

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA944580**

Filing date: **12/31/2018**

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

Proceeding	91223018
Party	Defendant Great Management Group, LLC
Correspondence Address	LISEL M FERGUSON PROCOPIO CORY HARGREAVES & SAVITCH LLP 525 B ST STE 2200 SAN DIEGO, CA 92101-4474 UNITED STATES lisel.ferguson@procopio.com, calendaring@procopio.com, docketing@procopio.com, diane.trus@procopio.com, jamie.quent@procopio.com, michele.fuger@procopio.com, matthew.sheilds@procopio.com, mlf@procopio.com, liz.bojorquez@procopio.com 619-238-1900
Submission	Brief on Merits for Defendant
Filer's Name	Lisel M. Ferguson
Filer's email	Lisel.Ferguson@procopio.com, calendaring@procopio.com, Michele.fuger@procopio.com, matthew.shields@procopio.com
Signature	/Lisel M. Ferguson/
Date	12/31/2018
Attachments	GMGs_and_GC's_Brief_on_the_Merits_of_the_Case.PDF(139936 bytes)

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

CHUTTER, INC.,)	Opposition No. 91223018 (parent)
)	Cancellation No. 92061951
Opposer,)	
)	
v.)	Serial Nos. 86-434,445
)	86-434,461
GREAT MANAGEMENT GROUP, LLC,)	
)	
Applicant.)	Marks: DANTANNA'S
)	DANTANNA'S TAVERN
)	
CHUTTER, INC.,)	
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
GREAT CONCEPTS, LLC,)	
)	
Registrant.)	

GREAT MANAGEMENT GROUP, LLC'S AND GREAT CONCEPTS, LLC'S

BRIEF ON THE MERITS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. DESCRIPTION OF THE RECORD	3
III. STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES.....	4
IV. RECITATION OF THE FACTS	5
V. ARGUMENT	10
A. The Board Should Deny Chutter’s Petition to Cancel the Registration, Because Chutter Has Failed to Show that GC Knowingly Made a False, Material Representation with the Willful Intent to Deceive the USPTO in Order to Obtain or Maintain its Registration.	10
1. Chutter Has Presented No Evidence to Show That Registrant “Knowingly” Made the Inaccurate Statement in the Declaration “with Intent to Deceive.”	11
2. Chutter Misguidedly Asks the Board to Establish New Law by Deciding that Fraudulent Intent Includes Either “Willful Blindness” or “Reckless Disregard for the Truth,” Despite the Lack of Any Evidence Here to Support Either Theory.....	14
3. Chutter’s Claims for Cancellation Based on Unpleaded and Undisclosed Allegations of “Fraudulent Retention of Benefits of the Declaration” and “Invalidity Due to Violation of USPTO Signature Rules”.....	17
4. Even if Chutter Had Presented Sufficient Evidence of a Willful Intent to Deceive the USPTO, the Inaccurate Statement Was Plainly Not Material to GC’s Obtaining or Maintaining Its Registration of the Mark.....	21
B. The Board Should Deny Chutter’s Opposition to the Application Because It Has Failed to Either Establish a Likelihood of Confusion or a False Suggestion of Connection to Mr. Tana.....	25
1. Chutter Fails to Show Any Likelihood of Confusion within the Meaning of Section 2(d) of the Lanham Act Because of the Marks’ Dissimilar Geographic and Marketing Channels and Because of the Lack of Any Actual Confusion	25
2. Chutter Also Once Again Fails to Establish the Existence of Any False Suggestion of a Connection to Mr. Tana within the Meaning of section 2(a) of the Lanham Act.....	28
VI. SUMMARY	30

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page(s)
FEDERAL CASES	
<i>American Paging, Inc. v. American Mobilphone, Inc.</i> 13 U.S.P.Q.2D 2036 (TTAB 1989)	27, 28
<i>American Speech-Language-Hearing Association v. National Hearing Aid Society</i> 224 USPQ 798 (TTAB 1984)	30
<i>Boyd's Collection, Ltd. v. Herrington & Co.</i> 65 USPQ2d 2017 (TTAB 2003)	20
<i>Buffett v. Chi-Chi'S, Inc.</i> 226 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) ¶ 428 (P.T.O. June 13, 1985).....	29
<i>Canovas v. Venezia</i> 80 S.R.L., 220 USPQ 660 (TTAB 1983).....	30
<i>Cerveceria India, Inc. v. Cerveceria Centroamericana, S.A.</i> 10 USPQ2d 1064 (TTAB 1989)	20
<i>Conwood Corporation v. Loew's Theatres, Inc.</i> 173 U.S.P.Q. 829 (TTAB 1972)	24
<i>Crown Wallcovering Corp. v. Wall Paper Manufacturers Ltd.</i> 188 USPQ 141 (TTAB 1975)	23, 24
<i>Duffy-Mott Co. v. Cumberland Packing Co.</i> 424 F.2d 1095 (C.C.P.A. 1970)	23, 24
<i>G. B. Kent & Sons Ltd. v. Colonial Chemical Corporation</i> 162 U.S.P.Q. 557 (TTAB 1969)	24
<i>Global-Tech Appliances, Inc. v. SEB S.A.</i> 131 S.Ct. 2060 (2011).....	15
<i>In re Bose Corp.</i> 580 F.3d 1240 (Fed. Cir. 2009).....	1, 2, 10, 11, 13, 14, 17
<i>In re E.I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.</i> 476 F.2d 1357, 177 USPQ 563 (CCPA 1973).....	25
<i>In re Majestic Distilling Co., Inc.</i> 315 F.3d 1311, 65 USPQ2d 1201 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	26

<i>Kemin Indus., Inc. v. Waltkins Prods., Inc.</i> 192 USPQ 327 (T.T.A.B. 1976)	14
<i>Kenner Parker Toys, Inc. v. Rose Art Indus., Inc.</i> 963 F.2d 350, 22 USPQ2d 1453 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	26
<i>King Candy Co. v. Eunice King’s Kitchen, Inc.</i> 496 F.2d 1400 (C.C.P.A. 1974)	28
<i>Kingsdown Med. Consultants, Ltd. v. Hollister Inc.</i> 863 F.2d 867 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	14
<i>L.D. Kichler Co. v. Davoil, Inc.</i> 192 F.3d 1349 (Fed. Cir. 1999).....	11
<i>McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. National Data Corp.</i> 228 USPQ 45 (TTAB 1985)	29
<i>Mecanicos Unidos S.A. v. Victorio, LLC,</i> 2016 WL 6833508 at *7, Cancellation No. 92058060 (TTAB 2016)	16
<i>Metro Traffic Control, Inc. v. Shadow Network Inc.</i> 104 F.3d 336 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	11
<i>Miller Brewing Co. v. Anheiser Busch Inc.</i> 27 USPQ2d 1711 (TTAB 1993)	28
<i>Morehouse Mfg. Corp. v. J. Strickland & Co.</i> 407 F.2d 881 (C.C.P.A. 1969)	21, 23
<i>Royal Hawaiian Perfumes, Ltd. v. Diamond Head Products of Hawaii, Inc.</i> 204 U.S.P.Q. 144 (T.T.A.B. 1979)	23, 24, 25
<i>Smith Int’l, Inc. v. Olin Corp.</i> 209 USPQ 1033 (T.T.A.B. 1981)	10, 14, 17, 21
<i>Sony Corp. of Am. v. Universal City Studios, Inc.</i> 464 U.S. 417 (1984).....	15
<i>Sovereign Mil. Hospitaller Or. of St. John of Jerusalem of Rhodes and of Malta v. Fla. Priory of Knights Hospitallers of Sovereign Or. of St. John of Jerusalem, Knights of Malta, Ecumenical Or.</i> 702 F.3d 1279 (11th Cir. 2012)	15
<i>Standard Knitting, Ltd. v. Toyota Jidosha Kabushiki Kaisha</i> 77 USPQ2d 1917 (TTAB 2006)	16

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.