

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA459133**

Filing date: **02/29/2012**

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

Proceeding	91203708
Party	Defendant Fiber Composites, LLC
Correspondence Address	DEBRA S. SEROTA FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022  tmdoctc@fr.com
Submission	Motion to Suspend for Civil Action
Filer's Name	John M. Nading
Filer's e-mail	Tamar.Duvdevani@dlapiper.com, John.Nading@dlapiper.com, David.Huff@dlapiper.com
Signature	/John M. Nading/
Date	02/29/2012
Attachments	Cambridge v Fiber - Applicant Mot to Susp Proceed Disp of Fed Lit - Opp No 91203708.pdf ( 20 pages )(463879 bytes )

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

In the matter of Trademark  
Application Serial No. 85/142,604  
Mark: ARMORGUARD  
Filing Date: September 30, 2010  
Publication date: January 10, 2012

CAMBRIDGE PAVERS, INC.,	)	
	)	
Opposer,	)	
	)	
v.	)	Opposition No. 91203708
	)	
FIBER COMPOSITES, LLC,	)	
	)	
Applicant.	)	

**APPLICANT’S MOTION TO SUSPEND PROCEEDING PENDING  
DISPOSITION OF FEDERAL LITIGATION AND MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT**

Applicant Fiber Composites, LLC (hereinafter “Applicant”), by and through the undersigned counsel, files this Motion to Suspend Proceeding Pending Disposition of Federal Litigation and Memorandum in Support, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 2.117(a) and TBMP § 510.02(a). For the reasons set out below, Opposer Cambridge Pavers, Inc.’s (hereinafter “Opposer”) Notice of Opposition, which was filed February 7, 2012, should be suspended pending the outcome of a prior pending federal district court action.<sup>1</sup>

**ARGUMENT**

This Opposition Proceeding should be suspended pending the outcome of a federal district court action for trademark infringement, false designation of origin, dilution, and unfair

---

<sup>1</sup> While the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board (“Board”) considers this Motion, Applicant respectfully requests that the Board suspend this Opposition Proceeding “with respect to all matters not germane to the motion” pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 2.127(d).

competition between these same parties and involving the identical claim in the United States District Court for the District of New Jersey, Case No. 2:11-CV-05543 (WJM)(MF) (hereinafter “federal litigation” or “federal court action”) (*see* true and correct copy of Opposer’s Complaint, attached hereto as Exhibit A). Opposer, as Plaintiff, filed the federal court action on September 23, 2011 against Applicant, as Defendant, and Homer TLC, Inc. Opposer then filed the Notice of Opposition on February 7, 2012.

“To the extent that a civil action in a [f]ederal district court involves issues in common with those in a proceeding before the Board, the decision of the [f]ederal district court is often binding upon the Board.” TBMP § 510.02(a). “[W]hile a decision by the District Court would be binding upon the [United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”)], a decision by the [Board] would only be advisory in respect to the disposition of the case pending in the District Court.” *Tokaido v. Honda Assocs. Inc.*, 179 U.S.P.Q. 861, 862 (T.T.A.B. 1973) (“[N]otwithstanding the fact that the [USPTO] proceeding was the first to be filed, it is deemed to be the better policy to suspend proceedings herein until the civil suit has been finally concluded”) (citations omitted). *See also Whopper-Burger, Inc. v. Burger King Corp.*, 171 U.S.P.Q. 805, 807 (1971) (“The duty of this Court, as of every other judicial tribunal, is to decide actual controversies by a judgment which can be carried into effect, and not to give opinions upon moot questions or abstract propositions, or to declare principles or rules of law which cannot affect the matter in issue in the case before it.”) (quotation omitted). “The only question for determination . . . is whether the outcome of the civil action will have a bearing on the issues involved in the opposition proceeding.” *Other Tel. Co. v. Conn. Nat’l Tel. Co., Inc.*, 181 U.S.P.Q. 125, 126 (T.T.A.B. 1974), *petition denied*, 181 U.S.P.Q. 779 (Comm’r 1974). Here, the federal court action has been ongoing for five months and the final determination of that

federal court action will have a bearing on the issues before the Board because both proceedings are between the same parties and involve the same claims.

Specifically, both the Notice of Opposition and the federal litigation involve Applicant's ARMORGUARD Mark, as depicted in Application Serial No. 85142604, and Opposer's ARMORTEC Mark, as depicted in stylized font & design in Registration Nos. 3094763 and 3105701. In the Notice of Opposition, Opposer asserts that Applicant's ARMORGUARD Mark should be refused registration because of an alleged likelihood of confusion with Opposer's ARMORTEC Mark. Likewise, in the federal action, the basis for Opposer's claims for relief is an alleged likelihood of confusion between Applicant's ARMORGUARD Mark and Opposer's ARMORTEC Mark. *See Exhibit A, pp. 4-7.* Indeed, Opposer specifically identifies Applicant's Application Serial No. 85142604 for the ARMORGUARD Mark, as well as Opposer's Registration Nos. 3094763 and 3105701 in the Complaint in the federal litigation. *See Exhibit A, Paras. 8, 12, and 17.*

There can be no doubt then that the final resolution of the federal litigation will be dispositive of the issues in this Opposition Proceeding. To proceed further with a claim in this forum would waste the resources of this agency, while the federal court is considering identical evidence and arguments on the exact same claim. For all these reasons, the Notice of Opposition should be suspended pending the outcome of the federal court action.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the reasons set forth herein, Applicant respectfully submits that it has established good cause for the suspension of this Opposition Proceeding and requests the granting of its Motion to Suspend Proceeding Pending Disposition of Federal Litigation.

Dated: February 29, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

DLA PIPER LLP (US)

/s/ John M. Nading

By: Tamar Y. Duvdevani  
John M. Nading  
500 8th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20004  
Tel. (202) 799-4157  
Fax (202) 799-5157

*Attorneys for Applicant  
Fiber Composites, LLC*

# 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.