

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA959543**

Filing date: **03/11/2019**

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

Proceeding	91226322
Party	Plaintiff Lupin Pharmaceuticals, Inc.
Correspondence Address	DIANE B MELNICK POWLEY & GIBSON PC 304 HUDSON ST 2ND FLOOR NEW YORK, NY 10013 UNITED STATES trademarks@powleygibson.com, dbmelnick@powleygibson.com, thcurtin@powleygibson.com, smmorales@powleygibson.com 212-226-5054
Submission	Rebuttal Brief
Filer's Name	Suzanna M. M. Morales
Filer's email	thcurtin@powleygibson.com, smmorales@powleygibson.com
Signature	/suzanna m m morales/
Date	03/11/2019
Attachments	rebuttal public.pdf(1912723 bytes ) Lupin - Ampel - rebuttal appendix of evidentiary issues FINAL.pdf(39526 bytes ) Lupin - Ampel - rebuttal brief cert of service.pdf(20764 bytes )

IN THE U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

-----X

LUPIN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.,

Opposer,

Opposition No. 91226322

v.

AMPEL, LLC,

Applicant.

-----X

**REBUTTAL BRIEF OF OPPOSER**  
**LUPIN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

A. Introduction ..... 1

B. Applicant’s Arguments Cannot Detract from the Near Identity of the Marks ..... 5

    i. Applicant’s Assertions About How Opposer “Always” Presents the LUPIN Mark Are  
    False and Irrelevant ..... 5

    ii. LUPIN Is the Dominant Portion of Opposer’s Composite Mark and Opposer’s Composite  
    LUPIN Mark Adds to the Strength of Its Rights to LUPIN ..... 8

    iii. Applicant’s Argument That Opposer Does Not Use Its House Mark As the Actual Name  
    of Its Products Is Not Based on the Record and Irrelevant ..... 9

    iv. Opposer’s LUPIN Mark Is Strong and Entitled to a Broad Scope of Protection ..... 11

    v. There Is No Basis to Distinguish the Parties’ Marks ..... 12

C. The Parties’ Respective Channels of Trade and Classes of Consumers Overlap ..... 15

    i. Both Parties’ Goods and Services Are Provided to Ordinary Patients ..... 15

    ii. Applicant’s Arguments That Its Channels of Trade Are Limited Only Demonstrate That  
    Applicant Sells Its Suite of Services Directly to Opposer’s Competitors ..... 18

    iii. Applicant’s Misstatement of the Law Does Not Detract from the Relatedness of the  
    Parties’ Goods and Services ..... 20

D. Conclusion ..... 21

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<u>B&amp;B Hardware, Inc. v. Hargis Indus., Inc.</u> , 135 S. Ct. 1293, 113 U.S.P.Q.2d 2045 (2015) .....	1
<u>B.V.D. Licensing Corp. v. Rodriguez</u> , 83 U.S.P.Q.2d 1500 (T.T.A.B. 2007).....	8
<u>Baroid Drilling Fluids, Inc. v. Sun Drilling Products</u> , 24 U.S.P.Q.2D 1048 (T.T.A.B. 1992).....	13
<u>Bose Corp. v. QSC Audio Prods.</u> , 293 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	11, 12
<u>Braun Inc. v. Dynamics Corp. of Am.</u> , 975 F.2d 815 (Fed. Cir. 1992).....	12
<u>CareFirst of Md., Inc. v. First Care P.C.</u> , 434 F.3d 263 (4th Cir. 2006).....	5
<u>CBS Inc. v. Morrow</u> , 708 F.2d 1579, 218 USPQ 198 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....	8, 19
<u>Cont'l Plastic Containers v. Owens Brockway Plastic Prod., Inc.</u> , 141 F.3d 1071, 46 U.S.P.Q.2d 1277 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	15, 16
<u>Cunningham v. Laser Golf Corp.</u> , 222 F.3d 943 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	5
<u>George &amp; Co. LLC v. Imagination Ent'mt Ltd.</u> , 575 F.3d 383 (4th Cir. 2009).....	5
<u>Giant Food, Inc. v. Nation's Foodservice, Inc.</u> , 710 F.2d 1565, 218 U.S.P.Q. 390, 395 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....	8
<u>Hornady Mfg. Co. v. Doubletap, Inc.</u> , 746 F.3d 995 (10th Cir. 2014).....	5
<u>In re Appetito Provisions Co.</u> , 3 U.S.P.Q.2d 1553, 1553 (T.T.A.B. 1987).....	8
<u>In re Bay State Brewing Co.</u> , 117 U.S.P.Q.2d 1958 (TTAB 2016).....	13
<u>In re Big Pig, Inc.</u> , 81 U.S.P.Q.2d 1436 (T.T.A.B. 2006).....	5
<u>In re Concordia Int'l Forwarding Com.</u> , 222 U.S.P.Q. 355 (T.T.A.B. 1983).....	15
<u>In re Coors Brewing Co.</u> , 68 U.S.P.Q.2d 1059, 343 F.3d 1340 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	12
<u>In re Max Capital Group Ltd.</u> , 93 U.S.P.Q.2d 1243 (T.T.A.B. 2010).....	5, 8, 9
<u>In re Morinaga Nyugyo Kabusihki Kaisha</u> , 120 U.S.P.Q. 1738 (T.T.A.B. 2016).....	6, 15
<u>In re Mucky Duck Mustard Co., Inc.</u> , 6 U.S.P.Q.2d 1467 (T.T.A.B. 1988).....	17

<u>Jack Wolfskin Ausrüstung Fur Draussen GmbH &amp; Co. KGaA v. New Millennium Sports, S.L.U.,</u> 797 F.3d 1363, 116 U.S.P.Q.2d 1129 (Fed. Cir. 2015).....	8
<u>Kellogg Co. v. General Foods Corp.,</u> 166 U.S.P.Q. 281 (T.T.A.B. 1970).....	10
<u>King of the Mountain Sports, Inc. v. Chrysler Corp.,</u> 185 F.3d 1084 (10th Cir. 1999).....	5
<u>Kohler Co. v. Baldwin Hardware Corp.,</u> 82 U.S.P.Q.2d 1100 (T.T.A.B. 2007).....	3, 11, 21
<u>Kos Pharms., Inc. v. Andrx Corp.,</u> 369 F.3d 700 (3d Cir. 2004).....	16
<u>Mattel, Inc. v. Funline Merchandise Co., Inc.,</u> 81 U.S.P.Q.2d 1372 (T.T.A.B. 2006).....	1
<u>Miss Universe L.P., LLLP v. Cmty. Mktg., Inc.,</u> 82 U.S.P.Q.2d 1562 (T.T.A.B. 2007).....	15
<u>Octocom Sys. v. Houston Computer Servs.,</u> 918 F.2d 937 (Fed. Cir. 1990).....	1
<u>Pandora Jewelry, LLC v. Pandora’s Makeup Box Inc.,</u> 2015 TTAB LEXIS 556 (T.T.A.B. Apr. 1, 2015).....	11
<u>RE/MAX of Am., Inc. v. Realty Mart, Inc.,</u> 207 U.S.P.Q. 960 (T.T.A.B. 1980).....	13
<u>T.A.B. Sys. v. Pactel Teletrac,</u> 77 F.3d 1372, 37 U.S.P.Q. 1879 (Fed. Cir. 1996).....	11
<u>The N. Face Apparel Corp. v. Samyan Indus. Co., Ltd.,</u> 116 U.S.P.Q.2d 1217 (T.T.A.B. 2015).....	12, 17
<u>Two Pesos Inc. v. Taco Cabana,</u> 120 L. Ed. 2d 615, 505 U.S. 763 (1992).....	12
<u>Viacom Int’l. Inc. v. IJR Cap. Investments, L.L.C.,</u> 127 U.S.P.Q.2d 1112 (5th Cir. 2018).....	17
<u>Wag’n Enters., LLC v. United Animal Nations,</u> 2012 WL 1633410 (E.D. Va. 2012).....	12
<u>Weider Pubs., LLC v. D &amp; D Beauty Care Co., LLC,</u> 109 U.S.P.Q.2d 1347 (T.T.A.B. 2014).....	12, 20, 21
<u>Worthington Foods, Inc. v. Kellogg Co.,</u> 732 F. Supp. 1417 (S.D. Oh. 1990).....	21

**Statutes**

TBMP § 704.03(a).....	14
TMEP § 1212.06(e)(v).....	13
TMEP § 1402.03(b).....	9, 10
TMEP § 1402.03(c).....	4

**Other Authorities**

MCCARTHY ON TRADEMARKS AND UNFAIR COMPETITION § 11.13 (5 <sup>th</sup> Ed. 2019) .....	11
--	----

# 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.