

THIS DISPOSITION IS NOT CITABLE  
AS PRECEDENT OF THE TTAB

MAY 29, 98

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

---

Trademark Trial and Appeal Board

---

Sabroso Company  
v.  
Sabroso Foods Enterprises, Inc.

---

Opposition No. 95,968 to application Serial No. 74/498,053  
filed on March 7, 1994

---

Charles D. McClung and Nancy J. Moriarty of Chernoff, Vilhauer,  
McClung & Stenzel, LLP for Sabroso Company.

John Cyril Malloy, III and Jennifer K. Lawson of Malloy & Malloy,  
P.A. for Sabroso Foods Enterprises, Inc.

---

Before Cissel, Quinn and Hohein, Administrative Trademark Judges.

Opinion by Hohein, Administrative Trademark Judge:

Sabroso Foods Enterprises, Inc. has filed an  
application to register the mark "S SABROSO!" and design, as  
reproduced below,



for "canned peas, dry peas, frozen peas, canned black beans, canned soursop, coconut milk and prepared sausage" in International Class 29 and "barbecue sauce, sour orange sauce, [and] garlic and onion sauce" in International Class 30.<sup>1</sup>

Registration has been opposed by Sabroso Company on the ground that applicant's mark, when applied to applicant's goods, so resembles both opposer's previously used and well known mark "SABROSO" for "fruit puree concentrates" and its previously used and well known trade name "SABROSO COMPANY" as to be likely to cause confusion, mistake or deception.

Applicant, in its answer, has denied the allegations of the notice of opposition.<sup>2</sup>

The record includes the pleadings; the file of the opposed application; and, as opposer's case-in-chief, the testimony, with exhibits, of opposer's president, James M. Root,

---

<sup>1</sup> Ser. No. 74/498,053, filed on March 7, 1994, which alleges, for the goods in each class, a date of first use anywhere of October 8, 1990 and a date of first use in commerce of September 9, 1991. The term "SABROSO," the English translation of which is stated to mean "TASTY," is disclaimed.

<sup>2</sup> Although applicant has also alleged, as an affirmative defense, that while opposer "knew or should have known upon reasonable inquiry of the use by Applicant of its mark since at least the date of Applicant's previous trademark application," inasmuch as opposer "has taken no action against Applicant, Opposer is estopped and is guilty of laches and acquiescence by virtue of Applicant's reliance upon such inaction." However, since such defense was neither pursued at trial nor argued in the briefs, no further consideration will be given thereto.

and the testimony of a former marketing consultant to opposer (and who presently is the executive vice president and chief operating officer of Liberty Federal Bank), Frank H. Hoell III.<sup>3</sup> Applicant, as its case-in-chief, submitted the testimony, with an exhibit, of its president, Carlos Bordon.<sup>4</sup> Briefs have been filed,<sup>5</sup> but an oral hearing was not requested.

The issues to be determined are whether opposer has priority of use of its mark and/or trade name and, if so, whether applicant's "S SABROSO!" and design mark, when used in connection with its specified food products and sauces, so resembles opposer's "SABROSO" mark for its "fruit puree concentrates" and/or its "SABROSO COMPANY" trade name that confusion is likely as to the source or sponsorship of the parties' goods.

According to the record, opposer began operations in 1964 under the name Western Pear Distributors, Inc. However, because such name was too limiting and thus not appropriate for

---

<sup>3</sup> Although the depositions of opposer's witnesses have been designated as confidential pursuant to the terms of a stipulated protective order approved by the Board, we note that, except for certain proprietary business information such as sales figures, advertising expenditures and customer names, the facts and exhibits disclosed in such depositions have not been treated as confidential in the briefs filed by opposer. Moreover, many of the publicly available newspaper articles mention the names of opposer's principal customers. In view thereof, and since the Board simply cannot render an intelligible opinion in this proceeding without reference thereto, only such proprietary business information as opposer's actual sales and advertising figures will be treated herein as confidential.

<sup>4</sup> The parties' stipulation, filed by applicant, to correct certain portions of Mr. Bordon's deposition is approved.

<sup>5</sup> Portions of the parties' briefs have been designated as confidential.

the markets opposer wanted to develop,<sup>6</sup> opposer amended its articles of incorporation, effective as of July 13, 1965, to change its name to Sabroso Company. Since then, opposer has been known solely by that name and, since 1965, has continuously used the mark "SABROSO," which is Spanish for "tasty" or "delicious," in connection with its business of selling fruit puree concentrates and fruit purees. Opposer selected the designation "SABROSO" for use as its mark and in its trade name because, according to Mr. Root, "[o]ur markets were principally in Hispanic or Spanish-speaking countries and portions of the United States, and we wanted a name that would have good market appeal to Spanish-speaking customers."<sup>7</sup> (Root dep. at 39.)

Opposer's products are currently sold primarily to food manufacturers and food processors to produce fruit juices, fruit nectars, baby foods, fruit-based sauces and fruit candies for sale, ultimately, to consumers through retail stores. Basically, opposer's products are used as ingredients for consumer food products and for intermediate food products, such as fruit fillings for cookies. None of opposer's products themselves, however, are currently sold at the retail level to the end or ultimate consumers of fruit-based foods.

---

<sup>6</sup> Specifically, opposer was interested in expanding its business beyond the sale of pear puree concentrates and pear purees to include other varieties of fruit puree concentrates and fruit purees.

<sup>7</sup> While Mr. Root conceded on cross-examination that speakers of Spanish would consider the designation "sabroso" to mean that opposer's products are tasty, he added that in Spanish-speaking markets such a designation "would have a positive and quality connotation for our company" and that, for those who do not understand Spanish, "the name just has a good sound". (Root dep. at 42.)

Although opposer is located in Medford, Oregon, its initial sales under its trade name and mark were principally to foreign, rather than domestic markets, with sales expanding through the late 1960's and early 1970's to include 19 foreign countries. However, beginning in 1974, opposer started experiencing rapid growth in its United States markets and, in 1988, added a second facility in Sandy, Oregon to produce berry products as well as cherry puree concentrates. At present, opposer's product line covers fruit purees, fruit puree concentrates and fruit juice concentrates. While its largest selling product is pear puree concentrates, it also sells apple, apricot, peach, nectarine, white grape, plum, and prune purees and puree concentrates, along with blackberry, strawberry, black raspberry, red raspberry, blueberry, boysenberry and cherry juice concentrates, purees and puree concentrates.

Opposer's fruit puree concentrates, according to Mr. Root, "are packaged in bulk packaging from as small as a five-gallon plastic pail to as large as a [stainless steel tanker] truck," with aseptic 55-gallon drums being commonplace. (Id. at 11.) Sales of opposer's products for fiscal year 1996 (expressed herein in round figures since the actual amounts testified to are considered to be confidential) were in the neighborhood of tens of millions of dollars, representing many millions of pounds of fruit juice concentrates, fruit purees and fruit puree concentrates. Although annual sales for prior fiscal years were not provided, estimated sales of opposer's products for fiscal

year 1997 were projected to increase by 50 percent over those for fiscal year 1996.

Opposer utilizes its "SABROSO COMPANY" trade name and/or its "SABROSO" mark on printed marketing pieces, which include technical information about how its products are to be used, specification sheets, and advertising brochures which provide a general history of opposer and/or descriptions of its products. Such marketing materials are distributed by opposer to "food company purchasing agents, food company scientists and products developers and to the general management of food companies." (Id. at 17.) Brochures advertising, for example, use of opposer's fruit puree concentrates for use in producing fat-free brownies have been distributed at food science shows attended by food product developers. In addition, a number of opposer's brochures play off the meaning of the Spanish term "sabroso" by utilizing the slogan: "Sabroso. Another way to say delicious." (E.g., opposer's exhibits 5 and 11.) Some of opposer's brochures, as well as product labels, also include the use of a circular, stylized letter "S" logo in close proximity to its trade name or mark, with two of its brochures even utilizing such logo in formats which, much like applicant's mark, feature the letter "S" as immediately preceding the term "SABROSO," as illustrated below:

Opposer regularly exhibits at the Institute of Food Technologist Show, an annual trade show held in the United States and attended by approximately 20,000 food scientists. At that show, opposer displays its new products and distributes brochures and other promotional materials bearing its mark and trade name. Opposer, for many years, also has been listed in various trade directories, such as the Thomas Food Industry Register, which is principally used by food company purchasing agents and, in particular, indicates that opposer is a producer and exporter of fruit purees, puree concentrates and juice concentrates; the Directory of the Canning, Freezing, Preserving Industries, which "is used by operations people in the food industry" and specifically includes a reference to opposer's "SABROSO" brand; the Produce Reporter Blue Book; and the Membership Directory and Buyers Guide of the Northwest Food Processors Association. (Root dep. at 21.) Since 1994, opposer has additionally advertised in the Thomas Food Industry Register, with an ad listing its products as juice concentrates, purees, pastes and puree concentrates and stating the applications for such products as including "sauces/toppings". (Opposer's exhibit 20.)

Opposer's name, business and mark have received considerable publicity over the years by being mentioned in various newspaper and trade journal articles. While most of the articles appeared in the local Oregon press, a few stories, such as those concerning opposer's receipt of an award from the

Governor of Oregon for "Outstanding International Business Achievement" in 1996, were "picked up by the Associated Press and ... appeared in newspapers throughout the country." (Root dep. at 24.) Among the examples of record of the publicity garnered by opposer is a February 25, 1982 article from the Medford, Oregon Mail Tribune newspaper which quotes Tim Root, a cousin of James M. "Jim" Root, as noting that "[t]he two largest demands for our product come from Latin American peoples and baby food manufacturers. The Latin Americans use a puree concentrate drink--a pulpy fruit drink". (Opposer's exhibit 50.) Another example, consisting of a December 20, 1992 story about opposer which appeared in the business section of the same newspaper, reported among other things that:

Baby food accounts for the biggest share of the company's product. Sabroso sells puree to Beech Nut and Heinz and is the exclusive vendor for Gerber Baby Food.

The second-largest share is in fruit juices and nectars, followed by fruit snacks and barbecue and other sauces. The company's customers include Tropicana, Nestle, Treetop, Ocean Spray and Coca-Cola.

(Opposer's exhibit 32.) Similarly, a July 22, 1996 article on opposer from the business section of the Salem, Oregon Statesman newspaper indicated that:

Baby food is the biggest market for Sabroso. It supplies Gerber, Beech Nut, Heinz and Earth's Best.

Fruit juices and nectars are the second-largest product line for Sabroso, which serves Tropicana Twister juices, Dole, Chiquita, Libbey and Kern.

The "healthy snack" sector, including fruit rollup and Gummi snacks, ranks third. Sabroso is the sole supplier for the big

three producers: General Mills, Farley's and Stretch Island.

"We have a fourth new area that's pretty exciting--McDonald's dipping sauces for McNuggets," Root said.

(Opposer's exhibit 27.)

As a result of its long-range business planning during the early 1990's, opposer formulated a marketing plan followed by a strategic growth plan. The research culminating in opposer's marketing plan revealed, according to Mr. Root, that "Sabroso Company had a very high recognition in the food business, that [is,] food companies knew our name readily," and that "in our area of fruit concentrates, purees and juices, ... we had a very large market position." (Root dep. at 12.) In Mr. Root's opinion, opposer is a world leader in the production of fruit puree concentrates inasmuch as, by consensus of those in the industry, it has approximately 30 percent of the worldwide market for such products.

Similarly, as testified to by Mr. Hoell, who at the time owned the management consulting firm which conducted the survey of opposer's food manufacturing customers, his marketing research revealed that opposer "was very well-known to these people" due to the consistent quality of product it provided. (Hoell dep. at 5.) Mr. Hoell noted, moreover, that not only did his study find a high name recognition for opposer in the trade, but "one of the conclusions that the marketing study drew was that one of Sabroso's strengths ... in the marketplace ... was their name recognition and, in fact, the uniqueness of their name, Sabroso ...." (Id. at 6.) While conceding under cross-

examination that opposer's Spanish-speaking customers would understand such name as meaning "tasty" or "delicious," Mr. Hoell nevertheless indicated that the name was unique, in relation to food products produced in the United States, because "no other company ... had a name anything like it in the marketplace" and that the name reflected "a long-term association with quality in terms of the quality of the product provided." (Id. at 8.)

Furthermore, in light of the market research finding that "the perception of the company was one that produced very high quality products and that it was the quality image that had caused growth and would be the avenue for future growth," opposer decided, as part of the strategic growth plan which it completed in 1992, to expand its business. (Root dep. at 12.) Such expansion was to occur by increasing the market share occupied by opposer's existing products, by "develop[ing] new but related products to the current market line" and by "enter[ing] retail production". (Id. at 13.) Specifically, as to the latter, opposer's plan calls for the use of its "SABROSO COMPANY" name in connection with the production of "retail or consumer products, primarily in the juice, nectar and beverage area." (Id.) Under the plan's timetable, opposer expects to expand into the retail marketplace by 2002, with development of fruit beverage products, utilizing its existing products as ingredients, occurring around 1999 or 2000. Moreover, while opposer anticipates selling such products at retail throughout the United States, since its nectar lines would be targeted primarily to Hispanic markets, sales thereof would be focused on such regional areas as Chicago,

Florida, southern California, and New York and New Jersey, both of which have large Puerto Rican populations. Using the products which it currently produces, opposer also plans to expand to bakery and baked filling products as well as to dietary, fruit and yogurt applications.

Opposer, even though its has federally registered only its stylized letter "S" logo, nevertheless has acted to police its "SABROSO" mark and "SABROSO COMPANY" trade name. In particular, upon becoming aware of a company in Ashford, Oregon which was also using the name "Sabroso Company," opposer requested through an attorney that such use stop and, by agreement, the company changed its name. However, although opposer sells its products in Puerto Rico and a number of states in which applicant's goods have also been sold,<sup>8</sup> opposer was not aware of applicant until opposer's in-house counsel spotted applicant's mark when it was published for opposition. Opposer, furthermore, admits that it is not aware of any instances of actual confusion between the parties, such as misdirected telephone calls or written correspondence.

Applicant, according to Mr. Bordon, was formed on June 30, 1992 and, although originally known as La Preferida Florida, Inc., changed its name to Sabroso Foods Enterprises, Inc. Previously, however, Mr. Bordon himself had used the term

---

<sup>8</sup> Specifically, such states are Florida, Louisiana and California. Opposer, in addition, has sold its products under its "SABROSO" mark in Massachusetts, Vermont, New York, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Mississippi, Missouri, Iowa, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, Nebraska, Oklahoma,

**Opposition No. 95,968**

"SABROSO" as a trademark in Florida beginning in 1990 and had used such mark in interstate commerce commencing about September 1991. Sometime after its formation, applicant adopted its "SABROSO!" and design mark, choosing such mark because "the Sabroso name was very good for the Spanish trade" in the sense that "they really know [that] sabroso means tasty, [and] that means the food is good ...." (Bordon dep. at 5.) The term "SABROSO," therefore, was considered to be particularly apt as the basis for a trademark for applicant's goods inasmuch as 90 percent of applicant's sales are to the retail Spanish-speaking or Hispanic trade.

Having selected such term, Mr. Bordon "went to the library" and, although he "found there were ... at least two companies that [had] ... the Sabroso trademark registered ... under different class[es]," he was told by "a few persons" that he "would have no problem" if the goods for which registration of the mark would be sought were classified in "class ... 29 and 30." (Id. at 6.) Given the differences in the respective products, Mr. Bordon decided to go ahead and use the term "SABROSO" and neither he nor applicant has experienced any trademark problems with such companies. Applicant, moreover, was not aware of opposer at such time and did not learn of opposer until this opposition proceeding ensued.

Applicant, as of the December 30, 1996 date of its president's deposition, primarily sells its products through

---

Arizona, Utah, Idaho, Washington, Oregon and Hawaii. Applicant has ceased selling its goods pending the disposition of this opposition.

retail food stores, most of which are located in the Hispanic or Spanish-speaking areas of Florida, Louisiana and California. Unlike opposer, none of applicant's food products is sold as an ingredient to intermediary or other food manufacturers. Among the products which applicant has sold under its "S SABROSO!" and design mark are a "fruit that is coming from Santo Domingo by [the] name of guanabana," which "is also known as sour-sop by Jamaicans";<sup>9</sup> a sour orange sauce which is used for barbecue; and coconut milk. (Id. at 11.) Although, at one time, applicant also sold "guava nectars, mango nectars, [and] tamarino nectars," applicant has largely stopped selling its goods ever since "it started having this difficulty with the trademark". (Id. at 12.) Applicant, however, has never experienced any incidents of actual confusion, such as receipt of communications meant for opposer or another company, nor has anyone ever inquired into whether a possible connection or affiliation exists between applicant and opposer.

Turning first to the issue of which party has priority of use, the Board pointed out in *Perma Ceram Enterprises Inc. v. Preco Industries Ltd.*, 23 USPQ2d 1134, 1138 (TTAB 1992), that:

---

<sup>9</sup> We judicially notice, in this regard, that "soursop," which is one of the goods listed in applicant's application, is defined in The Random House Dictionary of the English Language (2d ed. 1987) at 1824 as meaning: "1. The large, dark green, slightly acid, pulpy fruit of a small West Indian tree, *Annona muricata*, of the annona family. 2. the tree itself. Also called **guanabana**." It is settled that the Board may properly take judicial notice of dictionary definitions. See, e.g., *Hancock v. American Steel & Wire Co. of New Jersey*, 203 F.2d 737, 97 USPQ 330, 332 (CCPA 1953) and *University of Notre Dame du Lac v. J. C. Gourmet Food Imports Co., Inc.*, 213 USPQ 594, 596 (TTAB 1982), *aff'd*, 703 F.2d 1372, 217 USPQ 505 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

[T]he controlling law ... is that where the mark [or trade name] relied upon by a plaintiff in support of its priority of use and likelihood of confusion claim is merely descriptive ..., then the plaintiff must establish priority of acquired distinctiveness. As noted above, the priority contest ... is not solely one of who used the mark first chronologically--rather, the test is which party first achieved secondary meaning in its mark. See: J. T. McCarthy, *Trademarks and Unfair Competition*, Section 16:12 (2d ed. 1984). ....

It is clear from the record that, even if the term "SABROSO" is initially regarded, under the doctrine of foreign equivalents,<sup>10</sup> as being merely descriptive of a characteristic or feature of opposer's products and the nature of its business, opposer has demonstrated, as it must, that not only have the mark "SABROSO" and the trade name "SABROSO COMPANY" acquired distinctiveness, but such occurred prior to the earliest date upon which applicant can rely in this proceeding.

Specifically, opposer has shown that by no later than the earliest use of the term "SABROSO" by applicant, which use occurred, as part of its "S SABROSO!" and design mark, sometime after the formation of applicant on June 30, 1992,<sup>11</sup> both

---

<sup>10</sup> It is well established that the foreign equivalent of a merely descriptive English word or expression generally is itself merely descriptive and is no more registrable than the English word or expression would be. See, e.g., *In re Optima Int'l*, 196 USPQ 775, 777 (TTAB 1977) and cases cited therein.

<sup>11</sup> While, as noted earlier in this opinion, applicant's president testified that he first used the term "SABROSO" in Florida in 1990 and later used such term in interstate commerce by September 1991, there is nothing in the record, such as sales and advertising figures or representative advertisements, from which we can infer that the term "SABROSO" itself has acquired distinctiveness as used in connection with applicant's goods. Accordingly, for purposes of priority, the only relevant use on which applicant rely, given its disclaimer of the

opposer's "SABROSO" mark and "SABROSO COMPANY" trade name had acquired distinctiveness as a result of opposer's substantially exclusive and continuous use thereof since 1965, including steadily growing sales and advertising under such designations and receipt of appreciable exposure at trade shows and in the printed media. Opposer's sales, in particular, had expanded through the late 1960's and early 1970's to include 19 foreign countries and, beginning in 1974, opposer began to experience rapid growth in its United States markets, even adding a second facility by 1988. In view thereof, and in light of its trade directory listings, annual trade show participation, long-standing media coverage and vigilance in policing the "SABROSO" name, it is plain that to opposer's customers in the trade for fruit purees, fruit puree concentrates and fruit juice concentrates, the mark "SABROSO" and the trade name "SABROSO COMPANY" have come to be recognized as designations identifying and distinguishing opposer and its products and that such mark and trade name acquired their distinctiveness prior to the first use of the mark "S SABROSO!" and design by applicant.

This brings us, therefore, to consideration of the pertinent factors set forth in *In re E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 476 F.2d 1357, 177 USPQ 563, 567 (CCPA 1973), for determining whether a likelihood of confusion exists. We find, in view thereof, that confusion as to the source or sponsorship of the parties' goods is likely to occur. Among other things, we

---

merely descriptive term "SABROSO," is its earliest use of the mark "S SABROSO!" and design.

note that applicant does not dispute that opposer's "SABROSO" mark and "SABROSO COMPANY" trade name are substantially similar to applicant's "S SABROSO!" and design mark. Specifically, when considered in their entirety, opposer's mark and trade name are substantially similar in sound, appearance and connotation to applicant's mark and, as used in connection with their respective food products, create virtually the same commercial impression.<sup>12</sup> Moreover, while not necessarily famous, the record demonstrates that to opposer's customers, its "SABROSO" mark and "SABROSO COMPANY" trade name have become well known and are recognized as indications of quality. Clearly, if such designations and applicant's "S SABROSO!" and design mark were to be used in connection with identical or closely related products, confusion as to the source or sponsorship of the goods would be likely to occur.

Applicant argues, however, that confusion is not likely because its products are primarily sold through retail food stores for consumption by ordinary consumers while opposer's products are marketed exclusively to food manufacturers and producers for use as ingredients. However, as correctly pointed out by opposer in its reply brief, it is settled that the registrability of an applicant's mark must be evaluated on the basis of the identification of goods set forth in the involved

---

<sup>12</sup> Such is especially the case when opposer's mark and trade name are also used in connection with its stylized letter "S" logo, since the sound of the letter "S" would suggest to Spanish-speaking or Hispanic customers that, like the phrase "S SABROSO!" in applicant's mark, opposer's goods also "es sabroso," that is, they "are tasty" or "are delicious".

application, regardless of what the record may reveal as to the particular nature of the applicant's goods, their actual channels of trade, or the classes of purchasers to which they are in fact sold. See, e.g., *Octocom Systems Inc. v. Houston Computer Services Inc.*, 918 F.2d 937, 16 USPQ2d 1783, 1787 (Fed. Cir. 1990) and *Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce, N.A. v. Wells Fargo Bank*, 811 F.2d 1490, 1 USPQ2d 1813, 1815-16 (Fed. Cir. 1987).

Here, the goods set forth in applicant's application are neither expressly nor implicitly limited as being for sale through retail food stores for use by the ultimate consumers thereof. Thus, notwithstanding applicant's arguments that the parties' goods are very different in their actual use and would appeal to different and unrelated classes of purchasers, the respective goods must be considered to be closely related since, as broadly identified, applicant's goods would be suitable for sale through the identical channels of trade and to the same food purchasing agents as are opposer's products. Applicant's canned, dry and frozen peas, canned black beans, canned soursop, coconut milk and prepared sausage, as well as its barbecue, sour orange, and garlic and onion sauces, must be presumed, given the absence of any restrictions in their identification, to be suitable for use as ingredients by the same food producers and manufacturers as those who utilize opposer's fruit purees, fruit puree concentrates and fruit juice concentrates.

Consequently, while purchasers of food products utilized as ingredients for other food products are undoubtedly

---

sophisticated and discriminating, their knowledge of their product needs, sources of supply and the costs involved does not mean, even if they were to recognize the slight differences between applicant's "S SABROSO!" and design mark and either opposer's "SABROSO" mark or its "SABROSO COMPANY" trade name, that they would be immune from confusion as to the source or sponsorship of the parties' products. Such purchasers, for example, could reasonably believe, upon encountering applicant's canned soursop or its coconut milk, that opposer had simply expanded its existing product line to include another processed fruit product, or they could assume, upon initial exposure in the marketplace to any of applicant's other goods, that opposer had entered a new but related line of food products. In either event, confusion as to origin or affiliation of the respective goods would be likely.

Finally, while we note that neither party has experienced any incidents of actual confusion as a result of the contemporaneous use of their respective marks and opposer's trade name, suffice it to say that such is not a meaningful factor in this case since the record fails to indicate that, for a significant period of time, applicant's sales of its goods and any advertising thereof have been so appreciable and continuous that, if confusion were likely to happen, any instances of actual confusion would have occurred and been brought to the parties' attention. See, e.g., Gillette Canada Inc. v. Ranir Corp., 23 USPQ2d 1768, 1774 (TTAB 1992).

Opposition No. 95,968

**Decision:** The opposition is sustained and registration to applicant is refused.

R. F. Cissel

T. J. Quinn

G. D. Hohein  
Administrative Trademark Judges,  
Trademark Trial and Appeal Board