I KAUEMAKK EXAMINATION VORKSHEET

☐ AMENDMENT	STAGE	☑ NO CHANGE ☑ PÍ	JBLICATION/REGISTRATE
Name: Caseaundre	a Roberts	LO. 114 Date 72962	JBLICATION/REGISTRATI 75932890 Serial No
INSTRUCTIONS: Place a	check mark in t	he appropriate column and/or box to indicate which d	ata elements have been amended/coded
Legal Instrument	Examiner	(LIE)	
	Amended		Data Element
Class Data		☐ Prime/International Class	☐ Goods and Services
		☐ First Use Date	First Use in Commerce I
		☐ In Another Form	☐ Certification
		□ 1b	
Mark Data		☐ Word Mark	☐ Pseudo Mark
		☐ Mark Drawing Code	☐ Design Search Code
		☐ Scan Sub Drawing	
Misc. Mark Data		☐ Mark Description	☐ Disclaimer
rans Stee		☐ Lining/Stippling	☐ Name/Portrait/Consent
		☐ Translation	
Section 2(f)		☐ Section 2(f) Entire Mark	
		☐ Section 2(f) Limitation Statement	☐ Section 2(f) in Part
		☐ Amended Register	☐ Amended Register Date
Foreign Reg. Data		☐ Foreign Country	☐ 44(d)
		☐ Foreign Application Number	☐ Foreign Application Filin
		☐ Foreign Registration Number	☐ Foreign Registration Date
		☐ Foreign Registration Expiration Date	☐ Foreign Renewal Reg. Nu
		☐ Foreign Reg. Renewal Expiration Date	☐ Foreign Renewal Reg. Da
Owner Data		☐ Owner Name	□ DBA/AKA/TA
		☐ Address I	☐ Address 2
		☐ City	☐ State
		☐ Zip Code	
		☐ Citizenship	☐ Entity
		☐ Entity Statement	☐ Composed of
		☐ Assignment(s)/Name Change	
Amd/Corr Restr.		☐ Concurrent Use	
Prior U.S. Reg.		☐ Prior Registration	<del></del>
Correspondence		☐ Attorney	Domostia Parameterisia
		☐ Attorney Docket Number	☐ Domestic Representative
		☐ Correspondence Firm Name/Address	
certify that all corrections ha	ve been entered	in accordance with text editing guidelines.	
		( Coheats	7/2000
Nafa		LIE	DATE
Other:			
:			



## THIS DISPOSITION IS NOT CITABLE AS PRECEDENT OF THE T.T.A.B.

**27 JUN 2002**Paper No. 11

EWH

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Trademark Trial and Appeal Board

In re George R. Melby

Serial No. 75/932,890

Jonathon Grad for George R. Melby.

David H. Stine, Trademark Examining Attorney, Law Office 114 (Margaret Le, Managing Attorney).

Before Hanak, Quinn and Hohein, Administrative Trademark Judges.

Opinion by Hanak, Administrative Trademark Judge:

George R. Melby (applicant) seeks to register THE 4TH SHELL in typed drawing form for "accessories for shotguns, namely externally-mounted auxiliary shell holders." The application was filed on December 4, 2000 with a claimed first use date of August 6, 1999.

Citing Section 2(e)(1) of the Trademark Act, the Examining Attorney has refused registration on the basis that applicant's mark is merely descriptive of applicant's goods.



Serial No. 75/932,890

When the refusal to register was made final, applicant appealed to this Board. Applicant and the Examining Attorney filed briefs. Applicant did not request an oral hearing.

As has been stated repeatedly, "a term is merely descriptive if it <u>forthwith</u> conveys an <u>immediate</u> idea of the ingredients, qualities or characteristics of the goods." <u>In re Abcor Development Corp.</u>, 588 F.2d 811, 200 USPQ 215, 218 (CCPA 1978) (emphasis added). Moreover, the immediate idea must be conveyed forthwith with a "degree of particularity." <u>In re TMS Corp. of the Americas</u>, 200 USPQ 57, 59 (TTAB 1978); <u>In re Entenmann's Inc.</u>, 15 USPQ 57, 751 (TTAB 1990), <u>aff'd</u> 90-1495 (Fed. Cir. February 13, 1991).

At the outset, we note that the Examining Attorney has the burden of establishing that applicant's mark is merely descriptive of its goods. In this case, the Examining Attorney has made of record absolutely no evidence showing that applicant's mark is merely descriptive of applicant's goods. In the first Office Action, the Examining Attorney tentatively argued that "it appears that [applicant's] goods are, literally, holders for a 4<sup>th</sup> shell." In his brief at page 2, the Examining Attorney took on a more



Serial No. 75/932,890

- -----

adamant tone stating that applicant's "goods are, without dispute, an external holder for a 4<sup>th</sup> shell for use in connection with shotguns otherwise having a three-shell magazine." However, in his brief the Examining Attorney never addressed the following argument set forth by applicant at pages 4 and 5 of his brief:

"In the instant case, thought, perception and imagination would be required to reach a conclusion, based on the mark, as to the nature of the goods. Upon hearing the mark, one would first question what exactly a fourth shell is ... Next, one would have to pause to consider why the term '4<sup>th</sup>' is present in the mark. The shot that is held by the shell holder [applicant's goods] may be a first shell, a second shell, a third shell, a fourth shell or even a fifth shell, depending on how many shells have been loaded into the shotgun, how many shells have already been fired, and how many shells are being held by the shell holder."

We find that based on this particular record where the Examining Attorney has introduced absolutely no evidence, that applicant's mark is simply suggestive of applicant's goods. Put quite simply, there is nothing in the record (including applicant's brochure describing his goods) which limits applicant's externally-mounted auxiliary shell holder to shotguns having a three-shell magazine. As previously noted, the Examining Attorney has never taken issue with applicant's contention that its goods could be



Serial No. 75/932,890

....

used in connection with shotguns having various shell capacities. Quite telling is the failure of the Examining Attorney to make of record newspaper or magazine articles showing that users of shotguns have expressed the desire that they have a fourth shell or fourth shot. In short, based on this record, there is nothing to indicate that among users of shotguns, the terms "fourth shell" or "fourth shot" are ever used.

Decision: The refusal to register is reversed.



# DOCKET

## 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.

