

To: Yu Hao Yao(mickey.yao@tylawgp.com)
Subject: U.S. Trademark Application Serial No. 97845314 - MSADELA - TUS123987
Sent: April 22, 2023 05:44:42 PM EDT
Sent As: tmng.notices@uspto.gov

Attachments

[5644391](#)

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

U.S. Application Serial No. 97845314

Mark: MSADELA

Correspondence Address:

YU HAO YAO
TIANYU LAW GROUP, INC.
9660 FLAIR DR, STE 328
EL MONTE CA 91731 UNITED STATES

Applicant: QINGDAO LOVE HAIR PRODUCTS CO.,LTD

Reference/Docket No. TUS123987

Correspondence Email Address: mickey.yao@tylawgp.com

NONFINAL OFFICE ACTION

Response deadline. File a response to this nonfinal Office action within three months of the “Issue date” below to avoid [abandonment](#) of the application. Review the Office action and respond using one of the links to the appropriate electronic forms in the “How to respond” section below.

Request an extension. For a fee, applicant may [request one three-month extension](#) of the response deadline prior to filing a response. The request must be filed within three months of the “Issue date” below. If the extension request is granted, the USPTO must receive applicant's response to this letter within six months of the “Issue date” to avoid abandonment of the application.

Issue date: April 22, 2023

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

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. 5644391. 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 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). 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 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.

COMPARISON 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 Fondee 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)), *aff’d per curiam*, 777 F. App’x 516, 2019 BL 343921 (Fed. Cir. 2019); 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.*, 901 F.3d 1367, 1373, 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 Ox Paperboard, LLC*, 2020 USPQ2d 10878, at *4 (TTAB 2020) (citing *In re Bay State Brewing Co.*, 117 USPQ2d 1958, 1960 (TTAB 2016)); *In re Inn at St. John’s, LLC*, 126 USPQ2d 1742, 1746 (TTAB 2018); TMEP §1207.01(b); *see In re St. Helena Hosp.*, 774 F.3d 747, 750-51, 113 USPQ2d 1082, 1085 (Fed. Cir.

2014).

Here, the registered mark is ADELA (Reg. No. 5644391) in standard character form.

The applied-for mark is MSADELA, also in standard character form.

In this case, the applied-for and registered marks share the identical wording "ADELA." Marks may be confusingly similar in appearance where similar terms or phrases or similar parts of terms or phrases appear in the compared marks and create a similar overall commercial impression. *See Crocker Nat'l Bank v. Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce*, 228 USPQ 689, 690-91 (TTAB 1986), *aff'd sub nom. Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Wells Fargo Bank, Nat'l Ass'n*, 811 F.2d 1490, 1495, 1 USPQ2d 1813, 1817 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (holding COMMCASH and COMMUNICASH confusingly similar); *In re Corning Glass Works*, 229 USPQ 65, 66 (TTAB 1985) (holding CONFIRM and CONFIRMCELLS confusingly similar); *In re Pellerin Milnor Corp.*, 221 USPQ 558, 560 (TTAB 1983) (holding MILTRON and MILLTRONICS confusingly similar); TMEP §1207.01(b)(ii)-(iii).

Here, the registered mark ADELA (Reg. No. 5644391) is entirely incorporated into the applied-for mark MSADELA. 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) (holding 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) (holding BENGAL LANCER and design and BENGAL confusingly similar); *Double Coin Holdings, Ltd. v. Tru Dev.*, 2019 USPQ2d 377409, at *6-7 (TTAB 2019) (holding ROAD WARRIOR and WARRIOR (stylized) confusingly similar); *In re Mr. Recipe, LLC*, 118 USPQ2d 1084, 1090 (TTAB 2016) (holding JAWS DEVOUR YOUR HUNGER and JAWS confusingly similar); TMEP §1207.01(b)(iii).

Further, although the applied-for mark includes the additional letters "MS", this does not obviate the similarity of the marks. Adding a term to a registered mark generally 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 Coca-Cola Bottling Co. v. Jos. E. Seagram & Sons, Inc.*, 526 F.2d 556, 557, 188 USPQ 105, 106 (C.C.P.A. 1975) (holding BENGAL and BENGAL LANCER and design confusingly similar); *In re Toshiba Med. Sys. Corp.*, 91 USPQ2d 1266, 1269 (TTAB 2009) (holding TITAN and VANTAGE TITAN confusingly similar); *In re El Torito Rests., Inc.*, 9 USPQ2d 2002, 2004 (TTAB 1988) (holding MACHO and MACHO COMBOS confusingly similar); TMEP §1207.01(b)(iii). In the present case, the marks are identical in part.

In sum, the applied-for mark MSADELA has the same commercial impression as the registered mark ADELA (Reg. No. 5644391). As such, the marks are confusingly similar.

COMPARISON OF THE GOODS

In a likelihood of confusion determination, the goods and/or services 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 and/or services 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); *see Made in Nature, LLC v. Pharmavite LLC*, 2022 USPQ2d 557, at *44 (TTAB 2022) (quoting *In re Jump Designs LLC*, 80 USPQ2d 1370, 1374 (TTAB 2006)).

Here, the registrant's goods are identified as "cosmetics."

The applicant's goods are identified as "Fragrances; Lipstick; Adhesives for false eyelashes, hair and nails; Baby oils; Body and beauty care cosmetics; Depilatory creams; Essential oils; Eye shadow; False eyelashes; Laundry bleaching preparations; Nail cosmetics; Shampoo-conditioners; Skin masks; Sun tan lotion; Teeth whitening kit."

Determining likelihood of confusion is based on the description of the goods and/or services stated in the application and registration at issue, not on extrinsic evidence of actual use. *See In re Detroit Athletic Co.*, 903 F.3d 1297, 1307, 128 USPQ2d 1047, 1052 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (citing *In re i.am.symbolic, llc*, 866 F.3d 1315, 1325, 123 USPQ2d 1744, 1749 (Fed. Cir. 2017)).

In this case, the registration(s) use(s) broad wording to describe its goods as "cosmetics", which presumably encompasses all goods and/or services of the type described, including applicant's more narrow identifications for various cosmetic goods, including the lipstick, body and beauty care cosmetics, eye shadow, and nail cosmetics identified in the application. *See, e.g., Made in Nature, LLC v. Pharmavite LLC*, 2022 USPQ2d 557, at *44 (TTAB 2022); *In re Solid State Design Inc.*, 125 USPQ2d 1409, 1412-15 (TTAB 2018); *Sw. Mgmt., Inc. v. Ocinomled, Ltd.*, 115 USPQ2d 1007, 1025 (TTAB 2015). Thus, applicant's and registrant's goods are encompassing and therefore legally identical. *See, e.g., In re i.am.symbolic, llc*, 127 USPQ2d 1627, 1629 (TTAB 2018) (citing *Tuxedo Monopoly, Inc. v. Gen. Mills Fun Grp., Inc.*, 648 F.2d 1335, 1336, 209 USPQ 986, 988 (C.C.P.A. 1981); *Inter IKEA Sys. B.V. v. Akea, LLC*, 110 USPQ2d 1734, 1745 (TTAB 2014); *Baseball Am. Inc. v. Powerplay Sports Ltd.*, 71 USPQ2d 1844, 1847 n.9 (TTAB 2004)).

Additionally, the goods and/or services of the parties have no restrictions as to nature, type, channels of trade, or classes of purchasers and are “presumed to travel in the same channels of trade to the same class of purchasers.” *In re Viterra Inc.*, 671 F.3d 1358, 1362, 101 USPQ2d 1905, 1908 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (quoting *Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Packard Press, Inc.*, 281 F.3d 1261, 1268, 62 USPQ2d 1001, 1005 (Fed. Cir. 2002)); *Made in Nature, LLC v. Pharmavite LLC*, 2022 USPQ2d 557, at *49. Thus, applicant's and registrant's goods and/or services are related.

In summary, applicant's and registrant's marks create the same commercial impression and their respective goods are sufficiently related such that consumers are likely to be confused by the use of similar marks on or in connection with these goods. Accordingly, registration must be refused under Section 2(d) of the Trademark 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.

RESPONSE GUIDELINES

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. File a [response form to this nonfinal Office action](#) or file a [request form for an extension of time to file a response](#).

/Laura Taraban/
Laura Taraban
Examining Attorney
LO127--LAW OFFICE 127
(571) 272-3352
Laura.Taraban@USPTO.GOV

RESPONSE GUIDANCE

- **Missing the deadline for responding to this letter will cause the application to [abandon](#).** A response or extension request must be received by the USPTO before 11:59 p.m. **Eastern Time** of the last day of the response deadline. Trademark Electronic Application System (TEAS) [system availability](#) could affect an applicant's ability to timely respond. For help resolving technical issues with TEAS, email TEAS@uspto.gov.
- **[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.