

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (USPTO)
OFFICE ACTION (OFFICIAL LETTER) ABOUT APPLICANT'S TRADEMARK APPLICATION

U.S. APPLICATION SERIAL NO. 79193577

MARK:

79193577

CORRESPONDENT ADDRESS:

Patrade A/S
Fredens Torv 3A
DK-8000 Aarhus C
DENMARK

CLICK HERE TO RESPOND TO THIS LETTER:

http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/teas/response_forms.jsp

APPLICANT: HUMMEL HOLDING A/S

CORRESPONDENT'S REFERENCE/DOCKET NO:

N/A

CORRESPONDENT E-MAIL ADDRESS:

OFFICE ACTION

INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION NO. 1313403

STRICT DEADLINE TO RESPOND TO THIS NOTIFICATION: TO AVOID ABANDONMENT OF THE REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF PROTECTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION, THE USPTO MUST RECEIVE A COMPLETE RESPONSE TO THIS PROVISIONAL FULL REFUSAL NOTIFICATION **WITHIN 6 MONTHS** OF THE "DATE ON WHICH THE NOTIFICATION WAS SENT TO WIPO (MAILING DATE)" LOCATED ON THE WIPO COVER LETTER ACCOMPANYING THIS NOTIFICATION.

In addition to the Mailing Date appearing on the WIPO cover letter, a holder (hereafter "applicant") may confirm this Mailing Date using the USPTO's Trademark Status and Document Retrieval (TSDR) system at <http://tsdr.uspto.gov/>. To do so, enter the U.S. application serial number for this application and then select "Documents." The Mailing Date used to calculate the response deadline for this provisional full refusal is the "Create/Mail Date" of the "IB-1st Refusal Note."

This is a **PROVISIONAL FULL REFUSAL** of the request for extension of protection of the mark in the above-referenced U.S. application. See 15 U.S.C. §1141h(c). See below in this notification (hereafter "Office action") for details regarding the provisional full refusal.

The referenced application has been reviewed by the assigned trademark examining attorney. Applicant must respond timely and completely to the issue(s) below. 15 U.S.C. §1062(b); 37 C.F.R. §§2.62(a), 2.65(a); TMEP §§711, 718.03.

SUMMARY OF ISSUES:

- SECTION 2(d) REFUSAL – LIKELIHOOD OF CONFUSION
- DESCRIPTION OF MARK REQUIRED

SECTION 2(d) REFUSAL – LIKELIHOOD OF CONFUSION

Registration of the applied-for mark is refused because of a likelihood of confusion with the mark in U.S. Registration No. 3115250. Trademark Act Section 2(d), 15 U.S.C. §1052(d); see TMEP §§1207.01 *et seq.* See the attached registration.

The applicant has applied for the stylized design mark in the nature of two angular bands on the side of a shoe for goods identified as "footwear."

Registration No. 3115250 is for the stylized design mark in the nature of two angular bands on the side of a shoe for goods identified as "footwear."

Trademark Act Section 2(d) bars registration of an applied-for mark that so resembles a registered mark that it is likely a potential consumer would be confused, mistaken, or deceived as to the source of the goods and/or services of the applicant and registrant. See 15 U.S.C. §1052(d). A determination of likelihood of confusion under Section 2(d) is made on a case-by-case basis and the factors set forth in *In re E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 476 F.2d 1357, 1361, 177 USPQ 563, 567 (C.C.P.A. 1973) aid in this determination. *Citigroup Inc. v. Capital City Bank Grp., Inc.*, 637 F.3d 1344, 1349, 98 USPQ2d 1253, 1256 (Fed. Cir. 2011) (citing *On-Line Careline, Inc. v. Am. Online, Inc.*, 229 F.3d 1080, 1085, 56 USPQ2d 1471, 1474 (Fed. Cir. 2000)). Not all the *du Pont* factors, however, are necessarily relevant or of equal weight, and any one of the factors may control in a given case, depending upon the evidence of record. *Citigroup Inc. v. Capital City Bank Grp., Inc.*, 637 F.3d at 1355, 98 USPQ2d at 1260; *In re Majestic Distilling Co.*, 315 F.3d 1311, 1315, 65 USPQ2d 1201, 1204 (Fed. Cir. 2003); see *In re E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 476 F.2d at 1361-62, 177 USPQ at 567.

In this case, the following factors are the most relevant: similarity of the marks, similarity and nature of the goods, and similarity of the trade channels of the goods. See *In re Viterro Inc.*, 671 F.3d 1358, 1361-62, 101 USPQ2d 1905, 1908 (Fed. Cir. 2012); *In re Dakin's Miniatures Inc.*, 59 USPQ2d 1593, 1595-96 (TTAB 1999); TMEP §§1207.01 *et seq.*

In any likelihood of confusion determination, two key considerations are similarity of the marks and similarity or relatedness of the goods. *In re*

Aquamar, Inc., 115 USPQ2d 1122, 1126 (TTAB 2015) (citing *Federated Foods, Inc. v. Fort Howard Paper Co.*, 544 F.2d 1098, 1103, 192 USPQ 24, 29 (C.C.P.A. 1976)); *In re Iolo Techs., LLC*, 95 USPQ2d 1498, 1499 (TTAB 2010); see TMEP §1207.01. That is, the marks are compared in their entireties for similarities in appearance, sound, connotation, and commercial impression. *In re Viterra Inc.*, 671 F.3d 1358, 1362, 101 USPQ2d 1905, 1908 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (quoting *In re E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 476 F.2d 1357, 1361, 177 USPQ 563, 567 (C.C.P.A. 1973)); TMEP §1207.01(b)-(b)(v). Additionally, the goods are compared to determine whether they are similar or commercially related or travel in the same trade channels. See *Coach Servs., Inc. v. Triumph Learning LLC*, 668 F.3d 1356, 1369-71, 101 USPQ2d 1713, 1722-23 (Fed. Cir. 2012); *Herbko Int'l, Inc. v. Kappa Books, Inc.*, 308 F.3d 1156, 1165, 64 USPQ2d 1375, 1381 (Fed. Cir. 2002); TMEP §1207.01, (a)(vi).

COMPARISON OF MARKS

Marks are compared in their entireties for similarities in appearance, sound, connotation, and commercial impression. *Stone Lion Capital Partners, LP v. Lion Capital LLP*, 746 F.3d 1317, 1321, 110 USPQ2d 1157, 1160 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (quoting *Palm Bay Imps., Inc. v. Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin Maison Fondée En 1772*, 396 F.3d 1369, 1371, 73 USPQ2d 1689, 1691 (Fed. Cir. 2005)); TMEP §1207.01(b)-(b)(v). “Similarity in any one of these elements may be sufficient to find the marks confusingly similar.” *In re Davia*, 110 USPQ2d 1810, 1812 (TTAB 2014) (citing *In re 1st USA Realty Prof'ls, Inc.*, 84 USPQ2d 1581, 1586 (TTAB 2007)); *In re White Swan Ltd.*, 8 USPQ2d 1534, 1535 (TTAB 1988)); TMEP §1207.01(b).

When comparing marks, the test is not whether the marks can be distinguished in a side-by-side comparison, but rather whether the marks are sufficiently similar in terms of their overall commercial impression that confusion as to the source of the goods offered under the respective marks is likely to result. *Midwestern Pet Foods, Inc. v. Societe des Produits Nestle S.A.*, 685 F.3d 1046, 1053, 103 USPQ2d 1435, 1440 (Fed. Cir. 2012); *In re Bay State Brewing Co.*, 117 USPQ2d 1958, 1960 (TTAB 2016) (quoting *Coach Servs., Inc. v. Triumph Learning LLC*, 668 F.3d 1356, 1368, 101 USPQ2d 1713, 1721 (Fed. Cir. 2012)); TMEP §1207.01(b). The proper focus is on the recollection of the average purchaser, who retains a general rather than specific impression of trademarks. *In re Bay State Brewing Co.*, 117 USPQ2d at 1960 ((citing *Spoons Rests., Inc. v. Morrison, Inc.*, 23 USPQ2d 1735, 1741 (TTAB 1991), *aff'd per curiam*, 972 F.2d 1353 (Fed. Cir. 1992)); *In re C.H. Hanson Co.*, 116 USPQ2d 1351, 1353 (TTAB 2015) (citing *Joel Gott Wines LLC v. Rehoboth Von Gott Inc.*, 107 USPQ2d 1424, 1430 (TTAB 2013)); TMEP §1207.01(b).

When the marks at issue are both design marks, similarity of the marks is determined primarily on the basis of visual similarity. See, e.g., *Volkswagenwerk Aktiengesellschaft v. Rose 'Vear Enters.*, 592 F.2d 1180, 1183, 201 USPQ 7, 9 (C.C.P.A. 1979) (quoting *In re ATV Network Ltd.*, 552 F.2d 925, 929, 193 USPQ 331, 332 (C.C.P.A. 1977)); *Ft. James Operating Co. v. Royal Paper Converting Inc.*, 83 USPQ2d 1624, 1628 (TTAB 2007); TMEP §1207.01(c). However, a side-by-side comparison is not the test. See *Grandpa Pidgeon's of Mo., Inc. v. Borgsmiller*, 477 F.2d 586, 587, 177 USPQ 573, 574 (C.C.P.A. 1973). When comparing design marks, the focus is on the overall commercial impression conveyed by such marks, not on specific differences. See *Grandpa Pidgeon's of Mo., Inc. v. Borgsmiller*, 477 F.2d at 587, 177 USPQ at 574; *In re Triple R Mfg. Corp.*, 168 USPQ 447, 448 (TTAB 1970); TMEP §1207.01(c).

In this case, the applied-for mark is similar to the registered mark because both marks are formed of two angular bands displayed on the side of a shoe. The bands of both marks are substantially parallel to each other, are displayed in the same location on the side of a shoe and are both formed of a pointed arc. Thus the overall commercial impression of each of the marks is the same – two curved angular bars displayed on the side of a shoe.

Thus the applied for mark is similar to the registered mark.

COMPARISON OF GOODS

When analyzing an applicant's and registrant's goods and/or services for similarity and relatedness, that determination is based on the description of the goods and/or services stated in the application and registration at issue, not on extrinsic evidence of actual use. See *Octocom Sys. Inc. v. Hous. Computers Servs. Inc.*, 918 F.2d 937, 942, 16 USPQ2d 1783, 1787 (Fed. Cir. 1990); see also *Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Packard Press Inc.*, 281 F.3d 1261, 1267, 62 USPQ2d 1001, 1004 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

Absent restrictions in an application and/or registration, the identified goods and/or services are presumed to travel in the same channels of trade to the same class of purchasers. *Citigroup Inc. v. Capital City Bank Grp., Inc.*, 637 F.3d 1344, 1356, 98 USPQ2d 1253, 1261 (Fed. Cir. 2011); *Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Packard Press Inc.*, 281 F.3d at 1268, 62 USPQ2d at 1005. Additionally, unrestricted and broad identifications are presumed to encompass all goods and/or services of the type described. See *In re Jump Designs*, 80 USPQ2d 1370, 1374 (TTAB 2006); *In re Linkvest S.A.*, 24 USPQ2d 1716, 1716 (TTAB 1992).

In this case, the identifications set forth in the application and registration(s) are identical and have no restrictions as to nature, type, channels of trade, or classes of purchasers. Therefore, it is presumed that these goods and/or services travel in all normal channels of trade, and are available to the same class of purchasers. See *Midwestern Pet Foods, Inc. v. Societe des Produits Nestle S.A.*, 685 F.3d 1046, 1053, 103 USPQ2d 1435, 1440 (Fed. Cir. 2012). Accordingly, the goods and/or services of applicant and the registrant(s) are considered related for purposes of the likelihood of confusion analysis.

Thus as the applicant's mark is similar to the registrant's mark, and as the goods are related, there is a likelihood of confusion as to the source of the applicant's goods. The applied for mark is thus not entitled to registration under Section 2(d).

Although applicant's mark has been refused registration, applicant may respond to the refusal(s) by submitting evidence and arguments in support of registration.

If applicant responds to the refusal(s), applicant must also respond to the requirement(s) set forth below.

DESCRIPTION OF MARK REQUIRED

The applied-for mark is not in standard characters and applicant did not provide a description of the mark with the initial application. Applications for marks not in standard characters must include an accurate and concise description of the entire mark that identifies literal elements as well as any design elements. *See* 37 C.F.R. §2.37; TMEP §§808.01, 808.02, 808.03(b).

Therefore, applicant must provide a description of the applied-for mark. Further, the drawing includes broken or dotted lines which are generally used to show the position of the mark on the goods. 37 C.F.R. §2.52(b)(4); TMEP §§807.08, 1202.02(c)(i). The applicant has also indicated that the applied-for mark is not a three dimensional mark. Thus the following description of the mark is suggested, if accurate:

The mark consists of two angular bands on the side of a shoe. The broken lines are used to indicate the position of the mark and are not a feature of the mark.

ADVISORY – FOREIGN ATTORNEY MAY NOT REPRESENT APPLICANTS AT USPTO

The application indicates that a foreign attorney either represents applicant and/or has been identified as the correspondent in this application. When responding to this Office action, please note that the only attorneys who may sign responses and otherwise practice before the USPTO in trademark matters are as follows:

- (1) **Attorneys in good standing with a bar of the highest court of any U.S. state**, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and other U.S. commonwealths or U.S. territories; and
- (2) **Canadian agents/attorneys** who represent applicants located in Canada and (a) are registered with the USPTO and in good standing as patent agents or (b) have been granted reciprocal recognition by the USPTO.

See 37 C.F.R. §§2.17(a), (e), 2.62(b), 11.1, 11.14(a), (c); TMEP §§602, 712.01.

Foreign attorneys, other than authorized Canadian attorneys, are not permitted to represent applicants before the USPTO (e.g., file written communications, authorize an amendment to an application, or submit legal arguments in response to a requirement or refusal). *See* 37 C.F.R. §§2.17(e), 11.14(c), (e); TMEP §602.03-.03(c).

Unless the identified foreign attorney can establish that he or she is authorized under 37 C.F.R. §11.14, then this attorney is not authorized to practice before the USPTO in trademark matters and may not sign responses or otherwise represent applicant in this application. *See* 37 C.F.R. §2.62(b); TMEP §602.03(e). Any power of attorney to this foreign attorney is void *ab initio*. TMEP §602.03(e).

RESPONSE GUIDELINES

For this application to proceed further, applicant must explicitly address each refusal and/or requirement raised in this Office action. If the action includes a refusal, applicant may provide arguments and/or evidence as to why the refusal should be withdrawn and the mark should register. Applicant may also have other options specified in this Office action for responding to a refusal, and should consider those options carefully. To respond to requirements and certain refusal response options, applicant should set forth in writing the required changes or statements. For more information and general tips on responding to USPTO Office actions, response options, and how to file a response online, see [“Responding to Office Actions”](#) on the USPTO’s website.

If applicant does not respond to this Office action within six months of the date on which the USPTO sends this Office action to the International Bureau, or responds by expressly abandoning the application, the application process will end and the trademark will fail to register. *See* 15 U.S.C. §1062(b); 37 C.F.R. §§2.65(a), 2.68(a); TMEP §§711, 718.01, 718.02. Where the application has been abandoned for failure to respond to an Office action, applicant’s only option would be to file a timely petition to revive the application, which, if granted, would allow the application to return to active status. *See* 37 C.F.R. §2.66; TMEP §1714. There is a \$100 fee for such petitions. *See* 37 C.F.R. §§2.6(15), 2.66(b)(1).

If applicant has questions regarding this Office action, please telephone or e-mail the assigned trademark examining attorney. All relevant e-mail communications will be placed in the official application record; however, an e-mail communication will not be accepted as a response to this Office action and will not extend the deadline for filing a proper response. *See* 37 C.F.R. §§2.62(c), 2.191; TMEP §§304.01-.02, 709.04-.05. Further, although the trademark examining attorney may provide additional explanation pertaining to the refusal(s) and/or requirement(s) in this Office action, the trademark examining attorney may not provide legal advice or statements about applicant’s rights. *See* TMEP §§705.02, 709.06.

WHO IS PERMITTED TO RESPOND TO THIS PROVISIONAL FULL REFUSAL: Any response to this provisional refusal must be personally signed by an individual applicant, all joint applicants, or someone with legal authority to bind a juristic applicant (e.g., a corporate officer or general partner). 37 C.F.R. §§2.62(b), 2.193(e)(2)(ii); TMEP §712.01. If applicant hires a qualified U.S. attorney to respond on his or her behalf, then the attorney must sign the response. 37 C.F.R. §§2.193(e)(2)(i), 11.18(a); TMEP §§611.03(b), 712.01. Qualified U.S. attorneys include those in good standing with a bar of the highest court of any U.S. state, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and other U.S. commonwealths or U.S. territories. *See* 37 C.F.R. §§2.17(a), 2.62(b), 11.1, 11.14(a); TMEP §§602, 712.01. Additionally, for all responses, the proper signatory must personally sign the document or personally enter his or her electronic signature on the electronic filing. *See* 37 C.F.R. §2.193(a); TMEP §§611.01(b), 611.02. The name of the signatory must also be printed or typed immediately below or adjacent to the signature, or identified elsewhere in the filing. 37 C.F.R. §2.193(d); TMEP §611.01(b).

In general, foreign attorneys are not permitted to represent applicants before the USPTO (e.g., file written communications, authorize an amendment to an application, or submit legal arguments in response to a requirement or refusal). *See* 37 C.F.R. §11.14(c), (e); TMEP §§602.03-.03(b), 608.01.

DESIGNATION OF DOMESTIC REPRESENTATIVE: The USPTO encourages applicants who do not reside in the United States to designate a domestic representative upon whom any notice or process may be served. TMEP §610; *see* 15 U.S.C. §§1051(e), 1141h(d); 37 C.F.R. §2.24(a) (1)-(2). Such designations may be filed online at <http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/teas/correspondence.jsp>.

/Natalie L. Kenealy/
Examining Attorney
Law Office 104
571-272-7817
Natalie.Kenealy@uspto.gov

TO RESPOND TO THIS LETTER: Go to http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/teas/response_forms.jsp. Please wait 48-72 hours from the issue/ mailing date before using the Trademark Electronic Application System (TEAS), to allow for necessary system updates of the application. For *technical* assistance with online forms, e-mail TEAS@uspto.gov. For questions about the Office action itself, please contact the assigned trademark examining attorney. **E-mail communications will not be accepted as responses to Office actions; therefore, do not respond to this Office action by e-mail.**

All informal e-mail communications relevant to this application will be placed in the official application record.

WHO MUST SIGN THE RESPONSE: It must be personally signed by an individual applicant or someone with legal authority to bind an applicant (i.e., a corporate officer, a general partner, all joint applicants). If an applicant is represented by an attorney, the attorney must sign the response.

PERIODICALLY CHECK THE STATUS OF THE APPLICATION: To ensure that applicant does not miss crucial deadlines or official notices, check the status of the application every three to four months using the Trademark Status and Document Retrieval (TSDR) system at <http://tsdr.uspto.gov/>. Please keep a copy of the TSDR status screen. If the status shows no change for more than six months, contact the Trademark Assistance Center by e-mail at TrademarkAssistanceCenter@uspto.gov or call 1-800-786-9199. For more information on checking status, see <http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/process/status/>.

TO UPDATE CORRESPONDENCE/E-MAIL ADDRESS: Use the TEAS form at <http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/teas/correspondence.jsp>.

DESIGN MARK

Serial Number

78524474

Status

REGISTERED AND RENEWED

Registration Number

3115250

Date Registered

2006/07/11

Type of Mark

TRADEMARK

Register

PRINCIPAL

Mark Drawing Code

(2) DESIGN ONLY

Owner

CALERES, INC. CORPORATION NEW YORK 8300 MARYLAND AVENUE ST. LOUIS
MISSOURI 63105

Goods/Services

Class Status -- ACTIVE. IC 025. US 022 039. G & S: footwear.
First Use: 2005/01/10. First Use In Commerce: 2005/01/10.

Description of Mark

The mark consists of two angular bands on the side of a shoe. The broken lines show the position of the mark on the goods, but no claim is made to that depicted by the broken lines.

Colors Claimed

Color is not claimed as a feature of the mark.

Filing Date

2004/11/30

Examining Attorney

MCCRAY, RENEE

