

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA702427**

Filing date: **10/15/2015**

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

Proceeding	92057500
Party	Plaintiff Orbis Distribution, Inc.
Correspondence Address	JOHN M BOLGER BOLGER LEGAL GROUP LLC PO BOX 170616 WHITEFISH BAY, WI 53217 UNITED STATES John@BolgerLegalGroup.com
Submission	Motion for Summary Judgment
Filer's Name	John M. Bolger
Filer's e-mail	john@bolgerlegalgroup.com
Signature	/John M. Bolger/
Date	10/15/2015
Attachments	Motion for Summary Judgment. 10.15.15.pdf(695864 bytes )

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

In the Matter of Trademark Application Serial Number: 78/368710  
Registration Number: 3197276  
For the Mark: Bee Naturals

Orbis Distribution, Inc,  
Plaintiff,

v.

Bee Naturals, Inc.,  
Defendant.

Cancellation Number:  
92057500

**PLAINTIFF’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND BRIEF IN SUPPORT**

Because the solely remaining issues before the Board are a legal matters, this Cancellation proceeding is appropriate for summary judgment.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, the Plaintiff requests that the Board decide the remaining legal issues.

**INTRODUCTION**

This matter concerns the most basis aspects of the federal laws governing trademark registration and maintenance: (1) use in commerce, and (2) ownership of a mark.

First, in order to maintain a federal trademark registration in the United States, a mark must be used in continuous lawful commerce during the five to six year period prior to the submission of the declaration of use document. The Defendant was administratively dissolved for nearly nine consecutive years of the “Bee Naturals” mark’s registration and was unable to use its mark in commerce as a matter of law. Thus, the mark must be cancelled.

In its Answer, the Defendant has admitted all material aspects of the Plaintiff’s case regarding administrative dissolution and use in commerce. The Defendant has exclusively relied

---

<sup>1</sup> The parties have exchanged Initial Disclosures and had a Discovery Conference.

on a defensive argument in its Answer that Missouri law allows for rescission of the corporation and that said rescission of a corporation somehow makes illegal commerce during its period of dissolution legal. However, that argument is contrary to the United States Code, decisions of the Federal Circuit, the Missouri statutes, and decisions of the Missouri Court of Appeals and Federal Courts. Furthermore, the Missouri rescission statute was repealed in 1990.

Second, at the time of filing the Combined Declaration of Use and Incontestability, a registrant must be the owner of the mark, pursuant to federal trademark law. In this case, the Defendant could not have used the mark in commerce; thus, it was not an owner of the mark as a matter of law, and the mark must be cancelled.

The Defendant's case fails both of these basic areas of law. Each one of these carries the same penalty—cancellation of the mark; therefore, the Plaintiff is only required to prove one in order for the mark to be cancelled.

## **FACTS**

The following facts are undisputed.

### I. Facts Regarding Use in Commerce and Administrative Dissolution

The Defendant has admitted it was administratively dissolved. (Defendant's Answer, ¶¶24-25.) The Defendant was administratively dissolved in 2006. (Exhibits A-E.) The mark was registered in 2007. (TSDR, Serial Number 78368710, Registration Certificate.) The Defendant did not reinstate its company until April 29, 2014. (TTAB Record.)

The Defendant has admitted that a corporation when dissolved cannot carry on any business. (Defendant's Answer, ¶26.) Specifically, the Defendant answered two allegations by admitting that Missouri does not authorize an administratively dissolved corporation to carry on business except to wind up and liquidate its business and referenced two section of the Missouri

statutes in support. (Id. at ¶¶24, 26.) Sections 351.476 and 351.486 of the Missouri Statutes are incorporated into the Defendant's Answer. (Id.) The Defendant also admitted the following allegations of the Complaint:

24. As shown on the Missouri Secretary of State Business Name History webpage, the relevant part of which is attached hereto as Exhibit B, the business BeeNaturals, Inc. had been previously administratively dissolved and did not exist as a legal entity as of July 10, 2013. [ADMITTED as to Administrative Dissolution.]

25. As shown on the Administrative Dissolution or Revocation for a For-Profit Corporation dated December 29, 2006, attached hereto as Exhibit D, BeeNaturals, Inc. was administratively dissolved or revoked under relevant Missouri law "as of December 29, 2006." [ADMITTED as to Administrative Dissolution or Revocation.]

26. As shown on the Administrative Dissolution or Revocation for a For-Profit Corporation dated December 29, 2006, attached hereto as Exhibit D, BeeNaturals, Inc., due to its administrative dissolution, cannot (as of 2006) carry on any business except that necessary to wind up and liquidate its business and affairs. [ADMITTED BY DEFENDANT, except for the year 2006.]

27. Pursuant to the Trademark Act, an owner must be a legal entity or person in order to maintain a trademark registration. [ADMITTED BY DEFENDANT.]

28. Pursuant to the Trademark Act, an owner must be a legal entity or person in order to file a Combined Declaration under Section 8 and Section 15. [ADMITTED BY DEFENDANT.]

(Petition to Cancel, ¶¶24-28.) Specifically, this is how the Defendant answered allegations 24-28 of the Complaint:

24. Defendant **admits that the corporation has been administratively dissolved** subject to rescission; however, under Missouri law, this does not mean the corporation ceases to exist. RSMO 351.486.

25. Denied. **The corporation was administratively dissolved or revoked**, subject to rescission.

26. **It is admitted that Missouri does not authorize an administratively dissolved corporation to carry on business except to wind up and liquidate its business as in RSMO 351.476.** The parenthetical "(as of 2006)" in paragraph 26 is denied.

27. **Admitted.**

28. **Admitted.**

Answer, ¶¶24-29. (Emphases added.)

## II. Facts Regarding Ownership

As the Board found in its Decision of June 14, 2014, the respondent has put forth the contention that it alone owned the mark, and “the record now supports respondent’s contention that BeeNaturals Inc. is the sole owner of the registration . . . .” (Decision, June 14, 2014, 5.)

## LAW

### **Introduction: Summary Judgment and Abandonment**

#### A. The Law of Summary Judgment

Motion for summary judgment is appropriate where “the pleadings . . . show that there is no genuine issue as to any material fact and that the moving party is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.” Trademark Trial and Appeal Board Manual of Procedure, § 528.01 (2014)(citations omitted).

The purpose . . . [is] to avoid an unnecessary trial where there is no genuine issue of material fact and more evidence than is already available in connection with the summary judgment motion could not reasonably be expected to change the result in the case. . . . [T]he Board does not hesitate to dispose of cases on summary judgment when appropriate.

Id. (citations omitted).

A party moving for summary judgment has the burden of demonstrating the absence of any genuine issue of material fact, and that it is entitled to judgment as a matter of law . . . [which] may be met by showing “that there is an absence of evidence to support the nonmoving party’s case.” If the moving party meets its burden, that is, if the moving party has supported its motion with affidavits or other evidence which if unopposed would establish its right to judgment, the nonmoving party may not rest on mere denials or conclusory assertions, but rather must proffer countering evidence, by affidavit or as otherwise provided in Fed. R. Civ. P. 56, showing that there is a genuine factual dispute for trial.

Id. (citations omitted).

A factual dispute is genuine only if, on the evidence of record, a reasonable fact finder could resolve the matter in favor of the nonmoving party. . . . A fact is material if it “may affect the decision, whereby the finding of that

# 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.