

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA956352**

Filing date: **02/25/2019**

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

Proceeding	91226322
Party	Defendant Ampel, LLC
Correspondence Address	PATRICK C ASPLIN LENHART PETTIT 530 E MAIN ST, PO BOX 2057 CHARLOTTESVILLE, VA 22902 UNITED STATES pca@lplaw.com, tlg@lplaw.com, asb@lplaw.com 434-979-1400
Submission	Brief on Merits for Defendant
Filer's Name	Patrick C. Asplin
Filer's email	pca@lplaw.com, asb@lplaw.com, tlg@lplaw.com
Signature	/patrick asplin/
Date	02/25/2019
Attachments	Ampel - Trial Brief.pdf(127131 bytes)

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

LUPIN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,

Opposer,

v.

Opposition No. 91226322

AMPEL, LLC,

Applicant.

TRIAL BRIEF OF APPLICANT AMPEL, LLC

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT	1
II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY	2
III. DESCRIPTION OF THE RECORD	3
IV. STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES	4
V. STATEMENT OF THE FACTS	5
A. Opposer’s “Lupin” marks specifically relate to the manufacture and distribution of generic pharmaceuticals	5
B. The commercial impression of Opposer’s marks almost always includes the flower design and never features the word “Lupin”	6
C. Opposer’s trade channels are targeted to highly sophisticated buyers	8
D. Opposer is completely absent from the “Lupus” space	9
E. Applicant’s “LuPPiN” mark is specifically for education and patient support groups and specifically targeted to Lupus patients and caregivers	11
F. Applicant’s marketing of “LuPPiN” and its consumer base is specifically targeted to Lupus patients	13
G. Opposer’s inadmissible speculation concerning Applicant’s activities	14
VI. ARGUMENT	16
A. Opposer cannot prove that registration of Applicant’s mark would create a likelihood of confusion, particularly when Opposer’s use and its buyer class are markedly distinct from Applicant	17
1. The Board must look to Opposer’s <i>actual</i> use of its mark, specifically, its own “approved” logos that prominently feature the flower design and its secondary impression to the actual brand or generic name featured in the marketplace for Opposer’s products	17

2. Opposer’s relevant buyer class consists of highly sophisticated parties, including some of the world’s largest wholesalers and retailers	19
3. Opposer may have priority via its registration, but that priority is limited ...	21
4. The parties’ marks are sufficiently distinct and dissimilar.....	22
5. The parties offer different services, target different consumers, and use different channels of trade.....	25
a. The parties’ services are different	25
b. The parties’ customers are different.....	27
c. The parties’ trade channels are different	28
d. Opposer’s sales and advertising figures, without context, do not demonstrate strength of its mark.....	29
e. Opposer’s speculative arguments of “harm” should be ignored	30
 VII. CONCLUSION	 31
VIII. APPENDIX OF EVIDENTIARY ISSUES.....	32

..

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases

<i>Braun Inc. v. Dynamics Corp. of Am.</i> , 975 F.2d 815 (Fed. Cir. 1992).....	24
<i>Bridgestone Americas Tire Ops., LLC v. Fed. Corp.</i> , 673 F.3d 1330, 102 U.S.P.Q.2d 1061 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	7
<i>CareFirst of Md., Inc. v. First Care P.C.</i> , 434 F.3d 263 (4th Cir. 2006).....	20
<i>Cont'l Plastic Containers v. Owens Brockway Plastic Prod., Inc.</i> , 141 F.3d 1073, 46 U.S.P.Q.2d 1277 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	21, 22
<i>Cunningham v. Laser Golf Corp.</i> , 222 F.3d 943, 55 U.S.P.Q.2d 1842 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	7, 27
<i>Dynamics Research Corp. v. Langenau Mfg. Co.</i> , 704 F.2d 1575, 217 U.S.P.Q. 649 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....	22
<i>E.I. DuPont DeNemours & Co.</i> , 476 F.2d 1357 (C.C.P.A. 1976).....	19, 29, 30
<i>Ferrotec (USA) Corp. & Ferrotec Corp.</i> , 2009 WL 273256 (TTAB Jan. 29, 2009)	24
<i>George & Co. LLC v. Imagination Entertainment Ltd.</i> , 575 F.3d 383 (4th Cir. 2009).....	20, 26
<i>Heartsprings, Inv. v. Heartspring, Inc.</i> , 143 F.3d 550 (10th Cir. 1998).....	31
<i>Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Human Performance Measurement Inc.</i> , 23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1390, 1991 WL 350751 (T.T.A.B. 1991)	22
<i>Hornady Mfg. Co., Inc. v. Doubletap, Inc.</i> , 746 F.3d 995 (10th Cir. 2014).....	26
<i>In re Cook Med. Techs., LLC</i> , 105 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1377 (TTAB 2012).....	32
<i>In re Coors Brewing Co.</i> , 343 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	26, 28

...

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.