .	37
<i>Precision Foods, Inc. v. Major Products Co.</i> , 2001 WL 1131865 (T.T.A.B. Sept. 20, 2001).....	33
<i>Re/MAX International Inc. v. Singh</i> , No. 91175272, 2008 WL 5256414 (T.T.A.B. 2008).....	26
<i>Smithkline Beckman Corp. v. Proctor &amp; Gamble Co.</i> , 223 U.S.P.Q. 1230 (N.D.N.Y. 1984).....	34
<i>Tea Board of India v. Republic of Tea Inc.</i> , 80 U.S.P.Q.2d 1881 (T.T.A.B. 2006) .....	43
<i>Threshold.TV Inc. v. Metronome Enterprises, Inc.</i> , 96 U.S.P.Q.2d 1031 (T.T.A.B. 2010) ...	22, 25
<i>Toro Co. v. Grassmasters, Inc.</i> , 66 U.S.P.Q.2d 1032 (T.T.A.B. 2003).....	37
<i>Union Carbide Corp. v. Ever-Ready Inc.</i> , 531 F.2d 366 (7th Cir. 1976) .....	39, 40
<b>Statutes</b>	
15 U.S.C. § 1125.....	15, 46
<b>Rules</b>	
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 11 .....	29
Trademark Board Manual of Procedure § 539 .....	29
<b>Treatises</b>	
6 J. THOMAS MCCARTHY, MCCARTHY ON TRADEMARKS AND UNFAIR COMPETITION § 32:189 ..	41
<b>Regulations</b>	
37 C.F.R. § 2.120 .....	7
37 C.F.R. § 2.123 .....	7

# 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.