

To: Largo Bioscience, Inc. (mdolan@thedolanlawfirm.com)

Subject: U.S. TRADEMARK APPLICATION NO. 77644245 - LONGEVITEA - N/A

Sent: 4/25/2012 12:08:58 PM

Sent As: ECOM109@USPTO.GOV

Attachments: [Attachment - 1](#)
[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](#)
[Attachment - 35](#)
[Attachment - 36](#)
[Attachment - 37](#)
[Attachment - 38](#)
[Attachment - 39](#)
[Attachment - 40](#)
[Attachment - 41](#)
[Attachment - 42](#)
[Attachment - 43](#)
[Attachment - 44](#)

[Attachment - 45](#)
[Attachment - 46](#)
[Attachment - 47](#)
[Attachment - 48](#)
[Attachment - 49](#)
[Attachment - 50](#)
[Attachment - 51](#)

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (USPTO)
OFFICE ACTION (OFFICIAL LETTER) ABOUT APPLICANT'S TRADEMARK APPLICATION

APPLICATION SERIAL NO. 77644245

MARK: LONGEVITEA

77644245

CORRESPONDENT ADDRESS:

MARK R. DOLAN
1277 BAYSHORE BLVD
DUNEDIN, FL 34698-4245

CLICK HERE TO RESPOND TO THIS LETTER:
http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/teas/response_forms.jsp

APPLICANT: Largo Bioscience, Inc.

CORRESPONDENT'S REFERENCE/DOCKET NO :

N/A

CORRESPONDENT E-MAIL ADDRESS:

mdolan@thedolanlawfirm.com

OFFICE ACTION

STRICT DEADLINE TO RESPOND TO THIS LETTER

TO AVOID ABANDONMENT OF APPLICANT'S TRADEMARK APPLICATION, THE USPTO MUST RECEIVE APPLICANT'S COMPLETE RESPONSE TO THIS LETTER **WITHIN 6 MONTHS** OF THE ISSUE/MAILING DATE BELOW.

ISSUE/MAILING DATE: 4/25/2012

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(a), 2.65(a); TMEP §§711, 718.03.

A. Refusal to Register: 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. 4099310. Trademark Act Section 2(d), 15 U.S.C. §1052(d); see TMEP §§1207.01 *et seq.* See the enclosed registration.

For the reasons discussed below, the examining attorney concludes that confusion as to the source of goods and services is likely between the applicant's mark LONGEVITEA and the registrant's mark LONGEV-A-TEA for the goods and/or services listed in the application, namely, tea and powered mix for making beverages

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.

Taking into account the relevant *du Pont* factors, a likelihood of confusion determination in this case involves a two-part analysis. The marks are compared for similarities in their appearance, sound, connotation and commercial impression. TMEP §§1207.01, 1207.01(b). The goods and/or services are compared to determine whether they are similar or commercially related or travel in the same trade channels. See *Herbko Int'l, Inc. v. Kappa Books, Inc.*, 308 F.3d 1156, 1164-65, 64 USPQ2d 1375, 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *Han Beauty, Inc. v. Alberto-Culver Co.*, 236 F.3d 1333, 1336, 57 USPQ2d 1557, 1559 (Fed. Cir. 2001); TMEP §§1207.01, 1207.01(a)(vi).

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).

In the present case, the applicant's mark(s) LONGEVITEA and the wording in the registered mark(s) LONGEV-A-TEA are similar in appearance and sound and would create the same general overall commercial impression among potential consumers. The marks are phonetically equivalent and almost identical in appearance with the only difference is that the registrant's mark contains two hyphens. Furthermore the marks also create the same connotation and overall, the marks have the same commercial impression as the hyphens do not change the impression of the mark.

If the marks of the respective parties are identical or highly similar, the examining attorney must consider the commercial relationship between the goods or services of the respective parties carefully to determine whether there is a likelihood of confusion. *In re Concordia International Forwarding Corp.*, 222 USPQ 355 (TTAB 1983).

Similarity of the Goods/Services

The second part of the legal analysis involves comparing the goods to determine whether they are similar or related, and could cause a mistaken belief among potential purchasers that the goods come from a common source.

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).

The fact that the goods or services of the parties differ is not controlling in determining likelihood of confusion. The issue is not likelihood of confusion between particular goods or services, but likelihood of confusion as to the source of those goods or services. *In re Shell Oil Co.*, 992 F.2d 1204, 1208, 26 USPQ2d 1687, 1690 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *Safety-Kleen Corp. v. Dresser Indus., Inc.*, 518 F.2d 1399, 1404, 186 USPQ 476, 480 (C.C.P.A. 1975); TMEP §1207.01.

The applicant's goods/services, namely "Herbal tea" are almost identical to registrant's goods/services, namely "Powdered mix for a vitamin fortified beverage". It is therefore quite likely that both applicant's and registrant's goods/services will travel through the same channels of trade to the same classes of purchasers.

The trademark examining attorney has attached evidence from the USPTO's X-Search database consisting of a number of third-party marks registered for use in connection with the same or similar goods and/or services as those of both applicant and registrant in this case. This evidence shows that the goods and/or services listed therein, namely. Tea and vitamin fortified beverages are of a kind that may emanate from a single source under a single mark. See *In re Davey Prods. Pty Ltd.*, 92 USPQ2d 1198, 1203 (TTAB 2009); *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).

1. See registrant's goods actually contain tea at <http://www.trademarkia.com/longevatea-85511173.html>
2. see also powered tea containing vitamins at <http://www.celsius.com/products/ingredients>
3. see also nutritional powered tea mix at <http://www.livestrong.com/crystal-light/>

The marks are very similar. The goods/services are identical. The similarities among the marks and the goods/services are so great as to create a likelihood of confusion among consumers. The examining attorney must resolve any doubt regarding a likelihood of confusion in favor of the prior registrant. *In re Hyper Shoppes (Ohio), Inc.*, 837 F.2d 463, 6 USPQ2d 1025 (Fed. Cir., 1988). TMEP §§1207.01(d)(i).

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 APPLICANTS MUST SUBMIT DOCUMENTS ELECTRONICALLY OR SUBMIT FEE: Applicants who filed their application online using the reduced-fee TEAS Plus application must continue to submit certain documents online using TEAS, including responses to Office actions. *See* 37 C.F.R. §2.23(a)(1). For a complete list of these documents, see TMEP §819.02(b). In addition, such applicants must accept correspondence from the Office via e-mail throughout the examination process and must maintain a valid e-mail address. 37 C.F.R. §2.23(a)(2); TMEP §§819, 819.02(a). TEAS Plus applicants who do not meet these requirements must submit an additional fee of \$50 per international class of goods and/or services. 37 C.F.R. §2.6(a)(1)(iv); TMEP §819.04. In appropriate situations and where all issues can be resolved by amendment, responding by telephone to authorize an examiner's amendment will not incur this additional fee.

/wrossman/
William M. Rossman
Trademark Examining Attorney
Law Office 109
William.Rossman@USPTO.GOV
571-272-9029

TO RESPOND TO THIS LETTER: Go to http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/teas/response_forms.jsp. Please wait 48-72 hours from the issue/ mailing date before using TEAS, to allow for necessary system updates of the application. For *technical* assistance with online forms, e-mail TEAS@uspto.gov. For questions about the Office action itself, please contact the assigned trademark examining attorney. **E-mail communications will not be accepted as responses to Office actions; therefore, do not respond to this Office action by e-mail.**

All informal e-mail communications relevant to this application will be placed in the official application record.

WHO MUST SIGN THE RESPONSE: It must be personally signed by an individual applicant or someone with legal authority to bind an applicant (i.e., a corporate officer, a general partner, all joint applicants). If an applicant is represented by an attorney, the attorney must sign the response.

PERIODICALLY CHECK THE STATUS OF THE APPLICATION: To ensure that applicant does not miss crucial deadlines or official notices, check the status of the application every three to four months using Trademark Applications and Registrations Retrieval (TARR) at <http://tarr.uspto.gov/>. Please keep a copy of the complete TARR screen. If TARR shows no change for more than six months, call 1-800-786-9199. For more information on checking status, see <http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/process/status/>.

TO UPDATE CORRESPONDENCE/E-MAIL ADDRESS: Use the TEAS form at <http://www.uspto.gov/teas/eTEASpageE.htm>.

DESIGN MARK

Serial Number

77540968

Status

REGISTERED

Word Mark

LONGEV-A-TEA

Standard Character Mark

Yes

Registration Number

4099310

Date Registered

2012/02/14

Type of Mark

TRADEMARK

Register

PRINCIPAL

Mark Drawing Code

(4) STANDARD CHARACTER MARK

Owner

Arlen, Michael W. DBA Arlen Nutraceuticals INDIVIDUAL UNITED STATES
Suite 200 11400 W. Olympic Blvd. Los Angeles CALIFORNIA 900641557

Goods/Services

Class Status -- ACTIVE. IC 005. US 006 018 044 046 051 052. G & S:
Powdered mix for a vitamin fortified beverage. First Use: 2011/11/30.
First Use In Commerce: 2011/11/30.

Filing Date

2008/08/06

Examining Attorney

BIDDULPH, HEATHER

Attorney of Record

Robert Berliner

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.