

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA378419**

Filing date: **11/13/2010**

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

Proceeding	91167828
Party	Plaintiff Judith Mendez
Correspondence Address	SEAN M NOVAK NOVAK & BEN-COHEN LLP 8383 WILSHIRE BLVD, PH 1004 BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90211 UNITED STATES bgarner@gmail.com
Submission	Rebuttal Brief
Filer's Name	Sean M. Novak, Esq.
Filer's e-mail	smn@nobelaw.com
Signature	/Sean M. Novak/
Date	11/13/2010
Attachments	Opposer's Reply Trial Brief.pdf (26 pages)(1045772 bytes) Declaration of SMN Re Opposer's Reply Trial Brief.pdf (15 pages)(503258 bytes)

JUDITH MENDEZ
Artistically Known As
DITA & DITA DE LEON
269 S. Beverly Dr., #1026
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Opposer

SEAN M. NOVAK, ESQ. (BAR NO. 198307)
NOVAK & BEN-COHEN, LLP
8383 Wilshire Blvd., PH 1004
Beverly Hills, California 90211
Tel: (323) 651-4222
Fax: (323) 651-4221

Attorney for Opposer
JUDITH MENDEZ
Artistically Known As DITA and/or DITA DE LEON

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

JUDITH MENDEZ,
Artistically Known As DITA and/or
DITA DE LEON

Opposer,

vs.

DITA, INC.

Applicant.

) Opposition No.: 91167828 (consolidated with
) Opposition No. 91170265)

) Applicant Serial No.: 78507802

) **OPPOSER'S REPLY TRIAL BRIEF;
) DECLARATION OF SEAN M. NOVAK**

**TO THE TRADEMARK APPEAL BOARD, ALL PARTIES AND THEIR
COUNSEL OF RECORD:**

COMES NOW Opposer JUDITH MENDEZ Artistically Known As DITA and/or
DITA DE LEON (hereinafter referred to as "Opposer") submitting her Reply Brief for Trial
in this matter.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page Nos.</u>
I. <u>INTRODUCTION</u>	2
II. <u>ARGUMENT</u>	3
A. <u>THE EVIDENCE CONCLUSIVELY ESTABLISHES A PRIMA FACIE CASE THAT APPLICANT HAS LEGALLY ABANDONED ANY USE OF THE "DITA" MARK IN THE DISPUTED CATEGORIES</u>	5
1. <u>Applicant's Own "Evidence" It Has Submitted For Consideration at Trial In This Matter Conclusively Establishes That Applicant Abandoned Use of The Mark In The Disputed Categories In 2003</u>	8
2. <u>Applicant Does Not Sell Clothing, Invalidating Its Application for Registration of The Mark in This Category</u>	10
3. <u>Applicant Does Not Sell Leather Goods, Invalidating Its Application for Registration of the Mark In This Category</u>	12
4. <u>Applicant Does Not Sell Jewelry, Invalidating Its Application for Registration of the Mark In This Category</u>	12
5. <u>The Evidence Establishes That Applicant Had Abandoned Use Of The "DITA" Mark In The Disputed Categories BEFORE It Filed Its Applications to Register The Mark, Justifying Denial Of The Application</u> . .	13
6. <u>Applicant's Claim Of Intent To Resume Sales Of Items In The Disputed Categories Does Not Rebut The Clear Abandonment</u> . .	13
7. <u>In Contrast to It's Self-Aggrandizing, the Public Record And All Evidence Establishes That Applicant Is Not A Successful Company</u>	14
B. <u>OPPOSER WILL SUFFER SUBSTANTIAL HARM IF APPLICANT'S APPLICATION FOR REGISTRATION OF THE "DITA" MARK IN THE DISPUTED CATEGORIES IS GRANTED IN THE DISPUTED CATEGORIES</u>	14
1. <u>Opposer Relies Upon Use of the "Dita" Mark In The Disputed Categories To Promote Her Celebrity Image</u>	16

1	2.	<u>Applicant Concedes That Opposer Has</u>	
2		<u>Consistently Offered Goods for Sale In The</u>	
3		<u>Disputed Categories</u>	17
4	3.	<u>Applicant is Judicially Estopped From Denying</u>	
5		<u>That Opposer is Currently In Use of the “Dita”</u>	
6		<u>Mark</u>	17
7	4.	<u>Opposer Is At Risk of Substantial Harm Due To</u>	
8		<u>Confusion By The Public If Applicant Is Granted</u>	
9		<u>Registration of the “Dita” Mark In The Disputed</u>	
10		<u>Categories</u>	18
11	5.	<u>Applicant Incorrectly Maintains That Opposer</u>	
12		<u>Has An Obligation To Prove That Her Use of The</u>	
13		<u>Mark Has “Created A Substantial Impact On The</u>	
14		<u>Purchasing Public”</u>	19
15	6.	<u>Applicant Falsely Contends That Opposer Does</u>	
16		<u>Not Create Any Products</u>	20
17	C.	<u>APPLICANT’S OBJECTIONS TO OPPOSER’S EXHIBITS</u>	
18		<u>Nos. 12 AND 13 ARE NOT LEGALLY PROPER</u>	20

19	III.	<u>CONCLUSION</u>	21
----	------	-----------------------------	----

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

		<u>Page Nos.</u>
	<u>Statutes:</u>	
1.	15 U.S.C. §1112	3
2.	15 U.S.C. §1119.	13
3.	15 U.S.C. §1127(1)	5,7,13
4.	28 U.S.C. §1746	20
5.	F. R. Civ. P. 56(e).	20
6.	37 C.F.R. §2.81.	4
7.	37 C.F.R. §2.85(a)	3
8.	37 C.F.R. §2.71(a)	4
9.	37 C.F.R. §2.88	4
10.	U.S. Trademark Manual of Examining Procedure (TMEP) §1402.06	4
11.	U.S. Trademark Manual of Examining Procedure (TMEP) §1402.07.	4
12.	U.S. Trademark Manual of Examining Procedure (TMEP) §1403	3
13.	U.S. Trademark Manual of Examining Procedure (TMEP) §1401.02(b).	3
14.	U.S. Trademark Manual of Examining Procedure (TMEP) §1401.07 ...	3
	<u>Cases:</u>	
1.	<u>Abdul-Jabbar v. Gen. Motors Corp.</u> , 85 F.3d 407, 411 (9th Cir.1996)....	8
2.	<u>Blue Bell, Inc. v. Farah Manuf. Co., Inc.</u> , 508 F.2d 1260, 1267 (5th Cir.1975).....	7
3.	<u>Brookfield Communications, Inc. v. West Coast Entertainment Corp.</u> , 174 F.3d 1036, 1047 (C.A.9 1999).....	7
4.	<u>California Spray-Chemical Corp. v. Osmose Wood Preserving Co. of America, Inc.</u> , 102 USPQ 321 (Comm'r Pats. 1954).....	3
5.	<u>Casual Corner Assoc., Inc. v. Casual Stores of Nevada, Inc.</u> , 493 F.2d 709, 712 (9th Cir.1974).....	7
6.	<u>Chance v. Pac-Tel Teletrac Inc.</u> , 242 F.3d 1151, 1157 (9th Cir. 2001).	15
7.	<u>Dep't of Parks & Recreation vs. Bazaar del Mundo, Inc.</u> , 448 F.3d 1118, 1124-26 (9th Cir.1999).....	6
8.	<u>eCash Technologies, Inc. v. Guagliardo</u> , 127 F.Supp.2d 1069, 1079 (C.D.Cal.,2000).....	13

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.