Trademark Trial and Appeal Board Electronic Filing System. http://estta.uspto.gov

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA60687** Filing date:

01/06/2006

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

Proceeding	92044438
Party	Defendant AARP AARP 601 E STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20049
Correspondence Address	JOHN J. DABNEY MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP 600 THIRTEENTH STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20005
Submission	Motion to Suspend for Civil Action
Filer's Name	John J. Dabney
Filer's e-mail	jdabney@mwe.com, sabrown@mwe.com, tdevitis@mwe.com, Washington_IP_Docket@mwe.com
Signature	/JJD/
Date	01/06/2006
Attachments	Motion to Suspend.pdf (16 pages)

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO: 034247-0320

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

		`
200 Kalean Ass	~	
200 Kelsey Associates, LLC,		
	Petitioner,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	rennoner,	,
••		~
v.		,
		`
		~
AARP		,
	Registrant.	```
	registiunt.	~

Cancellation No. 92044438 Registration No. 737,930

MOTION TO SUSPEND PROCEEDINGS

Registrant AARP hereby moves to suspend this cancellation proceeding, pursuant to 37 CFR § 2.117 and Trademark Trial and Appeal Board Manual of Procedure (TBMP) § 510.02(a), pending resolution of the action (the "Federal Court Action") filed by AARP against Petitioner 200 Kelsey Associates, LLC ("Petitioner") and Michael Reich in the Federal District Court for the Southern District of New York on January 5, 2006 (No 06-cv-0081, attached hereto as Exhibit A).

I. BACKGROUND

AARP has owned the federal trademark registration for MODERN MATURITY that is the subject of this cancellation proceeding since 1962 and has built up considerable goodwill in that mark though continuous use since 1962 and substantial advertising and promotion of the mark. AARP has recently learned that Petitioner is infringing the MODERN MATURITY mark. AARP has thus filed the Federal Court Action to protect the Mark and AARP's reputation, alleging trademark infringement, false designation of origin, trademark dilution and unfair trade practices under federal and New York law.

AARP's complaint in the Federal Court Action seeks a permanent injunction, damages, and attorney's fees. AARP also seeks an order requiring Petitioner to withdraw this cancellation proceeding and its trademark application to register MODERN MATURITY for magazines, Ser. No. 78/448,077.

II. ARGUMENT

Resolution of the Federal Court Action will necessarily resolve all of the issues before the Board in this proceeding, including the continuing validity of AARP's registration for MODERN MATURITY. See TBMP § 510.02(a). The federal court adjudicating the Federal Court Action would effectively have the "last word" regarding whether AARP's registration for MODERN MATURITY is still valid. Therefore, adjudication of the Federal Court Action would necessarily render this cancellation proceeding moot. In addition, if the court orders Petitioner to withdraw its cancellation petition in this matter, as AARP has requested, any further action in this proceeding would essentially be wasted effort for the Board and for the parties. See Whopper-Burger, Inc. v. Burger King Corp., 171 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 805 (TTAB 1971) (granting a motion to suspend when movant had filed an action in federal district court that would "have a direct bearing on the question of the rights of the parties herein and may in fact completely resolve all the issues" and noting that "a decision by the United States District Court would be binding on the Patent Office whereas a determination by the Patent Office as to respondent's right ... would not be binding or res judicata in respect to the proceeding pending before the federal district court.").

CKET LARM Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

Further, AARP's allegation that Petitioner has infringed AARP's MODERN

MATURITY mark can only be decided by a federal court, and only the federal court can issue the injunction that is sought here and grant the monetary relief that is sought. AARP has also raised state law claims that are not within the jurisdiction of the TTAB. As a result, federal court is the only venue in which all issues between the parties can be resolved. It would be more efficient to allow the Federal Court Action to proceed to its conclusion before resuming this proceeding if necessary. See Goya Foods Inc. v. Tropicana Products Inc., 846 F.2d 848 (2d Cir. 1988) (holding that when court action concerns trademark infringement, the interest in prompt adjudication outweighs the value of having the views of the PTO); American Bakeries Co. v. Pan-O-Gold Baking Co., 650 F. Supp. 563 (D. Minn. 1986) (TTAB should not be given primary jurisdiction when the district court action includes claims which cannot be raised before the Board). The TTAB routinely grants a motion to stay in favor of a federal court action. See TBMP § 510.02(a) ("Ordinarily, the Board will suspend proceedings in the case before it if the final determination of the other proceeding will have a bearing on the issues before the Board."); see also General Motors Corp v. Cadillac Club Fashions, Inc., 22 USPQ 2d 1933 (TTAB 1992) (granting petitioner's motion to stay the proceeding when petitioner had filed a case in federal district court that would be dispositive of the issues before the Board); The Other Telephone Co. v. Connecticut Nat'l. Telephone Co., 181 USPQ 125 (TTAB 1974) (noting that once a civil action between the parties is filed in federal court, "[t]he only question for determination ... is whether the outcome of the civil action will have a bearing on the issues involved in the ... proceeding").

DOCKET A L A R M Find authenticated court documents without watermarks at <u>docketalarm.com</u>.

III. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, AARP requests that its motion be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

AARP

Dated: January 6, 2006

By: <u>s/John J. Dabney</u> John J. Dabney MCDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP 600 Thirteenth Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005 Telephone: 202.756.8000 Facsimile: 202.756.8087

DOCKET A L A R M



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.