

To: Albert Bordas, Esq(tm@bordasiplaw.com)
Subject: U.S. Trademark Application Serial No. 97120534 - AMERICAN WELDING SUPPLY CO - 210394
Sent: August 24, 2022 01:21:12 PM EDT
Sent As: tmng.notices@uspto.gov

Attachments

[3924542](#)

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

U.S. Application Serial No. 97120534

Mark: AMERICAN WELDING SUPPLY CO

Correspondence Address:

ALBERT BORDAS, ESQ
ALBERT BORDAS, P.A.
5975 SUNSET DRIVE
MIAMI FL 33143 UNITED STATES

Applicant: American Welding Supply Co.

Reference/Docket No. 210394

Correspondence Email Address: tm@bordasiplaw.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: August 24, 2022

Introduction

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) - Likelihood of Confusion Refusal
- Mark Description - Amendment Required
- Disclaimer of Descriptive Wording Required

Section 2(d) - Likelihood of Confusion Refusal

Registration of the applied-for mark is refused because of a likelihood of confusion with the mark in U.S. Registration No. 3924542. 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.

Applicant has applied to register the mark AMERICAN WELDING SUPPLY CO in stylized text with a design for “on-line wholesale and retail store services featuring welders and plasma cutters, welding supplies, gas cutting and welding tools, welding helmets and safety equipment, welding accessories, and welder service parts; wholesale and retail store services featuring welders and plasma cutters, welding supplies, gas cutting and welding tools, welding helmets and safety equipment, welding accessories, and welder service parts” in International Class 35.

Registrant’s mark is AWG AMERICAN WELDING & GAS INC in stylized text with a design for, in relevant part, “retail store and distributorship services in the field of gas supply, welding supplies and welding equipment” in International Class 35.

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 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). Moreover, although marks are compared in their entireties, one feature of a mark may be more significant or dominant in creating a commercial impression. See *In re Detroit Athletic Co.*, 903 F.3d 1297, 1305, 128 USPQ2d 1047, 1050 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (citing *In re Dixie Rests.*, 105 F.3d 1405, 1407, 41 USPQ2d 1531, 1533-34 (Fed. Cir. 1997)); TMEP §1207.01(b)(viii), (c)(ii). Greater weight is often given to this dominant feature when determining whether marks are confusingly similar. See *In re Detroit Athletic Co.*, 903 F.3d at 1305, 128 USPQ2d at 1050 (citing *In re Dixie Rests.*, 105 F.3d at 1407, 41 USPQ2d at 1533-34).

Here, applicant’s mark, AMERICAN WELDING SUPPLY CO, is confusingly similar to the registered mark, AWG AMERICAN WELDING & GAS INC. Both marks begin with the same dominant wording AMERICAN WELDING which means the marks look and sound similar initially. Consumers are generally more inclined to focus on the first word, prefix, or syllable in any trademark or service mark. See *Palm Bay Imps., Inc. v. Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin Maison Fondee En 1772*, 396 F.3d 1369, 1372, 73 USPQ2d 1689, 1692 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (finding similarity between VEUVE ROYALE and two VEUVE CLICQUOT marks in part because “VEUVE . . . remains a ‘prominent feature’ as the first word in the mark and the first word to appear on the label”); *Century 21 Real Estate Corp. v. Century Life of Am.*, 970 F.2d 874, 876, 23 USPQ2d 1698, 1700 (Fed. Cir. 1992) (finding similarity between CENTURY 21 and CENTURY LIFE OF AMERICA in part because “consumers must first notice th[e] identical lead word”); see also *In re Detroit Athletic Co.*, 903 F.3d 1297, 1303, 128 USPQ2d 1047, 1049 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (finding “the identity of the marks’ two initial words is particularly significant because consumers typically notice those words first”).

Similarly, the common phrasing between the marks, AMERICAN WELDING, not only makes the marks look and sound similar but it also conveys an overall similar commercial impression. 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).

While the two marks have slightly different stylization and design elements, both marks have a similar commercial impression in the design of the marks as both contain a type of spark or firework like element with bands. Consumer confusion has been held likely for marks that do not physically sound or look alike but that convey the same idea, stimulate the same mental reaction, or may have the same overall meaning. *Proctor & Gamble Co. v. Conway*, 419 F.2d 1332, 1336, 164 USPQ 301, 304 (C.C.P.A. 1970) (holding MISTER STAIN likely to be confused with MR. CLEAN on competing cleaning products); see *In re M. Serman & Co.*, 223 USPQ 52, 53 (TTAB 1984) (holding CITY WOMAN for ladies’ blouses likely to be confused with CITY GIRL for a variety of female clothing); *H. Sichel Sohne, GmbH v. John Gross & Co.*, 204 USPQ 257, 260-61 (TTAB 1979) (holding BLUE NUN for wines likely to be confused with BLUE CHAPEL for the same goods); *Ralston Purina Co. v. Old Ranchers Canning Co.*, 199 USPQ 125, 128 (TTAB 1978) (holding TUNA O’ THE FARM for

canned chicken likely to be confused with CHICKEN OF THE SEA for canned tuna); *Downtowner Corp. v. Uptowner Inns, Inc.*, 178 USPQ 105, 109 (TTAB 1973) (holding UPTOWNER for motor inn and restaurant services likely to be confused with DOWNTOWNER for the same services); TMEP §1207.01(b). In the present case, the marks do look and sound alike as well as convey a similar commercial impression which means there is a likelihood of confusion between the marks.

When evaluating composite marks consisting of words and a design, the word portion is normally accorded greater weight because it is likely to make a greater impression upon purchasers, be remembered by them, and be used by them to refer to or request the goods and/or services. *In re Aquitaine Wine USA, LLC*, 126 USPQ2d 1181, 1184 (TTAB 2018) (citing *In re Viterra Inc.*, 671 F.3d 1358, 1362, 101 USPQ2d 1905, 1908 (Fed. Cir. 2012)); TMEP §1207.01(c)(ii). Thus, although marks must be compared in their entireties, the word portion is often considered the dominant feature and is accorded greater weight in determining whether marks are confusingly similar, even where the word portion has been disclaimed. *In re Viterra Inc.*, 671 F.3d at 1366-67, 101 USPQ2d at 1911 (citing *Giant Food, Inc. v. Nation's Foodservice, Inc.*, 710 F.2d 1565, 1570-71, 218 USPQ2d 390, 395 (Fed. Cir. 1983)).

Because the marks look and sound similar and create a similar commercial impression, the marks are considered similar for likelihood of confusion purposes.

Relatedness of the Services

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).

In this case, the registration uses broad wording to describe "retail store and distributorship services in the field of gas supply, welding supplies and welding equipment," which encompasses all services of the type described, including applicant's more narrow "on-line wholesale and retail store services featuring welders and plasma cutters, welding supplies, gas cutting and welding tools, welding helmets and safety equipment, welding accessories, and welder service parts" and "wholesale and retail store services featuring welders and plasma cutters, welding supplies, gas cutting and welding tools, welding helmets and safety equipment, welding accessories, and welder service parts." *See, e.g., 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 services are 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 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 Vittera 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)). Thus, applicant’s and registrant’s goods and/or services are related.

Accordingly, the services are considered related for purposes of the likelihood of confusion analysis.

Conclusion

Because the marks are similar and the services are legally identical, there is a likelihood of confusion as to the source of applicant’s services, and registration is refused pursuant to Section 2(d) of the Trademark Act.

Response Options to Refusals

Although applicant’s mark has been refused registration, applicant may respond to the refusal by submitting evidence and arguments in support of registration. However, if applicant responds to the refusal, applicant must also respond to the requirements set forth below.

Mark Description - Amendment Required

Applicant must delete from the description any text that does not reference things appearing in the mark, such as interpretation, assessment, or analysis of the mark elements, or indications of how the mark is or is not used or intended to be used. In the present case, the word "you" appears in the mark description and WELDING is misspelled in the last sentence. A description must identify only the literal and design elements shown in the drawing. *See* 37 C.F.R. §2.37; TMEP §808.02. In addition, applicant did not provide a complete description specifying where each color appears in the literal and design elements in the mark. *See* 37 C.F.R. §§2.37, 2.52(b)(1); TMEP §807.07(a)-(a)(ii). Specifically, the mark description did not identify the color of the spark that appears above the letter "I". Therefore, applicant must provide a corrected mark description identifying all the colors in the mark and where they appear. *See* TMEP §807.07(a)(ii).

The following description is suggested, if accurate:

The mark consists of the words "AMERICAN WELDING SUPPLY CO" in stylized letters. "AMERICAN" is shown in blue with a red fire spark on top of the letter "I" and a ribbon of red, white and blue starting on top of the spark and ending across the letter "A" in the color red. Underneath is the words "WELDING SUPPLY CO" in the color red.

Disclaimer of Descriptive Wording Required

Applicant must disclaim all the wording in the mark because it is merely descriptive of an ingredient, quality, characteristic, function, feature, purpose, or use of applicant’s goods and/or services. *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).

First, the term AMERICAN must be disclaimed because the application identifies the address based in

Miami, Florida, which is in the United States suggesting the origin of the services is America. In addition, WELDING SUPPLY must also be disclaimed because the application identifies "welding supplies" as part of the identification of services. Moreover, the term CO must also be disclaimed because business type designations and abbreviations such as "Corporation," "Inc.," "Company," "LLC," and "Ltd." or family business designations such as "& Son's" or "Bros." must be disclaimed, because they merely indicate applicant's business type or structure and generally have no source-indicating capacity. TMEP §1213.03(d); *see, e.g., Goodyear's India Rubber Glove Mfg. Co. v. Goodyear Rubber Co.*, 128 U.S. 598, 602-03 (1888); *In re Piano Factory Grp., Inc.*, 85 USPQ2d 1522, 1526 (TTAB 2006); *In re Patent & Trademark Servs., Inc.*, 49 USPQ2d 1537, 1539-40 (TTAB 1998). Thus, the wording AMERICAN WELDING SUPPLY CO merely describes applicant's services as a company the supplies welding products likely based in America.

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

No claim is made to the exclusive right to use "AMERICAN WELDING SUPPLY CO" apart from the mark as shown.

For an overview of disclaimers and instructions on how to provide one 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 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.](#)

/Deborah Sterlin/
Deborah Sterlin
Trademark Examining Attorney
Law Office 305
(571) 272-4529
deborah.sterlin@uspto.gov

RESPONSE GUIDANCE

- **Missing the response deadline to this letter will cause the application to [abandon](#).** The response must be received by the USPTO before midnight **Eastern Time** of the last day of the response period. TEAS 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.

(3) DESIGN PLUS WORDS, LETTERS, AND/OR NUMBERS



Mark Punctuated

AWG AMERICAN WELDING & GAS INC

Translation

Goods/Services

- IC 001. US 001 005 006 010 026 046.G & S: Industrial gases, medical gases, and specialty gases, namely, oxygen, nitrogen, argon, and carbon dioxide; oxygen, nitrogen, argon, acetylene, carbon dioxide and nitrous oxide contained in cylinders. FIRST USE: 20080800. FIRST USE IN COMMERCE: 20080800
- (CANCELLED) IC 004. US 001 006 015.G & S: [propane for use as fuels]. FIRST USE: 20080800. FIRST USE IN COMMERCE: 20080800
- IC 035. US 100 101 102.G & S: Retail store and distributorship services in the field of gas supply, welding supplies and welding equipment. FIRST USE: 20080800. FIRST USE IN COMMERCE: 20080800

Mark Drawing Code

(3) DESIGN PLUS WORDS, LETTERS, AND/OR NUMBERS

Design Code

010105 240905 261702 261705

Serial Number

77817411

Filing Date

20090901

Current Filing Basis

1A

Original Filing Basis

1A

Publication for Opposition Date

20101214

Registration Number

3924542

Date Registered

20110301

Owner

(REGISTRANT) American Welding & Gas, Inc. CORPORATION NORTH CAROLINA 4800 Falls of Neuse Suite 315 Raleigh NORTH CAROLINA 27609

Priority Date**Disclaimer Statement**

NO CLAIM IS MADE TO THE EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO USE "AMERICAN" AND "WELDING & GAS" AND "INC" APART FROM THE MARK AS SHOWN

Description of Mark

Color is not claimed as a feature of the mark. The mark consists of the letters "AWG" with a star in the letter "A" and a stars and stripe design appearing in the letters "AWG", which appear above the word "AMERICAN" that has stripes on either side of the word. Beneath the word "AMERICAN" are the words "WELDING & GAS", with the designation "INC" to the right of "GAS".

Type of Mark

TRADEMARK. SERVICE MARK

Register

PRINCIPAL

Live Dead Indicator

LIVE

Attorney of Record

Eva Gullick Frongello

United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO)

USPTO OFFICIAL NOTICE

Office Action (Official Letter) has issued
on August 24, 2022 for
U.S. Trademark Application Serial No. 97120534

A USPTO examining attorney has reviewed your trademark application and issued an Office action. You must respond to this Office action in order to avoid your application abandoning. Follow the steps below.

- (1) **[Read the Office action](#)**. This email is NOT the Office action.
- (2) **Respond to the Office action by the deadline** using the Trademark Electronic Application System (TEAS). Your response must be received by the USPTO on or before 11:59 p.m. **Eastern Time** of the last day of the response period. Otherwise, your application will be **[abandoned](#)**. See the Office action itself regarding how to respond.
- (3) **Direct general questions** about using USPTO electronic forms, the USPTO **[website](#)**, the application process, the status of your application, and whether there are outstanding deadlines to the **[Trademark Assistance Center \(TAC\)](#)**.

After reading the Office action, address any question(s) regarding the specific content to the USPTO examining attorney identified in the Office action.

GENERAL GUIDANCE

- **[Check the status](#) of your application periodically** in the **[Trademark Status & Document Retrieval \(TSDR\)](#)** database to avoid missing critical deadlines.
- **[Update your correspondence email address](#)** to ensure you receive important USPTO notices about your application.
- **[Beware of trademark-related scams](#)**. Protect yourself from people and companies that may try to take financial advantage of you. Private companies may call you and pretend to be the USPTO or may send you communications that resemble official USPTO documents to trick you. We will never request your credit card number or social security number over the phone. And all official USPTO correspondence will only be emailed from the domain “@uspto.gov.” Verify the correspondence originated from us by using your Serial Number in our database, **[TSDR](#)**, to confirm that it appears under the “Documents” tab, or contact the **[Trademark Assistance Center](#)**.

- **Hiring a U.S.-licensed attorney.** If you do not have an attorney and are not required to have one under the trademark rules, we encourage you to hire a U.S.-licensed attorney specializing in trademark law to help guide you through the registration process. The USPTO examining attorney is not your attorney and cannot give you legal advice, but rather works for and represents the USPTO in trademark matters.