

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA965982**

Filing date: **04/10/2019**

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

Proceeding	91243459
Party	Plaintiff Pinkette Clothing, Inc.
Correspondence Address	AMANDA V DWIGHT DWIGHT LAW GROUP 2603 MAIN STREET SUITE 200 IRVINE, CA 92614 UNITED STATES adwight@dwightlawgroup.com 949-515-0003
Submission	Opposition/Response to Motion
Filer's Name	Amanda V. Dwight
Filer's email	adwight@dwightlawgroup.com
Signature	/amanda dwight/
Date	04/10/2019
Attachments	Pinkette Opposition to MSJ.pdf(199940 bytes) Pinkette Evidentiary Objections ISO Opposition to MSJ.pdf(91109 bytes) Pinkette Statement of Undisputed and Disputed Facts.pdf(93732 bytes) Declaration of Edward Kim ISO Opp to MSJ.pdf(1521722 bytes) Declaration of Amanda Dwight ISO Opp to MSJ.pdf(4474469 bytes)

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

Pinkette Clothing, Inc. a California
corporation,

Opposer,

v.

Finance Arts, LLC, an Indiana Limited
Liability Company

Applicant.

Opposition No. 91243459
Re Application Serial No. 87628012
Mark: LVN LVSH

**Pinkette Clothing, Inc.'s Opposition to Applicant's Motion for Summary Judgment
And/Or in the Alternative, Judgment Be Summarily Entered in Favor of Opposer**

Submitted by:

Amanda V. Dwight
Dwight Law Group
2603 Main Street, Suite 200
Irvine, CA 92614
(949) 515-0003
(949) 266-8680
adwight@dwrightlawgroup.com
Attorneys for Opposer

Table of Contents

I.	Introduction.....	1
II.	Statement of Relevant Facts.....	2
	A. The LUSH Brand	2
	B. The LVN LVSH Mark	3
	C. Statement of Opposer’s Undisputed Material Facts	4
III.	Summary Judgment Standard	5
IV.	Analysis	6
	A. Opposer Has Standing and Prior Rights.....	6
	B. Applicant’s Mark Is Likely To Cause Confusion With Opposer’s LUSH® Mark.....	7
	1. Applicant Wrongly Conflates Third-Party Registration with Third-Party Use.....	8
	a. Opposer is the Lone Holder of a “LUSH” Registration.	8
	b. Third-Party Use is Irrelevant in the <i>Du Pont</i> Analysis.....	9
	2. Being the only one registered with the USPTO, Opposer’s LUSH Mark Is Strong and Well Known.....	11
	a. Applicant’s Lack of Distinctiveness Argument is Spurious.	13
	3. Even the Examining Attorney Initially Found That the Marks are Confusingly Similar.	14
	a. Applicant’s Own Admission that its Mark has Multiple Interpretations is Reason Alone to Deny the MSJ.....	14
	b. The Near Identicalness of the Marks is Likely to Cause Confusion.....	15
	c. This is Not a Case Where the Junior Mark Contains a Famous Mark to Distinguish itself from the other Famous Mark.	17
	d. Applicant’s Admission that Goods are Identical and In The Same Channels Is Grounds for Denying the MSJ.....	18
	4. Applicant’s References to the Cosmetic Warriors’ Litigation Actually Supports a Finding of Likely Confusion.....	19
V.	Conclusion	19

Table of Authorities

Cases

<i>7-Eleven Inc. v. Wechsler</i> , 83 USPQ2d 1715, 1717 n.2 (TTAB 2007).....	10
<i>Angos Tropical Cafe, Llc V. Paradise Restaurant Group, Inc. Of St Augustine</i> , 2014 WL 3427348 (TTAB 2014).....	10
<i>Bausch & Lomb Inc. v. Leupold & Stevens Inc.</i> , 6 USPQ2d 1475, 1477 (TTAB 1988)	14
<i>Bose v. QSC Audio Products, Inc.</i> , 293 F.3d 1367, 1371, 63 USPQ2d 1303, 1305 (Fed. Cir. 2002)12	
<i>Bristol Meyers Squibb Co. v. McNeil</i> , 973 F.2d 1033 (2d Cir.1992).....	17
<i>Brown Shoe Co. v. Robbins</i> , 90 USPQ2d 1752, 1754 (TTAB 2009).....	7
<i>Celotex Corp. v. Catrett</i> , 477 U.S. 317, 323-24 (1986)	6
<i>Century 21 Real Estate Corp. v. Century Life of America</i> , 970 F.2d 874, 877, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1698, 1700 (Fed. Cir. 1992).....	18
<i>Coach/Braunsdorf Affinity, Inc. v. 12 Interactive, LLC</i> , 110 USPQ2d 1458, 1476 (TTAB 2014).....	10
<i>Dena Corp. v. Belvedere Intl., Inc.</i> , 950 F.2d 1555, 15557, 21 U.S.P.Q.2d 1047, 1049 (Fed. Cir. 1991).....	5
<i>Han Beauty, Inc. v. <u>Alberto-Culver Co.</u></i> , 236 F.3d 1333, 1337 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	16
<i>Hilson Research Inc. v. Soc’y for Human Res. Mgmt.</i> , 27 USPQ2d 1423, 1429 (TTAB 1993).....	15
<i>In re America Online Inc.</i> , 77 USPQ2d 1618, 1622-23, 1625 (TTAB 2006).....	13
<i>In re CHA Direct, Inc.</i> , 2008 WL 4354131 (TTAB 2018).....	8, 14
<i>In re E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.</i> , 177 U.S.P.Q. 563, 567 (C.C.P.A. 1973).....	7
<i>In Re Felt Racing, LLC</i> , 2013 WL 3188885, Serial No. (TTAB 2013).....	18
<i>In re Mighty Leaf Tea</i> , 601 F.3d 1342, 94 USPQ2d 1257, 1260 (Fed. Cir. 2010)	18
<i>In re Smith and Mehaffey</i> , 31 USPQ2d 1531, 1533 (TTAB 1994).....	14
<i>In re United States Shoe Corp.</i> , 229 USPQ 707, 709 (TTAB 1985).....	18
<i>Kenner Parker Toys, Inc. v. Rose Art Industries, Inc.</i> , 22 USPQ2d 1453, 1456 (Fed. Cir. 1992))...	11
<i>King Candy Co. v. Eunice King's Kitchen, Inc.</i> , 496 F.2d 1400, 182 USPQ 108, 109 (CCPA 1974) .	14

<i>King-Kup Candies, Inc. v. King Candy Co.</i> , 288 F.2d 944, 129 USPQ 272, 273 (CCPA 1961)	14
<i>L.C. Licensing Inc. v. Berman</i> , 86 USPQ2d 1883, 1887 (TTAB 2008)	7
<i>Life Zone Inc. v. Middleman Group Inc.</i> , 87 USPQ2d 1953, 1956 n.5 (TTAB 2008).....	11
<i>Lilly Pulitzer, Inc. v. Lilli Ann Corp.</i> , 376 F.2d 324, 153 USPQ 406, 407 (CCPA 1967)	18
<i>Lloyd's Food Prods., Inc. v. Eli's, Inc.</i> , 987 F.2d 766, 25 USPQ2d 2027, 2029 (Fed. Cir. 1993).....	6
<i>Mag Instrument Inc. v. Brinkmann Corp.</i> , 96 USPQ2d 1701, 1708 (TTAB 2010)	11
<i>Maybelline Company v. Matney</i> , 194 USPQ 438, 440 (TTAB 1977)	14
<i>Meyers v. Brooks Shoe Inc.</i> , 912 F.2d 1459, 16 USPQ2d 1055, 1056 (Fed. Cir. 1990).....	6
<i>Midwestern Pet Foods, Inc. v. Societe des Produits Nestle S.A.</i> , 685 F.3d 1046, 1053, 103 U.S.P.Q.2d 1435, 1440 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	16
<i>n re Max Capital Group Ltd.</i> , 93 USPQ2d 1243, 1248 (TTAB 2010)	19
<i>n re Smith and Mehaffey</i> , 31 USPQ2d 1531, 1533 (TTAB 1994).....	8
<i>Nabisco Inc. v. Warner Lambert Co.</i> , 220 F.3d 43 (2d Cir.2000)	17
<i>Nike Inc. v. Maher</i> , 100 USPQ2d 1018, 1031 (TTAB 2011)	13
<i>Opryland USA Inc. v. Great Am. Music Show, Inc.</i> , 23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1471, 1473 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	7
<i>Opryland USA Inc. v. The Great American Music Show, Inc.</i> , 970 F.2d 847, 851, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1471, 1473 (Fed. Cir. 1992)	5
<i>Park 'N Fly, Inc. v. Dollar Park & Fly</i> , 469 U.S. 189, 224 USPQ 327, 330 (1985)	14
<i>Pharm Co. v. Gillette Co.</i> , 984 F.2d 567, 573 (2d Cir.1993)	17
<i>Pinkette Clothing, Inc. v. Lawrence Mallard</i> , Opposition No. 91223575 (TTAB 2018)	16
<i>Recot, Inc. v. Becton</i> , 214 F.3d 1322, 1327, 54 USPQ2d 1894, 1897 (Fed. Cir. 2000)	11
<i>Safer Inc. v. OMS Investments Inc.</i> , 94 USPQ2d 1031, 1039 (TTAB 2010)	10
<i>Seaboard Corp. v. R&R Turf Supply Inc.</i> , 101 USPQ2d 1826, 1832 n. 13 (TTAB 2012)	9
<i>Specialty Brands Inc. v. Coffee Bean Distribs., Inc.</i> , 223 USPQ 1281, 1284 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....	13
<i>Sunrise Jewelry Mfg. Corp. v. Fred S.A.</i> , 175 F.3d 1322, 50 USPQ2d 1532, 1534 (Fed. Cir. 1999)	14
<i>The United States Shoe Corp. v. Kiddie Kobbler Ltd.</i> , 231 USPQ 815, 818 n. 7 (TTAB 20 WAI- 3129049v3 1986).....	9

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.