

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

HANGINOUT, INC., a Delaware corporation,	}	Case No.13cv2811 AJB (NLS)
Plaintiff,		ORDER:
v.	}	(1) DENYING HANGINOUT’S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION, (Doc. No. 12); and
GOOGLE, INC., a Delaware corporation,		(2) DENYING GOOGLE’S MOTION TO DISMISS THE FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT, (Doc. No. 23).
Defendant.	)	

On November 26, 2013, Hanginout, Inc. (“Hanginout”) filed this action against Google, Inc. (“Google”) alleging trademark infringement, federal unfair competition, and California statutory and common law unfair competition.<sup>1</sup> (Doc. No. 1.) In the First Amended Complaint, Hanginout alleges that it has used the HANGINOUT mark in commerce to market its interactive video-response platform since at least March 2010, and that Google’s use of the HANGOUTS mark to market its video-response platform, which is substantially similar if not identical to Hanginout’s product, infringes on Hanginout’s common law trademark rights. (Doc. No. 14.)

<sup>1</sup> Google filed a motion to dismiss the original complaint on January 10, 2014, (Doc. No. 9), which was deemed moot after Hanginout filed the First Amended Complaint on January 28, 2014, (Doc. No. 14).

1 Currently before the Court are Hanginout’s motion for preliminary injunction filed  
2 on January 22, 2014, (Doc. No. 12), and Google’s motion to dismiss the First Amended  
3 Complaint filed on February 28, 2014, (Doc. No. 23). Hanginout’s motion for prelimi-  
4 nary injunction seeks to enjoin Google from using the HANGOUTS mark on the Internet  
5 in connection with its social media platform, either nationwide or limited to California.  
6 The Court heard oral argument on both motions on April 25, 2014. (Doc. No. 41.) For  
7 the reasons set forth below, the Court DENIES Hanginout’s motion for a preliminary  
8 injunction and DENIES Google’s motion to dismiss.

## 9 **BACKGROUND**

### 10 **I. Factual Background**

11 Hanginout is a technology based Delaware corporation that has developed mobile  
12 video and social media based communication products since at least 2009.<sup>2</sup> (Doc. No. 14  
13 ¶ 10.) At issue in this litigation is Hanginout’s interactive video response platform  
14 HANGINOUT, which enables users to create, promote, and sell their own brands by  
15 engaging directly with potential customers via pre-recorded video messages and/or video  
16 profiles. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 12–14.) The HANGINOUT platform also includes a “Q&A”  
17 function, wherein users can exchange questions and personal video responses from  
18 anyone in the application at any time. (*Id.* at ¶¶ 14–15.)

#### 19 **A. The HANGINOUT mark**

20 Hanginout alleges it adopted the HANGINOUT word and design marks in  
21 connection with its social media based platform as early as November 2008, and that for  
22 the first year or so developed business plans and the technological know-how to turn its  
23 vision into a reality. (*Id.* at ¶ 11; Doc. No. 12, Malone Decl. ¶¶ 6, 7, Ex. 1.) Thereafter,  
24 beginning in early 2010, Hanginout began marketing the HANGINOUT platform  
25 through social media and various partnerships with celebrities and professional athletes.  
26 (Doc. No. 4 ¶¶ 16-17.) For example, in March 2010, Hanginout’s company Facebook

---

27  
28 <sup>2</sup> Hanginout incorporated in the state of Delaware in 2011. (Doc. No. 14 at ¶ 1.)  
Its principal place of business is located at 2712 Jefferson Street, Carlsbad, CA 92008.  
(*Id.*)

1 profile containing the HANGINOUT mark was uploaded and Hanginout partnered with  
2 professional athlete Shawne Merriman to shoot a HANGINOUT promotional video.

3 (*Id.*)

4       Approximately a year later, in or around March or April 2011, Hanginout alleges  
5 that consumers began registering for HANGINOUT profiles via Hanginout’s web-based  
6 application and endorsing the product on social-media based platforms such as Twitter  
7 and Facebook. (*Id.* at ¶ 18.) Thereafter, Hanginout alleges it continued to market the  
8 HANGINOUT application through various social-media outlets. (*Id.* at ¶ 19.) By May  
9 2011, Hanginout alleges that over 200 customers had registered for and used Version 1.0  
10 of the HANGINOUT Q&A web-based platform. (*Id.* at ¶ 20.)

11       On July 12, 2012, Hanginout filed trademark applications for the HANGINOUT  
12 word and design marks with the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”).  
13 (*Id.* at ¶ 21.) The USPTO assigned Application Serial No. 85674801 to the  
14 HANGINOUT word mark and Application Serial No. 85674799 to the HANGINOUT  
15 design mark.<sup>3</sup> (*Id.* at ¶ 22.) Both applications have since been published by the USPTO  
16 for opposition. (*Id.* at ¶ 24.) As of the date of this order, neither trademark is officially  
17 registered with the USPTO. Two months later, on September 12, 2012, Hanginout  
18 officially launched a HANGINOUT iOS application for its web-based platform on the  
19 iTunes App Store. (Doc. No. 12 at 5:2–3, 25; Doc. No. 14 ¶ 27.) Since this date,  
20 Hanginout alleges that the HANGINOUT app has received hundreds of thousands of  
21 views from individuals across the world, received celebrity media attention, has been  
22 downloaded and used by consumers across the United States, and has been featured by  
23 Apple in the iTunes application portal. (Doc. No. 12 ¶ 27.)

#### 24       **B.     The HANGOUTS Mark**

25       By 2009, Google alleges it had already developed an internal version of what later  
26 became its HANGOUTS product, referring to the prototype as “The Hangout.” (Doc.

---

27  
28       <sup>3</sup> Hanginout attached both trademark applications to the First Amended Complaint.  
(Doc. No. 14, Exs. A, B.)

1 No. 30 at 2:24-25, Lachappelle Decl. ¶ 4.) Thereafter, on June 28, 2011, Google made  
2 HANGOUTS accessible to the public, including it as one of several products that made  
3 up Google+, a social layer that connects many of Google’s products.<sup>4</sup> (Doc. No. 30 at  
4 2:26-28, Leske Decl. ¶ 3, Exs. 1-2.) Among other features, HANGOUTS allows users to  
5 engage in live interactions with other users, including instant messaging and real-time  
6 video-conferencing. (Doc. No. 34, Caruso Decl. ¶ 3, Ex. 1; Leske Decl. ¶¶ 3, 6.)  
7 HANGOUTS had 50,000 unique registered users the very first day it launched and  
8 150,000 unique registered users as of July 8, 2011.<sup>5</sup> (Doc. No. 30 at 3:6, Leske Decl. ¶ 3,  
9 Ex. 1.) Since HANGOUTS launch, Google contends that users have initiated more than  
10 ██████████ HANGOUT video conferences and the app version of HANGOUTS has been  
11 installed on more than ██████████ mobile devices. (*Id.* at 3:6-10, Leske Decl. ¶¶ 5-6.)

12 On April 26, 2013, Google filed an application with the USPTO to register the  
13 HANGOUTS mark, which was assigned Application Serial No. 85916316. (Doc. No. 14  
14 ¶ 29.) Thereafter, in or around May 2013, Google released the HANGOUTS iTunes  
15 application for the App store. (Doc. No. 12 at 7:2-3.) On July 30, 2013, the USPTO  
16 suspended Google’s HANGOUTS trademark application after finding that a “pending  
17 application(s) may present a bar to registration of the applicant’s mark.” (Doc. No. 12,  
18 Malone Decl., Ex. 26.)

19 On September 12, 2013, Google launched Hangouts On Air (“HOA”), which  
20 offers users the ability to host interactive conversations with people from around the  
21 world. (Doc. No. 29, Ex. 3.) HOA is different from HANGOUTS because HOA is not  
22  
23

---

24  
25 <sup>4</sup> At oral argument, counsel for Google provided the Court with a time line of  
26 Google’s uses of “Hangouts” and “Google+ Hangouts.” This document has been marked  
at Court’s Exhibit 1. (Doc. No. 42.)

27 <sup>5</sup> Google asserts that by June 30, 2011, Google’s official blog post announcing  
28 HANGOUTS was viewed more than 460,000 times. (Doc. No. 30, Leske Decl. ¶ 3.)  
Press reports regarding the release of HANGOUTS immediately followed, including  
articles and announcements by The New York Times, NBC News, CNN, Fox News,  
Bloomberg Businessweek, Computer World, Rolling Stone, and PC Magazine. (*Id.*)

1 limited to ten participants and allows the public to view the live feed.<sup>6</sup> (Doc. No. 30,  
2 Leske Decl. ¶¶ 8–10.) Google alleges that HANGOUTS can be accessed through Gmail,  
3 Google+ websites, or through mobile applications available for Android and iOS  
4 devices. (*Id.* at ¶ 28.)

## 5 DISCUSSION

### 6 **I. Hanginout’s Motion for Preliminary Injunction**

7 Hanginout moves to preliminary enjoin Google from using the HANGOUTS mark  
8 in its messaging and social media platforms, its Q&A platform, and cease advertising  
9 and soliciting the HANGOUTS mark in connection with its messaging platform.

10 Because the parties’ briefing focused solely on Hanginout’s trademark infringement  
11 claim under the Lanham Act, the Court does not address Hanginout’s federal unfair  
12 competition claim or Hanginout’s statutory and common law unfair competition claims  
13 under California law.

#### 14 **A. Legal Standard**

15 In deciding whether to issue a preliminary injunction, the court must consider: (1)  
16 the likelihood of the moving party’s success on the merits; (2) the possibility of irrepara-  
17 ble injury to the moving party if relief is not granted; (3) the extent to which the balance  
18 of hardships tips in favor of one party or the other; and (4) whether the public interest  
19 will be advanced by granting preliminary relief. *Toyo Tire Holdings of Ams. Inc. v.*  
20 *Cont’l Tire N. Am., Inc.*, 609 F.3d 975, 982 (9th Cir. 2010) (citing *Winter v. Natural Res.*  
21 *Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 22, 20 (2008)). “A preliminary injunction is an extraordi-  
22 nary remedy” that may only be granted “upon a clear showing that the plaintiff is entitled  
23 to such relief.” *Winter*, 555 U.S. at 22, 24; *Mazurek v. Armstrong*, 520 U.S. 968, 972  
24 (1997) (“And what is at issue here is not even a defendant’s motion for summary  
25 judgment, but a plaintiff’s motion for preliminary injunctive relief, as to which the  
26 requirement for substantial proof is much higher.”). The mere possibility that a plaintiff  
27

---

28 <sup>6</sup> The live feed is then saved on the host Google+ page and YouTube to allow editing and sharing. (Doc. No. 30, Leske Decl. ¶¶ 8–10.)

1 will suffer irreparable injury is insufficient. *See Am. Trucking Ass’n, Inc. v. City of L.A.*,  
2 559 F.3d 1046, 1052 (9th Cir. 2009) (stating that following *Winter* cases suggesting a  
3 lower standard “are no longer controlling, or even viable”).

4 **B. Analysis**

5 **1. Likelihood of Success on the Merits**

6 To state a claim for trademark infringement under the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. §  
7 1125(a), a plaintiff must demonstrate that it is: “(1) the owner of a valid, protectable  
8 mark, and (2) that the alleged infringer is using a confusingly similar mark.” *Herb Reed*  
9 *Enters., LLC v. Fla. Entm’t Mgmt, Inc.*, 736 F.3d 1239, 1247 (9th Cir. 2013) (citing  
10 *Grocery Outlet, Inc. v. Albertson’s, Inc.*, 497 F.3d 949, 951 (9th Cir. 2007)).

11 **i. Ownership of a Valid, Protectable Mark**

12 To establish common law trademark rights in the absence of federal registration, a  
13 plaintiff must plead and prove that it is the senior user of the mark with sufficient market  
14 penetration to preclude the defendant from using the mark in a specific geographic  
15 market.<sup>7</sup> *See Sengoku Works Ltd. v. RMC Int’l, Ltd.*, 96 F.3d 1217, 1219 (9th Cir. 1996)  
16 (“To acquire ownership of a trademark it is not enough to have invented the mark first or  
17 even to have registered it first; the party claiming ownership must have been the first to  
18 actually use the mark in the sale of goods or services.”); *Quiksilver, Inc. v. Kymsta*  
19 *Corp.*, 466 F.3d 749, 761–62 (9th Cir. 2006) (stating that use equated to sales in a  
20 specified area); *Adray v. Adry-Mart, Inc.*, 76 F.3d 984, 988 (9th Cir. 1995); *Credit One*  
21 *Corp. v. Credit One Fin., Inc.*, 661 F. Supp. 2d 1134, 1138 (C.D. Cal. 2009) (“A party  
22 asserting common law rights must not only establish that it is the senior user, it must also  
23 show that it has ‘legally sufficient market penetration’ in a certain geographic market to  
24  
25  
26

---

27 <sup>7</sup> It is undisputed that neither mark—HANGOUTS or HANGINOUT—is  
28 registered with the USPTO. Therefore, neither are presumed valid. *See Tie Tech, Inc. v.*  
*Kinedyne Corp.*, 296 F.3d 778, 783 (9th Cir. 2002) (stating that registration of a mark  
carries a “presumption of validity”).

1 establish those trademark rights.”)<sup>8</sup> Contrary to Plaintiff’s contentions, the Court finds  
2 these are two independent determinations—seniority of use and market penetra-  
3 tion—both of which must be satisfied in the absence of federal registration.<sup>9</sup>

4 **a. Senior User**

5 “It is axiomatic in trademark law that the standard test of ownership is priority of  
6 use. To acquire ownership of a trademark it is not enough to have invented the mark  
7 first or even to have registered it first; the party claiming ownership must have been the  
8 first to actually use the mark in the sale of goods or services.” *Brookfield Commc'ns,*  
9 *Inc. v. W. Coast Entm't Corp.*, 174 F.3d 1036, 1047 (9th Cir. 1999). Although seniority  
10 of use does not require “evidence of actual sales,” *Rearden LLC v. Rearden Commerce,*  
11 683 F.3d 1190, 1205 (9th Cir. 2012), the Ninth Circuit has stated that use of the mark  
12 must be “sufficiently public” so that the public identifies the mark with the “adopter of  
13 the mark,” *Johnny Blastoff, Inc. v. L.A. Rams Football Co.*, 188 F.3d 427, 433-34 (9th  
14 Cir. 1999). In making this determination, a court may rely on the mark’s use and  
15 promotion in “ ‘advertising brochures, catalogs, newspaper ads, and articles in newspa-  
16 pers and trade publications,’ as well as in media outlets such as television and radio.” *Id.*  
17 at 434 (quoting *T.A.B. Sys. v. Pactel Teletrac*, 77 F.3d 1372, 1375 (Fed. Cir. 1996); see

---

18  
19 <sup>8</sup> Hanginout contends that a presumption of nationwide ownership should exist  
20 based on Hanginout’s pending federal trademark applications. The Court does not agree.  
21 *See, e.g., CG Roxane LLC v. Fiji Water Co. LLC*, 569 F. Supp. 2d 1019, 1032 (N.D. Cal.  
2008) (“[S]ince the defendant was using the mark prior to its registration, plaintiff is not  
entitled to a presumption that the mark is valid.”); *Pollution Denim & Co. v. Pollution*  
*Clothing Co.*, 547 F. Supp. 2d 1132, 1139 (C.D. Cal. 2007).

22 <sup>9</sup> At oral argument, Hanginout suggested that market penetration in a specific  
23 geographic area is not required to assert common law trademark rights in the absence of  
24 federal registration. The Court does not agree. It is nonsensical that mere advertising or  
25 use of a mark in commerce could be enough to enjoin a junior user from using a similar  
26 mark anywhere in the United States—priority of use is limited to the geographic area in  
27 which the product at issue is sold. *See, e.g., Adray*, 76 F.3d at 989 (“The extent of  
28 market penetration depends upon the volume of sales, the positive and negative growth  
trends, the number of people who purchased the party’s goods in relation to the number  
of potential customers, and the amount of advertising.”); *Glow*, 252 F. Supp. 2d at 983  
 (“Generally, the senior user of a mark is entitled to assert trademark rights in all areas in  
which it has legally sufficient market penetration.”); *Optimal Pets*, 877 F. Supp. 2d at  
958 (“A party asserting common law rights must not only establish that it is the senior  
user, it must also show that it has ‘legally sufficient market penetration’ in a certain  
geographic market to establish those trademark rights.”) (internal citation omitted).

1 *also Brookfield Commc'ns*, 174 F.3d at 1036 (stating that trademark rights can vest even  
2 before any goods are actually sold if “the totality of [one’s] prior actions, taken together,  
3 [can] establish a right to use the trademark”) (internal quotations and citation omitted).

4 Under the framework set forth above, Hanginout contends it is the senior user of  
5 the mark based on the totality of the circumstances. Hanginout asserts that by March  
6 2010, over a year before Google released Hangouts+ as part of the Google+ platform,  
7 and over two years before Google rebranded the platform as purely HANGOUTS,  
8 Shawne Meriman shot a HANGINOUT promotional video and Hanginout’s company  
9 Facebook page was uploaded. Thereafter, by May 2011, nearly two months before  
10 Google’s release of HANGOUTS+, Hanginout asserts that over 200 consumers regis-  
11 tered for and used Version 1.0 of the HANGINOUT Q&A web-based platform. (Doc.  
12 No. 12, Malone Decl. ¶ 17.) Hanginout further argues that the marketing campaign for  
13 the HANGINOUT platform, all of which utilized the HANGINOUT mark, was aggres-  
14 sively and publicly pursued on a continuous basis beginning in May 2011 via LinedkIn,  
15 Twitter, and celebrity YouTube videos.

16 In opposition, Google contends Hanginout cannot possibly be the senior user of  
17 the mark based on Hanginout’s own representations to the USPTO. Google argues that  
18 on July 12, 2012, more than a year after Google released HANGOUTS, Hanginout filed  
19 trademark applications with the USPTO asserting that it first began using the mark in  
20 commerce on June 6, 2012.<sup>10</sup> (Doc. No. 14 ¶ 22, Exs. A, B.) Therefore, because  
21 Hanginout previously represented to the USPTO that it first began using the mark in  
22 commerce on June 6, 2012, but now asserts an earlier “first use” date, Google argues  
23 Hanginout must prove the earlier first-use date by clear and convincing evidence. *See*  
24 *Wells Fargo & Co. v. Stagecoach Props., Inc.*, 685 F.2d 302, 304 n.1 (9th Cir. 1982).<sup>11</sup>  
25

---

26 <sup>10</sup> Google contends it was only after it raised this priority of use argument in its  
27 first motion to dismiss that Hanginout amended its complaint. (Doc. No. 14 ¶¶ 17–20.)

28 <sup>11</sup> Both parties agree that under *Wells Fargo v. Stagecoach* a party must present  
“clear and convincing” evidence to establish a date prior in time than that represented to  
the USPTO. (Doc. No. 30 at 7:19-23; Doc. No. 36 at 3:9-11.)



1 Representations to the USPTO aside, Google argues Hanginout’s actions fail to  
2 establish seniority of use in a nationwide market. Google maintains that similar to  
3 *Future Domain Corp. v. Trantor Sys. Ltd.*, No. C930812, 1993 WL 270522, at \*8 (N.D.  
4 Cal. May 3, 1993), wherein the court found the plaintiff’s advertisement at a large trade  
5 show was insufficient to establish seniority of use, here, the only evidence Hanginout  
6 provides to support its alleged aggressive marketing campaign prior to June 28, 2011  
7 (Google’s alleged first use date), are exhibits showing two promotional YouTube videos,  
8 Hanginout’s company Facebook page, an announcement of the HANGINOUT preview  
9 launch on LinkedIn, a brief article in a lesser-known tech-blog called Tech Cocktail, and  
10 48 tweets on Hanginout’s company Twitter page. (Doc. No. 12 at 3, Malone Decl. ¶¶ 7,  
11 11, 12, 15–16; Doc. No. 30, Caruso Decl. ¶¶ 4–5, Exs. 2–5.) However, Google contends  
12 none of these alleged advertising tactics are noteworthy because the article in Tech  
13 Cocktail received no likes, tweets, or shares; the endorsement on Facebook by Tech  
14 Cocktail received only two likes (one of which was from the then COO/CFO of  
15 Hanginout); the announcement of the preview on LinkedIn received only one like; and  
16 Hanginout’s Twitter feed shows only 48 tweets before June 28, 2011 (18 of which were  
17 from Hanginout). As a result, Google contends Hanginout has failed to provide any  
18 evidence that a sufficient number of people actually saw or noticed its promotional  
19 efforts.<sup>12</sup>

20 Although the parties ardently dispute whether Google first began using the  
21 HANGOUTS mark in commerce as of June 2011, or whether the use did not commence  
22 until May 2013, this argument need not be resolved because the Court finds Hanginout  
23 first began using the HANGINOUT mark in commerce in or around May 2011—prior to  
24 both of Google’s alleged first-use dates.<sup>13</sup> Therefore, because more than 200 customers  
25

---

26 <sup>12</sup> Google asserts that Hanginout’s promotional YouTube videos were poorly  
27 viewed. (Doc. No. 30, Caruso Decl. ¶¶4–5, Exs. 2, 5.)

28 <sup>13</sup> Because Hanginout’s trademark applications stated that the marks were first  
used in commerce “[a]t least as early as 06/06/2012,” the clear and convincing standard  
set forth in *Wells Fargo* does not apply. (Doc. No. 36, Wagner Decl., Exs. 13, 14.)

1 had registered for Version 1.0 of Hanginout’s web-based platform as of May 2011,  
2 which was then followed by continuous advertising and marketing of the platform under  
3 the HANGOUTS mark, this case is markedly different from *Future Domain and Chance*  
4 *v. Pac-Bel*, both of which were cited by Google. *Future Domain v. Trantor*, No.  
5 C930812, 1993 WL 270522, at \*6–10 (N.D. Cal May 3, 1993) (stating that the launch of  
6 a mark at a single trade show was insufficient to show priority of use); *Chance v. Pac-*  
7 *Bel*, 242 F.3d 1151 (9th Cir. 1988) (finding no priority of use based on postcards that did  
8 not generate a single use of services) and, because here, Hanginout has presented  
9 evidence of its actual use and marketing of the HANGINOUT mark, in commerce, prior  
10 to the first use date of Google’s HANGOUTS mark.<sup>14</sup>

11 Accordingly, the Court finds Hanginout is the senior user of the marks based on  
12 the totality of the circumstances—number of registered users, marketing via social  
13 media, and launch of iTunes app in the Apple store to name a few. *See Allard Enter-*  
14 *prises, Inc. v. Advanced Programming Res., Inc.*, 146 F.3d 350, 358 (6th Cir. 1998) (“As  
15 long as there is a genuine use of the mark in commerce, however, ownership may be  
16 established even if the first uses are not extensive and do not result in deep market  
17 penetration or widespread recognition.”); *Dep’t of Parks & Recreation v. Bazaar del*  
18 *Mundo Inc.*, 448 F.3d 1118, 1126 (9th Cir. 2006) (“Although mere advertising by itself  
19 may not establish priority of use, advertising combined with other non-sales activity,  
20 under our ‘totality of the circumstances test,’ can constitute prior use in commerce.”)  
21 (internal citations omitted).

22 **b. Market Penetration in a Specific Geographic Area**

23 Establishing priority of use however is not in and of itself sufficient to  
24 bestow common law trademark rights. To warrant immediate injunctive relief,

---

25  
26 <sup>14</sup> The HANGINOUT app had been viewed more than a million times (90% repeat  
27 visits) from users in every state in the U.S. (30,000 from California), it enjoyed tens of  
28 thousand of users (including high-profile celebrities and politicians), and had substantial  
media attention (including ESPN). (Doc. No. 12, Malone Decl. ¶¶ 3-5, 9, 11-17, 20, 23,  
24, 26, 27, 29-33, Exs. 2-7, 9, 11-12, 14, 15, 17-19.) Hanginout also contends that of the  
nearly 300 YouTube views, it generated over 200 customers, thereby equating to a 65%  
conversion ratio.

1 Hanginout must also establish sufficient market penetration in a specified geographic  
2 area. *See Credit One Corp*, 661 F. Supp. 2d at 1138 (“A party asserting common law  
3 rights must not only establish that it is the senior user, it must also show that it has  
4 ‘legally sufficient market penetration’ in a certain geographic market to establish those  
5 trademark rights.”); *Optimal Pets*, 877 F. Supp. 2d at 958 (“The first to use a mark in an  
6 area is deemed the ‘senior’ user and has the right to enjoin ‘junior’ users from using  
7 confusingly similar marks in the same industry and market or within the senior user’s  
8 natural zone of expansion.”).

9 To determine whether Hanginout has market penetration in an identified geo-  
10 graphic area, the court considers: (1) the volume of Hanginout’s sales with regard to the  
11 product at issue; (2) the growth trends of the product both positive and negative; (3) the  
12 number of persons actually purchasing/registering for the pertinent product in relation to  
13 the total number of potential customers; and (4) the amount of advertising with the  
14 regard to the product at issue. *See Adray*, 76 F.3d at 989 (9th Cir. 1995); *Optimal Pets*,  
15 877 F. Supp. 2d at 958. Thereafter, and only if Hanginout can establish market penetra-  
16 tion in a specific geographic area, the Court must then assess whether Hanginout may  
17 preclude Google from utilizing the mark within Hanginout’s “natural zone of expan-  
18 sion.” *Optimal Pets*, 877 F. Supp. 2d at 958; 4 J. Thomas McCarthy, McCarthy on  
19 Trademarks and Unfair Competition, § 26:13 (4th ed. 2002) (stating that “in the absence  
20 of federal registration, both parties have the right to expand [use of an unregistered  
21 mark] into unoccupied territory and establish exclusive rights by being first in that  
22 territory. In effect, it is a race between the parties to establish customer recognition in  
23 unoccupied territory.”).

24 Here, Hanginout urges the Court to find that its market penetration is either  
25 nationwide, or Southern California with a nationwide zone of expansion. In support,  
26 Hanginout asserts that: (1) it had a Facebook profile by March 2011; (2) by May  
27 2011, over 200 consumers had registered for and used Version 1.0 of the HANGINOUT  
28 web-based platform; (3) from September 15, 2012 through December 23, 2013 the

1 HANGINOUT smart phone application had 30,000 visits from California<sup>15</sup> consumers,  
2 7,000 visits from New York consumers, 3,500 visits from Florida consumers, 2,700  
3 visits from Michigan consumers, 2,600 visits from Texas consumers, and a ranging  
4 number of visits from consumers in the remaining states; (4) nearly 8,000 individuals  
5 had registered for the HANGINOUT iTunes application by the filing of the preliminary  
6 injunction; and (5) various celebrities and politicians have created HANGINOUT  
7 accounts and published content utilizing the HANGINOUT platform. (Doc. No. 12 at  
8 10–11; Malone Decl. ¶¶ 10, 20, 17, 32, Exs. 9, 19.) Therefore, Hanginout contends that  
9 because it offered and marketed its computer-based services under the HANGINOUT  
10 mark via its website and iTunes application, its customers, and therefore its market  
11 penetration, is nationwide.

12 In response, Google contends Hanginout has failed to submit any evidence of its  
13 actual market penetration in a specific area, and use of a mark over the Internet does not  
14 automatically implicate a nationwide market. In support, Google relies on *Glow Indus.,*  
15 *Inc. v. Lopez*, 252 F. Supp. 2d 962, 984 (C.D. Cal. 2002) (finding no market penetration  
16 because the plaintiff had presented no evidence of the “volume or level of sales in any  
17 location, nor how [the plaintiff’s] market penetration compares with that of competi-  
18 tors”); *Credit One Corp. v. Credit One Fin., Inc.*, 661 F. Supp. 2d 1134, 1137 (C.D. Cal.  
19 2009) (stating that the plaintiff failed to show market penetration in areas where an  
20 office had closed and there was no basis for which to believe sales had occurred); and  
21 *Optimal Pets*, 877 F. Supp. 2d 953, 962 (C.D. Cal. 2012) (finding no market penetration  
22 because the plaintiff had no sales in 34 states, in 8 of the 16 states where there were sales  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

---

28 <sup>15</sup> The California data can be further broken down as follows: Los Angeles (4,456 visits), Carlsbad (4,191 visits), and San Diego (3,726 visits). (Doc. No. 12, Malone Decl. ¶ 45, Ex. 28.)

1 those sales were under \$80, and the two states with “big ticket” sales all originated in a  
2 single zip code).<sup>16</sup>

3 The Court finds the cases relied upon by Google instructive, and Hanginout’s  
4 failure to present any evidence as to the actual location of its registered users dispositive.  
5 First, with regard to total sales, or in this case registered users, although Hanginout  
6 represented that it had over 200 registered users of its web-based platform as of May  
7 2011, and nearly 8,000 registered users of its iTunes application as of the filing of the  
8 preliminary injunction, Hanginout has never identified the state of residence of these  
9 alleged registered users.<sup>17</sup> See *Optimal Pets*, 877 F. Supp. 2d at 962 (“Thus, a sale to a  
10 customer through the internet will be considered a sale in the geographical area in which  
11 the customer is located.”).<sup>18</sup> Hanginout’s evidence of “site visits” fails no better.<sup>19</sup>  
12 Although this evidence pins down the state (and city within California) of the consumer  
13 that viewed Hanginout’s mobile profile, the Court is at a loss as to how these statistics  
14

---

15 <sup>16</sup> The *Optimal Pets* court further noted that there was a “downward trend” in  
16 sales, no evidence of “actual vis-à-vis potential purchasers,” and no evidence of  
“continued” marketing or advertising from 2004 through 2008. *Id.* at 963–64.

17 <sup>17</sup> Hanginout conceded this point at oral argument, stating that they are not  
18 required to identify the location of their users to attain common law trademark rights. As  
19 stated below, the Court does not agree, and finds the location of Hanginout’s users key to  
fashioning an injunction.

20 <sup>18</sup> Hanginout provided a print-out from Apple to document the total number of  
21 individuals who registered for the HANGINOUT iTunes application in 2012 and 2013.  
(Doc. No. 12, Malone Decl., Ex. 28.) However, this document shows that of the 9,534  
22 individuals who downloaded the application in 2012, only 6,926 resided in the United  
23 States; and of the 2,306 individuals who downloaded the application in 2013, only 1,235  
24 resided in the United States. (*Id.*) The document never specifies the specific geographic  
residence within the United States of each registered user. (*Id.*) Furthermore, Hanginout  
did not provide any evidence, other than the Malone Declaration, of the 200 users that  
registered for its web-based platform in May 2011. (*Id.*)

25 <sup>19</sup> Hanginout attached a Google Analytic Report showing that between September  
26 15, 2015 and December 23, 2012, 61,601 total individuals visited/clicked on  
HANGINOUT Mobile. (Doc. No. 12, Malone Decl., Ex. 17.) This information further  
27 breaks down the number of visits between and among the various states in the United  
28 States, showing visits from every state with the highest number of visits from California  
(29,985), New York (7,056), Florida (3,506), Michigan (2,701), Texas (2,629), Colorado  
(1,283), and Illinois (1,094). (Doc. No. 12, Malone Decl., Ex. 19.) Although the total  
number of visits is 71,503, the Court disregards visits from individuals outside the  
United States.

1 identify the location of Hanginout's registered users. Therefore, although evidence of  
2 site visits shows that consumers are actually looking at Hanginout's website and/or  
3 products, and supports Hanginout's seniority of use argument, it is insufficient to show  
4 actual sales/registration for Hanginout's product necessary to establish market penetra-  
5 tion.

6         Second, with regard to actual growth trends of the product at issue, although  
7 Hanginout never specifically commented on this factor, the Court finds the evidence  
8 submitted by Hanginout speaks for itself. For example, the Google Analytic Audience  
9 Overview report shows a dramatic decline in the overall number of views of the  
10 HANGINOUT application, with the number of visits the highest in or around October  
11 2012, then nearly flat-lining in or around October 2013. (Doc. No. 12, Malone Decl.,  
12 Ex. 17.) This analysis is then confirmed by sales statistics that were reported to  
13 Hanginout by iTunes. (Doc. No. 12, Malone Decl., Ex. 28.) These sales reports indicate  
14 that 6,926 individuals downloaded the HANGINOUT application in 2012, and that 1,235  
15 individuals downloaded the HANGINOUT application in 2013. (*Id.*) This represents a  
16 82.17% decline in the number of registered users, or 5,691 fewer registered users from  
17 2012 to 2013. (*Id.*) Therefore, based on these statistics, all of which were produced by  
18 Hanginout, there appears to be a negative growth trend for the HANGINOUT product.  
19 *See Optimal Pets*, 877 F. Supp. 2d at 963.

20         Third, with regard to the actual number of consumers actually purchas-  
21 ing/registering for the product in relation to the total number of potential consumers,  
22 Hanginout once again did not produce or direct the Court to any evidence indicative of  
23 this factor. Instead, the only evidence the Court is left to consider is that 6,926 individu-  
24 als registered for the HANGINOUT iTunes application in 2012, 1,235 individuals  
25 registered for the HANGINOUT iTunes Application in 2013, and that 61,601 individuals  
26 viewed HANGINOUT Mobile between September 2012 and December 23, 2013.  
27 However, as these numbers do not directly overlap, nor did Hanginout present any  
28

1 evidence regarding its market share, this weighs against finding Hanginout had sufficient  
2 market penetration to warrant immediate injunctive relief.

3         However, with regard to marketing and advertising, Hanginout fares much better.  
4 Hanginout contends that as early as 2009, it began utilizing various means to market and  
5 advertise the HANGINOUT web-based platform. For example, Hanginout asserts that  
6 by March 2010, it began partnering with celebrities and professional athletes to create  
7 HANGINOUT profiles for their interactive social-media platforms. These individuals  
8 included Kassim Osgoode (NFL), Shawne Meriman (NFL), Ritchie Brusco (X-Games),  
9 DJ Chuckie (DJ), Eric Griggs (Music Producer), Miles McPherson (Pastor at the Rock  
10 Church and former NFL player), Mike Hill (ESPN), Daphne Joy (Actress/Model),  
11 Jessica Burciaga (Model), Amanda Cerny (Model), Da Internez (Music Producers), and  
12 Belmont Lights (Band). (Doc. No. 12, Malone Decl. ¶ 10, Ex. 2.) Hanginout further  
13 contends that these efforts were supplemented by announcements on Twitter, LinkedIn,  
14 and the release of YouTube videos detailing key elements of the HANGINOUT plat-  
15 form. (Doc. No. 12, Malone Decl. ¶¶ 11, 13-14.) Thereafter, on October 24, 2011, San  
16 Diego mayoral candidate Carl DeMaio utilized HANGINOUT to create a “virtual town  
17 hall” for his campaign, and on July 6, 2012, professional skateboarder Ritchie Brusco  
18 launched an application utilizing the HANGINOUT platform. (*Id.* at ¶ 22, Ex. 11.)  
19 Hanginout further contends that ESPN ran an article about the Brusco application in  
20 conjunction with the upcoming X-Games, (*Id.* at ¶ 23, Ex. 12), and that on September 16,  
21 2012, Hanginout officially launched a HANGINOUT application in the iTunes App store  
22 and Apple elected to feature the HANGINOUT app as one of its social-media based  
23 applications. (*Id.* at ¶ 24.)

24         Although the Court finds the evidence presented above exemplifies Hanginout’s  
25 marketing and intent to use the HANGINOUT mark in commerce, none of the evidence  
26 is sufficient to support a finding of market penetration in a specific geographic market.  
27 Therefore, because marketing and advertising is but one factor to consider in determin-  
28 ing market penetration of an unregistered mark, without evidence as to the actual

1 location of Hanginout’s registered users, the Court cannot determine Hanginout’s market  
2 penetration. *See Charles Jacquin Et Cie, Inc. v. Destileria Serralles, Inc.*, 921 F.2d 467,  
3 472 (3d Cir. 1990) (“The proper geographic scope of an injunction in a trademark  
4 infringement case is determined by examining the market penetration of the mark.”).  
5 Accordingly, although the Court is cognizant of the complexities posed by the use of  
6 Internet, the Court does not agree with Hanginout that marketing, advertising, and  
7 promoting an unregistered mark over the Internet is sufficient to find nationwide market  
8 penetration. The Court also does not agree with Hanginout that it has sufficient market  
9 penetration in Southern California by virtue of the location of its office and/or the  
10 number of site views originating out of Southern California.

11 As a result, the Court finds Hanginout had not presented sufficient evidence to  
12 permit the Court to determine its market penetration in a specific geographic area, and as  
13 a result, the Court need not consider Hanginout’s natural zone of expansion. *See, e.g.*,  
14 *Optimal Pets*, 877 F. Supp. 2d at 962 (quoting Brian L. Berlandi, What State Am I In?:  
15 Common Law Trademarks on the Internet, 4 Mich. Telecomm. & Tech. L. Rev. 105,  
16 123–24 (1998) (“[T]he limits of territorial protection for a common law mark become  
17 much more difficult to define once that mark is placed on the Internet . . . mostly due to  
18 the apparent lack of ‘boundaries’ on the Internet.”); *Echo Drain v. Newsted*, 307 F. Supp.  
19 2d 1116, 1128 (C.D. Cal. 2003) (“Although Echo Drain has a website, Echo Drain offers  
20 no evidence that people outside of the Dallas–Fort Worth area have accessed the  
21 website, downloaded performances from the website, or even posted messages to the  
22 website.”); *Pure Imagination, Inc. v. Pure Imagination Studios, Inc.*, No. 03 C 6070,  
23 2004 WL 2967446, at \*12 (N.D. Ill. Nov. 15, 2004) (“Studios has failed to offer any  
24 specificity as to its activity in any markets in which it alleges priority rights.”); *Alliance*  
25 *for the Wild Rockies v. Cottrell*, 632 F.3d 1127, 1131 (9th Cir. 2011) (“A preliminary  
26  
27  
28



1 injunction is an extraordinary remedy never awarded as of right.”) (internal citations  
2 omitted).<sup>20</sup>

3 **ii. Likelihood of Confusion**

4 Although the Court has determined that Hanginout has not shown market penetra-  
5 tion in a specific geographic area, the Court will nonetheless examine whether Google’s  
6 use of the HANGOUTS mark will likely confuse the consuming public as to the source  
7 of the parties’ products. A court considers eight factors to determine if there is a  
8 likelihood of confusion:

9 (1) strength of the mark, (2) proximity of the goods, (3) similarity of the  
10 marks, (4) evidence of actual confusion, (5) marketing channels used, (6)  
11 type of goods and the degree of care likely to be exercised by the purchaser,  
12 (7) defendant's intent in selecting the mark, and (8) likelihood of expansion  
13 of the product lines.

14 *AMF Inc. v. Sleekcraft Boats*, 599 F.2d 341, 348–49 (9th Cir. 1979).

15 A court need not address all eight factors, nor must the plaintiff establish that each  
16 weighs in its favor to establish a likelihood of confusion. *See C & C Org. v. AGDS, Inc.*,  
17 676 F. Supp. 204, 206 (C.D. Cal. 1987); *Network Automation, Inc. v. Advanced Sys.*  
18 *Concepts, Inc.*, 638 F.3d 1137, 1145 (9th Cir. 2011) (“The Sleekcraft factors are  
19 intended as an adaptable proxy for consumer confusion, not a rote checklist.”);  
20 *Dreamwerks Prod. Grp., Inc. v. SKG Studio*, 142 F.3d 1127, 1129 (9th Cir. 1998) (“The  
21 factors should not be rigidly weighed; we do not count beans.”); *Eclipse Assoc. Ltd. v.*  
22 *Data Gen. Corp.*, 894 F.2d 1114, 1118 (9th Cir.1990) (“These tests were not meant to be  
23 requirements or hoops that a district court need jump through to make the determina-  
24 tion.”). The Court addresses the *Sleekcraft* factors in the order presented by Hanginout.

25 **a. Proximity or Relatedness of the Goods**

26 “Related goods are those ‘products which would be reasonably thought by the  
27 buying public to come from the same source if sold under the same mark.’ ” *Sleekcraft*,

---

28 <sup>20</sup> The Court finds Hanginout’s citation to *Taylor v. Thomas*, No. 2:12-CV-02309-JPM, 2013 WL 228033, (W.D. Tenn. Jan. 22, 2013) unavailing. The issue in *Taylor* was not whether the plaintiff had established sufficient use in a particular market, but whether ownership of a mark could be based on an assignment.

1 599 F.2d at 348, n.10 (quoting *Standard Brands, Inc. v. Smidler*, 151 F.2d 34, 37 (2d Cir.  
2 1945)); *see also* 4 J. McCarthy, McCarthy on Trademarks and Unfair Competition, §  
3 24.24 (4th ed. 2002) (“Goods are ‘related’ if consumers are likely to mistakenly think  
4 that the infringer’s goods come from the same source as the senior user’s goods or are  
5 sponsored or approved by the senior user.”). “[T]he danger presented is that the public  
6 will mistakenly assume there is an association between the producers of the related  
7 goods, though no such association exists.” *Sleekcraft*, 599 F.2d at 350. Proximity of  
8 goods is measured by whether the products are: (1) complementary; (2) sold to the same  
9 class of purchasers; and (3) similar in use and function. *Id.*

10 Hanginout contends the products offered by Hanginout and Google directly  
11 overlap because they are both social-media based platforms offering the same services  
12 through the iTunes app store. To support this contention, Hanginout compares its  
13 pending trademark application, which lists computer application software, telecommuni-  
14 cation services, audio, text, and video broadcasting, electronic messaging services, and  
15 providing online forums for communication as the marks uses, with information obtained  
16 from Google’s website, wherein Google describes the HANGOUTS Q&A platform as  
17 allowing users to solicit questions from concurrent viewers, select and answer live  
18 questions, and timestamp a YouTube recording by marking questions as they are  
19 answered.

20 In opposition, Google contends that although the products contain some similar  
21 functions within the broad category of video communications, the purposes and func-  
22 tions of the products are neither identical nor interchangeable. For example, whereas  
23 HANGOUTS allows real-time, live video-conferencing, instant messaging, and other  
24 communications among multiple parties, HANGINOUT is merely a platform for posting  
25 and viewing pre-recorded video messages or video profiles. Furthermore, Google  
26 maintains that contrary to Hanginout’s contentions, there is no such thing as the HANG-  
27 OUTS Q&A application, instead HANGOUTS Q&A is a feature of Google’s HANG-  
28 OUTS ON AIR, which the host can turn on or off. Therefore, because the Q&A feature

1 is only related to HANGOUTS ON AIR, which is not the basis of this litigation, Google  
2 argues the Q&A feature of HANGOUTS ON AIR is irrelevant.

3 Although the Court finds Google and Hanginout offer similar products under the  
4 HANGOUTS and HANGINOUT marks, the Court finds the products have distinct  
5 differences that change the functionality of the products. Therefore, because Hanginout  
6 did not respond to Google’s contention that the products are necessarily different based  
7 on the fact that HANGOUTS offers real-time capabilities whereas HANGINOUT only  
8 offers pre-recorded messaging and video features, this factor does not weigh in favor of  
9 finding a likelihood of confusion.

10 **b. Similarity of the Marks**

11 “[T]he more similar the marks in terms of appearance, sound, and meaning, the  
12 greater the likelihood of confusion.” *Brookfield*, 174 F.3d at 1054. “Where the two  
13 marks are entirely dissimilar, there is no likelihood of confusion.” *Id.* “Similarity of the  
14 marks is tested on three levels: sight, sound, and meaning. Each must be considered as  
15 they are encountered in the marketplace.” *Sleekcraft*, 599 F.2d at 351 (citations omit-  
16 ted).

17 Here, Hanginout contends that the marks at issue—HANGINOUT and HANG-  
18 OUTS—are nearly identical in sight, sound, and meaning, and therefore, this factor  
19 weighs in favor of finding a likelihood of confusion. *See, e.g. Banff, Ltd. v. Federated*  
20 *Dep’t Stores, Inc.*, 841 F.2d 486, 491 (2d Cir. 1988) (finding a likelihood of confusion  
21 between B WEAR and BEE WEAR for women’s clothing); *Baker v. Simmons Co.*, 307  
22 F.2d 458, 465 (1st. Cir. 1962) (finding SIMMONS and SIMMONS essentially identical  
23 in sound). As would be expected, Google does not agree. Instead, Google maintains the  
24 marks are significantly different because unlike *Banff* and *Baker*, the two decisions cited  
25 by Hanginout, the marks are not phonetically identical. Google argues that whereas  
26 HANGOUTS has two syllables, is plural, and is a noun; HANGINOUT has three  
27 syllables, is singular, and describes an activity. These nonsensical arguments aside,  
28 Google argues that given the actual appearance of the marks in commerce, in that the

1 Google name appears next to or close to any reference to HANGOUTS, no consumer is  
2 likely to be confused as to the product's origin.

3 Although the Court finds Google's final contention persuasive, in that marks must  
4 be considered as they will be encountered in the marketplace, *Lindy Pen Co., v. Bic Pen*  
5 *Corp.*, 725 F.2d 1240, 1245 (9th Cir. 1984), the Court also finds that the marks are  
6 relatively similar in sight, sound, and meaning. Thus, although the marks have different  
7 design features associated with the words that define them, courts have found that where  
8 a trademark includes a combination of words and a design, "the word is normally  
9 accorded greater weight[] because it would be used by purchasers to request the goods."  
10 *L.C. Licensing, Inc. v. Cary Berman*, 86 U.S.P.Q.2d 1883, 2008 WL 835278, at \*3  
11 (T.T.A.B. 2008); *see also Herbko Int'l v. Kappa Books*, 308 F.3d 1156, 1165 (Fed. Cir.  
12 2002) ("The words dominate the design feature."). Accordingly, although Hanginout has  
13 not presented any evidence of actual consumer confusion (as detailed below), the Court  
14 finds this factor weighs slightly in favor of Hanginout.

### 15 c. Marketing Channels Used

16 "Convergent marketing channels increase the likelihood of confusion." *Sleekcraft*,  
17 599 F.2d at 353 (finding that confusion is likely due to the fact that both parties adver-  
18 tised in niche markets, including boat shows, speciality retail outlets, and trade maga-  
19 zines). "However, this factor becomes less important when the marketing channel is less  
20 obscure." *Network Automation, Inc. v. Advanced Sys. Concepts, Inc.*, 638 F.3d 1137,  
21 1151 (9th Cir. 2011). Where both parties utilize the Internet to market the products at  
22 issue, the Ninth Circuit has found this factor carries little weight in the likelihood of  
23 confusion calculation. *See Playboy Enters., Inc. v. Netscape Commc'ns Corp.*, 354 F.3d  
24 1020, 1028 (9th Cir. 2004) ("Given the broad use of the Internet today, the same could  
25 be said for countless companies. Thus, this factor merits little weight.").

26 Here, although Hanginout urges the Court to find that this factor weighs in favor  
27 of finding a likelihood of consumer confusion because there is a limited number of  
28 iTunes app store applications, the Court finds *Network Automation* and *Playboy* control-

1 ling. Therefore, Google and Hanginout’s shared use of the Internet and iTunes app store  
2 to market their respective products weighs against a likelihood of confusion.

3 **d. Strength of the Plaintiff’s Mark**

4 “The stronger a mark—meaning the more likely it is to be remembered and  
5 associated in the public mind with the mark’s owner—the greater the protection it is  
6 accorded by the trademark laws.” *Brookfield*, 174 F.3d at 1058. Strength of a given  
7 mark is determined by measuring conceptual strength and commercial strength. *Network*  
8 *Automation*, 638 F.3d at 1149. “Conceptual strength involves classification of a mark  
9 ‘along a spectrum of generally increasing inherent distinctiveness as generic, descriptive,  
10 suggestive, arbitrary, or fanciful.’ ” *Id.* (quoting *Brookfield*, 174 F.3d at 1058). “A  
11 mark’s conceptual strength depends largely on the obviousness of its connection to the  
12 good or service to which it refers.” *Fortune Dynamic, Inc. v. Victoria's Secret Stores*  
13 *Brand Mgmt., Inc.*, 618 F.3d 1025, 1032–33 (9th Cir. 2010). Once a mark has been  
14 placed on the conceptual strength spectrum, the court must then assess the marks  
15 commercial strength, i.e., whether the mark has actual “marketplace recognition.”  
16 *Brookfield*, 174 F.3d at 1058 (stating that large advertising expenditures can transform a  
17 suggestive mark into a strong mark).<sup>21</sup>

18 Hanginout contends its marks are suggestive, if not stronger, because a “mental  
19 leap” is required to get from the term HANGINOUT to the product’s features. *See*  
20 *Network Automation*, 638 F.3d at 1149 (“If a mental leap between the word and the  
21 product’s attribute is not almost instantaneous, this strongly indicates suggestiveness, not  
22 direct descriptiveness.”). Hanginout further argues that Google has admitted that the  
23 HANGINOUT mark is inherently distinctive because Google identified the mark on its  
24 trademark list as “Hanginout™ Messaging Service.”<sup>22</sup> However, besides these two  
25 points, Hanginout does not address either marks commercial strength. In opposition,

26  
27 <sup>21</sup> Hanginout confirmed at oral argument that this is not a reverse confusion case,  
which would necessitate a different analysis.

28 <sup>22</sup> Hanginout argues that designating a mark with a TM is an admission that the  
mark is distinctive.

1 Google asserts that the HANGINOUT mark is weak and the HANGOUTS mark is  
2 strong, which can be exemplified by the market penetration and actual use of the  
3 respective marks. Google further argues that Hanginout has an erroneous understanding  
4 of the meaning of the TM symbol, in that the symbol reflects common law trademark  
5 rights not inherent distinctiveness.

6 The Court finds it telling that Hanginout failed to identify or discuss the commer-  
7 cial strength of the HANGINOUT mark, which is key to determining whether Google’s  
8 marketing and advertising has resulted in a “saturation in the public awareness of  
9 [Hanginout’s] mark,” thereby reducing Hanginout’s marketplace recognition. *A & H*  
10 *Sportswear, Inc. v. Victoria's Secret Stores, Inc.*, 237 F.3d 198, 231 (3d Cir. 2000).  
11 However, based on the evidence presented to the Court, it is apparent that Google has  
12 spent substantial time and substantial monies developing and promoting HANGOUTS,  
13 which has an installed base of millions of users.<sup>23</sup> Google has further represented that  
14 the HANGOUTS product has been featured by prominent magazines and websites, and  
15 that Google has invested substantial resources in media costs for advertising.<sup>24</sup> In  
16 contrast, Hanginout has failed to present any evidence as to the amount of money  
17 expended to develop, market, and/or promote HANGINOUT, and the only evidence of  
18 Hanginout’s growth trends shows a 82% drop in the number of individuals who regis-  
19 tered for the HANGINOUT iTunes application from 2012 to 2013.

20 Therefore, although the parties ardently dispute the marketplace recognition of  
21 their respective products, seemingly engaging in a popularity contest based on who  
22 utilized their products (Dalai Lama for Google and Shawne Merriman for Hanginout),  
23 the Court finds Google is likely to overwhelm Hanginout’s product line if the products  
24 are in competition with one another in the market due to Google’s marketplace recogni-  
25 tion. *See Cohn v. Petsmart, Inc.*, 281 F.3d 837, 841 (9th Cir. 2002) (“Petsmart’s  
26 extensive advertising gives it the ability to overwhelm any public recognition and  
27

---

28 <sup>23</sup> For exact figures see Google’s sealed opposition. (Doc. No. 34 at 1:20-25.)

<sup>24</sup> For exact figures see Google’s sealed opposition. (Doc. No. 34 at 23-24.)

1 goodwill that Cohn has developed in the mark.”). However, because the parties did not  
2 present any evidence as to how crowded the market actually is, and Hanginout cannot  
3 claim a right to all variants of the phrase in the given market, this factor does not weigh  
4 in favor of finding a likelihood of consumer confusion. *See SunEarth, Inc. v. Sun Earth*  
5 *Solar Power Co., Ltd.*, 846 F. Supp. 2d 1063, 1078 (N.D. Cal. 2012), appeal dismissed  
6 (Apr. 18, 2012) (recognizing that where the marks share a word or phrase but are  
7 otherwise different, the plaintiff is not permitted to claim a right to all variant of the  
8 phrase in a specific market).

9 **e. Evidence of Actual Confusion**

10 “[A] showing of actual confusion among significant numbers of consumers  
11 provides strong support for the likelihood of confusion.” *Playboy*, 354 F.3d at 1026  
12 (citing *Thane Int'l, Inc. v. Trek Bicycle Corp.*, 305 F.3d 894, 902 (9th Cir. 2002))  
13 (“Evidence of actual confusion constitutes persuasive proof that future confusion is  
14 likely . . . If enough people have been actually confused, then a likelihood that people are  
15 confused is established.”). “Actual confusion is not necessary to a finding of likelihood  
16 of confusion under the Lanham Act.” *Academy of Motion Picture Arts & Sciences v.*  
17 *Creative House Promotions, Inc.*, 944 F.2d 1446, 1456 (9th Cir. 1991) (citing *Am. Int'l*  
18 *Grp., Inc. v. Am. Int'l Bank*, 926 F.2d 829, 832 (9th Cir. 1991)). Indeed, “[p]roving  
19 actual confusion is difficult . . . and the courts have often discounted such evidence  
20 because it was unclear or insubstantial.” *Sleekcraft*, 599 F.2d at 352.

21 Here, Hanginout tries to articulate a basis for actual confusion when none in fact  
22 exists. Therefore, the Court finds this factor should be accorded no weight.<sup>25</sup> *See*  
23 *Network Automation*, 638 F.3d at 1151 (“Therefore, while this is a relevant factor for  
24 determining the likelihood of confusion in keyword advertising cases, its importance is  
25 diminished at the preliminary injunction stage of the proceedings.”); *Rearden*, 597 F.

---

27 <sup>25</sup> Hanginout’s only evidence of actual confusion is that consumers have used the  
28 phrase “Hanging out” and “Hangout” when referring to the HANGINOUT platform.  
However, Hanginout does not connect these references to Google’s HANGOUTS mark.  
(Doc. No. 12 at 20:18-23.)

1 Supp. 2d at 1023, 1023 n.9 (stating that, while courts outside of the Ninth Circuit may  
2 consider confusion by others relevant, the Ninth Circuit’s “precedents clearly hold that  
3 the key inquiry is confusion of prospective purchasers”).

4 **f. Degree of Care Likely Exercised by Purchasers**

5 “Low consumer care . . . increases the likelihood of confusion.” *Playboy*, 354  
6 F.3d at 1028. “In assessing the likelihood of confusion to the public, the standard used  
7 by the courts is the typical buyer exercising ordinary caution . . . . When the buyer has  
8 expertise in the field, a higher standard is proper though it will not preclude a finding  
9 that confusion is likely. Similarly, when the goods are expensive, the buyer can be  
10 expected to exercise greater care in his purchases; again, though, confusion may still be  
11 likely.” *Sleekcraft*, 599 F.2d at 353 (citations omitted).

12 Here, Hanginout argues that because the products at issue are inexpensive (or for  
13 that matter free), it is likely that consumers are likely to register for the products without  
14 doing significant investigation. In opposition, Google contends that Hanginout has  
15 presented no evidence of the degree of sophistication of its customers, and that such an  
16 inference can not be made purely on the basis that the products are offered free of  
17 charge. Google also contends that because consumers will most likely select a product  
18 that their friends, family, and/or acquaintances are also using (or will be using), this  
19 factor does not automatically weigh in favor of Hanginout. Finally, Google contends  
20 that because viruses and spyware can potentially be included in free software, it cannot  
21 be assumed that the average consumer takes minimal care in downloading free software.

22 Although Google’s final point is without merit, as Apple pre-screens all applica-  
23 tions offered on the iTunes app store (either free or at a cost), the Court finds Google’s  
24 first two points raise valid arguments. As recently explained by the Ninth Circuit in  
25 *Toyota Motor Sales, U.S.A., Inc. v. Tabari*, 610 F.3d 1171, 1176 (9th Cir. 2010), when  
26 examining consumer confusion in the context of products offered over the Internet, the  
27 “relevant marketplace is the online marketplace, and the relevant consumer is a reason-  
28 ably prudent consumer accustomed to shopping online . . . . Unreasonable, imprudent



1 and inexperienced web-shoppers are not relevant.” *Id.* As a result, although it is true  
2 that courts originally presumed a low degree of care exercised by Internet consumers, the  
3 Ninth Circuit has cautioned against such a conclusory analysis and instructed lower  
4 courts to consider the “nature and the cost of the goods, and whether the products being  
5 sold are marketed primarily to expert buyers.” *See Network Automation*, 638 F.3d at  
6 1152 (citing *Brookfield*, 174 F.3d at 1060).

7 Accordingly, taking all of these factors into consideration: (1) the heightened  
8 degree of care of Internet consumers; (2) the fact that both products are offered free of  
9 charge; and (3) the fact that the applications offered via the iTunes app store indicated  
10 the source of the application, i.e., whether the application was offered by Google or  
11 Hanginout, the Court finds Hanginout has not presented sufficient evidence to support a  
12 finding that this factor weighs in favor of a likelihood of confusion.

### 13 **g. Intent**

14 “When the alleged infringer knowingly adopts a mark similar to another’s,  
15 reviewing courts presume that the defendant can accomplish his purpose: that is, that the  
16 public will be deceived.” *Sleekcraft*, 599 F.2d at 354. However, the Ninth Circuit has  
17 cautioned lower courts that this factor must be considered in light of whether the defen-  
18 dant’s use of the trademark was to mislead consumers rather than truthfully inform them  
19 of their choice of products. *See Network Automation*, 638 F.3d 1153.

20 Hanginout contends Google intentionally adopted the HANGOUTS mark with full  
21 knowledge of the HANGINOUT mark because Google received the suspension notice  
22 from the USPTO of their trademark application on July 30, 2013, but nevertheless  
23 proceeded to launch the HANGOUTS iTunes application on September 12, 2013.

24 Hanginout further argues that considering the sheer size of Google, and the number of  
25 researchers, employees, and attorneys that work for Google, it seems highly improbable  
26 that Google had no knowledge of the HANGINOUT mark prior to releasing its HANG-  
27 OUTS iTunes application. In response, Google contends that its actions are not automat-  
28 ically indicative of bad faith because even after the USPTO alerted it of the existence of

1 Hanginout’s pending trademark application in July 2013, it nonetheless believed it had  
2 superior common law rights and intended to challenge the mark.

3 Although the date Google submitted its trademark application for HANGOUTS  
4 closely correlates with the date Hanginout successfully had a third-party mark for  
5 HANGOUTS suspended due to lack of use, the Court does not find that Google adopted  
6 the HANGOUTS mark with the intent to deceive consumers. Thus, to the extent Google  
7 believed it had superior common law trademark rights, the Court finds this fact does not  
8 weigh in favor of finding a likelihood of confusion. *See SecuraComm Consulting, Inc. v.*  
9 *Securacom Inc.*, 166 F.3d 182, 188 (3d Cir. 1999)

#### 10 **h. Likelihood of Expansion of the Product Line**

11 “Inasmuch as a trademark owner is afforded greater protection against competing  
12 goods, a ‘strong possibility’ that either party may expand his business to compete with  
13 the other will weigh in favor of finding that the present use is infringing. When goods  
14 are closely related, any expansion is likely to result in direct competition.” *Sleekcraft*,  
15 599 F.2d at 354 (citations omitted). However, where two companies “already compete to  
16 a significant extent,” this factor is unimportant. *Brookfield*, 174 F.3d at 1060; *See*  
17 *Network Automation*, 638 F.3d 1153.

18 Hanginout contends that Google intends to directly compete with Hanginout in the  
19 social-media arena, and therefore, expansion is an established fact. In opposition,  
20 Google contends that Hanginout’s assertions should be afforded little weight because  
21 Hanginout has failed to present any evidence that either Google or Hanginout plans to  
22 expand into a different product areas. *See Instant Media, Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.*, No. C  
23 07-02639 SBA, 2007 WL 2318948, at \* 17 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 13, 2007) (“Nevertheless, in  
24 the absence of any concrete evidence that Microsoft plans to use the i’m mark in  
25 connection with the sort of product that would compete with the I’M player, this factor  
26 weighs slightly in Microsoft’s favor.”).

27 The Court agrees with Google that Hanginout has failed to present any evidence  
28 that it plans to expand into real-time video conferencing and messaging services, thereby

1 merging into and offering services/products in competition with Google. As a result, the  
2 Court finds this factor neither weighs in favor or against a finding of likelihood of  
3 consumer confusion.

4 Accordingly, after taking all the *Sleekcraft* factors into consideration, the Court  
5 finds Hanginout has failed to show that consumers will likely be confused by the two  
6 products at issue based on the evidence presently before the Court. This determination  
7 was made with special consideration to: (1) the strength of the marks; (2) evidence of  
8 actual confusion; (3) the type of goods and degree of care likely to be exercised by the  
9 purchaser; and (4) the labeling and appearance of the marks when offered to consumers  
10 through the iTunes app store.

## 11 2. Irreparable Harm

12 In addition to the factors outlined above, a plaintiff must establish irreparable  
13 harm to be entitled to immediate injunctive relief, i.e., that the plaintiff is unlikely to be  
14 made whole by an award of monetary damages or some other legal remedy within the  
15 ordinary course of litigation.<sup>26</sup> *See Am. Trucking Associations*, 559 F.3d at 1059.  
16 Speculative future harm is insufficient. *See Herb Reed Enters.*, 736 F.3d at 1250 (stating  
17 that the record below failed to support a finding of irreparable harm in the absence of  
18 evidence that such harm was likely rather than speculative); *see also Mortgage Elec.*  
19 *Registration Sys. v. Brosnan*, No. C 09-3600, 2009 WL 3647125, at \*8, (N.D. Cal. Sept.  
20 4, 2009) (citing *Stuhlberg Intern. Sales Co., Inc. v. John D. Brush and Co., Inc.*, 240  
21 F.3d 832, 841 (9th Cir. 2001)) (“The potential loss of good will or the loss of the ability  
22 to control one’s reputation may constitute irreparable harm for purposes of preliminary  
23 injunctive relief.”). Moreover, where there is a delay in time between the defendant’s  
24

---

25 <sup>26</sup> Although the standard for issuing a preliminary injunction in the trademark  
26 context previously presumed irreparable injury if the moving party showed a likelihood  
27 of success on the merits, district courts in this circuit have found the presumption no  
28 longer applicable. *See, e.g., Jumbo Bright Trading Ltd. v. Gap, Inc.*, No. CV12-8932,  
2012 WL 5289784, at \*1 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 25, 2012) (“As far as this court is aware, every  
district court in the Ninth Circuit that has examined the issue after *Flexible Lifeline . . .*  
has either found or at least suggested that irreparable harm cannot be presumed in  
trademark cases as well.”) (collecting cases).

1 first alleged infringing use and the plaintiff's filing of the preliminary injunction, courts  
2 have found that a "lack of urgency" weighs against finding irreparable harm. *Oakland*  
3 *Tribune, Inc. v. Chronicle Publ'g Co.*, 762 F.2d 1374, 1377 (9th Cir. 1985); *see also*  
4 *Playboy Enters., Inc. v. Netscape Commc'ns Corp.*, 55 F. Supp. 2d 1070, 1090 (C.D. Cal.  
5 1999) ("[Plaintiff]'s [five-month] delay in seeking injunctive relief further demonstrates  
6 the lack of any irreparable harm.") *aff'd*, 202 F.3d 278 (9th Cir. 1999); *Valeo Intellectual*  
7 *Prop., Inc. v. Data Dep't Corp.*, 368 F. Supp. 2d 1121, 1128 (W.D. Wash. 2005) ("A  
8 three-month delay in seeking injunctive relief is inconsistent with [plaintiff]'s insistence  
9 that it faces irreparable harm.").

10 In the present case, Hanginout argues that it will suffer irreparable harm if an  
11 injunction does not issue because: (1) Google will continue to exploit Hanginout's  
12 goodwill; (2) Hanginout will lose the ability to police and control its brand and pending  
13 trademark applications; and (3) actual confusion, not just a likelihood of confusion, is  
14 already occurring. In opposition, Google contends any irreparable harm Hanginout  
15 alleges has or will continue to occur is displaced by Hanginout's failure to commence  
16 this litigation, or file the pending motion for preliminary injunctive relief, soon after it  
17 learned of Google's alleged infringing conduct. As a result, because Google first  
18 announced the release of HANGOUTS on June 28, 2011, but Hanginout did not file the  
19 instant litigation until November 26, 2013 (approximately 29 months later), or the  
20 pending motion for preliminary injunction until January 22, 2014 (approximately 31  
21 months later), Hanginout's lack of urgency weighs against irreparable harm. Finally,  
22 Google contends that Hanginout has failed to offer any evidence that: (1) it has experi-  
23 enced a decline in customers/goodwill or that such a decline is likely; (2) that actual  
24 consumer confusion has occurred; and/or (3) that any immediate threatened injury exists.

25 Whether the Court considers Google's first-use date as of June 28, 2011 or May  
26 2013 is irrelevant. Hanginout still waited anywhere between 29 months (June 2011) to 7  
27 months (May 2013) before initiating the instant litigation, and even longer before filing  
28 the instant motion for preliminary injunctive relief. Some courts have found a delay

1 shorter than this—7 months—on its own, sufficient to weigh against a finding of  
2 irreparable harm. *See, e.g., Edge Games, Inc. v. Elec. Arts, Inc.*, 745 F. Supp. 2d 1101,  
3 1117–18 (N.D. Cal. 2010) (“The undisputed fact that plaintiff did not timely act to  
4 prevent the “Mirror’s Edge” franchise from inundating the market is *alone* sufficient to  
5 deny the instant motion.”) (alteration in original); *Playboy Enters.*, 55 F. Supp. 2d at  
6 1090 (C.D. Cal. 1999) (stating the five month delay weighed against a finding of  
7 irreparable harm); *Valeo Intellectual Prop.*, 368 F. Supp. 2d at 1128 (stating that three  
8 month delay was inconsistent with a finding of irreparable harm). The Court also finds  
9 Hanginout’s contention, raised at oral argument, that they did not file sooner because  
10 they did not believe Google intended to use the mark without merit.

11 Finally, even if the Court found the delay excusable, which it does not, Hanginout  
12 has failed to present any evidence that it has experienced a decline in customers or  
13 goodwill that occurred as a result of actual customer confusion. Allegations that the  
14 plaintiff has invested resources in developing its brand and that the alleged infringing  
15 conduct is denying the plaintiff the benefit of its investment is insufficient. *See Mytee*  
16 *Prods., Inc. v. Shop Vac Corp.*, No. 13CV1610 BTM BGS, 2013 WL 5945060, at \*6–7  
17 (S.D. Cal. Nov. 4, 2013) (“Plaintiff has failed to establish that Defendant is causing  
18 irreparable harm that cannot be cured by money damages.”). Accordingly, the Court  
19 finds Hanginout has failed to produce “probative, nonspeculative evidence” that it has  
20 “lost, or will likely lose, prospective customers or goodwill due to” Goggle’s alleged  
21 infringing conduct. *Spiraledge, Inc. v. SeaWorld Entm’t, Inc.*, No. 13 CV296-  
22 WQH-BLM, 2013 WL 3467435, at \*4 (S.D. Cal. July 9, 2013); *see also ConocoPhillips*  
23 *Co. v. Gonzalez*, No. 5:12-CV-00576-LHK, 2012 WL 538266 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 17, 2012)  
24 (stating that if the “Plaintiff could wait eight months since becoming aware of the alleged  
25 trademark infringement before filing its ex parte application . . . Plaintiff can wait until  
26 Defendant has an opportunity to be heard”).

27 ///

28 ///

1                   **3. Balance of Equities and the Public Interest**

2                   Finally, the Court finds the remaining two factors—balance of equities and public  
3 interest—also weigh in favor of denying Hanginouts’s request for injunctive relief. In  
4 the trademark context, courts often define the public interest as the right of the public not  
5 to be deceived or confused. *See, e.g., Moroccan Oil, Inc. v. Moroccan Gold, LLC*, 590 F.  
6 Supp. 2d 1271, 1282 (C.D. Cal. 2008); *Davidoff & Cie, S.A. v. PLD Int’l Corp.*, 263 F.3d  
7 1297, 1304 (11th Cir. 2001) (noting the public interest is served by avoiding confusion  
8 in the marketplace); *BellSouth Adver. & Publ’g Corp. v. The Real Color Pages, Inc.*, 792  
9 F. Supp. 775, 785 (M.D. Fla. 1991) (“When a trademark is said to have been infringed,  
10 what is actually infringed is the right of the public to be free of confusion and the  
11 synonymous right of the trademark owner to control his products’ reputation.”).

12                   Therefore, in light of the findings set forth above, specifically Hanginout’s failure  
13 to show market penetration in a specific geographic area and actual consumer confusion,  
14 the Court finds the balance of equities and the public interest weigh against granting  
15 Hanginout’s motion for immediate injunctive relief. As noted by Google, it has ex-  
16 pended substantial time and resources to develop and market the HANGOUTS mark, and  
17 requiring Google to re-brand the product on the evidence presented now would be unjust  
18 and potentially harm third-party developers as well as the public.

19                   Accordingly, for the reasons stated above, Hanginout’s motion to preliminarily  
20 enjoin Google from using the HANGOUTS mark is DENIED.

21 **II. Motion to Dismiss**

22                   Similar to the arguments presented above, Google moves to dismiss the First  
23 Amended Complaint on the basis that Hanginout has failed to sufficiently allege  
24 seniority of use and market penetration in a specific geographic area.<sup>27</sup> However,  
25 because obtaining preliminary injunctive relief and succeeding on a motion to dismiss  
26 require different quanta of proof, the Court does not assume Google’s motion to dismiss  
27

---

28                   <sup>27</sup> Google contends Hanginout’s state law claims fail for the same reasons its federal trademark infringement claims fail.

1 will be granted purely because Hanginout’s motion for preliminary injunctive relief was  
2 denied. *See Walker v. Woodford*, 454 F. Supp. 2d 1007, 1024 (S.D. Cal. 2006), *aff’d in*  
3 *part*, 393 F. App’x 513 (9th Cir. 2010).

4 **A. Legal Standard**

5 A motion to dismiss pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) tests the legal sufficiency of the  
6 claims asserted in the complaint. Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6); *Navarro v. Block*, 250 F.3d  
7 729, 731 (9th Cir. 2001). When ruling on a motion to dismiss under Rule 12(b)(6), the  
8 court must accept all factual allegations pleaded in the complaint as true, and must  
9 construe them and draw all reasonable inferences from them in favor of the nonmoving  
10 party. *Cahill v. Liberty Mut. Ins. Co.*, 80 F.3d 336, 337–38 (9th Cir. 1996). The court,  
11 however, is not bound to accept “legal conclusions” as true. *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S.  
12 662, 664 (2009).

13 To avoid a Rule 12(b)(6) dismissal, a complaint need not contain detailed factual  
14 allegations; rather, the complaint must plead “enough facts to state a claim to relief that  
15 is plausible on its face.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007). A claim  
16 has “facial plausibility when the plaintiff pleads factual content that allows the court to  
17 draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct alleged.”  
18 *Iqbal*, 556 U.S. at 678. “The plausibility standard is not akin to a ‘probability require-  
19 ment,’ but it asks for more than a sheer possibility that a defendant has acted unlaw-  
20 fully.” *Id.* “Where a complaint pleads facts that are ‘merely consistent with’ a defen-  
21 dant’s liability, it ‘stops short of the line between possibility and plausibility of entitle-  
22 ment to relief.’ ” *Id.* (quoting *Twombly*, 550 U.S. at 557). It is not proper for the court to  
23 assume that “the [plaintiff] can prove facts that [he or she] has not alleged or that  
24 defendants have violated . . . laws in ways that have not been alleged.” *Associated Gen.*  
25 *Contractors of Cal., Inc. v. Cal. State Council of Carpenters*, 459 U.S. 519, 526 (1983).

26 **B. Analysis**

27 To state a claim for trademark infringement under the Lanham Act, a plaintiff  
28 must allege that it owns a valid, protectable trademark, and that the defendant is using a

1 mark in commerce that is confusingly similar to the plaintiff's mark. *See* 15 U.S.C. §  
2 1125(a); *Herb Reed Enters.*, 736 F.3d at 1247; *Dep't of Parks & Recreation for State of*  
3 *Cal. v. Bazaar Del Mundo Inc.*, 448 F.3d 1118, 1124 (9th Cir. 2006). Although federal  
4 registration is not a prerequisite to an infringement claim, in the absence of federal  
5 registration, a plaintiff must plead that it is the senior user of the market and has suffi-  
6 cient market penetration in the area in which protection is requested. *See, e.g., Adray*, 76  
7 F.3d at 989 (“The extent of market penetration depends upon the volume of sales, the  
8 positive and negative growth trends, the number of people who purchased the party’s  
9 goods in relation to the number of potential customers, and the amount of advertising”);  
10 *Glow*, 252 F. Supp. 2d at 983 (“Generally, the senior user of a mark is entitled to assert  
11 trademark rights in all areas in which it has legally sufficient market penetration.”);  
12 *Optimal Pets*, 877 F. Supp. 2d at 958 (“A party asserting common law rights must not  
13 only establish that it is the senior user, it must also show that it has “legally sufficient  
14 market penetration” in a certain geographic market to establish those trademark rights”).  
15 Google contends Hanginout has failed in both regards.

### 16 **1. Priority of Use**

17 “It is axiomatic in trademark law that the standard test of ownership is priority of  
18 use.” *See Sengoku Works Ltd. v. RMC Int'l, Ltd.*, 96 F.3d 1217, 1219 *as modified*, 97  
19 F.3d 1460 (9th Cir. 1996). “To acquire ownership of a trademark it is not enough to  
20 have invented the mark first or even to have registered it first; the party claiming  
21 ownership must have been the first to actually use the mark in the sale of goods or  
22 services.” *Id.* Courts must examine the totality of the circumstances when determining  
23 whether a mark has been adequately used in commerce so as to gain the protection of the  
24 Lanham Act. *See Chance*, 242 F.3d at 1159.

25 As discussed above, because Hanginout has alleged that it first used the  
26 HANGINOUT mark in commerce as early as March 2010, and had over 200 registered  
27 users of the web-based platform as early as May 2011, whereas Google did not begin  
28 using the HANGOUTS mark in commerce until June 28, 2011, assuming the Court



1 agreed with Google, the Court finds Hanginout has stated a plausible claim that it is the  
2 senior user of the mark in question. *See, e.g., Allard Enterprises*, 146 F.3d at 358 (“As  
3 long as there is a genuine use of the mark in commerce, however, ownership may be  
4 established even if the first uses are not extensive and do not result in deep market  
5 penetration or widespread recognition.”); *Dep’t of Parks & Recreation*, 448 F.3d at 1126  
6 (“Although mere advertising by itself may not establish priority of use, advertising  
7 combined with other non-sales activity, under our ‘totality of the circumstances test,’ can  
8 constitute prior use in commerce.”) (internal citations omitted); *Autodesk, Inc. v.*  
9 *Dassault Systemes SolidWorks Corp.*, No. C08-04397 WHA, 2008 WL 6742224, at \*2  
10 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 18, 2008) (denying motion to dismiss in trademark case where moving  
11 party claimed priority because factual allegations in the complaint were inconsistent with  
12 the plaintiff’s submissions to the USPTO); *Gulfstream Media Grp., Inc. v. PD Strategic*  
13 *Media, Inc.*, No. 12-62056-CIV, 2013 WL 1891281 at \*5 (S.D. Fla. May 6, 2013)  
14 (stating the Court must wait to consider the evidence adduced later in the litigation to  
15 determine priority of use and whether that use constituted use in commerce).<sup>28</sup>

## 16 **2. Market Penetration in a Specific Geographic Area**

17 “Sufficient market penetration is determined by ‘examining the trademark user’s  
18 volume of sales and growth, number of persons buying the trademarked product in  
19 relation to the number of potential purchasers, and the amount of advertising’ in a given  
20 market.” *Credit One Corp.*, 661 F. Supp. 2d at 1138 (quoting *Glow*, 661 F. Supp. 2d at  
21 1138); 5 McCarthy on Trademarks and Unfair Competition §26:13 (4th ed.) (“In the  
22 absence of federal registration, both parties have the right to expand into unoccupied  
23 territory and establish exclusive rights by being first in that territory. In effect, it is a race  
24 between the parties to establish customer recognition in unoccupied territory, possibly  
25 subject to the concept of a zone of natural expansion.”).

---

27  
28 <sup>28</sup> The Court also notes that none of the cases cited by Google with respect to this  
issue concerned a motion to dismiss pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6), in which the Court was  
required to accept the plaintiff’s factual allegations as true.

1 Google asserts Hanginout has failed to sufficiently allege market penetration “in  
2 any single geographic location, let alone nationwide.” (Doc. No. 23 at 7.) Google  
3 further claims that Hanginout “pleads no specific facts regarding its volume of sales and  
4 growth trends, the number of persons buying the trademarked product in relation to the  
5 number of potential purchasers, the amount of its advertising prior to June 2011, or  
6 where the 200 alleged users were located.” (*Id.*) In opposition, Hanginout contends  
7 Google completely ignores the pleading standard and what is required to defeat a motion  
8 to dismiss. Therefore, Hanginout asserts that Google’s efforts are premature, and  
9 “[w]hile Google may explore the depths of Hanginout’s allegations as litigation and  
10 discovery progress,” such an inquiry is not appropriate on a motion to dismiss.


11 The Court agrees. Although Hanginout has failed to present sufficient evidence of  
12 its market penetration in a specific geographic area to warrant preliminary injunctive  
13 relief at this juncture, on a motion to dismiss, the Court must take the plaintiff’s allega-  
14 tions as true, and construe the facts in the light most favorable to the plaintiff. *Cahill*, 80  
15 F.3d at 337–38; *Ashcroft*, 556 U.S. at 678 (stating that while a plaintiff need not “plead  
16 every detail or prove every fact,” a plaintiff must allege certain facts, which if true,  
17 would state a plausible claim for relief). Therefore, because Hanginout has alleged that  
18 it “achieved market penetration through the United States and, at a minimum, in Califor-  
19 nia,” the Court must take these facts as true and leave for a later date the determination  
20 of whether Hanginout will be able to support such facts with the necessary evidence. *See*  
21 *Monster Daddy, LLC v. Monster Cable Prods., Inc.*, No. CA 6:10-1170-TMC, 2012 WL  
22 2513466, at \*2-3 (D.S.C. June 29, 2012) (denying 12(b)(6) motion in trademark case on  
23 grounds that it was not appropriate for the court to make factual determinations at that  
24 time) (denying 12(b)(6) motion in trademark infringement case on the basis that it was  
25 inappropriate for the court to make factual determinations on a motion dismiss);  
26 *CYBERsitter, LLC v. Google Inc.*, 905 F. Supp. 2d 1080, 1087 (C.D. Cal. 2012).  
27 Accordingly, the Court DENIES Google’s motion to the dismiss the First Amended  
28 Complaint.

1 **CONCLUSION**

2 As set forth above, the Court DENIES Hanginout's motion for preliminary  
3 injunction, (Doc. No. 12), and DENIES Google's motion to dismiss the First Amended  
4 Complaint, (Doc. No. 23). Google must file an answer to the operative complaint no  
5 later than thirty (30) days from the date of this order.

6  
7 IT IS SO ORDERED.

8 DATED: May 12, 2014

9   
10 \_\_\_\_\_  
11 Hon. Anthony J. Battaglia  
12 U.S. District Judge  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28