

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA480391**

Filing date: **06/27/2012**

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

Proceeding	92055406
Party	Defendant Reginald C. Barrett
Correspondence Address	REGINALD C BARRETT 20 LAUREL HILL LANE, PO BOX 914 AMAGANSETT, NY 11930 UNITED STATES
Submission	Answer
Filer's Name	Todd Wengrovsky
Filer's e-mail	contact@twlegal.com
Signature	/Todd Wengrovsky/
Date	06/27/2012
Attachments	Barrett TTAB Answer 06272012 Filing.pdf (6 pages)(21589 bytes)

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

Proceeding Number: **92055406**

Registration No.: **3,883,715**

Mark: **(Logo in International Class 034)**

BOX TTAB
Commissioner for Trademarks
P.O. Box 1451
Alexandria, VA 22313-1451

**DEFENDANT'S ANSWER TO
PLAINTIFF'S PETITION TO CANCEL**

Defendant /Registrant Reginald Barrett, by his attorney Todd Wengrovsky, hereby responds to the petition letter filed by Plaintiff (the “Petition”), as follows:

1. Defendant denies the allegation identified as “(1)” in the Petition that *“the design descriptively suggests the applicant is a Native American, and that the products are Native American made products.”*

2. Defendant denies the allegation identified as “(2)” in the Petition that *“the design falsely suggests a connection with Native America.”*

3. Defendant denies the allegation identified as “(3)” in the Petition that *“the design application was a fraud upon the Patent and Trademark Office.”*

4. Furthermore, Defendant denies the unnumbered allegation on Page 2 of the Petition that *“Mr. Barrett went into competition against petitioner.”*

5. Defendant also denies the unnumbered allegation on Page 2 of the Petition that *“Petitioner has recently learned of Registration Number 3883715”* (emphasis added).

6. Finally, Defendant denies the unnumbered allegation on Page 2 of the Petition that the registration is petitioner’s earlier filed design *“with slight modification.”*

Defendant further states the following:

The parties to the present proceeding met in 2006 due to business unrelated to the present action. Petitioner happened to own a smoke shop at the time, and Defendant, originally from South Carolina, had contacts in the tobacco industry. Defendant therefore suggested a joint venture between the parties to develop a new cigarette brand. Defendant suggested several cigarette manufacturers and a graphic designer for the joint venture. Petitioner originally desired a foreign manufacturer for cost-cutting reasons, but Defendant selected a domestic manufacturer to insure the

highest quality product.

The parties then together developed a logo for a “SHINNECOCK BRAND” of cigarettes (hereinafter referred to as the “first logo”). Although Petitioner had *some* input in the contents of the first logo, Defendant later found out that Petitioner’s alleged contribution was taken directly from the Shinnecock Nation’s actual seal. In addition, the phrase “Made Under Sovereign Authority” was added by Petitioner, but was never wanted by Defendant. Petitioner represented that he had authority to use this language, but the usage of such language was later found to be inappropriate and indeed inaccurate.

Defendant’s contributions to the first logo were many, and included: (1) a unique large tan pipe with red and purple feathers in the foreground of the logo at issue; (2) a unique yellow and orange sunrise with a pink and white sky in the background of the image; and (3) a tobacco plant in the middle of the image.

Despite Defendant’s designing of the key components of the logo, Petitioner filed a trademark application including the first logo without Defendant’s knowledge and without Defendant being listed as a co-applicant. Consistent with such behavior, Petitioner also communicated directly with Defendant’s industry contacts without Defendant’s knowledge.

Following a falling out between the parties (largely due to the above-noted misrepresentations and behavior by Petitioner), Defendant left to develop his own product. At this time, Petitioner was not a manufacturer of cigarettes, and only owned the aforementioned retail location. Defendant then designed his own logo (hereinafter referred to as the “new logo”). The new logo used only the generic male native from the first logo and nothing else significant, but for the elements that had been designed by Defendant. With the new logo, and in his new business,

Defendant was acting privately and wholly independent from the Petitioner, the Shinnecock Nation, and any other entity.

As is well established in the record, Defendant then applied for and was granted Trademark Registration Number 3,883,715 for the new logo. It should be noted that Petitioner did not oppose the Registration, and did not protest Defendant's application publicly or privately in any way. In fact, Defendant's application was filed on May 27, 2009, nearly two years prior to the current Petition. Upon information and belief, Petitioner was well aware of Defendant's application long before the filing date of the present Petition and, without explanation, significantly delayed filing same.

Defendant also applied for and was granted a South Carolina state trademark for the new logo. In addition, Defendant applied for and was granted a New York state trademark for the new logo. Moreover, Defendant even applied for and was granted a Copyright Registration for the new logo, further solidifying his rights to the mark.

As for the commercialization of Defendant's product, Defendant uses a licensed and respected manufacturer for his SHINNEOCK BRAND. Furthermore, Defendant, in an abundance of caution, even uses a disclaimer on his packaging to the effect that his product is not in any way affiliated with or distributed by the Shinnecock Nation. Importantly, upon information and belief, the Shinnecock Nation was and is completely aware of Defendant's new logo and product. The Shinnecock Nation has filed nothing to challenge Defendant's Registration and has not objected to Defendant's logo or product in any way.

Due to all of the foregoing, it is disingenuous for Petitioner to assert that "*the design descriptively suggests the applicant is a Native American, and that the products are Native*

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.