

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA1266976**

Filing date: **02/17/2023**

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

Proceeding no.	91213597
Party	Defendant Tigercat International Inc.
Correspondence address	TAMAR Y DUVDEVANI DLA PIPER LLP US 1251 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NY 10020-1104 UNITED STATES Primary email: Gina.Durham@dlapiper.com Secondary email(s): tamar.duvdevani@dlapiper.com, marc.miller@dlapiper.com, Airina.Rodrigues@dlapiper.com, megan.michaels@dlapiper.com, docketingnewyork@dlapiper.com 212-335-4500
Submission	Brief on Merits for Defendant
Filer's name	Tamar Y. Duvdevani
Filer's email	tamar.duvdevani@dlapiper.com, marc.miller@dlapiper.com, Gina.Durham@dlapiper.com, valerie.fadis@us.dlapiper.com
Signature	/Tamar Y. Duvdevani/
Date	02/17/2023
Attachments	Tigercat Trial Brief - Redacted.pdf(4971107 bytes )

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

<p>CATERPILLAR INC.,</p> <p>Opposer,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>TIGERCAT INTERNATIONAL INC.,</p> <p>Applicant.</p>	<p>Opposition No. 91213597</p> <p>Application Serial No. 85/814,584</p> <p>Mark: TIGERCAT</p> <p>Application date: January 3, 2013</p>
--	--

**APPLICANT TIGERCAT INTERNATIONAL, INC.'S TRIAL BRIEF**

**REDACTED – PUBLIC VERSION**

## Table of Contents

<b>PRELIMINARY STATEMENT</b> .....	1
<b>DESCRIPTION OF THE RECORD</b> .....	3
<b>COUNTERSTATEMENT OF THE ISSUES</b> .....	3
<b>STATEMENT OF FACTS</b> .....	4
<b>I. TIGERCAT’S BUSINESS AND BRAND</b> .....	4
<b>II. HISTORY BETWEEN TIGERCAT AND CATERPILLAR</b> .....	7
<b>ARGUMENT</b> .....	9
<b>III. CATERPILLAR’S CLAIM UNDER SECTION 2(d) FAILS</b> .....	9
<i>a. Standard of Review</i> .....	9
<i>b. Factor One (The similarity or dissimilarity of the marks in their entireties as to appearance, sound, connotation and commercial impression) favors Tigercat – There are numerous differences between the marks at issue in sound, connotation, and commercial impression.</i> .....	10
i. Relevant Considerations .....	10
ii. Caterpillar fails to address both its CATERPILLAR marks and the additional marks it has submitted via notice of reliance, and therefore concedes that there are no similarities between those marks and the TIGERCAT marks.....	10
iii. There are no meaningful similarities between Caterpillar’s CAT marks and the TIGERCAT Mark .....	10
<i>c. Factor Two (The similarity or dissimilarity and nature of the goods or services) favors Tigercat – Caterpillar has submitted trademark registrations covering a host of products and services, many of them entirely unrelated to the goods covered in the Application, and Caterpillar fails to explain which of those registrations, specifically, cover goods that overlap with the goods in the Application.</i> .....	15
<i>d. Factor Three (The similarity or dissimilarity of established, likely-to-continue trade channels) favors Tigercat – The parties utilize distinct and highly bespoke trade channels, for example, party-specific dealer networks, to market and sell their products.</i> .....	19
<i>e. Factor Four (The conditions under which and buyers to whom sales are made, i.e. “impulse” vs. careful, sophisticated purchasing) favors Tigercat – The goods covered in the Application cost many thousands of dollars, as do all goods that Caterpillar sells that might be argued to compete with those products, and consumers exercise great care in purchasing those products.</i> .....	22
<i>f. Factor Five (The fame of the prior mark) – Caterpillar fails to establish that the specific registrations in its notice of opposition are famous in connection with the goods and services listed therein, and in any case, the purported fame of Caterpillar’s marks is insufficient to outweigh the other DuPont factors, all of which favor Tigercat.</i> .....	26
<i>g. Factor Six (The number and nature of similar marks in use on similar goods) favors Tigercat – Several third parties make use of marks incorporating the term CAT in connection with products similar to those sold by Caterpillar.</i> .....	30

*h. Factors Seven (The nature and extent of any actual confusion) and Eight (The length of time during and conditions under which there has been concurrent use without evidence of actual confusion) favor Tigercat – Tigercat has operated alongside Caterpillar under the TIGERCAT Mark for three decades, with zero evidence of actual confusion in that time. .... 32*

*i. Evaluation of all DuPont factors addressed by the parties establishes that there is no likelihood of confusion. .... 36*

**IV. CATERPILLAR’S DILUTION CLAIM FAILS WITH RESPECT TO CATERPILLAR’S ASSERTED CAT MARKS ..... 37**

**V. CATERPILLAR’S CLAIMS FAIL GIVEN TIGERCAT’S LONGSTANDING USE OF ITS MARK AND ITS PRIOR REGISTRATION FOR THE TIGERCAT MARK ..... 41**

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>Cases</b>	
<i>7-Eleven, Inc. v. Lawrence I. Wechsler</i> , 83 USPQ2d 1715 (TTAB 2007).....	40
<i>Astra Pharm. Prod., Inc. v. Beckman Instruments, Inc.</i> , 718 F.2d 1201, 220 USPQ 786 (1st Cir. 1983) .....	25
<i>In re Bed &amp; Breakfast Registry</i> , 791 F.2d 157, 229 USPQ 818 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	10, 14
<i>Blue Man Prods., Inc. v. Tarmann</i> , 75 USPQ2d 1811, 1820-21 (TTAB 2005) <i>rev'd on other grounds</i> , <i>Blue Man Prods., Inc. v. Tarmann</i> , 2008 WL 6862402 (D.D.C. Apr. 3, 2008) .....	14, 15, 38
<i>Carefirst of Maryland, Inc. v. Firsthealth of the Carolinas Inc.</i> , 77 USPQ2d 1492 (TTAB 2005).....	40
<i>Caterpillar Inc. v. Kelly</i> , 2015 TTAB LEXIS 407 (TTAB Sept. 30, 2015) .....	14
<i>Caterpillar Tractor Co. v. Gehl Co.</i> , 177 USPQ 343 (TTAB 1973).....	15
<i>CDOC, Inc. v. Liberty Bankers Life Ins. Co.</i> , 844 F. App'x 357 (Fed. Cir. 2021).....	12, 33
<i>Champagne Louis Roederer, S.A. v. Delicato Vineyards</i> , 148 F.3d 1373, 47 USPQ2d 1459 (Fed. Cir. 1998).....	13
<i>Chicago Mercantile Exch., Inc., Successor in Int. to P-M-T Ltd. P'ship</i> , 2004 WL 838405 (TTAB Apr. 8, 2004).....	35
<i>Citigroup Inc. v. Cap. City Bank Grp., Inc.</i> , 637 F.3d 1344, 98 USPQ2d 1253 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	26
<i>Coach Servs., Inc. v. Triumph Learning LLC</i> , 668 F.3d 1356, 101 USPQ2d 1713 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Cortex Corp. v. W.L. Gore &amp; Assocs., Inc.</i> , 1 F.3d 1253, 28 USPQ2d 1152 (Fed. Cir. 1993).....	27, 29, 33
<i>In re Dixie Restaurants, Inc.</i> , 105 F.3d 1405, 41 USPQ2d 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	9
<i>Downs v. River City Grp., LLC</i> , 2014 WL 814303 (D. Nev. Feb. 28, 2014).....	35

# 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.