

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA1346453**
Filing date: **03/15/2024**

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

Proceeding no.	91247241
Party	Plaintiff PepsiCo, Inc.
Correspondence address	PAUL J REILLY BAKER BOTTS LLP 2001 ROSS AVENUE DALLAS, TX 75201 UNITED STATES Primary email: nytmdpt@bakerbotts.com Secondary email(s): julie.albert@bakerbotts.com, paul.reilly@bakerbotts.com 212-408-2500
Submission	Brief on Merits for Plaintiff
Filer's name	Julie Beth Albert
Filer's email	paul.reilly@bakerbotts.com, julie.albert@bakerbotts.com, lucy.soyinka@bakerbotts.com, caroline.duncan@bakerbotts.com, nytm- dpt@bakerbotts.com, john.mitchell@bakerbotts.com
Signature	/Julie Beth Albert/
Date	03/15/2024
Attachments	2024.03.15 PepsiCo Trial Brief.pdf(1416503 bytes) Appendix A.pdf(4105860 bytes)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. PRELIMINARY STATEMENT..... 7

II. DESCRIPTION OF THE RECORD..... 8

A. Opposer’s Trial Evidence..... 8

B. Applicant’s Submissions to the Board 9

III. STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES 9

IV. STATEMENT OF FACTS 9

A. PepsiCo’s Ownership and Use of its Well-Known ROCKSTAR Marks 9

1. The Origins of Rockstar, Inc., and the Birth of ROCKSTAR..... 10

2. PepsiCo’s Numerous Federal Registrations 11

3. Overwhelming Evidence of Use, Including Billions of Products Sold and Millions of Dollars in Annual Advertising, Establish Brand Goodwill and Recognition..... 12

B. Applicant’s Challenged Applications and Registrations for ROCKSTAR 18

V. ARGUMENT 20

A. PepsiCo Is Entitled to A Statutory Cause of Action and has Priority 20

B. Registration and Use of Applicant’s Mark Is Likely to Cause and Has Caused Confusion.... 21

1. Applicant Has Caused Actual Confusion (*DuPont* Factors 7, 8 and 12) 23

2. The Parties’ Marks are Identical (*DuPont* Factor 1) 27

3. PepsiCo’s ROCKSTAR Marks are Commercially and Conceptually Strong (*DuPont* Factors 5, 6, 9 and 11)..... 32

4. The Parties’ Goods at Issue are Similar, Related, and/or Complementary (*DuPont* Factor 2) 35

5. The Goods at Issue are Purchased on Impulse (*DuPont* Factor 4)..... 42

6. The Goods at Issue are Sold in Similar Channels of Trade to Similar Target Markets (*DuPont* Factor 3)..... 44

7. PepsiCo Has Never Agreed to Applicant’s Adoption of its Identical Marks (*DuPont* Factor 10) 47

8. Applicant’s Bad Intent Can be Presumed From its Actions and the Circumstances (*DuPont* Factor 13)..... 48

C. Applicant Lacks a *Bona Fide* Intent to Use its Mark in Commerce..... 52

VI. CONCLUSION..... 54

INDEX OF CASES CITED

CASES

<i>Action Temp. Servs., Inc. v. Labor Force, Inc.</i> , 870 F.2d 1563, 10 U.S.P.Q.2d 1307 (Fed. Cir. 1989).....	49
<i>B&B Hardware, Inc. v. Hargis Indus., Inc.</i> , 575 U.S. 138, 113 U.S.P.Q.2d 2045 (2015)	22
* <i>Bath & Body Works Brand Mgmt., Inc. v. Summit Ent., LLC</i> , 7 F. Supp. 3d 385 (S.D.N.Y. 2014)	43
<i>Bonaventure Associates v. Westin Hotel Co.</i> , 218 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 537 (T.T.A.B. June 2, 1983)	21
<i>Boston Red Sox Baseball Club Limited Partnership v. Brad Francis Sherman</i> , 88 U.S.P.Q.2d 1581, 2008 WL 4149008 (T.T.A.B. 2008).....	53
* <i>Chanel, Inc. v. Mauriello</i> , Nos. 91168097, 91172654, 9204626, 2010 WL 3873650 (T.T.A.B. Sept. 20, 2010).....	27
* <i>Citadel Dc Holdings, LLC v. Virtual Citadel, Inc.</i> , No. 91235209, 2020 WL 1864661 (T.T.A.B. Mar. 19, 2020)	20
* <i>Clear Choice Holdings LLC v. Implant Direct Intl</i> , No. 91190485, 2013 WL 5402082 (T.T.A.B. Aug. 26, 2013)	26
* <i>Corcamore, LLC v. SFM, LLC</i> , 978 F.3d 1298 (Fed. Cir. 2020), <i>cert. denied</i> , 141 S. Ct. 2671 (2021).....	20
* <i>Cosmic Crusaders LLC v. Andrusiek</i> , No. 2023-1150, 2023 WL 6889054 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 19, 2023)	21
<i>Cunningham v. Laser Golf Corp.</i> , 222 F.3d 943, 55 U.S.P.Q.2d 1842 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	20-21
<i>Empresa Cubana Del Tabaco v. Gen. Cigar Co., Inc.</i> , No. CANCELLATION 9202585, 2020 WL 5089291 (T.T.A.B. Aug. 26, 2020)	22
<i>Gen. Mills, Inc. et al. v. Fage Dairy Processing Indus. S.A.</i> , 100 U.S.P.Q.2d 1584 (T.T.A.B. 2011), <i>judgment set aside pursuant to settlement</i> , 110 U.S.P.Q.2d 1679 (T.T.A.B. 2014).....	43
<i>Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Packard Press, Inc.</i> , 281 F.3d 1261, 62 U.S.P.Q.2d 1001 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	36-37
* <i>Hybrid Athletics, LLC</i> , No. 91213057, 2016 WL 7646395 (T.T.A.B. Dec. 15, 2016).....	23

* Copy of case provided in Appendix A pursuant to TBMP § 101.03

<i>In re Chippendales USA Inc.</i> , 622 F.3d 1346, 96 U.S.P.Q.2d 1681 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	32
* <i>In Re Dub Nutrition, LLC</i> , No. 77752113, 2012 WL 5196134 (T.T.A.B. Oct. 3, 2012)	35
<i>In re E.I. DuPont DeNemours & Co.</i> , 476 F.2d 1357, 177 U.S.P.Q. 563 (C.C.P.A. 1973).....	22, 23, 27, 32, 35, 42, 44, 47, 48, 51
* <i>In Re Harrison</i> , No. 86134276, 2016 WL 4702452 (T.T.A.B. Aug. 12, 2016)	43
* <i>In re Hawk Racing</i> , No. 76698132, 2011 WL 4871859 (T.T.A.B. Sept. 22, 2011).....	44
* <i>In re Leiner Health Services Corp.</i> , 2004 WL 1294388 (T.T.A.B. May 26, 2004).....	43
<i>In re Majestic Distilling Co.</i> , 315 F.3d 1311, 65 U.S.P.Q.2d 1201 (Fed. Cir. 2003).....	26
<i>In re Mighty Leaf Tea</i> , 601 F.3d 1342, 94 U.S.P.Q.2d 1257 (Fed. Cir. 2010).....	22, 34
* <i>In re Mucky Duck Mustard Co.</i> , 6 U.S.P.Q.2d 1467 (T.T.A.B. 1988), <i>aff'd per curiam</i> , 864 F.2d 149 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	37
<i>In re Phillips-Van Heusen Corp.</i> , 228 U.S.P.Q. 949 (T.T.A.B. 1986).....	36
<i>In re Shell Oil Co.</i> , 992 F.2d 1204, 26 U.S.P.Q.2d 1687 (Fed. Cir. 1993).....	22
* <i>In re Tropical Seas, Inc.</i> , No. 77830997, 2011 WL 3828727 (T.T.A.B. Aug. 12, 2011)	27
<i>Kenner Parker Toys Inc. v. Rose Art Indus., Inc.</i> , 963 F.2d 350, 22 U.S.P.Q.2d 1453 (Fed. Cir. 1992).....	32
<i>L'Oreal S.A. & L'Oreal USA, Inc. v. Marcon</i> , 102 U.S.P.Q.2d 1434 (T.T.A.B. 2012).....	35
<i>Lane Ltd. v. Jackson Int'l Trading Co.</i> , 33 U.S.P.Q.2d 1351 (T.T.A.B. 1994).....	52
<i>Lincoln National Corporation v. Kent G. Anderson</i> , 110 U.S.P.Q.2d 1271, 2014 WL 879506 (T.T.A.B. 2014).....	52
<i>Lipton Indus., Inc. v. Ralston Purina Co.</i> , 670 F.2d 1024, 213 U.S.P.Q. 185 (C.C.P.A. 1982).....	21

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.