

EXHIBIT D

To: Google Inc. (trademarks@google.com)
Subject: TRADEMARK APPLICATION NO. 77318565 - ANDROID - N/A
Sent: 2/14/2008 10:04:35 AM
Sent As: ECOM103@USPTO.GOV
Attachments: Attachment - 1
Attachment - 2

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

SERIAL NO: 77/318565

MARK: ANDROID

77318565

CORRESPONDENT ADDRESS:

GOOGLE INC.
GOOGLE INC.
1600 AMPHITHEATRE PKWY
MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94043-1351

RESPOND TO THIS ACTION:

<http://www.uspto.gov/teas/eTEASpageD.htm>

GENERAL TRADEMARK INFORMATION:

<http://www.uspto.gov/main/trademarks.htm>

APPLICANT: Google Inc.

CORRESPONDENT'S REFERENCE/DOCKET

NO:

N/A

CORRESPONDENT E-MAIL ADDRESS:

trademarks@google.com

OFFICE ACTION

TO AVOID ABANDONMENT, THE OFFICE MUST RECEIVE A PROPER RESPONSE TO THIS OFFICE ACTION WITHIN 6 MONTHS OF THE ISSUE/MAILING DATE.

ISSUE/MAILING DATE: 2/14/2008

The assigned trademark examining attorney has reviewed the referenced application and has determined the following:

Refusal: Section 2(d) - Likelihood of Confusion Refusal

Registration of the proposed mark is refused because of a likelihood of confusion with the mark in U.S.

Registration No. 2639556. Trademark Act Section 2(d), 15 U.S.C. §1052(d); TMEP §§1207.01 *et seq.* See the enclosed registration.

Taking into account the relevant *du Pont* factors, a likelihood of confusion determination in this case involves a two-part analysis. First, the marks are compared for similarities in appearance, sound, connotation and commercial impression. *In re E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 476 F.2d 1357, 177 USPQ 563 (C.C.P.A. 1973). Second, the goods or services are compared to determine whether they are similar or related or whether the activities surrounding their marketing are such that confusion as to origin is likely. *In re National Novice Hockey League, Inc.*, 222 USPQ 638 (TTAB 1984); *In re August Storck KG*, 218 USPQ 823 (TTAB 1983); *In re Int'l Tel. and Tel. Corp.*, 197 USPQ 910 (TTAB 1978); *Guardian Prods. Co. v. Scott Paper Co.*, 200 USPQ 738 (TTAB 1978); TMEP §§1207.01 *et seq.*

In the case at hand, the applicant seeks registration of ANDROID in standard character form for “hardware; software.” The cited registered mark is ANDROID DATA in typed form for “computer e-commerce software to allow users to perform electronic business transactions via a global computer network.”

Regarding the first prong of the test, disclaimed matter is typically less significant or less dominant when comparing marks. Although a disclaimed portion of a mark certainly cannot be ignored, and the marks must be compared in their entireties, one feature of a mark may be more significant in creating a commercial impression. *In re Dixie Restaurants Inc.*, 105 F.3d 1405, 41 USPQ2d 1531 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *In re National Data Corporation*, 753 F.2d 1056, 224 USPQ 749 (Fed. Cir. 1985); and *In re Appetito Provisions Co. Inc.*, 3 USPQ2d 1553 (TTAB 1987). See also *Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Packard Press Inc.*, 281 F.3d 1261, 62 USPQ 2d 1001 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *Tektronix, Inc. v. Daktronics, Inc.*, 534 F.2d 915, 189 USPQ 693 (C.C.P.A. 1976); *In re El Torito Rests. Inc.*, 9 USPQ2d 2002 (TTAB 1988); *In re Equitable Bancorporation*, 229 USPQ 709 (TTAB 1986). The registrant has disclaimed the descriptive wording DATA apart from the mark as shown. Therefore, the examining attorney must closely examine the dominant portion of the registered mark against the applicant’s mark.

The dominant portion of the registrant’s mark is the term ANDROID, which is identical in sound, appearance, and commercial impression to the cited registered mark. Marks may be confusingly similar in appearance where there are similar terms or phrases or similar parts of terms or phrases appearing in both applicant’s and registrant’s mark. See *e.g.*, *Crocker Nat’l Bank v. Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce*, 228 USPQ 689 (TTAB 1986), *aff’d* 1 USPQ2d 1813 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (COMMCASH and COMMUNICASH); *In re Phillips-Van Heusen Corp.*, 228 USPQ 949 (TTAB 1986) (21 CLUB and “21” CLUB (stylized)); *In re Corning Glass Works*, 229 USPQ 65 (TTAB 1985) (CONFIRM and CONFIRMCELLS); *In re Collegian Sportswear Inc.*, 224 USPQ 174 (TTAB 1984) (COLLEGIAN OF CALIFORNIA and COLLEGIENNE); *In re Pellerin Milnor Corp.*, 221 USPQ 558 (TTAB 1983) (MILTRON and MILLTRONICS); *In re BASF A.G.*, 189 USPQ 424 (TTAB 1975) (LUTEXAL and LUTEX); TMEP §§1207.01(b)(ii) and (b)(iii).

Regarding the issue of likelihood of confusion, the question is not whether people will confuse the marks, but whether the marks will confuse people into believing that the goods they identify come from the same source. *In re West Point-Pepperell, Inc.*, 468 F.2d 200, 175 USPQ 558 (C.C.P.A. 1972). For that reason, the test of likelihood of confusion is not whether the marks can be distinguished when subjected to a side-by-side comparison. The question is whether the marks create the same overall impression. *Recot, Inc. v. M.C. Becton*, 214 F.2d 1322, 54 USPQ2d 1894, 1890 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Visual Information Inst., Inc. v.*

Vicon Indus. Inc., 209 USPQ 179 (TTAB 1980). The focus is on the recollection of the average purchaser who normally retains a general rather than specific impression of trademarks. *Chemetron Corp. v. Morris Coupling & Clamp Co.*, 203 USPQ 537 (TTAB 1979); *Sealed Air Corp. v. Scott Paper Co.*, 190 USPQ 106 (TTAB 1975); TMEP §1207.01(b). Considering the above, the marks are sufficiently similar to cause a likelihood of confusion under Trademark Act Section 2(d).

Turning to the second prong of the test, the goods of the parties need not be identical or directly competitive to find a likelihood of confusion. Instead, they need only be related in some manner, or the conditions surrounding their marketing are such that they would be encountered by the same purchasers under circumstances that would give rise to the mistaken belief that the goods come from a common source. *On-line Careline Inc. v. America Online Inc.*, 229 F.3d 1080, 56 USPQ2d 1471 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *In re Martin's Famous Pastry Shoppe, Inc.*, 748 F.2d 1565, 223 USPQ 1289 (Fed. Cir. 1984); *In re Melville Corp.*, 18 USPQ2d 1386, 1388 (TTAB 1991); *In re Corning Glass Works*, 229 USPQ 65 (TTAB 1985); *In re Rexel Inc.*, 223 USPQ 830 (TTAB 1984); *Guardian Prods. Co., Inc. v. Scott Paper Co.*, 200 USPQ 738 (TTAB 1978); *In re Int'l Tel. & Tel. Corp.*, 197 USPQ 910 (TTAB 1978); TMEP §1207.01(a)(i).

Both the applicant and the registrant are providing software. The registrant has more narrowly stated its goods as "computer e-commerce software to allow users to perform electronic business transactions via a global computer network." Likelihood of confusion is determined on the basis of the goods or services as they are identified in the application and the registration. *Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Packard Press Inc.*, 281 F.3d 1261, 62 USPQ2d 1001 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *In re Shell Oil Co.*, 992 F.2d 1204, 26 USPQ2d 1687, 1690 n.4 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *J & J Snack Foods Corp. v. McDonald's Corp.*, 932 F.2d 1460, 18 USPQ2d 1889 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *Octocom Systems Inc. v. Houston Computer Services Inc.*, 918 F.2d 937, 16 USPQ2d 1783 (Fed. Cir. 1990). Since the identification of the applicant's goods is very broad, it is presumed that the application encompasses all goods and/or services of the type described, including those in the registrant's more specific identification, that they move in all normal channels of trade and that they are available to all potential customers. TMEP §1207.01(a)(iii).

Therefore, with the contemporaneous use of highly similar marks that share the dominant term ANDROID, consumers are likely to conclude that the goods are related and originate from a single source. As such, registration must be refused under Trademark Act Section 2(d).

Any doubt regarding a likelihood of confusion is resolved in favor of the prior registrant. *Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Packard Press Inc.*, 281 F.3d 1261, 62 USPQ2d 1001, 1004 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *In re Hyper Shoppes (Ohio), Inc.*, 837 F.2d 463, 6 USPQ2d 1025 (Fed. Cir. 1988); TMEP §§1207.01(d)(i).

Although the trademark examining attorney has refused registration, applicant may respond to the refusal to register by submitting evidence and arguments in support of registration. If applicant chooses to respond to the refusal to register, then applicant must also respond to the following requirements.

Requirement: Identification of Goods

The identification of goods is indefinite and must be clarified because it is too broad. Applicant may adopt the following identification, if accurate:

International Class 009: Computer hardware; Computer software for {specify the function of the programs, e.g., use in database management, use as a spreadsheet, word processing, etc. and, if software is content- or field-specific, the content or field of use}.

TMEP §1402.01.

Please note that, while the identification of goods may be amended to clarify or limit the goods, adding to the goods or broadening the scope of the goods is not permitted. 37 C.F.R. §2.71(a); TMEP §1402.06. Therefore, applicant may not amend the identification to include goods that are not within the scope of the goods set forth in the present identification.

For assistance with identifying and classifying goods and/or services in trademark applications, please see the online searchable *Manual of Acceptable Identifications of Goods and Services* at <http://tess2.uspto.gov/netahtml/tidm.html>.

Requirement: Significance of Mark

Applicant must specify whether “ANDROID” has any significance in the computer hardware and software trade or industry, any geographical significance, or any meaning in a foreign language. 37 C.F.R. §2.61(b).

Response Guidelines

Applicant should include the following information on all correspondence with the Office: (1) the name and law office number of the trademark examining attorney; (2) the serial number of this application; (3) the mailing date of this Office action; and, (4) applicant's telephone number. 37 C.F.R. §2.194(b)(1); TMEP §302.03(a).

To expedite prosecution of this application, applicant is encouraged to file its response to this Office action through the Trademark Electronic Application System (TEAS), available at <http://www.uspto.gov/teas/index.html>.

If applicant has questions about its application or needs assistance in responding to this Office action, please telephone the assigned trademark examining attorney directly at the number below.

/Seth A. Rappaport/
Seth A. Rappaport
Trademark Examining Attorney
Law Office 103
Phone: (571) 270-1508
Fax: (571) 270-2508

RESPOND TO THIS ACTION: If there are any questions about the Office action, please contact the assigned examining attorney. A response to this Office action should be filed using the form available at <http://www.uspto.gov/teas/eTEASpageD.htm>. If notification of this Office action was received via e-mail, no response using this form may be filed for 72 hours after receipt of the notification. **Do not attempt to respond by e-mail as the USPTO does not accept e-mailed responses.**

If responding by paper mail, please include the following information: the application serial number, the mark, the filing date and the name, title/position, telephone number and e-mail address of the person signing the response. Please use the following address: Commissioner for Trademarks, P.O. Box 1451, Alexandria, VA 22313-1451.

STATUS CHECK: Check the status of the application at least once every six months from the initial

filing date using the USPTO Trademark Applications and Registrations Retrieval (TARR) online system at <http://tarr.uspto.gov>. When conducting an online status check, print and maintain a copy of the complete TARR screen. If the status of your application has not changed for more than six months, please contact the assigned examining attorney.

Print: Feb 14, 2008

78011167

DESIGN MARK

Serial Number

78011167

Status

REGISTERED

Word Mark

ANDROID DATA

Standard Character Mark

No

Registration Number

2639556

Date Registered

2002/10/22

Type of Mark

TRADEMARK

Register

PRINCIPAL

Mark Drawing Code

(1) TYPED DRAWING

Owner

Android Data Corporation CORPORATION ILLINOIS 114 North Ashland Avenue
Palatine ILLINOIS 60067

Goods/Services

Class Status -- ACTIVE. IC 009. US 021 023 026 036 038. G & S:
Computer e-commerce software to allow users to perform electronic
business transactions via a global computer network. First Use:
1999/01/01. First Use In Commerce: 1999/01/01.

Disclaimer Statement

NO CLAIM IS MADE TO THE EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO USE "DATA" APART FROM THE
MARK AS SHOWN.

Filing Date

2000/06/04

Examining Attorney

BLANDU, FLORENTINA

ANDROID DATA

To: Google Inc. (trademarks@google.com)
Subject: TRADEMARK APPLICATION NO. 77318565 - ANDROID - N/A
Sent: 2/14/2008 10:04:37 AM
Sent As: ECOM103@USPTO.GOV
Attachments:

IMPORTANT NOTICE
USPTO OFFICE ACTION HAS ISSUED ON 2/14/2008 FOR
APPLICATION SERIAL NO. 77318565

Please follow the instructions below to continue the prosecution of your application:

VIEW OFFICE ACTION: Click on this link http://tportal.uspto.gov/external/portal/tow?DDA=Y&serial_number=77318565&doc_type=OOA& (or copy and paste this URL into the address field of your browser), or visit <http://tportal.uspto.gov/external/portal/tow> and enter the application serial number to access the Office action.

PLEASE NOTE: The Office action may not be immediately available but will be viewable within 24 hours of this notification.

RESPONSE MAY BE REQUIRED: You should carefully review the Office action to determine (1) if a response is required; (2) how to respond; and (3) the applicable response time period. Your response deadline will be calculated from 2/14/2008.

Do NOT hit "Reply" to this e-mail notification, or otherwise attempt to e-mail your response, as the USPTO does NOT accept e-mailed responses. Instead, the USPTO recommends that you respond online using the Trademark Electronic Application System response form at <http://www.uspto.gov/teas/eTEASpageD.htm>.

HELP: For *technical* assistance in accessing the Office action, please e-mail TDR@uspto.gov. Please contact the assigned examining attorney with questions about the Office action.

WARNING

- 1. The USPTO will NOT send a separate e-mail with the Office action attached.**
- 2. Failure to file any required response by the applicable deadline will result in the ABANDONMENT of your application.**