

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA1160154**

Filing date: **09/16/2021**

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

Proceeding	91253709
Party	Defendant Pimmonster LLC
Correspondence Address	EVE J BROWN HOGAN DUFF LLP 83 MORSE STREET BLDG 6 NORWOOD, MA 02062 UNITED STATES Primary Email: <a href="mailto:ejh@hoganduff.com">ejh@hoganduff.com</a> Secondary Email(s): <a href="mailto:ajd@hoganduff.com">ajd@hoganduff.com</a> , <a href="mailto:vfphillips@wcl.american.edu">vfphillips@wcl.american.edu</a> , <a href="mailto:ipclinic-filings@wcl.american.edu">ipclinic-filings@wcl.american.edu</a> (617) 209-9753
Submission	Brief on Merits for Defendant
Filer's Name	Eve J. Brown
Filer's email	<a href="mailto:ejh@hoganduff.com">ejh@hoganduff.com</a>
Signature	/Eve J. Brown/
Date	09/16/2021
Attachments	2021-09-16 Pimmonster Trial Brief.pdf(497423 bytes )

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

MONSTER ENERGY COMPANY	)	
Opposer,	)	Opposition No.: 91253709
	)	
v.	)	Serial No.: 88/453689
	)	
PIMMONSTER, LLC,	)	Mark: PIMMONSTER
Applicant.	)	
_____	)	

**APPLICANT'S TRIAL BRIEF**

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	5
II.	STATEMENT OF FACTS	6
A.	Applicant Pimmonster, LLC	6
B.	Opposer Monster Energy Company	8
III.	STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES	7
IV.	OPPOSER’S CLAIM OF PRIORITY DOES NOT EXTEND TO ANY ALLEGED COMMON LAW RIGHTS	10
V.	THERE IS NO LIKELIHOOD OF CONFUSION BETWEEN APPLICANT AND OPPOSER’S MARKS	8
A.	Applicant’s Mark is Substantially Dissimilar to Opposer’s Marks in Appearance, Sound, Connotation, and Commercial Impression	9
B.	Applicant’s Goods are Dissimilar to Opposer’s Goods and the Trade Channels for the Respective Goods Do Not Overlap	19
C.	The Conditions Under Which and Buyers to Whom Sales of the Respective Goods Are Made Weigh Against Confusion	18
D.	Opposer Has Failed to Establish Fame of its Marks for Likelihood of Confusion	22
E.	A Large Number of Marks Registered with the Word “Monster” Narrows the Scope of Protection Afforded to that Term	26
F.	The Record Shows No Actual or Potential Confusion of the Marks	27
G.	Opposer’s Remaining Arguments are Unpersuasive	28
a.	Opposer’s “Bad Faith” Accusations are Contradicted by the Record	28
b.	Opposer’s Claim that Applicant’s Mark will Confuse Consumers into Believing there is Co-Branding between Monster and PIMM’s is Without Merit	28
VI.	CONCLUSION	31

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Aero Mayflower Transit Co. v. Snark Products, Inc.</i> , 190 U.S.P.Q. 100 (TTAB 1976) .....	27
<i>Astra Pharmaceutical Products, Inc. v. Beckman Instruments, Inc.</i> , 718 F.2d 1201 U.S.P.Q. 786 (1st Cir. 1983).....	23
<i>Bells Brewery, Inc. v. Bell Hill Vineyards, LLC</i> , 2009 WL 5118319 (T.T.A.B. 2009), aff'd, 404 Fed. Appx. 502 (Fed. Cir. 2010) .....	19
<i>Bond v. Taylor</i> , 119 U.S.P.Q.2d 1049 (TTAB 2016) .....	21
<i>Bose Corp. v. QSC Audio Prod., Inc.</i> , 293 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2002).....	24, 25
<i>Bridgestone Ams. Tire Operations, LLC v. Fed. Corp.</i> , 102 U.S.P.Q.2d 1061 (Fed. Cir. 2012).....	12
<i>Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Wells Fargo Bank</i> , 811 F.2d 1490, 1 U.S.P.Q.2d 1813 (Fed. Cir. 1987) .....	21
<i>China Healthways Institute, Inc. v. Wang</i> , 491 F.3d 1337, 83 U.S.P.Q.2d 1123 (Fed. Cir. 2007) .....	17
<i>Citigroup Inc. v. Cap. City Bank Grp., Inc.</i> , 637 F.3d 1344 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	26
<i>Coach Services, Inc. v. Triumph Learning LLC</i> , 668 F.3d 1356 (Fed Cir. 2012).....	19, 24
<i>Electronic Design &amp; Sales, Inc. v. Electronic Data Systems Corp.</i> , 954 F.2d 713, 21 U.S.P.Q.2d 1388 (Fed. Cir. 1992) .....	23
<i>Estate of P.D. Beckwith Inc. v. Comm'r. of Patents</i> , 252 U.S. 538 (1920).....	18
<i>Estrada v. Telefonos De Mex., S.A.B. de C.V.</i> , 447 F. App'x 197 (Fed. Cir. 2011).....	29
<i>Federated Foods, Inc. v. Fort Howard Paper Co.</i> , 544 F.2d 1098, 192 U.S.P.Q. 24 (CCPA 1976).....	20
<i>Franklin Mint Corp. v. Master Mfg. Co.</i> , 212 U.S.P.Q. 233 (CCPA 1981) .....	17
<i>Herbko Int'l, Inc. v. Kappa Books, Inc.</i> , 308 F.3d 1156, 64 U.S.P.Q.2d 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2002). .....	28
<i>In re Bed &amp; Breakfast Registry</i> , 7 91 F.2d 157, 229 U.S.P.Q. 818 (Fed. Cir. 1986) .....	17
<i>In re E.I. DuPont DeNemours &amp; Co.</i> , 177 U.S.P.Q. 563 (CCPA 1973) .....	12, 28
<i>In re Fat Boys Water Sports LLC</i> , 118 U.S.P.Q.2d 1511 (TTAB 2016) .....	13
<i>In re Hard Rock Cafe Licensing Corp. v. Elsea</i> , 48 U.S.P.Q.2d 1400 (TTAB 1998) .....	24
<i>In re Max Capital Grp., Ltd.</i> , 93 U.S.P.Q.2d 1243 (TTAB 2010) .....	13
<i>In re N.A.D. Inc.</i> , 224 U.S.P.Q. 969 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	23

<i>In re Ship</i> , 4 U.S.P.Q.2d 1174 (TTAB 1987) .....	23
<i>In re Nat'l Data Corp.</i> , 224 U.S.P.Q. 749 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	17, 33
<i>In re Sears, Roebuck and Co.</i> , 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1312 (TTAB 1987) .....	19
<i>In re Strategic Partners, Inc.</i> , 102 U.S.P.Q.2d 1397 (TTAB 2012) .....	20
<i>Inter IKEA Systems B.V. v. AKEA, LLC</i> , 110 U.S.P.Q.2d 1734 (TTAB 2014) .....	25
<i>Jerrold Electronics Corp. v. Magnavox Co.</i> , 199 U.S.P.Q. 751 (TTAB 1978) .....	28
<i>Joseph Phelps Vineyards, LLC v. Fairmont Holdings, LLC</i> , 857 F.3d 1323 (Fed. Cir. 2017).....	24
<i>Kimberly-Clark Corp. V. H. Douglas Enter., Ltd.</i> , 774 F.2d 1144, 227 U.S.P.Q. 541 (Fed. Cir. 1985) .....	23
<i>Leading Jewelers Guild, Inc. v. LJOW Holdings, LLC</i> , 82 U.S.P.Q.2d 1901 (TTAB 2007) .....	24
<i>Monster Energy Co. v. Li-Wei Chih</i> , Opp. No. 91/205,893, 2016 BL 50874 (TTAB Feb. 1, 2016) .....	26
<i>Palm Bay Imports, Inc. v. Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin Maison Fondée en 1772</i> , 396 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	24
<i>QuikTrip West, Inc. v. Weigel Stores, Inc.</i> , 984 F.3d 1031(Fed. Cir. 2021).....	29
<i>Recot, Inc. v. Becton</i> , 214 F.3d 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	21,23
<i>Shen Mfg. Co. Inc. v. Ritz Hotel Ltd.</i> , 393 F.3d 1238, 73 U.S.P.Q.2d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 2004) .....	11, 17
<i>Sweats Fashions, Inc. v. Pannill Knitting Co.</i> , 4 U.S.P.Q.2d 1793 (Fed. Cir. 1987).....	30
<i>Tuxedo Monopoly, Inc. v. Gen. Mills Fun Grp., Inc.</i> , 648 F.2d 1335 (C.C.P.A. 1981) .....	24
<i>Yamaha Int'l Corp. v. Hoshino Gakki Co.</i> , 840 F.2d 1572, 6 U.S.P.Q.2d 1001 (Fed. Cir. 1988) .....	11
 <b>Other Authorities</b>	
15 U.S.C. § 1052(d) .....	11
McCarthy on Trademarks and Unfair Competition, § 20:3 (5th ed.) .....	11, 16, 17, 26, 28
Trademark Rule 2.222(b)(1) .....	10

# 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.