

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA274426**

Filing date: **03/25/2009**

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

Proceeding	91185393
Party	Defendant Vudu, Inc.
Correspondence Address	D. Peter Harvey Harvey Siskind LLP Four Embarcadero Center, 39th Floor San Francisco, CA 94111 UNITED STATES mstratton@harveysiskind.com, pharvey@harveysiskind.com, clee@harveysiskind.com
Submission	Motion for Summary Judgment
Filer's Name	Matthew A. Stratton
Filer's e-mail	mstratton@harveysiskind.com, pharvey@harveysiskind.com, clee@harveysiskind.com
Signature	/Matthew A. Stratton/
Date	03/25/2009
Attachments	Opp MSJ.090325.FINAL.pdf ( 18 pages )(66847 bytes ) Lichty.Decl.with exhibits.090325.pdf ( 15 pages )(1207919 bytes ) MAS.Decl.with exhibits.090325.pdf ( 9 pages )(554818 bytes )

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

In the Matter of Application Serial No. 77112745 for the mark VUDU, filed on February 21, 2007, and published in the Official Gazette on March 25, 2008.

HEWLETT-PACKARD DEVELOPMENT  
COMPANY, L.P.

Opposer,

v.

VUDU, INC.,

Applicant.

Opposition No. 91185393

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

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	Page
I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. STATEMENT OF FACTS .....	1
A. Opposer .....	1
B. Applicant.....	2
C. Procedural History .....	3
III. ARGUMENT .....	3
A. Opposer’s Burden on Summary Judgment .....	3
B. A Likelihood of Confusion Is Not Present .....	4
(1) Standard .....	4
(2) The Marks Are Not Sufficiently Similar .....	5
(3) The Goods Are Not Sufficiently Related.....	7
(4) The Marks Have Different Channels of Distribution .....	10
(5) The Parties’ Goods Are Not Bought on “Impulse” .....	10
(6) HP’s VOODOO Mark Is Not Famous .....	11
(7) HP Has Shown No Actual Confusion.....	11
IV. CONCLUSION.....	11

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

### CASES

<i>Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.</i> 477 U.S. 242, 248 (1986).....	4
<i>Arrow Fastener Co., Inc. v. Stanley Works</i> 59 F.3d 384, 399 (2d Cir. 1995).....	10
<i>Big O Tire Dealers, Inc. v. Goodyear Tire &amp; Rubber Co.</i> 408 F. Supp. 1219, 1225 (D. Colo. 1976).....	9
<i>Carnival Brand Seafood Co. v. Carnival Brands, Inc.</i> 51 U.S.P.Q.2d 1929 (11th Cir. 1999) .....	9
<i>Champagne Louis Roederer, S.A. v. Delicato Vineyards</i> 148 F.3d 1373, 1375 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	5
<i>Cognis Corp. v. DBC LLC</i> 73 U.S.P.Q.2d 1766 (T.T.A.B. 2004) .....	4, 7
<i>Cunningham v. Laser Golf Corp.</i> 222 F.3d 943-44 (Fed. Cir. 2000) .....	3
<i>General Mills, Inc. v. Kellogg Co.</i> 824 F.2d 622, 627 (8th Cir. 1987) .....	6
<i>In re Bed &amp; Breakfast Registry</i> 791 F.2d 157, 159 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	5
<i>In re British Bulldog, Ltd.</i> 224 U.S.P.Q. 854 (T.T.A.B. 1984) .....	6
<i>In re E.I. du Pont de Nemours &amp; Co.</i> 476 F.2d 1357, 1361 (C.C.P.A. 1973) .....	4, 5, 10
<i>In re General Motors Corporation</i> 23 U.S.P.Q.2D (BNA) 1465 *9 .....	10
<i>In re Omaha National Corp.</i> 819 F.2d 1117, 2 USPQ2d 1859, 1861 (Fed. Cir. 1987) .....	8
<i>In re Sears, Roebuck and Co.</i> 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1312 (T.T.A.B. 1987) .....	6

<i>In re Sydel Lingerie Co., Inc.</i> 197 U.S.P.Q. 629 (T.T.A.B. 1977) .....	6
<i>Machine Head v. Dewey Global Holdings Inc.</i> 61 U.S.P.Q.2d 1313 (W.D. Pa. 2001) .....	9
<i>McGregor-Doniger, Inc. v. Drizzle, Inc.</i> 599 F.2d 1126, 1139 (2d Cir. 1979).....	9
<i>Nabisco, Inc. v. PF Brands, Inc.</i> 191 F.3d 208 (2d Cir. 2000).....	11
<i>Opryland USA Inc. v. The Great Am. Music Show</i> 970 F.2d 847, 849-50 (Fed. Cir. 1992) .....	4
<i>Specialty Brands, Inc. v. Coffee Bean Distributors, Inc.</i> 748 F.2d 669, 674 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....	6
<i>The Sports Authority, Inc. v. Prime Hospitality Corp.</i> 89 F.3d 955 (2d Cir. 1996).....	4
<i>Victor Comptometer Corp. v. Shakespeare Co.</i> 184 U.S.P.Q. 634 (T.T.A.B. 1974) .....	9
<i>Vornado, Inc. v. Breuer Electric Mfg. Co.</i> 390 F.2d 724 (1968).....	6

## RULES

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rule 56 (2008).....	4
---	---

# 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.