

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA93888**

Filing date: **08/09/2006**

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

Proceeding	91161747
Party	Defendant SnoWizard Holdings, Inc. SnoWizard Holdings, Inc. 101 River Road Jefferson, LA 70121
Correspondence Address	Seth M. Nehrbass Garvey, Smith, Nehrbass & Doody, LLC 3838 N. Causeway Blvd. Suite 3290 Metairie, LA 70002 UNITED STATES nehrbass@gsnd.us, nehrbass@aol.com
Submission	Opposition/Response to Motion
Filer's Name	Seth M. Nehrbass
Filer's e-mail	nehrbass@gsnn.us, nehrbass@aol.com
Signature	/smn/
Date	08/09/2006
Attachments	98876.16.ResponsetoMotions.pdf (3 pages)(39515 bytes)

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

P.C. Richard & Son Long Island Corp

v

SnoWizard Holdings, Inc.

Opposition No. 91161747

Serial No. 78/279177

Opposition No. 91163495

Serial No. 78279192

Atty. Docket No. I04113US (98876.16)

* * * * *

**APPLICANT'S RESPONSE to OPPOSER'S
MOTION TO COMPEL and MOTION TO SUSPEND**

Applicant, SnoWizard Holdings, Inc., through its attorneys, hereby makes its response to OPPOSER'S MOTION TO COMPEL and MOTION TO SUSPEND filed 25 July 2006 as follows:

SnoWizard moves to strike the 33-page memo filed 25 July 2006 as it does not comply with 37 CFR Section 2.127(a), which limits such a memo to 25 pages. See Ron Cauldwell Jewelry Inc. v. Clothestime Clothes Inc., 63 USPQ2d 2009, 2010 (TTAB 2002). This opposition proceeding is already burdensome on Applicant without Applicant being required to respond to lengthy memos which do not comply with TTAB rules.

SnoWizard respectfully requests that OPPOSER'S MOTION TO COMPEL and MOTION TO SUSPEND filed 25 July 2006 both be denied.

In the event that SnoWizard's motion to strike is not granted, and SnoWizard is not otherwise granted time to respond to the Motions filed 25 July 2006, SnoWizard makes a preliminary response as follows.

SnoWizard properly answered the interrogatories and document requests which were properly propounded. SnoWizard properly objected to many interrogatories as being unduly burdensome and not likely to lead to relevant discoverable matter. Also, SnoWizard properly objected to many interrogatories as calling for information protected by the attorney/client privilege and the attorney work-product doctrine. SnoWizard properly objected to many

requests as being unduly burdensome and not likely to lead to relevant discoverable matter. Also, SnoWizard properly objected to many requests as calling for information protected by the attorney/client privilege and the attorney work-product doctrine.

Applicant is in the business of selling snowball-related machines and supplies. It is believed that Opposer sells consumer electronics online. There is no likelihood of confusion by Applicant's use of the mark sought to be registered with its goods and services. It is believed that Opposer still had a few home electronics stores in New York and New Jersey at the beginning of this opposition proceeding, but Opposer's answer to an interrogatory indicates that it only operates online now (see below:

"Interrogatory No. 6:

Identify the cities and states of Opposer 's current places of business at which it uses the designation "Nobody Beats the Wiz".

PCRICHARD promotes its goods/services in all 50 states, and has sold goods/services in most, if not all 50 states."). Applicant and Opposer are not competitors, and the information and things sought by Opposer but not provided by Applicant are not relevant to this proceeding, would be unduly burdensome to provide, and are not likely to lead to relevant discoverable matter. Also, some of the information and things sought by Opposer but not provided by Applicant are protected by the attorney/client privilege and the attorney work-product doctrine. It appears that Opposer is trying to wear down Applicant with excessive discovery and unreasonable demands for additional discovery. Opposer's mark is simply not famous, and through this proceeding Opposer is simply trying to garner more protection for its mark than the law provides. Applicant would like for the proceedings not to be suspended. Rather, Applicant would like for the proceedings to conclude as soon as possible.

Applicant respectfully requests that OPPOSER'S MOTION TO COMPEL and MOTION TO SUSPEND filed 25 July 2006 be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

/smn/

Seth M. Nehrbass, Reg. No. 31,281,

Nehrbass@aol.com, SethNehrbass@gsnn.us

Charles C. Garvey, Jr., Reg. No. 27,889

Gregory C. Smith, Reg. No. 29,441
Brett A. North, Reg. No. 42,040
GARVEY, SMITH, NEHRBASS & NORTH, L.L.C.
Lakeway Three Building
3838 N. Causeway Blvd., Suite 3290
Metairie, LA 70002
Phone: (504) 835-2000; Fax: (504) 835-2070
Attorneys for Applicant

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being served electronically and is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to:
Celeste Butera and Ed Mangano
Rivkin Radler LLP
EAB Plaza - 10th Flr West Twr
Uniondale, NY 11556-0111
(516) 357-3356
celeste.butera@rivkin.com, edward.mangano@rivkin.com, on August 9, 2006.

/smn/
Seth M. Nehrbass

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being filed electronically and/or is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to:

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
Trademark Trial and Appeal Board
P.O. Box 1451
Alexandria, VA 22313-1451, on August 9, 2006.

/smn/
Seth M. Nehrbass

P:\Seth2006\98876.16.ResponsetoMotions.wpd (WP)
_____ .pdf (Adobe)