- 1		
1	GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP	
2	George M. Belfield (SBN 100272) Email: belfieldg@gtlaw.com	
3	Nina D. Boyajian (SBN 246415)	
ار	Email: boyajiann@gtlaw.com 2450 Colorado Avenue, Suite 400 East	
4	Santa Monica, CA 90404-5524	
5	Telephone: (310) 586-7700 Facsimile: (310) 586-7800	
6		
7	Attorneys for Defendants MADONNA LOUISE VERONICA CICCO	NE.
8	MATERIAL GIRL BRAND, LLC, MG ICO	N, LLC
9	and MACY'S RETAIL HOLDINGS, INC.	
10		
	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
11	CENTRAL DISTRIC	CT OF CALIFORNIA
12	WESTERN	DIVISION
13	WESTELL.	
14		CACENO CUAO (105 CIO (IC)
15	L.A. TRIUMPH, INC., a California corporation,	CASE NO. CV 10 6195-SJO (JCx)
16		DEFENDANT MACY'S RETAIL HOLDINGS, INC.'S ANSWER TO
17	Plaintiff,	FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT
18	vs.	
- 1	MADONNA LOUISE VERONICA	THE CONTRACTOR OF THE CONTRACT
19	CICCONE, an individual; MATERIAL	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
20	GIRL BRAND, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company; MG ICON, a Delaware	
21	limited liability company; MACY'S	•
22	RETAIL HOLDINGS, INC., a Delaware corporation; and DOES 1 through 10,	
23		
24	Defendants.	
1		1
25 26		
26		
27		
28		

MACY'S' ANSWER TO FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT

129,174,992 v1

Defendant Macy's Retail Holdings, Inc. ("Macy's"), for itself alone, hereby answers Plaintiff L.A. Triumph, Inc.'s ("L.A. Triumph") First Amended Complaint ("FAC") as follows:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 1. Answering paragraph 1 of the FAC, Macy's admits that this Court has jurisdiction over these federal question trademark claims under the Lanham Act.
 - 2. Answering paragraph 2, Macy's admits that venue is proper in this District.

PARTIES

- 3. Macy's lacks sufficient information and belief to answer the allegations of paragraph 3 and, therefore, denies each and every allegation therein.
- 4. Macy's lacks sufficient information or belief to answer the allegations of paragraph 4 and, therefore, denies each and every allegation therein.
- 5. Macy's lacks sufficient information or belief to answer the allegations of paragraph 5 and, therefore, denies each and every allegation therein.
- 6. Macy's lacks sufficient information and belief to answer the allegations of paragraph 6 and, therefore, denies each and every allegation therein.
- 7. Answering paragraph 7, Macy's admits and alleges that it is a corporation existing under the laws of New York with its principal place of business in Cincinnati, Ohio. Macy's further admits and alleges that it operates retail department stores in California and other parts of the United States.
 - 8. Macy's denies the allegations of paragraph 8.

FACTS COMMON TO ALL COUNTS

- 9. Macy's lacks sufficient information or belief to answer the allegations of paragraph 9 and, therefore, denies each and every allegation therein.
- 10. Macy's lacks sufficient information or belief to answer the allegations of paragraph 10 and, therefore, denies each and every allegation therein.
- 11. Answering paragraph 11, Macy's admits that the public record discloses that there was a trademark registration filed by O.C. Mercantile with the California Secretary

of State, No. 102808, for "Material Girl" on about August 5, 1997, but allege that said
trademark registration expired on or about August 5, 2007. Except as expressly admitted
and alleged herein, Macy's lacks sufficient information or belief to answer the other
allegations of paragraph 11 and, therefore, denies said allegations.

- 12. Macy's lacks sufficient information or belief to answer the allegations of paragraph 12 and, therefore, denies each and every allegation therein.
- 13. Macy's lacks sufficient information or belief to answer the allegations of paragraph 13 and, therefore, denies each and every allegation therein.
- 14. Macy's lacks sufficient information or belief to answer the allegations of paragraph 14 and, therefore, denies each and every allegation therein.
- 15. Macy's lacks sufficient information or belief to answer the allegations of paragraph 15 and, therefore, denies each and every allegation therein.
 - 16. Macy's denies the allegations of paragraph 16.
- 17. Answering paragraph 17, Macy's admits and alleges that MG Icon in 2010 has been involved in selling a line of juniors' clothing for young women utilizing the mark "Material Girl" including through Macy's. Except as expressly admitted and alleged herein, Macy's denies the other allegations of paragraph 17.
- 18. Macy's lacks sufficient information or belief to answer the allegations of paragraph 18 and, therefore, denies each and every allegation therein.
- 19. Answering paragraph 19, Macy's admits that Material Girl Brand, LLC, now known as MG Icon, LLC, filed a United States Trademark Application on December 4, 2009 for the "Material Girl" mark for clothing in international class 025 and other classes under application No. 77/886,045. Except as expressly admitted and alleged herein, Macy's denies the other allegations of paragraph 19.
- 20. Answering paragraph 20, Macy's admits that MG Icon obtained certain rights to the "Material Girl" name, and that MG Icon, among others, is responsible for manufacturing the "Material Girl" line of juniors' clothing. Except as expressly admitted and alleged herein, Macy's denies the other allegations of paragraph 20.

- 21. Answering paragraph 21, Macy's admits and alleges that Macy's is a retailer currently selling, advertising, and promoting the "Material Girl" line of juniors' clothing. Except as expressly admitted and alleged herein, Macy's denies the other allegations of paragraph 21.
 - 22. Macy's denies the allegations of paragraph 22.

ANSWER TO FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Declaratory Relief against MGB, Madonna, and MG Icon under 28 U.S.C. § 2201)

- 23. Answering paragraph 23, Macy's incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 22, inclusive, of this Answer as if set forth in full herein.
- 24. Macy's is not a party to the First Claim for Relief which is not alleged against Macy's and, therefore, is not answering paragraph 24.
- 25. Macy's is not a party to the First Claim for Relief which is not alleged against Macy's and, therefore, is not answering paragraph 25.

ANSWER TO SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF

(Violation of Lanham Act § 43(a) against MGB and DOES 1-10)

- 26. Answering paragraph 26, Macy's incorporates by reference paragraphs 1 through 25, inclusive, of this Answer as if set forth in full herein.
- 27. Macy's lacks sufficient information or belief to answer the allegations of paragraph 27 and, therefore, denies said allegations.
- 28. Macy's lacks sufficient information or belief to answer the allegations of paragraph 28 as to Plaintiff and, therefore, denies said allegations.
- 29. Answering paragraph 29, Macy's admits and alleges that MG Icon and/or Macy's has in 2010, and continues to advertise and sell certain clothing using the name Material Girl. Macy's lacks sufficient information or belief to answer the other allegations of paragraph 29 and, therefore, denies said allegations.
 - 30. Macy's denies the allegations of paragraph 30.
 - 31. Macy's denies the allegations of paragraph 31.
 - 32. Macy's denies the allegations of paragraph 32.

24

25

26

27

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

1415

16

17

18

19

2021

22

2324

25

2627

28

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Failure to State a Claim for Relief)

1. Plaintiff's FAC, and each claim for relief therein, fails to state facts sufficient to constitute a claim for relief against Macy's.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Prior Use)

2. The other defendants or their predecessors-in-interest have used the "Material Girl" mark since in or about 1985, which is more than a decade before Plaintiff's alleged use.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Abandonment)

3. Plaintiff's registration of the "Material Girl" mark was limited to the State of California, expired on or about August 5, 2007, and has been abandoned by Plaintiff.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(No Likelihood of Confusion)

4. Macy's contends that Plaintiff's uses of the "Material Girl" name and trademark were and are improper. In any event, there is no likelihood of confusion for the public due to Macy's' uses of the "Material Girl" name and mark; indeed, it is Plaintiff's use of the name and mark which is likely to cause confusion for the public.

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Fair Use)

5. Plaintiff's claims are barred under the doctrine of fair use because Macy's' use of the name "Material Girl" includes using the name to identify the person endorsing MG Icon's business, i.e. Madonna, who popularized the name "Material Girl," and gave it secondary meaning; Macy's' use of the "Material Girl" name and mark does not describe or capitalize on plaintiff's use of "Material Girl."

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Laches)

6. Plaintiff has failed for over 15 years to raise any issues with or contest prior uses of the "Material Girl" name and mark and Plaintiff's FAC is thus barred under the doctrine of laches.

<u>SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE</u>

(Estoppel)

7. Plaintiff's FAC is barred under the doctrine of estoppel. For example, when due diligence was done on the "Material Girl" trademark for registration purposes, there was no federal registration by Plaintiff, and the California registration had expired and was abandoned; co-defendants reasonably relied on this fact in applying to register and in using the "Material Girl" mark in the retail clothing applications alleged in the FAC. Furthermore, Plaintiff over the years never contacted defendants, or their related parties or representatives, to make any claims or complaints with respect to the "Material Girl" name.

EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Misrepresentations and Fraud Re Plaintiff's Trademark Registration)

8. Macy's is informed and believes, and thereon alleges, that Plaintiff procured its California trademark registration for "Material Girl" based on misstatements, omissions of fact, misrepresentations and/or fraud including, without limitation, representing in 1997 that to Plaintiff's, or Plaintiff's predecessor O.C. Mercantile's, best knowledge and belief, no other person, firm or corporation had the right to use such mark in California, either in identical form or in such near resemblance thereto as might be calculated to deceive or confuse.

NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

(Unclean Hands)

9. Plaintiff's FAC is barred under the doctrine of unclean hands due to Plaintiff's own inequitable conduct with respect to this matter.

- 11			
1	TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE		
2	(No Damages)		
3	10. Plaintiff has suffered no damages as a result of Macy's' uses of the		
4	"Material Girl" name and mark; indeed, Plaintiff, on information and belief, may have		
5	benefited from Macy's' use of the "Material Girl" name.		
6	ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE		
7	(Sham Litigation)		
8	11. Plaintiff's FAC constitutes sham litigation filed for an improper purpose to		
9	interfere with and suppress fair competition.		
0	TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE		
. 1	(Statute of Limitations)		
.2	12. Plaintiff's FAC, and each claim for relief therein, is barred by the applicable		
3	statutes of limitations.		
4	WHEREFORE, defendant Macy's Retail Holdings, Inc. prays for relief as follows		
5	1. That plaintiff take nothing on its First Amended Complaint, and that this		
16	action be dismissed with prejudice;		
ا7	2. For attorney's fees as allowed by law;		
18	3. For its costs of suit herein; and		
19	4. For such further and other relief as the Court deems just and proper.		
20			
21	Dated: November 3, 2010 GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP		
22			
23	By: <u>/s/ George M. Belfield</u>		
24	GEORGE M. BELFIELD Attorneys for Defendants		
25	MADONNA LOUISE VERONICA		
26	CICCONE, MATERIAL GIRL BRAND, LLC, MG ICON, LLC and		
27	MACY'S RETAIL HOLDINGS, INC.		
28			

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

Defendant Macy's Retail Holdings, Inc. hereby demands a trial by jury.

Dated: November 3, 2010

GREENBERG TRAURIG, LLP

By: /s/ George M. Belfield

GEORGE M. BELFIELD
Attorneys for Defendants
MADONNA LOUISE VERONICA
CICCONE, MATERIAL GIRL BRAND,
LLC, MG ICON, LLC and
MACY'S RETAIL HOLDINGS, INC.