	Case 3:08-cv-05433-RBL Document	42 Filed 01/07/09 Page 1 of 2	
1 2		HONORABLE RONALD B. LEIGHTON	
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA		
10 11	UNC a Washington corporation	Case No. C08-5433RBL	
12	Plaintiff,		
13	v. C	DRDER ON MOTION FOR LARIFICATION AND	
14	PROVIDNET CO. TRUST, a Washington trust dba WORMWRANGLER.COM; BARRY PUSSELL an individual	ECONSIDERATION	
15	Defendant		
16			
17	This matter is before the court on Defendant Providnet's Motion for Clarification and Reconsideration		
18	[Dkt. #36] of the court's Order granting Plaintiff Cascade's Motion for a Preliminary Injunction. [Dkt. #33].		
19 20	Defendant argues that the court's order did not specify whether the injunction granted applied to its		
20	use of the name "Gusanito Factory of Worms," as well as the term "Worm Factory," which was clearly		
21	enjoined by the court's Order. It also seeks guidance as to the time frame for compliance with the court's		
22	Order, and argues that 90 days is a reasonable time to cease its infringing conduct.		
23	As to the former point, the court's Order was intended to enjoin the use of the term "Worm Factory"		
24 25	and confusingly similar marks. "Factory of Worms" is confusingly similar to "Worm Factory." Defendant has		
25 26	simply rearranged the two operative words, which does not sufficiently distinguish the Defendant's product		
26	from the Plaintiff's. See PRL USA Holdings, Inc. V. United States Polo Association, 520 F.2d 109, 117 (2 nd		
27	Cir. 2008). Nor does the addition of the term "Gusanito" prior to the "Factory of Worms" name remove or		
28	Ch. 2000). Not does the addition of the term Gusar	into prior to the tractory of worms name telliove	01

ORDER Page - 1

Case 3:08-cv-05433-RBL Document 42 Filed 01/07/09 Page 2 of 2

1 cure the infringement.

The term "Gusanito," itself, clearly does not infringe and is not enjoined. The term "Worm Wrangler"
(which is also used by Defendant to describe its product) does not infringe, and the use of that term is not
enjoined.

5 While it is clear that changing the Defendant's website and other marketing materials imposes a burden
6 upon it, that is not a reason to permit a continued infringement. The Defendant has 30 days from the date of
7 this order to comply with the Preliminary Injunction, as clarified by this Order.

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 7th day of January, 2009.

RONALD B. I

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE