**To:** Romar Universal, Inc. (<u>romario40@gmail.com</u>)

Subject: TRADEMARK APPLICATION NO. 77450786 - SURGE - N/A

**Sent:** 7/10/08 4:05:43 PM

Sent As: ECOM108@USPTO.GOV

**Attachments:** <u>Attachment - 1</u>

Attachment - 2
Attachment - 3
Attachment - 4
Attachment - 5
Attachment - 6
Attachment - 7
Attachment - 8
Attachment - 9
Attachment - 10
Attachment - 11
Attachment - 12

Attachment - 13
Attachment - 14
Attachment - 15
Attachment - 16
Attachment - 17

Attachment - 18 Attachment - 19 Attachment - 20 Attachment - 21

Attachment - 22 Attachment - 23 Attachment - 24 Attachment - 25

Attachment - 26
Attachment - 27

Attachment - 28 Attachment - 29 Attachment - 30 Attachment - 31

Attachment - 32 Attachment - 33

Attachment - 34

### UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

**SERIAL NO**: 77/450786

MARK: SURGE

\*77450786\*



CORRESPONDENT ADDRESS:

ROMAR UNIVERSAL, INC. ROMAR UNIVERSAL, INC. 1010 SEMINOLE DR APT 1607 FORT LAUDERDALE, FL 33304-3231

RESPOND TO THIS ACTION:

http://www.uspto.gov/teas/eTEASpageD.htm

GENERAL TRADEMARK INFORMATION:

http://www.uspto.gov/main/trademarks.htm

**APPLICANT**: Romar Universal, Inc.

CORRESPONDENT'S REFERENCE/DOCKET NO:

N/A

CORRESPONDENT E-MAIL ADDRESS:

romario40@gmail.com

# **OFFICE ACTION**

TO AVOID ABANDONMENT, THE OFFICE MUST RECEIVE A PROPER RESPONSE TO THIS OFFICE ACTION WITHIN 6 MONTHS OF THE ISSUE/MAILING DATE.

ISSUE/MAILING DATE: 7/10/2008

The referenced application has been reviewed by the assigned trademark examining attorney. Applicant must respond timely and completely to the issue(s) below. 15 U.S.C. §1062(b); 37 C.F.R. §§2.62, 2.65(a); TMEP §§711, 718.03.

# SEARCH RESULTS

# A. SECTION 2(d) REFUSAL – LIKELIHOOD OF CONFUSION

Registration of the applied-for mark is refused because of a likelihood of confusion with the mark in U.S. Registration No. 3339177. Trademark Act Section 2(d), 15 U.S.C. §1052(d); see TMEP §§1207.01 et seq. See the enclosed registration.

Trademark Act Section 2(d) bars registration of an applied-for mark that so resembles a registered mark that it is likely that a potential consumer would be confused or mistaken or deceived as to the source of the goods and/or services of the applicant and registrant. See 15 U.S.C. §1052(d). The court in *In re E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 476 F.2d 1357, 177 USPQ 563 (C.C.P.A. 1973) listed the principal factors to be considered when determining whether there is a likelihood of confusion under Section 2(d). See TMEP §1207.01. However, not all of the factors are necessarily relevant or of equal weight, and any one factor may be dominant in a given case, depending upon the evidence of record. *In re Majestic Distilling Co.*, 315 F.3d 1311, 1315, 65 USPQ2d 1201, 1204 (Fed. Cir. 2003); see *In re E. I. du Pont*, 476 F.2d at 1361-62, 177 USPQ at 567.

In this case, the following factors are the most relevant: similarity of the marks, similarity of the goods and/or services, and similarity of trade channels of the goods and/or services. See In re Opus One, Inc., 60 USPQ2d 1812 (TTAB 2001); In re Dakin's Miniatures Inc., 59 USPQ2d 1593 (TTAB 1999); In re Azteca Rest. Enters., Inc., 50 USPQ2d 1209 (TTAB 1999); TMEP §§1207.01 et seq.

# Similarity of the Marks

In a likelihood of confusion determination, the marks are compared for similarities in their appearance, sound, meaning or connotation and commercial impression. *In re E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 476 F.2d 1357, 1361, 177 USPQ 563, 567 (C.C.P.A. 1973); TMEP §1207.01(b). Similarity in any one of these elements may be sufficient to find a likelihood of confusion. *In re White Swan Ltd.*, 8 USPQ2d 1534, 1535 (TTAB 1988); *In re Lamson Oil Co.*, 6 USPQ2d 1041, 1043 (TTAB 1987); *see* TMEP §1207.01(b).

The marks are compared in their entireties under a Trademark Act Section 2(d) analysis. *See* TMEP §1207.01(b). Nevertheless, one feature of a mark may be recognized as more significant in creating a commercial impression. Greater weight is given to that dominant feature in determining whether there is a likelihood of confusion. *In re Nat'l Data Corp.*, 753 F.2d 1056, 224 USPQ 749 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *Tektronix, Inc. v. Daktronics, Inc.*, 534 F.2d 915, 189 USPQ 693 (C.C.P.A. 1976); *In re J.M. Originals Inc.*, 6 USPQ2d 1393 (TTAB 1987); *see* TMEP §1207.01(b)(viii), (c)(ii).

Although a disclaimed portion of a mark certainly cannot be ignored, and the marks must be compared in their entireties, one feature of a mark may be more significant in creating a commercial impression. Disclaimed matter is typically less significant or less dominant when comparing marks. *See In re Dixie Rests. Inc.*, 105 F.3d 1405, 1407, 41 USPQ2d 1531, 1533-34 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *In re Nat'l Data Corp.*, 753 F.2d 1056, 1060, 224 USPQ 740, 752 (Fed. Cir. 1985); TMEP \$1207.01(b)(piii) (a)(ii)



Applicant's mark, "SURGE", and U.S. Registration No. 3339177, "CREATINE SURGE" are very similar in sound, appearance and meaning. Applicant's mark merely deletes the descriptive wording "CREATINE" from registrant's mark. Moreover, the dominant portion of registrant's mark is "SURGE", because "CREATINE" is disclaimed, and the term "SURGE" is the only term in applicant's mark. The mere deletion of wording from a registered mark may not be sufficient to overcome a likelihood of confusion. *See In re Optical Int'l*, 196 USPQ 775, 778 (TTAB 1977); TMEP §1207.01(b)(ii)-(b)(iii). Applicant's mark does not create a distinct commercial impression because it contains the same common wording as registrant's mark, and there is no other wording to distinguish it from registrant's mark.

#### Similarity of the Goods and/or Services

The goods and/or services of the parties need not be identical or directly competitive to find a likelihood of confusion. *See Safety-Kleen Corp. v. Dresser Indus.*, *Inc.*, 518 F.2d 1399, 1404, 186 USPQ 476, 480 (C.C.P.A. 1975); TMEP §1207.01(a)(i). Rather, they need only be related in some manner, or the conditions surrounding their marketing are such that they would be encountered by the same purchasers under circumstances that would give rise to the mistaken belief that the goods and/or services come from a common source. *In re Total Quality Group, Inc.*, 51 USPQ2d 1474, 1476 (TTAB 1999); TMEP §1207.01(a)(i); *see, e.g., On-line Careline Inc. v. Am. Online Inc.*, 229 F.3d 1080, 1086-87, 56 USPQ2d 1471, 1475-76 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *In re Martin's Famous Pastry Shoppe, Inc.*, 748 F.2d 1565, 1566-68, 223 USPQ 1289, 1290 (Fed. Cir. 1984).

Likelihood of confusion is determined on the basis of the goods and/or services as they are identified in the application and registration. *Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Packard Press Inc.*, 281 F.3d 1261, 1267-68, 62 USPQ2d 1001, 1004-05 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *In re Shell Oil Co.*, 992 F.2d 1204, 1207 n.4, 26 USPQ2d 1687, 1690 n.4 (Fed. Cir. 1993); TMEP §1207.01(a)(iii).

The registered mark, "CREATINE SURGE", U.S. Registration No. 3339177, covers "Dietary and nutritional supplements; Powdered nutritional supplement drink mix" while applicant identified "energy drinks." Applicant's goods and registrant's goods/services are highly related because both involve drinks, and commonly originate from the same source as demonstrated by the third party registrations attached. Thus, applicant's mark is likely to cause confusion as to the source of the goods/services.

Attached are copies of printouts from the USPTO X-Search database, which show third-party registrations of marks used in connection with the same or similar goods and/or services as those of applicant and registrant in this case. These printouts have probative value to the extent that they serve to suggest that the goods and/or services listed therein, namely energy drinks and dietary and nutritional supplements, and powdered nutritional supplement drink mix are of a kind that may emanate from a single source. *In re Infinity Broad. Corp.*, 60 USPQ2d 1214, 1217-18 (TTAB 2001); *In re Albert Trostel & Sons Co.*, 29 USPQ2d 1783, 1785-86 (TTAB 1993); *In re Mucky Duck Mustard Co.*, 6 USPQ2d 1467, 1470 n.6 (TTAB 1988); TMEP §1207.01(d)(iii).

# B. PRIOR PENDING APPLICATIONS

Information regarding pending Application Serial Nos. 78972454, 77399162 and 77364672 is enclosed. The filing dates of the referenced applications precede applicant's filing date. There may be a likelihood of confusion under Trademark Act Section 2(d) between applicant's mark and the referenced marks. If one or more of the referenced applications registers, registration may be refused in this case under Section 2(d). 37 C.F.R. §2.83; TMEP §§1208 *et seq.* Therefore, upon entry of a response to this Office action, action on this case may be suspended pending final disposition of the earlier-filed applications.

If applicant believes that there is no potential conflict between this application and the earlier-filed applications, then applicant may present arguments relevant to the issue in a response to this Office action. The election not to submit arguments at this time in no way limits applicant's right to address this issue at a later point.

# C. APPLICANT'S RIGHT TO RESPOND

Although applicant's mark has been refused registration, applicant may respond to the refusal(s) by submitting evidence and arguments in support of registration.

# **TEAS PLUS RESPONSE GUIDELINES**

TEAS PLUS APPLICANTS MUST SUBMIT DOCUMENTS ELECTRONICALLY OR SUBMIT FEE: TEAS Plus applicants should submit the following documents using the Trademark Electronic Application System (TEAS) at <a href="http://www.uspto.gov/teas/index.html">http://www.uspto.gov/teas/index.html</a>: (1) written responses to Office actions; (2) preliminary amendments; (3) changes of correspondence address; (4) changes of owner's address; (5) appointments and revocations of attorney; (6) amendments to allege use; (7) statements of use; (8) requests for extension of time to file a statement of use, and (9) requests to delete a \$1(b) basis. If any of these documents are filed on paper, they must be accompanied by a \$50 per class fee. 37 C F R 882 6(a)(1)(iv) and 2 23(a)(i). Telephone responses will not incur an additional fee. NOTE: In addition to the above



applicant must also continue to accept correspondence from the Office via e-mail throughout the examination process in order to avoid the additional fee. 37 C.F.R. §2.23(a)(2).

/jcbesch/ Jay C. Besch Trademark Examining Attorney Law Office 108 United States Patent and Trademak Office (571)272-8606 phone jay

**RESPOND TO THIS ACTION:** Applicant should file a response to this Office action online using the form at <a href="http://www.uspto.gov/teas/eTEASpageD.htm">http://www.uspto.gov/teas/eTEASpageD.htm</a>, waiting 48-72 hours if applicant received notification of the Office action via e-mail. For *technical* assistance with the form, please e-mail <a href="https://www.uspto.gov">TEAS@uspto.gov</a>. For questions about the Office action itself, please contact the assigned examining attorney. **Do not respond to this Office action by e-mail; the USPTO does not accept e-mailed responses**.

If responding by paper mail, please include the following information: the application serial number, the mark, the filing date and the name, title/position, telephone number and e-mail address of the person signing the response. Please use the following address: Commissioner for Trademarks, P.O. Box 1451, Alexandria, VA 22313-1451.

**STATUS CHECK:** Check the status of the application at least once every six months from the initial filing date using the USPTO Trademark Applications and Registrations Retrieval (TARR) online system at <a href="http://tarr.uspto.gov">http://tarr.uspto.gov</a>. When conducting an online status check, print and maintain a copy of the complete TARR screen. If the status of your application has not changed for more than six months, please contact the assigned examining attorney.



Print: Jul 10, 2008 77161964

#### **DESIGN MARK**

#### Serial Number

77161964

#### Status

REGISTERED

#### Word Mark

CREATINE SURGE

#### Standard Character Mark

Yes

# Registration Number

3339177

# **Date Registered**

2007/11/20

# Type of Mark

TRADEMARK

# Register

PRINCIPAL

# **Mark Drawing Code**

(4) STANDARD CHARACTER MARK

#### Owner

Jarrow Formulas, Inc. CORPORATION CALIFORNIA 1824 South Robertson Blvd. Los Angeles CALIFORNIA 900354317

#### Goods/Services

Class Status -- ACTIVE. IC 005. US 006 018 044 046 051 052. G & S: Dietary and nutritional supplements; Powdered nutritional supplement drink mix. First Use: 1997/02/01. First Use In Commerce: 1997/02/01.

### **Disclaimer Statement**

NO CLAIM IS MADE TO THE EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO USE "CREATINE" APART FROM THE MARK AS SHOWN.

#### Filing Date

2007/04/20

# **Examining Attorney**

MORENO, PAUL

# Attorney of Record

Mark D. Giarratana, Esq.



# 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.

