

**To:** Tabacalera Falto, Inc. ([fherrera@hnewmedia.com](mailto:fherrera@hnewmedia.com))  
**Subject:** U.S. Trademark Application Serial No. 88488537 - LA PUREZA - N/A  
**Sent:** September 15, 2019 06:40:49 PM  
**Sent As:** ecom124@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.** 88488537

**Mark:** LA PUREZA

**Correspondence**

**Address:**  
FRANK HERRERA  
H NEW MEDIA LAW  
1110 BRICKELL AVE,  
SSUITE 506  
MIAMI, FL 33131

**Applicant:** Tabacalera  
Falto, Inc.

**Reference/Docket No.**

N/A

**Correspondence Email**

**Address:**

[fherrera@hnewmedia.com](mailto:fherrera@hnewmedia.com)

**NONFINAL OFFICE ACTION**

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 15, 2019**

The referenced application has been reviewed by the assigned trademark examining attorney. Applicant must respond timely and completely to the issues 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
- Prior Pending Advisory
- Translation Requirement

**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. 3948045 (PURE) and 4412537 (PURE). Trademark Act Section 2(d), 15 U.S.C. §1052(d); see TMEP §§1207.01 *et seq.* See the attached registrations.

Applicant seeks to register the mark “LA PUREZA” for “cigars” in Class 34.

The registered marks “PURE” identify “Cigarillos; Cigars” and “Cigar cutters; Cigar humidifiers; Hookahs” in Class 34.

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 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. 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.

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).

When comparing marks, “[t]he proper test is not a side-by-side comparison of the marks, but instead whether the marks are sufficiently similar in terms of their commercial impression such that [consumers] who encounter the marks would be likely to assume a connection between the parties.” *Cai v. Diamond Hong, Inc.*, \_\_\_ F.3d \_\_\_, 127 USPQ2d 1797, 1801 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (quoting *Coach Servs., Inc. v. Triumph Learning LLC*, 668 F.3d 1356, 1368, 101 USPQ2d 1713, 1721 (Fed. Cir. 2012)); TMEP §1207.01(b). The proper focus is on the recollection of the average purchaser, who retains a general rather than specific impression of trademarks. *In re Inn at St. John’s, LLC*, 126 USPQ2d 1742, 1746 (TTAB 2018) (citing *In re St. Helena Hosp.*, 774 F.3d 747, 750-51, 113 USPQ2d 1082, 1085 (Fed. Cir. 2014); *Geigy Chem. Corp. v. Atlas Chem. Indus., Inc.*, 438 F.2d 1005, 1007, 169 USPQ 39, 40 (CCPA 1971)); TMEP §1207.01(b).

Although one of registrant’s marks appears in stylized form and with a design element, applicant’s mark appears in standard characters and therefore could appear in a similar manner. A mark in typed or standard characters may be displayed in any lettering style; the rights reside in the wording or other literal element and not in any particular display or rendition. See *In re Viterro Inc.*, 671 F.3d 1358, 1363, 101 USPQ2d 1905, 1909 (Fed. Cir. 2012); *In re Mighty Leaf Tea*, 601 F.3d 1342, 1348, 94 USPQ2d 1257, 1260 (Fed. Cir. 2010); 37 C.F.R. §2.52(a); TMEP §1207.01(c)(iii). Thus, a mark presented in stylized characters and/or with a design element generally will not avoid likelihood of confusion with a mark in typed or standard characters because the word portion could be presented in the same manner of display. See, e.g., *In re Viterro Inc.*, 671 F.3d at 1363, 101 USPQ2d at 1909; *Squirtco v. Tomy Corp.*, 697 F.2d 1038, 1041, 216 USPQ 937, 939 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (stating that “the

argument concerning a difference in type style is not viable where one party asserts rights in no particular display”).

In this case, the applicant’s mark, LA PUREZA, creates a similar overall commercial impression to the cited registered mark, PURE, because the wording PUREZA in applicant’s mark fully contains the wording of the registered mark. When comparing similar marks, the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board has found that inclusion of the term “the” at the beginning of one of the marks will generally not affect or otherwise diminish the overall similarity between the marks. See *In re Thor Tech Inc.*, 90 USPQ2d 1634, 1635 (TTAB 2009) (finding WAVE and THE WAVE “virtually identical” marks; “[t]he addition of the word ‘The’ at the beginning of the registered mark does not have any trademark significance.”); *In re Narwood Prods. Inc.*, 223 USPQ 1034, 1034 (TTAB 1984) (finding THE MUSIC MAKERS and MUSIC-MAKERS “virtually identical” marks; the inclusion of the definite article “the” is “insignificant in determining likelihood of confusion”).

As such, the marks are highly similar and likely to cause confusion.

#### 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 compared goods need not be identical or even competitive to find a likelihood of confusion. See *On-line Careline Inc. v. Am. Online Inc.*, 229 F.3d 1080, 1086, 56 USPQ2d 1471, 1475 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Recot, Inc. v. Becton*, 214 F.3d 1322, 1329, 54 USPQ2d 1894, 1898 (Fed. Cir. 2000); TMEP §1207.01(a)(i). They need only be “related in some manner and/or if the circumstances surrounding their marketing are such that they could give rise to the mistaken belief that [the goods and/or services] emanate from the same source.” *Coach Servs., Inc. v. Triumph Learning LLC*, 668 F.3d 1356, 1369, 101 USPQ2d 1713, 1722 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (quoting *7-Eleven Inc. v. Wechsler*, 83 USPQ2d 1715, 1724 (TTAB 2007)); TMEP §1207.01(a)(i).

Regarding Registration No. 3948045, the attached Internet evidence, consisting of third party sites—Mike’s Cigars, Holt’s Cigar Company, and JR Cigar—establishes that cigars and cigar accessories are sold or provided through the same trade channels and used by the same classes of consumers in the same fields of use. 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).

In the case of Registration No. 4412537, the goods in the application and registration are identical. Therefore, it is presumed that the channels of trade and class of purchasers are the same for these goods and/or services. See *Cai v. Diamond Hong, Inc.*, \_\_\_ F.3d \_\_\_, 27 USPQ2d 1797, 1801 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (quoting *In re Viterra Inc.*, 671 F.3d 1358, 1362, 101 USPQ2d 1905, 1908 (Fed. Cir. 2012)). Thus, applicant’s and registrant’s goods are related.

For these reasons, consumers are likely to encounter the parties’ goods in the same market channels. Given the strong similarities between the key elements of the parties’ marks, consumers encountering the marks in the same commercial contexts are likely to confuse the marks and mistake the underlying sources of related goods provided under the marks. Accordingly, registration is refused under Trademark Act Section 2(d).

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

The applicant should also note the following potential grounds for refusal. If applicant responds to this action, applicant should note that the application may be suspended if the earlier-filed application below is still pending.

#### **PRIOR-FILED APPLICATIONS**

The filing dates of pending U.S. Application Serial Nos. 88067191 (PRECISION AND PURITY) and 88293062 (THE PEAK OF PURITY) precede applicant’s filing date. See attached referenced applications. If one or more of the marks in the referenced applications register, applicant’s mark may be refused registration under Trademark Act Section 2(d) because of a likelihood of confusion with the registered mark(s). See 15 U.S.C. §1052(d); 37 C.F.R. §2.83; TMEP §§1208 *et seq.* Therefore, upon receipt of applicant’s response to this Office action, action on this application may be suspended pending final disposition of the earlier-filed referenced applications.

In response to this Office action, applicant may present arguments in support of registration by addressing the issue of the potential conflict between applicant’s mark and the marks in the referenced applications. Applicant’s election not to submit arguments at this time in no way limits applicant’s right to address this issue later if a refusal under Section 2(d) issues.

## ENGLISH TRANSLATION REQUIREMENT

To permit proper examination of the application, applicant must submit an English translation of all wording in the mark that appears to be foreign. 37 C.F.R. §§2.32(a)(9), 2.61(b); TMEP §809. The applicant provided a translation that does not appear completely accurate.

The following English translation is suggested: **The English translation of “LA PUREZA” is “the purity”**. TMEP §809.03. See attached translation evidence.

### *Response Guidelines*

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](#)

/Alexandra El-Bayeh/  
Trademark Examining Attorney  
Law Office 124  
(571) 270-5911  
alexandra.el-bayeh@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.

**DESIGN MARK**

**Serial Number**

77073211

**Status**

SECTION 8 & 15-ACCEPTED AND ACKNOWLEDGED

**Word Mark**

PURE

**Standard Character Mark**

Yes

**Registration Number**

3948045

**Date Registered**

2011/04/19

**Type of Mark**

TRADEMARK

**Register**

PRINCIPAL

**Mark Drawing Code**

(4) STANDARD CHARACTER MARK

**Owner**

MTM MARKETING, LLC LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY NEVADA 5012 Arville St,  
#7 LAS VEGAS NEVADA 89118

**Goods/Services**

Class Status -- ACTIVE. IC 034. US 002 008 009 017. G & S: Cigar cutters; Cigar humidifiers; Hookahs [; Smoking pipes ]. First Use: 2011/01/03. First Use In Commerce: 2011/01/03.

**Filing Date**

2006/12/29

**Examining Attorney**

GLASSER, CARYN

**Attorney of Record**

Dana B. Robinson

# 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.