[DO NOT PUBLISH]

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

FILED
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
ELEVENTH CIRCUIT
MARCH 20, 2012
JOHN LEY
CLERK

No. 11-13578
Non-Argument Calendar

D.C. Docket No. 1:07-cv-20944-AJ

FARMAMEDICA, S.A.,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

versus

ANA ELOISA ALFARON DE MARON,
d.b.a. Combisa Laboratorios,

Defendant-Appellant.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of Florida

(March 20, 2012)

Before CARNES, WILSON and HILL, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM:

Plaintiff-Appellee Farmamedica, S.A. (Farmamedica), alleged that Defendant-Appellant Ana Eloisa Alfaro de Maron d/b/a Combisa Laboratorios (de Maron) infringed upon its trademark "Vital Fuerte" when she used the mark "Super Vital Forte." In 2007, de Maron's attorney made an offer of settlement.[1] Farmamedica accepted the offer. Final judgment was entered. A permanent injunction issued against de Maron from using the mark "Super Vital Forte."

In 2008, de Maron applied to register the mark "Supervitalforte." In 2009, Farmamedica moved for contempt. In 2011, forty-two (42) months after judgment was entered against her, de Maron filed a motion for relief from judgment under Rule 60(b), and Farmamedica renewed its motion for contempt. The district court denied de Maron's motion for relief from judgment, and granted in part, Farmamedica's renewed motion for contempt.

We have reviewed the record in this appeal, the briefs and the arguments of counsel. The July 14, 2011, order of the district court is thorough and well-reasoned. Finding no error, we affirm the judgment of the district court.

AFFIRMED.

---

[1] De Maron claims now that she did not give her attorney authority to settle in 2007. The district court assumed that de Maron's former attorney lacked the authority to settle, therefore, de Maron's motion requesting an evidentiary hearing on this factual dispute, was denied as moot.