

To: WHITE, JONATHAN (frank.knizner@bevlaw.com)
Subject: U.S. Trademark Application Serial No. 90141406 - AMP-ER-SAND - TM1395-T
Sent: December 28, 2020 11:59:02 PM
Sent As: ecom117@uspto.gov
Attachments: [Attachment - 1](#)
[Attachment - 2](#)

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

**U.S. Application Serial
No.** 90141406

Mark: AMP-ER-SAND

Correspondence

Address:
Frank Knizner
Lehrman Beverage Law
Suite 303
2911 Hunter Mill Road
Oakton VA 22124
Applicant: WHITE,
JONATHAN

Reference/Docket No.
TM1395-T

**Correspondence Email
Address:**

frank.knizner@bevlaw.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: **December 28, 2020**

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.

PRELIMINARY AMENDMENT(S)

This letter responds to applicant's communications, both filed on October 27, 2020. The following matters have been entered in the record: amendment of the mark.

SEARCH

The trademark examining attorney searched the USPTO database of registered and pending marks and found no conflicting marks that would bar registration under Trademark Act Section 2(d). 15 U.S.C. §1052(d); TMEP §704.02.

SECTION 2(D) – LIKELIHOOD OF CONFUSION REFUSAL

Registration of the applied-for mark **AM-PER-SAND** is refused because of a likelihood of confusion with the mark in **U.S. Registration No. 3374373 (AMPERSAND)**. Trademark Act Section 2(d), 15 U.S.C. §1052(d); *see* TMEP §§1207.01 *et seq.* See the attached registration.

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). Any evidence of record related to those factors need be considered; however, “not all of the *DuPont* factors are relevant or of similar weight in every case.” *In re Guild Mortg. Co.*, 912 F.3d 1376, 1379, 129 USPQ2d 1160, 1162 (Fed. Cir. 2019) (quoting *In re Dixie Rests., Inc.*, 105 F.3d 1405, 1406, 41 USPQ2d 1531, 1533 (Fed. Cir. 1997)).

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.

Comparison of Marks

In a likelihood of confusion determination, the marks in their entireties are compared for similarities in appearance, sound, connotation, and commercial impression. *In re i.am.symbolic, llc*, 866 F.3d 1315, 1323, 123 USPQ2d 1744, 1748 (Fed. Cir. 2017); *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)); *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)-(b)(v).

In the present case, applicant’s mark is AM-PER-SAND and registrant’s mark is AMPERSAND. In fact, the applicant’s mark is merely the term AMPERSAND (identical to the registrant’s mark) broken into syllables, as explained in the applicant’s October 27, 2020 preliminary response. These marks share the same letters, are identical in sound and meaning, “and have the potential to be used . . . in exactly the same manner.” *In re i.am.symbolic, llc*, 116 USPQ2d 1406, 1411 (TTAB 2015), *aff’d*, 866 F.3d 1315, 123 USPQ2d 1744 (Fed. Cir. 2017). Additionally, because they are virtually identical, these marks are likely to engender the same connotation and overall commercial impression when considered in connection with applicant and registrants’ respective goods. *Id.*

Therefore, the marks are confusingly similar.

Comparison of Goods

The registrant markets “Wine”.

The applicant plans to market “Wine.”

When analyzing an applicant’s and registrant’s goods for similarity and relatedness, that determination is based on the description of the goods in the application and registration at issue, not on extrinsic evidence of actual use. *See Stone Lion Capital Partners, LP v. Lion Capital LLP*, 746 F.3d 1317, 1323, 110 USPQ2d 1157, 1162 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (quoting *Octocom Sys. Inc. v. Hous. Computers Servs. Inc.*, 918 F.2d 937, 942, 16 USPQ2d 1783, 1787 (Fed. Cir. 1990)).

In this case, the goods in the application and registration(s) are identical. Therefore, it is presumed that the channels of trade and class(es) of purchasers are the same for these goods. *See Cai v. Diamond Hong, Inc.*, 901 F.3d 1367, 1372, 127 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.

Purchasers or potential purchasers, upon seeing these highly similar marks used on and in conjunction with similar goods, are likely to believe that the goods emanate from the same source. This, of course, would lead to confusion in the marketplace.

The overriding concern is not only to prevent buyer confusion as to the source of the goods, but to protect the registrant from adverse commercial impact due to use of a similar mark by a newcomer. *See In re Shell Oil Co.*, 992 F.2d 1204, 1208, 26 USPQ2d 1687, 1690 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Therefore, any doubt regarding a likelihood of confusion determination is resolved in favor of the registrant. TMEP §1207.01(d)(i); *see Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Packard Press, Inc.*, 281 F.3d 1261, 1265, 62 USPQ2d 1001, 1003 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *In re Hyper Shoppes (Ohio), Inc.*, 837 F.2d 463, 464-65, 6 USPQ2d 1025, 1026 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

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

PLEASE NOTE:

Please call or email the assigned trademark examining attorney with questions about this Office action. Although an examining attorney cannot provide legal advice, the examining attorney can provide additional explanation about the refusal(s) and/or requirement(s) in this Office action. *See* TMEP §§705.02, 709.06.

The USPTO does not accept emails as responses to Office actions; however, emails can be used for informal communications and are included in the application record. *See* 37 C.F.R. §§2.62(c), 2.191; TMEP §§304.01-.02, 709.04-.05.

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

/C. Skye Young/
Trademark Examining Attorney
Law Office 117
(571) 272-9713
skye.young@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.

Print: Dec 28, 2020

78935264

DESIGN MARK

Serial Number

78935264

Status

REGISTERED AND RENEWED

Word Mark

AMPERSAND

Standard Character Mark

Yes

Registration Number

3374373

Date Registered

2008/01/22

Type of Mark

TRADEMARK

Register

PRINCIPAL

Mark Drawing Code

(4) STANDARD CHARACTER MARK

Owner

LEVY & MCCLELLAN FAMILY TRUST TRUST CALIFORNIA P.O. BOX 524 ST. HELENA
CALIFORNIA 94574

Goods/Services

Class Status -- ACTIVE. IC 033. US 047 049. G & S: Wine. First
Use: 2007/11/14. First Use In Commerce: 2007/11/14.

Filing Date

2006/07/21

Examining Attorney

MEIER, SHARON

Attorney of Record

Melville Owen

AMPERSAND

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.