

**To:** Henrietta Letailleur ([hennylet@gmail.com](mailto:hennylet@gmail.com))  
**Subject:** U.S. Trademark Application Serial No. 88483920 - SCARF FACE LIT CITY BY SCARF FACE - N/A  
**Sent:** September 12, 2019 02:04:10 PM  
**Sent As:** ecom127@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](#)

**United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO)**  
**Office Action (Official Letter) About Applicant's Trademark Application**

**U.S. Application**

**Serial No.**  
88483920

**Mark:** SCARF  
FACE LIT CITY  
BY SCARF FACE

**Correspondence**

**Address:**  
HENRIETTA  
LETAILLEUR  
SCARF FACE  
114 S GRAMERCY  
PLACE, APT 209,  
114 S GRAMERCY  
PLACE  
LOS ANGELES,  
CA 90004

**Applicant:**  
Henrietta Letailleur

**Reference/Docket**  
**No.** N/A

**Correspondence**  
**Email Address:**

[hennylet@gmail.com](mailto:hennylet@gmail.com)

**The USPTO must receive applicant's response to this letter within six months of the issue date below or the application will be abandoned.** Respond using the Trademark Electronic Application System (TEAS). A link to the appropriate TEAS response form appears at the end of this Office action.

**Issue date: September 12, 2019**

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.

#### SUMMARY OF ISSUES:

- Section 2(d) Refusal – Likelihood of Confusion
- Specimen Refusal
- Disclaimer Requirement for International Class 25

#### **SECTION 2(d) REFUSAL – LIKELIHOOD OF CONFUSION**

Registration of the applied-for mark is refused because of a likelihood of confusion with the marks in U.S. Registration Nos. 3130385 and 3130384. Trademark Act Section 2(d), 15 U.S.C. §1052(d); see TMEP §§1207.01 *et seq.* See the attached registrations.

Here, applicant's mark is SCARF FACE LIT CITY BY SCARF FACE for "Scented candles" in International Class 4, and "Silk scarves" in International Class 25.

The registrant's marks are SCARFACE for "Hats, caps, shirts, t-shirts, tank tops, sweatshirts, jackets, underwear, polo shirts, shorts, sleepwear, jeans, shoes" in International Class 25, and "Postcards, posters, calendars" in International Class 16.

Trademark Act Section 2(d) bars registration of an applied-for mark that is so similar to a registered mark that it is likely consumers would be confused, mistaken, or deceived as to the commercial source of the goods and/or services of the parties. See 15 U.S.C. §1052(d). Likelihood of confusion is determined on a case-by-case basis by applying the factors set forth in *In re E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 476 F.2d 1357, 1361, 177 USPQ 563, 567 (C.C.P.A. 1973) (called the "*du Pont* factors"). *In re i.am.symbolic, llc*, 866 F.3d 1315, 1322, 123 USPQ2d 1744, 1747 (Fed. Cir. 2017). Only those factors that are "relevant and of record" need be considered. *M2 Software, Inc. v. M2 Commc'ns, Inc.*, 450 F.3d 1378, 1382, 78 USPQ2d 1944, 1947 (Fed. Cir. 2006) (citing *Shen Mfg. Co. v. Ritz Hotel Ltd.*, 393 F.3d 1238, 1241, 73 USPQ2d 1350, 1353 (Fed. Cir. 2004)); see *In re Inn at St. John's, LLC*, 126 USPQ2d 1742, 1744 (TTAB 2018).

Although not all *du Pont* factors may be relevant, there are generally two key considerations in any likelihood of confusion analysis: (1) the similarities between the compared marks and (2) the relatedness of the compared goods and/or services. See *In re i.am.symbolic, llc*, 866 F.3d at 1322, 123 USPQ2d at 1747 (quoting *Herbko Int'l, Inc. v. Kappa Books, Inc.*, 308 F.3d 1156, 1164-65, 64 USPQ2d 1375, 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2002)); *Federated Foods, Inc. v. Fort Howard Paper Co.*, 544 F.2d 1098, 1103, 192 USPQ 24, 29 (C.C.P.A. 1976) ("The fundamental inquiry mandated by [Section] 2(d) goes to the cumulative effect of differences in the essential characteristics of the goods [or services] and differences in the marks."); TMEP §1207.01.

#### 1. Similarity of the Marks

Marks are compared in their entireties for similarities in appearance, sound, connotation, and commercial impression. *Stone Lion Capital Partners, LP v. Lion Capital LLP*, 746 F.3d 1317, 1321, 110 USPQ2d 1157, 1160 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (quoting *Palm Bay Imps., Inc. v. Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin Maison Fondée En 1772*, 396 F.3d 1369, 1371, 73 USPQ2d 1689, 1691 (Fed. Cir. 2005)); TMEP §1207.01(b)-(b)(v). "Similarity in any one of these elements may be sufficient to find the marks confusingly similar." *In re Inn at St. John's, LLC*, 126 USPQ2d 1742, 1746 (TTAB 2018) (citing *In re Davia*, 110 USPQ2d 1810, 1812 (TTAB 2014)); TMEP §1207.01(b).

Incorporating the entirety of one mark within another does not obviate the similarity between the compared marks, as in the present case, nor does it overcome a likelihood of confusion under Section 2(d). See *Wella Corp. v. Cal. Concept Corp.*, 558 F.2d 1019, 1022, 194 USPQ 419, 422 (C.C.P.A. 1977) (finding CALIFORNIA CONCEPT and surfer design and CONCEPT confusingly similar); *Coca-Cola Bottling Co. v. Jos. E. Seagram & Sons, Inc.*, 526 F.2d 556, 557, 188 USPQ 105, 106 (C.C.P.A. 1975) (finding BENGAL LANCER and design and BENGAL confusingly similar); *In re Integrated Embedded*, 120 USPQ2d 1504, 1513 (TTAB 2016) (finding BARR GROUP and BARR confusingly similar); *In re Mr. Recipe, LLC*, 118 USPQ2d 1084, 1090 (TTAB 2016) (finding JAWS DEVOUR YOUR HUNGER and JAWS confusingly similar); TMEP §1207.01(b)(iii).

In the present case, the registered mark, SCARFACE, is incorporated in its entirety within the applied-for mark, SCARF FACE LIT CITY BY SCARF FACE. In fact, it appears twice in the applied-for mark. The only difference is the word “SCARFACE” appears as a compound word with no space separating the words in the registered mark, and it appears as multiple words with a space separating the words in the applied-for mark. As such, the term is identical in sound and virtually identical in appearance in the marks, and the marks are thus confusingly similar for the purposes of determining likelihood of confusion. *See, e.g., Seaguard Corp. v. Seaward Int’l, Inc.*, 223 USPQ 48, 51 (TTAB 1984) (“[T]he marks ‘SEAGUARD’ and ‘SEA GUARD’ are, in contemplation of law, identical [internal citation omitted.]”); *In re Best W. Family Steak House, Inc.*, 222 USPQ 827, 827 (TTAB 1984) (“There can be little doubt that the marks [BEEFMASTER and BEEF MASTER] are practically identical”); *Stock Pot, Inc., v. Stockpot Rest., Inc.*, 220 USPQ 52, 52 (TTAB 1983), *aff’d* 737 F.2d 1576, 222 USPQ 665 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (“There is no question that the marks of the parties [STOCKPOT and STOCK POT] are confusingly similar. The word marks are phonetically identical and visually almost identical.”).

Furthermore, the fact that a mark is intended to be a parody of another trademark is not, by itself, sufficient to overcome a likelihood of confusion refusal, because “[t]here are confusing parodies and non-confusing parodies.” J. Thomas McCarthy, *McCarthy on Trademarks and Unfair Competition*, §31.153 (4th ed. 2010); *see also Nike, Inc. v. Maher*, 100 USPQ2d 1018, 1023 (TTAB 2011) (“[P]arody is not a defense if the marks would otherwise be considered confusingly similar.”). “A true parody actually decreases the likelihood of confusion because the effect of the parody is to create a distinction in the viewer’s mind between the actual product and the joke.” *Mutual of Omaha Ins. Co. v. Novak*, 648 F. Supp. 905, 910, 231 USPQ 963, 965 (D. Neb. 1986), *aff’d*, 836 F.2d 397, 5 USPQ2d 1314 (8th Cir. 1987). Thus, “[w]hile a parody must call to mind the actual product to be successful, the same success also necessarily distinguishes the parody from the actual product.” *Id.*

Thus, because the marks are otherwise confusingly similar, the fact the applied-for mark is intended to be a parody of the registered mark does not obviate the confusing similarity between the marks.

For the foregoing reasons, the marks are confusingly similar.

## 2. Relatedness of the Goods

The goods are compared to determine whether they are similar, commercially related, or travel in the same trade channels. *See Coach Servs., Inc. v. Triumph Learning LLC*, 668 F.3d 1356, 1369-71, 101 USPQ2d 1713, 1722-23 (Fed. Cir. 2012); *Herbko Int’l, Inc. v. Kappa Books, Inc.*, 308 F.3d 1156, 1165, 64 USPQ2d 1375, 1381 (Fed. Cir. 2002); TMEP §§1207.01, 1207.01(a)(vi).

The attached Internet evidence, consisting of Madewell, Banana Republic, and J Crew, establishes that the same entity commonly manufactures/produces/provides silk scarves and clothing, and markets the goods under the same mark. Similarly, the attached evidence from Draper James, Southern Tide, and Lily Pulitzer, establishes that the same entity commonly manufactures/produces/provides both calendars and scented candles, and markets the goods under the same mark. Thus, applicant’s and registrant’s goods are considered related for likelihood of confusion purposes. *See, e.g., In re Davey Prods. Pty Ltd.*, 92 USPQ2d 1198, 1202-04 (TTAB 2009); *In re Toshiba Med. Sys. Corp.*, 91 USPQ2d 1266, 1268-69, 1271-72 (TTAB 2009).

Based on the analysis above, the applicant’s and registrant’s goods are related.

## 3. Conclusion

Because applicant’s and registrant’s marks are similar and the goods are related, there is a likelihood of confusion and applicant’s applied-for mark must be refused under Section 2(d) of the Lanham Act.

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

### SPECIMEN REFUSAL

Registration is refused because the specimen does not show the applied-for mark in use in commerce in connection with any of the goods specified in International Class(es) 4 and 25 in the application. Trademark Act Sections 1 and 45, 15 U.S.C. §§1051, 1127; 37 C.F.R. §§2.34(a)(1)(iv), 2.56(a); *In re Keep A Breast Found.*, 123 USPQ2d 1869, 1876-79 (TTAB 2017); *In re Graystone Consulting Assocs., Inc.*, 115 USPQ2d 2035, 2037-38 (TTAB 2015); TMEP §§904, 904.07(a), 1301.04(d), (g)(i). Specifically, the specimen provided shows a picture of a candle, but the candle does not contain the applied-for mark.

Furthermore, the other specimen provided is merely a picture or rendering of the applied-for mark, and thus fails to show the applied-for mark in use in commerce with the goods for each international class. Trademark Act Sections 1 and 45, 15 U.S.C. §§1051, 1127; 37 C.F.R. §§2.34(a)(1)(iv), 2.56(a); *In re Chica*, 84 USPQ2d 1845, 1848 (TTAB 2007); TMEP §§904, 904.07(a), 1301.04(g)(i).

An application based on Trademark Act Section 1(a) must include a specimen showing the applied-for mark in use in commerce for each international class of goods and/or services identified in the application or amendment to allege use. 15 U.S.C. §1051(a)(1); 37 C.F.R. §§2.34(a)(1)(iv), 2.56(a); TMEP §§904, 904.07(a).

Examples of specimens for goods include tags, labels, instruction manuals, containers, photographs that show the mark on the actual goods or packaging, and displays associated with the actual goods at their point of sale. *See* TMEP §§904.03 *et seq.* Webpages may also be specimens for goods when they include a picture or textual description of the goods associated with the mark and the means to order the goods. TMEP §904.03(i).

Applicant may respond to this refusal by satisfying one of the following for each applicable international class:

- (1) Submit a different specimen (a verified [“substitute” specimen](#)) that (a) was in actual use in commerce at least as early as the filing date of the application or prior to the filing of an amendment to allege use and (b) shows the mark in actual use in commerce for the goods and/or services identified in the application or amendment to allege use. A “verified substitute specimen” is a specimen that is accompanied by the following statement made in a signed affidavit or supported by a declaration under 37 C.F.R. §2.20: “The substitute (or new, or originally submitted, if appropriate) specimen(s) was/were in use in commerce at least as early as the filing date of the application or prior to the filing of the amendment to allege use.” The substitute specimen cannot be accepted without this statement.
- (2) Amend the filing basis to [intent to use under Section 1\(b\)](#), for which no specimen is required. This option will later necessitate additional fee(s) and filing requirements such as providing a specimen.

For an overview of *both* response options referenced above and instructions on how to satisfy either option online using the Trademark Electronic Application System (TEAS) form, please go to <http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/law/specimen.jsp>.

If applicant responds to the refusal(s), applicant must also respond to the requirement(s) set forth below.

#### **DISCLAIMER REQUIREMENT FOR INTERNATIONAL CLASS 25**

Applicant must provide a disclaimer of the unregistrable part(s) of the applied-for mark even though the mark as a whole appears to be registrable. *See* 15 U.S.C. §1056(a); TMEP §§1213, 1213.03(a). A disclaimer of an unregistrable part of a mark will not affect the mark’s appearance. *See Schwarzkopf v. John H. Breck, Inc.*, 340 F.2d 978, 979-80, 144 USPQ 433, 433 (C.C.P.A. 1965).

In this case, applicant must disclaim the word “SCARF” because it is not inherently distinctive. These unregistrable term(s) at best are merely descriptive of an ingredient and/or characteristic of applicant’s goods. *See* 15 U.S.C. §1052(e)(1); *DuoProSS Meditech Corp. v. Inviro Med. Devices, Ltd.*, 695 F.3d 1247, 1251, 103 USPQ2d 1753, 1755 (Fed. Cir. 2012); TMEP §§1213, 1213.03(a).

This wording appears in applicant’s identification of goods as “Silk scarves.” Thus, the wording merely describes applicant’s goods, namely, that applicant is offering scarves.

Applicant may respond to this issue by submitting a disclaimer in the following format:

**No claim is made to the exclusive right to use “SCARF” apart from the mark as shown in International Class 25.**

For an overview of disclaimers and instructions on how to satisfy this issue using the Trademark Electronic Application System (TEAS), see the [Disclaimer webpage](#).

**Response guidelines.** For this application to proceed, applicant must explicitly address each refusal and/or requirement in this Office action. For a refusal, applicant may provide written arguments and evidence against the refusal, and may have other response options if specified above. For a requirement, applicant should set forth the changes or statements. Please see [“Responding to Office Actions”](#) and the informational [video “Response to Office Action”](#) for more information and tips on responding.

Please call or email the assigned trademark examining attorney with questions about this Office action. Although the trademark examining attorney cannot provide legal advice or statements about applicant’s rights, the trademark examining attorney can provide applicant with additional explanation about the refusal(s) and/or requirement(s) in this Office action. *See* TMEP §§705.02, 709.06. Although the USPTO does not accept emails as responses to Office actions, emails can be used for informal communications and will be included in the application record. *See* 37 C.F.R. §§2.62(c), 2.191; TMEP §§304.01-.02, 709.04-.05.

**TEAS PLUS OR TEAS REDUCED FEE (TEAS RF) APPLICANTS – TO MAINTAIN LOWER FEE, ADDITIONAL**

**REQUIREMENTS MUST BE MET, INCLUDING SUBMITTING DOCUMENTS ONLINE:** Applicants who filed their application online using the lower-fee TEAS Plus or TEAS RF application form must (1) file certain documents online using TEAS, including responses to Office actions (see TMEP §§819.02(b), 820.02(b) for a complete list of these documents); (2) maintain a valid e-mail correspondence address; and (3) agree to receive correspondence from the USPTO by e-mail throughout the prosecution of the application. *See* 37 C.F.R. §§2.22(b), 2.23(b); TMEP §§819, 820. TEAS Plus or TEAS RF applicants who do not meet these requirements must submit an additional processing fee of \$125 per class of goods and/or services. 37 C.F.R. §§2.6(a)(1)(v), 2.22(c), 2.23(c); TMEP §§819.04, 820.04. However, in certain situations, TEAS Plus or TEAS RF applicants may respond to an Office action by authorizing an examiner's amendment by telephone or e-mail without incurring this additional fee.

**How to respond.** [Click to file a response to this nonfinal Office action](#)

/Megan Mischler/  
Trademark Examining Attorney  
Law Office 127  
(571) 272-9997  
megan.mischler@uspto.gov

## RESPONSE GUIDANCE

- **Missing the response deadline to this letter will cause the application to [abandon](#).** A response or notice of appeal must be received by the USPTO before midnight **Eastern Time** of the last day of the response period. TEAS and ESTTA maintenance or [unforeseen circumstances](#) could affect an applicant's ability to timely respond.
- **[Responses signed by an unauthorized party](#)** are not accepted and can **cause the application to [abandon](#)**. If applicant does not have an attorney, the response must be signed by the individual applicant, all joint applicants, or someone with [legal authority to bind a juristic applicant](#). If applicant has an attorney, the response must be signed by the attorney.
- If needed, **find [contact information for the supervisor](#)** of the office or unit listed in the signature block.

# 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.