

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA1118356**

Filing date: **03/04/2021**

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

Proceeding	92071109
Party	Defendant Majik Medecine, LLC
Correspondence Address	BLYNN L SHIDELER THE BLK LAW GROUP 3500 BROOKTREE ROAD, SUITE 200 WEXFORD, PA 15090 UNITED STATES Primary Email: blynn@blkLawGroup.com 724-934-5450
Submission	Motion to Suspend for Civil Action
Filer's Name	Blynn Shideler
Filer's email	Blynn@BLKLawGroup.com
Signature	/Blynn L. Shideler/
Date	03/04/2021
Attachments	OppositiontoMotiontoStayMARCH2021.pdf(83663 bytes) EXHIBITFirstRequestforDiscoveryJanuary22FINAL2021.pdf(141643 bytes) EXHIBITInitialDisclosurePetitioner.pdf(14250 bytes)

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

CBDMD, LLC

Cancellation Proceeding # 92071109

Plaintiff/Petitioner

Registration # 5173264

-v-

Majik Medecine, LLC,

Defendant/ Registrant

Registrant's Opposition to Petitioner's Motion to Stay Proceeding Pending Outcome of Civil Action

This filing is an opposition to **Petitioner's Motion to Stay Proceeding Pending Outcome of Civil Action** filed February 12, 2021 (paper 33).

This filing is made concurrently with i) a **Motion for Summary Judgement** and ii) a **Motion to Compel Discovery**. The **Motion to Compel Discovery** relates to Registrants interrogatories and request for production of documents contained in the "**Registrant's first request for Admissions, set of Interrogatories and Request for production of documents directed to Petitioner CBDMD, LLC**" (hereinafter Registrant's First Request attached hereto as an exhibit) which was properly properly served upon counsel for Petitioner on January 22, 2021. The **Motion to Compel Discovery** filing does not address the Request for Admissions contained in the Registrant's First Request, which are deemed admitted by operation of law pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 36(a)(3).

These three filings are interrelated but are separated in accordance with the guidance of TBMP 502.02(b), although the following background is generally repeated verbatim in all these filings.

BACKGROUND

This action remains a blatant attempt of a multimillion dollar corporation, now known as cbdMD, Inc (the managing member of the Petitioner¹) to usurp the legitimate prior trademark rights of a smaller competitor.

The Petitioner was formed November 26, 2018 by Level Brands, Inc after Level Brands, Inc. was advised to cease and desist from using marks confusing similar to the Registrant's mark, CBD MD.² The Petitioner's very name, CBDMD, LLC (now CBD Industries LLC), was selected to unfairly usurp the rights of the Registrant and in violation of federal and state unfair competition laws. The name of the managing member of Petitioner was changed from Level Brands, Inc. to cbdMD, Inc in the spring of 2019³ to unfairly usurp the rights of the Registrant and in violation of federal and state unfair competition laws and further at a time well after it was formally advised to cease and desist from using marks confusing similar to the Registrant's mark CBD MD and.

The Petitioner filed this cancellation proceeding in bad faith to drive up the legal fees of the Registrant. Marty Sumachrist, chairman of the Board of Directors and CoCEO of cbdMD, Inc., made this strategy clear when he sent a text message to a member of

¹ Admission No.3 of Registrant's First Request

²Admission No.2 of Registrant's First Request

³ Admission No. 11 of Registrant's First Request

Registrant stating “I hope your shareholders like to write checks to lawyers.”⁴ The initial pleadings of the Petitioner were so deficient that the Board noted in the Order of December 30, 2019 (paper #13 – Granting Defendant’s motion to dismiss on 7 of 9 grounds and denying the motion on two remaining grounds) that the “abundance of deficiencies in the pleadings appears to demonstrate a lack of reasonable inquiry into the subject matter.”

The Plaintiff filed a Corrected Amended Complaint which in paragraphs 61-63 baselessly asserted that that the “phrase CBD MD is a commonly used descriptive phrase that connotes information on products which include CBD as an ingredient” (Emphasis Added). The Petitioner concludes therein that the “CBD MD mark is incapable of distinguishing the goods of [Registrant] from the goods of others and therefore cannot function as a trademark and an indicator of source.” The Petitioner had, and still has, no basis to support this assertion which was raised in bad faith solely to harass the Defendant and increase their costs in defending this baseless claim.

The Defendants sought to engage in a discovery conference, in which, in accordance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(f)(2), “the parties must consider the nature and basis of their claims.” The Plaintiff further evidenced their bad faith filing of this case and their complete disinterest in prosecuting the merits of this action when for several months through November 16, 2020 they failed to cooperate with the Defendant to even schedule the required Discovery Conference. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 2.120(h)(1) the Defendant

⁴ Admission Nos. 77-78 of Registrant’s First Request

filed a Motion for Sanctions on November 16, 2020 against Plaintiff for its failure to participate in the required Discovery Conference.

The Plaintiff's counsel contacted the undersigned only after the filing of the Motion for Sanctions. The Parties then hastily conducted an extremely brief Discovery Conference, that the undersigned considers so brief and unavailing as not believed to be within the spirit or meaning of the rules. In the Discovery Conference when discussing the cancellation grounds that the "CBD MD mark is incapable of distinguishing the goods of [Registrant] from the goods of others and therefore cannot function as a trademark and an indicator of source" because "phrase CBD MD is a commonly used descriptive phrase that connotes information on products which include CBD as an ingredient," the Plaintiff's counsel would provide the undersigned no details or hint of supporting material.

The Order of January 8, 2021 (Paper 30) set a deadline for the Parties' Initial Disclosures to be due on January 11, 2021. On Monday January 11, 2021 the Registrant sent their initial disclosure to the Petitioner. On this court set deadline, the Plaintiff again evidenced their bad faith filing of this case and their complete disinterest in prosecuting the merits of this action when they made no disclosures to the Registrant and did not contact the undersigned on or prior to this deadline regarding this submission.

On Wednesday January 22, 2021 The Registrant served the Registrant's First Request upon Petitioner's counsel, which included requesting the identification and submission (Or making the materials available for inspection) of the materials that could form the Plaintiff's initial disclosures. The Plaintiff was required to file a response to these discovery requests ON OR BEFORE **February 22, 2021**. The Plaintiff again

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.