

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA466873**

Filing date: **04/12/2012**

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

Proceeding	91201582
Party	Defendant Guerlain S.A.
Correspondence Address	DAVID EHRLICH FROSS ZELNICK LEHRMAN & ZISSU, P.C. 866 UNITED NATIONS PLZ NEW YORK, NY 10017-1822 UNITED STATES ehrllich-docket@fzllz.com
Submission	Answer and Counterclaim
Filer's Name	David Ehrlich
Filer's e-mail	ehrllich-docket@fzllz.com
Signature	/dwe/
Date	04/12/2012
Attachments	Lupin Pharmaceuticals v. Guerlain - Answer and Cancellation Counterclaim (F0992144).PDF (7 pages)(286426 bytes)

Registration Subject to the filing

Registration No	4024405	Registration date	09/13/2011
Registrant	Lupin Pharmaceuticals, Inc. Harborplace Tower 111 South Calvert Street, 21st Floor Baltimore, MD 21202 UNITED STATES		

Goods/Services Subject to the filing

Class 005. First Use: 2005/07/01 First Use In Commerce: 2005/07/01
All goods and services in the class are requested, namely: HOUSE MARK FOR FULL LINE OF PHARMACEUTICALS FOR MEDICAL PURPOSES, BUT EXCLUDING DIETARY SUPPLEMENTS AND EDIBLE FLOUR

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

In the Matter of Application No. 85/161,714
Trademark: ARSENE LUPIN
Applicant's Ref.: GNS 1108044

	X	
	:	
Lupin Pharmaceuticals,	:	
	:	
Opposer,	:	
	:	
v.	:	
	:	Opposition No. 91201582
Guerlain S.A.,	:	
	:	
Applicant.	:	
	:	
	X	

APPLICANT'S ANSWER AND CANCELLATION COUNTERCLAIM

Applicant, by its undersigned attorney, hereby answers the Notice of Opposition as follows and makes the following counterclaim:

1. Applicant denies knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 1 in the Notice of Opposition.
2. Applicant admits the allegations of the Paragraph 2 of the Notice of Opposition.
3. Applicant denies knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 3 in the Notice of Opposition.
4. Applicant denies knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 4 in the Notice of Opposition.
5. Applicant denies the allegations of Paragraph 5 of the Notice of Opposition.

6. Applicant denies knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations of Paragraph 6 in the Notice of Opposition.
7. Applicant denies the allegations of Paragraph 7 of the Notice of Opposition.
8. Applicant denies the allegations of Paragraph 8 of the Notice of Opposition.
9. Applicant admits that the marks are inherently distinctive for pharmaceuticals not containing ingredients derived from the lupin plant and otherwise denies the allegations of Paragraph 9 of the Notice of Opposition.
10. Applicant admits the allegations of the Paragraph 10 of the Notice of Opposition.
11. Applicant admits that Opposer's application filing dates, for its two claimed applications, predate the filing date of the opposed application and otherwise denies the allegations of Paragraph 11 of the Notice of Opposition.
12. Applicant denies the allegations of Paragraph 12 of the Notice of Opposition.
13. Applicant admits that the literary character name and mark ARSENE LUPIN includes the word LUPIN and otherwise denies the allegations of Paragraph 13 of the Notice of Opposition.
14. Applicant denies the allegations of Paragraph 14 of the Notice of Opposition.
15. Applicant denies the allegations of Paragraph 15 of the Notice of Opposition.
16. Applicant denies the allegations of Paragraph 16 of the Notice of Opposition.
17. Applicant denies the allegations of Paragraph 17 of the Notice of Opposition.

18. Applicant denies the allegations of Paragraph 18 of the Notice of Opposition.
19. Applicant admits that this opposition was filed within the extended opposition deadline.

CANCELLATION COUNTERCLAIM

1. Opposer is the record owner of U.S. trademark Reg. No. 4024405, maturing from Serial No. 77/766,890, for the mark LUPIN for “house mark for a full line of pharmaceuticals for medical purposes, but excluding dietary supplements and edible flower,” which claims the date of first use of July 1, 2005, and which was filed on June 24, 2009, on the basis of use under Section 1(a), covering “house mark for a full line of pharmaceuticals for medical purposes.” The limiting phrase “but excluding dietary supplements and edible flower” was added by amendment later, during prosecution.
2. Section 1402.03(c) now states that, in an application in which the goods are a full line of pharmaceuticals, “the Examining Attorney must require the applicant to provide evidence that it uses the mark in connection with pharmaceuticals to treat diseases or health problems in all categories in the World Health Organization (“W.H.O.”) International Statistical Classification Of Diseases And Related Health Problems. Upon information and belief, the ninth revision of this list was in effect on the June 24, 2009 filing date of the application concerned and is still widely used in the United States. Upon information and belief, this list is organized with 18 top level classifications that group diseases or health conditions in broad scientific categories.
3. Upon information and belief, the Opposer was selling, in the United States, on the filing date of the application concerned, June 24, 2009, pharmaceuticals classified in fewer than such 18 categories.

4. Upon information and belief, on such date, the pharmaceuticals sold by Opposer in the United States consisted entirely of pharmaceuticals of the following types:

1. Antibiotics
2. Cardiovascular drugs
3. Anti-inflammatory drugs
4. Drugs for mental disorders and convulsions
5. Drugs for nervous system disorders

Upon information and belief, these drugs not only do not fall within all 18 of the required categories for a full line of pharmaceuticals, but do not even fall in one half of the required categories for a full line of pharmaceuticals. Upon information and belief, for example, Opposer's LUPIN drugs sold in the U.S. did not then include such required W.H.O. categories as neoplasms (cancer) and diseases of the digestive system.

COUNT I – INVALIDITY

5. Contrary to the claim of use in its application, Opposer was not using the mark LUPIN "in commerce," within the meaning of that term in the Lanham Act, for "full line of pharmaceuticals for medical purposes" on the filing date of its application, June 24, 2009.
6. The registration maturing from that application is accordingly invalid for a lack of use for the claimed goods under Section 1 of the Lanham Act.
7. If, as a matter of law, the TTAB determines that use of a mark for less than a full line of pharmaceuticals, in a registration claiming such use, is not a basis for complete cancellation, then the identification of goods in the registration should be appropriately limited to name the actual drug categories, such as antibiotics and pharmaceutical preparations for cardiovascular diseases, sold in commerce under the mark on the filing date.



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.