

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR  
THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND, NORTHERN DIVISION

THE CORYN GROUP II, LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

O.C. SEACRETS, INC.,

Defendant.

CIVIL NO.: WDQ-08-2764

\* \* \* \* \*

MEMORANDUM OPINION

The Coryn Group II, LLC ("Coryn II") appealed the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board's ("TTAB") cancellation of its registration for the mark "SECRETS" for "resort hotel services" and its denial of other relief. O.C. Seacrets ("O.C.") counterclaimed against Coryn II, and sued the Coryn Group, Inc., and AMR Resorts, LLC, (collectively "Coryn") under the Lanham Act and Maryland common law. On April 9, 2012, this Court entered a permanent injunction restraining Coryn's use of the SECRETS mark. ECF No. 319. Coryn has moved for clarification of the extent of the injunction. ECF No. 323.

The injunction prohibits Coryn and its agents from, among other things:

Registering, hosting, or maintaining any website with a domain name that includes the term SECRETS, by itself or with the words resort, hotel, spa, restaurant, or bar, in connection with resorts, hotels, spas, restaurants, or bars, or other services or goods within the hospitality field in a manner that


is likely to cause confusion or mistake with respect to the SEACRETS mark after DECEMBER 31, 2012.

ECF No. 318 ¶3(c). In its accompanying opinion, the Court noted that the injunction would "bar Coryn from hosting, maintaining, or registering a domain name whose predominant mark is SECRETS in the United States." ECF No. 320 at 50 n.55. That language was not included in the injunction.

To clarify the scope of the injunction, the Court will enter an amended injunction that explicitly limits the prohibition to "[r]egistering, hosting, or maintaining **within the United States and its Territory** any website with a domain name that includes the term SECRETS . . . . \*

Date

5/14/12

  
William D. Quarles, Jr.  
United States District Judge

---

\* Coryn proposes limiting the injunction to websites "targeted at U.S. consumers." ECF No. 323 at 5. Such a limitation was not contemplated in the original injunction or opinion and will not be added now.