

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA586083**

Filing date: **02/07/2014**

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

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Proceeding             | 92057839   |
| Party                  | Defendant<br>Kris Kaszuba  |
| Correspondence Address | KRIS KASZUBA<br>2683 VIA DE LA VALLE, SUITE G-Z46<br>DEL MAR, CA 92014-1961<br>UNITED STATES<br>kris@vip9.com  |
| Submission             | Other Motions/Papers   |
| Filer's Name           | Kris Kaszuba   |
| Filer's e-mail         | kris002@hotmail.com  |
| Signature              | /kk/   |
| Date                   | 02/07/2014   |
| Attachments            | Reply to P's Response to Motion To Dismiss Coyote Cancellation 92057839 Feb 6 2014.pdf(402991 bytes )<br>Griffin Jury Verdict Feb 5 2014.pdf(1268831 bytes ) |

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

|   |   |                                |
|---|---|--------------------------------|
| <b>Bruce Griffin, Plaintiff</b>             | ) |                                |
| <b>v.</b>                                   | ) | <b>Cancellation Proceeding</b> |
| <b>Kris Kaszuba, Defendant / Respondent</b> | ) | <b>No. 92057839</b>            |

**RESPONDENT’S REPLY TO PETITIONER’S RESPONSE TO  
MOTION TO DISMISS THE CANCELLATION PETITION**

Re: COYOTE Trademark, Serial No. 78566406, Registration No. 3379325

**BACKGROUND and INTRODUCTION**

Respondent is replying to Petitioner’s Response to Respondent’s MOTION TO DISMISS the CANCELLATION PETITION for his trademark COYOTE Registration No. 3379325 which was registered on Feb. 05, 2008. Respondent does not agree with the Petitioner’s Response.

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS & AUTHORITIES**

Petitioner’s RESPONSE does not comply with TBMP and the U.S. Trademark Act due to the three following points.

Firstly, Petitioner’s Response is not dated, thus not in compliance with TBMP and the U.S. Trademark Act.

Secondly, Petitioner’s Response, “Certificate of Service” is not dated and was not mailed as “certified” mail.

Thirdly, Petitioner’s Response does not contain a Memorandum of Points and Authorities and

is not in compliance with TBMP and the U.S. Trademark Act, 37 CFR § 2.119.

Therefore the Petitioner's Response is not valid and should not be entered or considered.

Bruce Griffin, the Petitioner has no standing to submit a cancellation petition.

Petitioner has no standing to maintain a cancellation petition.

Petitioner has submitted a fraudulent trademark application with his Coyote Engines, with a First Use Anywhere Date of "at least as early as 11/00/1990 and First Use In Commerce Date of "at least as early as 11/00/1990.

Attached as an Exhibit in Respondent's Motion to Dismiss is the Order of Judge Barbara Lynn, U.S. District Court, Northern District of Texas dated March 13, 2013, Case No. 3:11-CV-1046M wherein Bruce Griffin was a Defendant against The Tranman, Inc et al.

The ORDER and findings of Judge Lynn state as follows:

"Plaintiffs contend that, shortly before his termination (2011), Griffin and Defendant Craig Fenderson ("Fenderson") began their own automotive repair business called Coyote Engines and Transmissions ("Coyote Engines") and created the website [www.coyoteengines.com](http://www.coyoteengines.com) for the purpose of promoting their new business. Griffin also allegedly began promoting Coyote Engines to Plaintiffs' clients and business partners while using Plaintiffs' truck."

Petitioner, Bruce Griffin has committed fraud on the USPTO and has no standing to submit a Cancellation Petition.

Bruce Griffin does not solely own 100% of Coyote Engines.

Petitioner has a very recent partner as of 2011 being Craig Fenderson who is a co-owner of Coyote Engines.

With full knowledge of the above fraudulent dates and statements, the Petitioner's Attorney has no standing or right to represent the Petitioner before the TTAB or the USPTO as per the Professional Rules of Conduct.

The Oregon Code of Professional Responsibilities as approved by the Oregon Supreme Court



state as follows:

DR 1-102 Misconduct; Responsibility for Acts of Others

(A) It is professional misconduct for a lawyer to:

- (1) Violate these disciplinary rules, knowingly assist or induce another to do so, or do so through the acts of another;
- (2) Commit a criminal act that reflects adversely on the lawyer's honesty, trustworthiness or fitness to practice law;
- (3) Engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit or misrepresentation;
- (4) Engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice;

It appears that Plaintiff's Attorney is not in conformity with DR 1-102 (A) (3) AND (4).

Plaintiff's Attorney should withdraw as required by the Oregon Code DR 2-110 (B) "Mandatory withdrawal".

A lawyer representing a client before a tribunal, with its permission if required by its rules, shall withdraw from employment, and a lawyer representing a client in other matters shall withdraw from employment, if:

- (1) The lawyer knows or it is obvious that the lawyer's client is bringing the legal action, conducting the defense, or asserting a position in the litigation, or is otherwise having steps taken for the client, merely for the purpose of harassing or maliciously injuring any other person.
- (2) The lawyer knows or it is obvious that the lawyer's continued employment will result in violation of a Disciplinary Rule.

Yesterday on February 5, 2014, a U.S District Court Texas jury found the Petitioner, Bruce Griffin & co-defendant GUILTY of Injury to Reputation, Breach of Fiduciary Duty, aiding and abetting Breach of Fiduciary Duty and Conversion against The Tranman, Inc., Bruce Griffin's former employer.

A copy of the Verdict and Judge's Order is attached hereto consisting of 17 pages.

On the cover page of the Jury Verdict, the Defendants are Bruce Griffin and Craig Fenderson d/b/a Coyote Engines and Transmissions.

Each Defendant was found guilty and fined \$287,200 each and jointly fined an additional

\$102,800.

Both Defendants, Griffin and Fenderson are referenced in the Court documents as co-owners of Coyote Engines.

Only one owner "Bruce Griffin" applied to register Coyote Engines as a trademark in 2011 when the two owned and operated Coyote Engines and Transmissions.

Legally, based on this court case and lawsuit and the ownership, Craig Fenderson is a co-owner of their proposed mark. Fenderson has not been included in the Coyote Engines application.

Fenderson as co-Petitioner is absent from the Petitioner's trademark and this Petition.

This is additional evidence and proof that the Petitioner, Bruce Griffin has no standing to submit the Cancellation Petition without his co-owner, Craig Fenderson.

One additional point is that Mr. Luke Brean in his email to Respondent dated December 18, 2013 has admitted that:

"the only reason it (Cancellation) was filed was because your earlier registered mark is blocking my client's current trademark application for Coyote Engines".

This "reason" is not a bona fide reason or good faith reason for submitting a Cancellation Petition.

Furthermore, this may be viewed as an attempt to blackmail the owner of a registered mark with the USPTO. This too is unprofessional and unethical conduct before the TTAB and the USPTO.

The Respondent has shown and the above prima facie evidence proves that the Petitioner has committed a fraud on the USPTO. The above referenced lawsuit, Judge's Order and findings and Jury Verdict are conclusive proof and evidence that:

- 1) The Plaintiff Bruce Griffin did not use or own Coyote Engines in 1990.
- 2) Plaintiff Bruce Griffin and Craig Fenderson formed Coyote Engines in 2011 as per Judge Lynn's findings and Order.

# 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.