```
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
                        EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
 2
                             ALEXANDRIA DIVISION
 3
      DOCTOR'S ASSOCIATES, INC.,
 4
                Plaintiff,
                                        Docket No. 1:09-cv-88
 5
                                        Alexandria, Virginia
                v.
 6
                                        February 6, 2009
      SHEETZ, INC., et al.,
                                        10:00 a.m.
 7
                Defendants.
 8
 9
                            TRANSCRIPT OF HEARING
10
11
                   BEFORE THE HONORABLE CLAUDE M. HILTON
12
                        UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
13
14
15
16
17
18
    APPEARANCES:
19
      For the Plaintiff:
                             Paul Grandinetti, Esq.
20
                             Rebecca J. Stempien, Esq.
21
                             Roberta Jacobs-Meadway, Esq.
      For the Defendants:
22
                             Edward J. Longosz, II, Esq.
                             Sean McConnell, Esq.
23
      Court Reporter:
                             Tracy L. Westfall, RPR, CMRS, CCR
24
    Proceedings reported by machine shorthand, transcript produced
25
    by computer-aided transcription.
```

1

They're a sophisticated company. They have plenty of resources. They could have come up with anything. They could have come up something distinctive, but they didn't. They used the same four elements and the same spacial arrangement and the

same campaign, same goods, same type of outlet.

THE COURT: Well, I understand your argument, but I guess I just don't see it. In looking at these two ads, it seems to me that there's little likelihood of confusion when looking at the two of them. The names are clearly there. And when you talk about the spacial arrangement, the spacial arrangement of the two are different. The names are clearly on both of them. I just don't see that there's any likelihood of confusion from looking at this trade address.

You also have the problems with the fact that footlongs, that's certainly generic and somebody's hand's generic. I understand your argument that you could have a trade address that uses these combinations of things that could cause a problem, be distinctive, it could cause confusion, but in looking at these two ads, I just don't see it.

I'm going to have to deny your motion for a temporary restraining order. I'll consider it a motion for a preliminary injunction and deny a motion for preliminary injunction as well. I make no assessment as to how these facts will develop and what you'll eventually be able to show, but on what's presented to me, I just don't find any likelihood of confusion and deny your