

1 \*E-FILED: November 27, 2012\*

2  
3  
4  
5  
6 NOT FOR CITATION  
7 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
8 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
9 SAN JOSE DIVISION

10 WEST MARINE, INC.,

No. C11-04459 HRL

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 WATERCRAFT SUPERSTORE, INC. and  
DOES 1-50, inclusive,

14 Defendants.

**ORDER DENYING WEST MARINE'S  
MOTION FOR SUMMARY  
JUDGMENT ON WATERCRAFT  
SUPERSTORE'S COUNTERCLAIMS**

**[Dkts. 64]**

15  
16 This action arises from failed negotiations over the shared use of a trademark. Plaintiff West  
17 Marine, Inc. ("West Marine") and defendant Watercraft Superstore, Inc. ("Watercraft") are purveyors of  
18 boating equipment. Both parties attempted to register with the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
19 ("USPTO") a similar mark ("the mark" or "Blacktip mark"). Watercraft had filed its application  
20 with the USPTO first. West Marine approached Watercraft to negotiate an agreement to govern  
21 shared use of the mark, and withdrew its own application for trademark protection. The  
22 negotiations failed to yield an agreement, but West Marine has been using the mark in connection  
23 with fishing tools and accessories, clothing, hats, visors and personal floatation devices. West  
24 Marine filed this action against Watercraft for breach of oral contract and related claims (breach of  
25 the covenant of good faith and fair dealing, intentional and negligent interference with economic  
26 advantage, declaratory and injunctive relief, unjust enrichment, quantum meruit, and promissory  
27 estoppel). Watercraft counterclaimed for trademark infringement and related claims (false  
28

1 designation of origin, unfair competition, trademark dilution, injury to business reputation, and  
2 unfair business practices).

3 Third party Surftech, LLC (“Surftech”) also had a federal trademark registration for the  
4 Blacktip mark. Surftech had acquired its right to use the Blacktip mark before Watercraft had  
5 acquired its right to use the Blacktip mark, but Surftech had the right to use the mark in connection  
6 with surfboards. After filing this suit, West Marine obtained an assignment of Surftech’s right to  
7 use the Blacktip mark (“Surftech Assignment”). West Marine moves for dismissal of the  
8 counterclaims on the basis that the Surftech Assignment gives it priority rights in the Blacktip mark,  
9 thus defeating Watercraft’s counterclaims. In opposition to the motion, Watercraft contests the  
10 validity of the Surftech Assignment and argues that, even if it were a valid assignment relevant to  
11 this action, the Surftech Assignment would only cover the narrow product class of surfboards, not  
12 all of the other goods at issue in this suit. On November 13, 2012, this Court heard West Marine’s  
13 motion for summary judgment.<sup>1</sup> Based on the papers filed by the parties, as well as the arguments  
14 of counsel, the motion is denied.

15 West Marine has failed to establish that the Surftech Assignment defeats Watercraft’s  
16 counterclaims. To prevail on its motion, West Marine needed to establish, *inter alia*, that its use of  
17 the Blacktip mark in connection with its fishing equipment, accessories, clothing, and personal  
18 floatation devices was related to or within the zone of natural expansion of the rights it has now  
19 acquired from Surftech. It did not do so. The evidentiary submissions from both parties on this  
20 fact-intensive inquiry only established the existence of disputed issues of material fact. Although  
21 West Marine objects to some of the evidence submitted by Watercraft, the evidence that it does not  
22 object to amply shows that disputed issues of material fact preclude summary judgment. For these  
23 reasons, and for the reasons stated on the record at the hearing, West Marine’s motion is DENIED.

24 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

25 Dated: November 27, 2012

26  
27   
28 \_\_\_\_\_  
HOWARD R. LLOYD  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(c) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 73, all parties have expressly consented that all proceedings in this matter may be heard and finally adjudicated by the undersigned magistrate judge.

1 **C 11-04459 HRL Order will be electronically mailed to:**

2 Allen Ruby: Allen.Ruby@Skadden.com, abraham.andrade@skadden.com,  
3 chandra.snyder@skadden.com, marilyn.garibaldi@skadden.com, rosanna.keenan@skadden.com,  
4 thomas.christopher@skadden.com

4 Benjamin Ross Lemke: blemke@mount.com, mdavalos@mount.com

5 Chandra Sophia Snyder: chandra.snyder@skadden.com

6 Daniel Harlan Fingerman: dfingerman@mount.com, ecf@mount.com, jcherng@mount.com,  
7 mdavalos@mount.com

8 Ian Ballon: ballon@gtlaw.com, kolbers@gtlaw.com

9 Kathryn G. Spelman: kspelman@mount.com, mbikul@mount.com, mdavalos@mount.com

10 Lisa Christine McCurdy: mcurdyl@gtlaw.com, rodriguezje@gtlaw.com

11 Lori Chang: changl@gtlaw.com, cronkritec@gtlaw.com

12 Wendy Michelle Mantell: mantellw@gtlaw.com, [rincona@gtlaw.com](mailto:rincona@gtlaw.com)

13 **Counsel are responsible for distributing copies of this document to co-counsel who have not  
14 registered for e-filing under the court's CM/ECF program.**

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28