

**THIS OPINION IS
NOT A PRECEDENT
OF THE TTAB**

Mailed: December 14, 2007
PTH

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Trademark Trial and Appeal Board

Crazy Pet, LLC
v.
Pet Crazy, Inc.

Opposition No. 91164687

Motion for Reconsideration

Crystal A. Russell of Law Offices of Crystal A. Russell,
P.C. for Crazy Pet, LLC.

William E. Noonan, Law Office of William E. Noonan for Pet
Crazy, Inc.

Before Quinn, Hairston and Walters, Administrative Trademark
Judges.

Opinion by Hairston, Administrative Trademark Judge:

This panel of the Board, in a decision issued August 17, 2007, sustained the opposition of opposer to applicant's application to register the mark PET CRAZY and design for pet sitting services. The Board found that applicant's mark PET CRAZY and design for the identified services was likely to cause confusion with opposer's previously registered mark CRAZY PET for pet shampoos and conditioners.

Opposition No. 91164687

Applicant timely filed a request for reconsideration of the Board's decision and opposer timely filed a brief in response thereto. Applicant argues that the Board erred in finding that the respective marks are similar because they have different connotations and create different commercial impressions. Applicant's motion is essentially a rehash of the arguments previously raised in its brief on the case.

As indicated in our decision, we recognize that the marks PET CRAZY and design and CRAZY PET have somewhat different connotations. However, for the reasons discussed in our decision, we continue to be of the view that the marks are similar in sound and appearance and create similar commercial impressions. In other words, the marks are not so different in connotation that this element outweighs the similarities in sound, appearance and commercial impression. In sum, we remain of the view that when the marks PET CRAZY and design and CRAZY PET are considered in their entirety, they are sufficiently similar that confusion is likely to result when used in connection with the parties' respective goods and services.

In view of the foregoing, the motion for reconsideration is denied.