

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA1034720**

Filing date: **02/10/2020**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Proceeding	92066411
Party	Defendant Oneida Indian Nation of New York
Correspondence Address	LINDA K MCLEOD KELLY IP LLP 1300 19TH ST NW, SUITE 300 WASHINGTON, DC 20036 UNITED STATES linda.mcleod@kelly-ip.com, lit-docketing@kelly-ip.com, mike.chajon@kelly-ip.com, clint.taylor@kelly-ip.com, jason.joyal@kelly-ip.com 202-808-3570
Submission	Response to Board Order/Inquiry
Filer's Name	LINDA K. MCLEOD
Filer's email	linda.mcleod@kelly-ip.com, jason.joyal@kelly-ip.com, sara.parker@kelly-ip.com, lit-docketing@kelly-ip.com
Signature	/Linda K. McLeod/
Date	02/10/2020
Attachments	Petitioners Response to 9-11-19 Order.pdf(429127 bytes)

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

ONEIDA NATION, Petitioner, v. ONEIDA INDIAN NATION OF NEW YORK, Registrant.	Cancellation No. 92066411 Mark: ONEIDA INDIAN NATION Registration No.: 2309491 Registered: January 18, 2000 Mark: ONEIDA Registration No.: 4808677 Registered: September 8, 2015 Mark: ONEIDA Registration No.: 4813028 Registered: September 15, 2015
--	---

REGISTRANT’S RESPONSE TO BOARD’S SEPTEMBER 11, 2019 ORDER

Registrant Oneida Indian Nation of New York (“Registrant”) submits this response to the Board’s September 19, 2019 Order regarding the status of the Civil Action¹ which occasioned the suspension of this proceeding. (Dkt. 2.) On February 22, 2018, the Board issued an order suspending this proceeding “pending final disposition, including any appeals or remands, of the Civil Action” (“Suspension Order”). (Dkt. 16, p. 2.)

Registrant appealed the final decision of the Civil Action to the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit on September 4, 2018, and the docket for the Civil Action appeal is attached as Exhibit A. The Second Circuit affirmed the District Court’s ruling on October 21, 2019, and that ruling is attached as Exhibit B. The time for Registrant to file a petition for writ of certiorari to the U.S. Supreme Court expired on

¹ *Oneida Indian Nation v. United States Department of the Interior*, Case No. 5:17-cv-00913-MAD-TWD in the United States District Court for the Northern District of New York.

January 19, 2020. 28 U.S.C. § 2101. Registrant did not file a petition for writ of certiorari, making the Second Circuit's judgment final. Pursuant to the Board's Order that the parties notify the Board within twenty days after such final determination, Registrant respectfully requests that the Board lift the suspension of this proceeding.

Respectfully submitted,

ONEIDA INDIAN NATION OF NEW YORK

Dated: February 10, 2020

By: /Linda K. McLeod/

Linda K. McLeod
linda.mcleod@kelly-ip.com
Jason Joyal
jason.joyal@kelly-ip.com
Clint A. Taylor
clint.taylor@kelly-ip.com
Kelly IP, LLP
1300 19th Street, N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20036
Telephone: 202-808-3570
Facsimile: 202-354-5232

Attorneys for Registrant Oneida Indian
Nation of New York

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a true and accurate copy of the foregoing Registrant's Response to Board's September 11, 2019 Order was served by email on this 10th day of February 2020, upon Petitioner at the following email addresses of record:

chris.liro@andruslaw.com
mariem@andruslaw.com
cathym@andruslaw.com
aaron@andruslaw.com

/Larry L. White/

Larry White

Litigation Case Manager

EXHIBIT A

General Docket
Court of Appeals, 2nd Circuit

Court of Appeals Docket #: 18-2607 Nature of Suit: 2899 Other Statutes Oneida Indian Nation v. United States Department of th Appeal From: NDNY (SYRACUSE) Fee Status: Paid	Docketed: 09/04/2018 Termed: 10/21/2019
Case Type Information: 1) Civil 2) United States 3) -	
Originating Court Information: District: 0206-5 : 17-cv-913 Trial Judge: Mae A. D'Agostino, U.S. District Judge Trial Judge: Therese Wiley Dancks, U.S. Magistrate Judge Date Filed: 08/17/2017 Date Order/Judgment: 08/24/2018 <div style="float: right; text-align: right;"> Date NOA Filed: 08/30/2018 </div>	
Prior Cases: None	
Current Cases: None	
Panel Assignment: Not available	

Oneida Indian Nation Plaintiff - Appellant	David Adam Reiser, Esq., - [COR NTC Retained] Zuckerman Spaeder LLP 1800 M Street, NW Washington, DC 20036 Thomas L. Sansonetti, Esq., - Direct: 202-393-6500 [COR NTC -] Holland & Hart LLP Suite 900 975 F Street, NW Washington, DC 20004 Michael R. Smith, Attorney Direct: 202-778-1832 [COR NTC Retained] Zuckerman Spaeder LLP Suite 1000 1800 M Street, NW Washington, DC 20036
----- United States Department of the Interior Defendant - Appellee	Steven David Clymer, Assistant U.S. Attorney [COR NTC US Attorney] United States Attorney's Office for the Northern District of New York Firm: 315-448-0672 P.O. Box 7198, 100 South Clinton Street Syracuse, NY 13261 Karen Folster Lesperance, Esq., - [COR NTC -] United States Attorney's Office for the Northern District of New York 445 Broadway James T. Foley United States Courthouse Albany, NY 12207 Reuben Schiffman, Esq., - Direct: 202-305-4224 [COR NTC -] United States Department of Justice Environmental and Natural Resources Division 601 D Street, NW Washington, DC 20047

Oneida Indian Nation,



Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

United States Department of the Interior,

Defendant - Appellee.

09/04/2018	1 10 pg, 83.97 KB	NOTICE OF CIVIL APPEAL, with district court docket, on behalf of Appellant Oneida Indian Nation, FILED. [2381273] [18-2607] [Entered: 09/04/2018 01:33 PM]
09/04/2018	2 18 pg, 75.96 KB	DISTRICT COURT MEMORANDUM-DECISION AND ORDER, dated 08/24/2018, RECEIVED.[2381276] [18-2607] [Entered: 09/04/2018 01:35 PM]
09/04/2018	3 1 pg, 32.53 KB	DISTRICT COURT JUDGMENT, dated 08/24/2018, RECEIVED.[2381277] [18-2607] [Entered: 09/04/2018 01:36 PM]
09/04/2018	4	PAYMENT OF DOCKETING FEE, on behalf of Appellant Oneida Indian Nation, district court receipt # ANYNDC-4495061., FILED.[2381278] [18-2607] [Entered: 09/04/2018 01:36 PM]
09/04/2018	5 8 pg, 89.42 KB	ELECTRONIC INDEX, in lieu of record, FILED.[2381281] [18-2607] [Entered: 09/04/2018 01:37 PM]
09/13/2018	8 1 pg, 219.51 KB	ACKNOWLEDGMENT AND NOTICE OF APPEARANCE, on behalf of Appellant Oneida Indian Nation, FILED. Service date 09/13/2018 by CM/ECF.[2389025] [18-2607] [Entered: 09/13/2018 04:43 PM]
09/13/2018	9 1 pg, 238.98 KB	NOTICE OF APPEARANCE AS ADDITIONAL COUNSEL, on behalf of Appellant Oneida Indian Nation, FILED. Service date 09/13/2018 by CM/ECF. [2389032] [18-2607] [Entered: 09/13/2018 04:45 PM]
09/13/2018	10 36 pg, 9.11 MB	FORM C, on behalf of Appellant Oneida Indian Nation, FILED. Service date 09/13/2018 by CM/ECF. [2389042] [18-2607] [Entered: 09/13/2018 04:47 PM]
09/13/2018	11 1 pg, 1.14 MB	FORM D, on behalf of Appellant Oneida Indian Nation, FILED. Service date 09/13/2018 by CM/ECF. [2389061] [18-2607] [Entered: 09/13/2018 04:53 PM]
09/14/2018	12	ATTORNEY, David Adam Reiser for Oneida Indian Nation, in case 18-2607, 9 , ADDED.[2389159] [18-2607] [Entered: 09/14/2018 08:47 AM]
09/14/2018	15 1 pg, 93 KB	LR 31.2 SCHEDULING NOTIFICATION, on behalf of Appellant Oneida Indian Nation, informing Court of proposed due date 12/13/2018, RECEIVED. Service date 09/14/2018 by CM/ECF.[2389443] [18-2607] [Entered: 09/14/2018 11:35 AM]
09/14/2018	16 1 pg, 18.77 KB	CAMP ORDER, Type of Conference: Telephonic, Scheduled Date of Conference: 10/23/2018, Start Time: 10:30 AM, Required Attendees: Clients with Counsel, with Dean W.M. Leslie, ENTERED.[2389658] [18-2607] [Entered: 09/14/2018 01:23 PM]
09/18/2018	19 1 pg, 63.37 KB	NOTICE OF APPEARANCE AS ADDITIONAL COUNSEL, on behalf of Appellee United States Department of the Interior, FILED. Service date 09/18/2018 by CM/ECF. [2391824] [18-2607] [Entered: 09/18/2018 03:36 PM]
09/18/2018	20 1 pg, 63.27 KB	ACKNOWLEDGMENT AND NOTICE OF APPEARANCE, on behalf of Appellee United States Department of the Interior, FILED. Service date 09/18/2018 by CM/ECF.[2392024] [18-2607] [Entered: 09/18/2018 04:55 PM]
09/19/2018	21	ATTORNEY, Karen Folster Lesperance for United States Department of the Interior, in case 18-2607, 19 , ADDED.[2392338] [18-2607] [Entered: 09/19/2018 10:29 AM]
09/19/2018	22 1 pg, 6.65 KB	NEW CASE MANAGER, Elizabeth Munoz, ASSIGNED.[2392345] [18-2607] [Entered: 09/19/2018 10:32 AM]
09/20/2018	25 1 pg, 16.61 KB	SO-ORDERED SCHEDULING NOTIFICATION, setting Appellant Oneida Indian Nation Brief due date as 12/13/2018. Joint Appendix due date as 12/13/2018, FILED.[2393967] [18-2607] [Entered: 09/20/2018 05:18 PM]
10/17/2018	26 1 pg, 63.28 KB	NOTICE OF APPEARANCE AS ADDITIONAL COUNSEL, on behalf of Appellee United States Department of the Interior, FILED. Service date 10/17/2018 by CM/ECF. [2412652] [18-2607] [Entered: 10/17/2018 04:00 PM]
10/17/2018	27	ATTORNEY, Reuben Schiffman for United States Department of the Interior, in case 18-2607, 26 , ADDED.[2412773] [18-2607] [Entered: 10/17/2018 05:22 PM]
12/13/2018	30	BRIEF, on behalf of Appellant Oneida Indian Nation, FILED. Service date 12/13/2018 by CM/ECF. [2455091] [18-2607] [Entered: 12/13/2018 03:52 PM]
12/13/2018	31	JOINT APPENDIX, volume 1 of 1, (pp. 1-244), on behalf of Appellant Oneida Indian Nation, FILED. Service date 12/13/2018 by CM/ECF.[2455097] [18-2607] [Entered: 12/13/2018 03:57 PM]
12/14/2018	32 1 pg, 96.14 KB	LR 31.2 SCHEDULING NOTIFICATION, on behalf of Appellee United States Department of the Interior, informing Court of proposed due date 03/13/2019, RECEIVED. Service date 12/14/2018 by CM/ECF. [2455758] [18-2607] [Entered: 12/14/2018 01:50 PM]
12/17/2018	35 1 pg, 16.79 KB	SO-ORDERED SCHEDULING NOTIFICATION, setting Appellee United States Department of the Interior Brief due date as 03/13/2019, FILED.[2456491] [18-2607] [Entered: 12/17/2018 11:47 AM]
12/17/2018	36 1 pg, 41 KB	NOTICE OF APPEARANCE AS ADDITIONAL COUNSEL, on behalf of Appellant Oneida Indian Nation, FILED. Service date 12/17/2018 by CM/ECF. [2457013] [18-2607] [Entered: 12/17/2018 04:56 PM]
12/18/2018	37 2 pg, 11.82 KB	DEFECTIVE DOCUMENT, Brief and Appendix, [30], [31], on behalf of Appellant Oneida Indian Nation, FILED.[2457229] [18-2607] [Entered: 12/18/2018 09:16 AM]
12/18/2018	38	CORRECTED BRIEF, on behalf of Appellant Oneida Indian Nation, FILED. Service date 12/13/2018 by CM/ECF. [2457352] [18-2607] [Entered: 12/18/2018 10:07 AM]

12/18/2018		39	CORRECTED APPENDIX, on behalf of Appellant Oneida Indian Nation, FILED. Service date 12/13/2018 by CM/ECF. [2457364] [18-2607] [Entered: 12/18/2018 10:12 AM]
12/20/2018		40	ATTORNEY, Thomas L. Sansonetti for Oneida Indian Nation, in case 18-2607, [36] , ADDED.[2460261] [18-2607] [Entered: 12/20/2018 02:33 PM]
12/20/2018		41	DEFECTIVE DOCUMENT, Corrected Brief and Appendix, [38] , [39] , on behalf of Appellant Oneida Indian Nation, FILED.[2460265] [18-2607] [Entered: 12/20/2018 02:34 PM]
12/20/2018		42	BRIEF, on behalf of Appellant Oneida Indian Nation, FILED. Service date 12/13/2018 by CM/ECF. [2460306] [18-2607] [Entered: 12/20/2018 02:57 PM]
12/20/2018		43	JOINT APPENDIX, volume 1 of 1, (pp. 1-245), on behalf of Appellant Oneida Indian Nation, FILED. Service date 12/13/2018 by CM/ECF.[2460313] [18-2607] [Entered: 12/20/2018 03:00 PM]
12/20/2018		44	CURED DEFECTIVE: BRIEF, and JOINT APPENDIX, [41] , [42] , [43] , on behalf of Appellee United States Department of the Interior, FILED.[2460727] [18-2607] [Entered: 12/20/2018 05:39 PM]
02/22/2019		51	AMENDED SO-ORDERED SCHEDULING NOTIFICATION, setting Appellee United States Department of the Interior Brief due date as 04/22/2019, FILED.[2503820] [18-2607] [Entered: 02/22/2019 06:06 PM]
04/22/2019		52	BRIEF, on behalf of Appellee United States Department of the Interior, FILED. Service date 04/22/2019 by CM/ECF. [2545264] [18-2607] [Entered: 04/22/2019 04:12 PM]
04/22/2019		53	DEFECTIVE DOCUMENT, Brief, [52] , on behalf of Appellee United States Department of the Interior, FILED.[2545420] [18-2607] [Entered: 04/22/2019 05:24 PM]
04/23/2019		54	CORRECTED BRIEF, on behalf of Appellee United States Department of the Interior, FILED. Service date 04/22/2019 by CM/ECF. [2545787] [18-2607] [Entered: 04/23/2019 11:03 AM]
04/24/2019		55	DEFECTIVE DOCUMENT, Brief, [54] , on behalf of Appellee United States Department of the Interior, FILED.[2547278] [18-2607] [Entered: 04/24/2019 12:36 PM]
04/24/2019		56	BRIEF, on behalf of Appellee United States Department of the Interior, FILED. Service date 04/22/2019 by CM/ECF. [2547348] [18-2607] [Entered: 04/24/2019 01:38 PM]
04/24/2019		57	CURED DEFECTIVE: BRIEF, [56] , on behalf of Appellee United States Department of the Interior, FILED. [2547767] [18-2607] [Entered: 04/24/2019 05:10 PM]
04/26/2019		58	DEFECTIVE DOCUMENT, Brief, [56] , on behalf of Appellee United States Department of the Interior, FILED.[2549438] [18-2607] [Entered: 04/26/2019 01:50 PM]
04/26/2019		60	ORAL ARGUMENT STATEMENT LR 34.1 (a), on behalf of filer Attorney Michael R. Smith for Appellant Oneida Indian Nation, FILED. Service date 04/26/2019 by CM/ECF. [2549480] [18-2607] [Entered: 04/26/2019 02:25 PM]
04/26/2019		62	BRIEF, on behalf of Appellee United States Department of the Interior, FILED. Service date 04/26/2019 by CM/ECF. [2549818] [18-2607] [Entered: 04/26/2019 04:49 PM]
05/01/2019		63	DEFECTIVE DOCUMENT, BRIEF, [62] , on behalf of Appellee United States Department of the Interior, FILED.[2552774] [18-2607] [Entered: 05/01/2019 12:11 PM]
05/02/2019		64	BRIEF, on behalf of Appellee United States Department of the Interior, FILED. Service date 05/02/2019 by CM/ECF. [2554343] [18-2607] [Entered: 05/02/2019 04:09 PM]
05/03/2019		65	CURED DEFECTIVE : BRIEF, [64] , on behalf of Appellee United States Department of the Interior, FILED. [2554622] [18-2607] [Entered: 05/03/2019 08:04 AM]
05/03/2019		70	ORAL ARGUMENT STATEMENT LR 34.1 (a), on behalf of filer Attorney Reuben Schiffman, Esq. for Appellee United States Department of the Interior, FILED. Service date 05/03/2019 by CM/ECF. [2555510] [18-2607] [Entered: 05/03/2019 03:17 PM]
05/06/2019		73	REPLY BRIEF, on behalf of Appellant Oneida Indian Nation, FILED. Service date 05/06/2019 by CM/ECF. [2557002] [18-2607] [Entered: 05/06/2019 05:47 PM]
06/17/2019		75	CASE CALENDARING, for the week of 09/23/2019, PANEL B, PROPOSED.[2588257] [18-2607] [Entered: 06/17/2019 02:44 PM]
08/02/2019		76	CASE CALENDARING, for argument on 09/27/2019, B Panel, SET.[2622935] [18-2607] [Entered: 08/02/2019 10:21 AM]
08/05/2019		77	ARGUMENT NOTICE, to attorneys/parties, TRANSMITTED.[2624373] [18-2607] [Entered: 08/05/2019 03:11 PM]
08/21/2019		78	NOTICE OF HEARING DATE ACKNOWLEDGMENT, on behalf of Appellee United States Department of the Interior, FILED. Service date 08/21/2019 by CM/ECF. [2638587] [18-2607] [Entered: 08/21/2019 05:05 PM]
08/22/2019		79	NOTICE OF HEARING DATE ACKNOWLEDGMENT, on behalf of Appellant Oneida Indian Nation, FILED. Service date 08/22/2019 by CM/ECF. [2638885] [18-2607] [Entered: 08/22/2019 10:36 AM]
09/23/2019		80	LETTER, on behalf of Appellant Oneida Indian Nation, <EDIT by Clerk's Office> RECEIVED. Service date 09/23/2019 by CM/ECF.[2661581] [18-2607] [Entered: 09/23/2019 11:05 AM]
09/23/2019		82	DEFECTIVE DOCUMENT, Letter, [80] , on behalf of Appellant Oneida Indian Nation, FILED.[2662310] [18-2607] [Entered: 09/23/2019 05:28 PM]

09/23/2019	<input type="checkbox"/> 83 1 pg, 12.2 KB	FRAP 28(j) LETTER, dated 09/23/2019, on behalf of Appellant Oneida Indian Nation, RECEIVED. Service date 09/23/2019 by CM/ECF.[2662331] [18-2607] [Entered: 09/23/2019 05:54 PM]
09/23/2019	<input type="checkbox"/> 84	CURED DEFECTIVE FRAP 28(j) Letter [83] , on behalf of Appellant Oneida Indian Nation, FILED. [2663037] [18-2607] [Entered: 09/24/2019 01:38 PM]
09/27/2019	<input type="checkbox"/> 87	CASE, before DJ, RDS, PWH, HEARD.[2666634] [18-2607] [Entered: 09/27/2019 12:22 PM]
10/21/2019	<input type="checkbox"/> 88 1 pg, 9.14 KB	NEW CASE MANAGER, Margaret Lain, ASSIGNED.[2683878] [18-2607] [Entered: 10/21/2019 09:08 AM]
10/21/2019	<input type="checkbox"/> 89 16 pg, 259.72 KB	SUMMARY ORDER AND JUDGMENT, judgment of the district court is affirmed, by DJ, RDS, PWH, FILED.[2683890] [18-2607] [Entered: 10/21/2019 09:14 AM]
12/12/2019	<input type="checkbox"/> 93 14 pg, 805.99 KB	JUDGMENT MANDATE, ISSUED.[2727644] [18-2607] [Entered: 12/12/2019 11:50 AM]

[Clear All](#)☒ Documents and Docket Summary☐ Documents Only☒ Include Page NumbersSelected Pages: Selected Size: [View Selected](#)

PACER Service Center			
Transaction Receipt			
02/10/2020 12:36:05			
PACER Login:	KELLYIPLLP	Client Code:	
Description:	Docket Report (full)	Search Criteria:	18-2607
Billable Pages:	3	Cost:	0.30

EXHIBIT B

18-2607

Oneida Indian Nation v. United States Department of the Interior

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

SUMMARY ORDER

RULINGS BY SUMMARY ORDER DO NOT HAVE PRECEDENTIAL EFFECT. CITATION TO A SUMMARY ORDER FILED ON OR AFTER JANUARY 1, 2007, IS PERMITTED AND IS GOVERNED BY FEDERAL RULE OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE 32.1 AND THIS COURT’S LOCAL RULE 32.1.1. WHEN CITING A SUMMARY ORDER IN A DOCUMENT FILED WITH THIS COURT, A PARTY MUST CITE EITHER THE FEDERAL APPENDIX OR AN ELECTRONIC DATABASE (WITH THE NOTATION “SUMMARY ORDER”). A PARTY CITING A SUMMARY ORDER MUST SERVE A COPY OF IT ON ANY PARTY NOT REPRESENTED BY COUNSEL.

At a stated term of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit, held at the Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse, 40 Foley Square, in the City of New York, on the 21st day of October, two thousand nineteen.

PRESENT:

DENNIS JACOBS,
ROBERT D. SACK,
PETER W. HALL,
Circuit Judges.

ONEIDA INDIAN NATION,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

v.

18-2607

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE
INTERIOR,

Defendant-Appellee.

FOR APPELLANT:

MICHAEL R. SMITH, Zuckerman
Spaeder LLP, Washington, D.C.
(David A. Reiser, Zuckerman Spaeder
LLP, Washington, D.C., Thomas L.
Sansonetti, Holland & Hart LLP,
Washington, D.C., *on the brief*).

FOR APPELLEE:

REUBEN S. SCHIFMAN, Environment
and Natural Resources Division, U.S.
Department of Justice, Washington,
D.C. (Jeffrey Bossert Clark, Eric
Grant, J. David Gunter II,
Environment and Natural Resources
Division, U.S. Department of Justice,
Washington, D.C., Grant C. Jaquith,
Karen Folster Lesperance, United
States Attorney's Office for the
Northern District of New York,
Albany, NY *on the brief*).

Appeal from a judgment of the United States District Court for the Northern
District of New York (D'Agostino, J.).

**UPON DUE CONSIDERATION, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED,
ADJUDGED, AND DECREED** that judgment of the District Court is **AFFIRMED**.

Appellant appeals from a judgment of the United States District Court for
the Northern District of New York (D'Agostino, J.) entered on August 24, 2018
granting the motion by the Department of Interior ("DOI") to dismiss the

Complaint pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(1). We assume the parties' familiarity with the facts, record of prior proceedings, and arguments on appeal, which we reference only as necessary to explain our decision to affirm.

I.

The following undisputed facts are drawn from the Complaint. *See State Emps. Bargaining Agent Coal. v. Rowland*, 494 F.3d 71, 77 n.4 (2d Cir. 2007).

In 2010, a tribe, then known as the "Oneida Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin" (the "Wisconsin Oneidas") passed a resolution requesting that DOI conduct a Secretarial election to amend the tribe's constitution by, among other things, changing the tribe's name to "Oneida Nation."¹ In 2011, DOI's Midwest Regional

¹ The Indian Reorganization Act provides that an "Indian tribe . . . may adopt an appropriate constitution and . . . any amendments thereto." 25 U.S.C. § 5123(a). To "become effective," a tribe's constitutional amendment must "(1) [be] ratified by a majority vote of the adult members of the tribe . . . at a special election authorized and called by the Secretary [of the DOI] under such rules and regulations as the Secretary may prescribe; and (2) [be] approved by the Secretary pursuant to [U.S.C. § 5123(d)]." *Id.* Section 5123(d), in turn, provides that if the special election conducted pursuant to 25 U.S.C. § 5123(a)(1) "results in the adoption by the tribe of the proposed . . . [constitutional] amendment[] . . . the Secretary shall approve . . . [the] amendment[] . . . within forty-five days after the election unless the Secretary finds that the . . . amendment[] [is] contrary to applicable laws." 25 U.S.C. § 5123(d). Amendments are no longer required if a tribe has amended its constitution accordingly. *See* 80 Fed. Reg. 63094 (Oct. 19, 2015) (recent amendments to regulations, effective November 18, 2015, permitting tribes to amend constitutions to remove requirement that DOI approve subsequent amendments). The Wisconsin Oneidas have apparently amended their constitution to remove approval requirements by DOI in their constitution for future constitutional amendments.

Office notified the Wisconsin Oneidas by letter that the Secretarial election could proceed because “[n]one of the proposed amendments appear[s] to be contrary to federal law,” but DOI did note that the Wisconsin Oneidas should consider the potential that the name change may cause confusion with Appellant (the “New York Oneidas”), who then called itself “Oneida Nation of New York.” J App. at 26, 47-51. The Wisconsin Oneidas voted to adopt the proposed name change and received approval from DOI in June 2015. The Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 requires DOI to publish a list of federally recognized tribes in the Federal Register. In 2016, the revised list referred to the Wisconsin Oneidas as “Oneida Nation.”

The Wisconsin Oneidas thereafter petitioned the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“TTAB”) to cancel Appellant’s registration of the marks “Oneida” and “Oneida Indian Nation,” touting the Wisconsin Oneidas’ “federally recognized name—Oneida Nation” in arguing that Appellant should not be allowed to limit the Wisconsin Oneidas use of that name. *Id.* at 63.

In August 2017, Appellant brought this action against DOI, asserting claims under the Administrative Procedure Act. As relevant to this appeal, Appellant

asserts that it was injured by DOI's approval of the Wisconsin Oneidas' name change and its listing of the Wisconsin Oneidas as "Oneida Nation" as a federally recognized tribal entity in the Federal Register. Appellant asked the court to "[d]eclar[e] to be unlawful and set[] aside" the DOI's approval of the Wisconsin Oneidas' name-change amendment and decision to list Wisconsin Oneidas as "Oneida Nation" and to enjoin DOI from approving "Oneida Nation" as the name of the Wisconsin Oneidas. J. App. 44. The District Court granted the motion to dismiss for lack of subject matter jurisdiction because it determined that Appellant lacked standing.

II.

"We review *de novo* a district court's dismissal of a complaint for lack of standing." *Selevan v. New York Thruway Authority*, 584 F.3d 82, 88 (2d Cir. 2009).

III.

As a preliminary matter, Appellant contends that the District Court erroneously failed to accept as true certain "plausible, corroborated, and uncontradicted allegations of injury" in the Complaint, to wit: "the allegations that [Appellant] would be harmed by the probable confusion of federal agencies, the public and others, by the [Wisconsin Oneidas'] actual claim to superior rights to

. . . the name Oneida Nation, and the claimed cultural and political diminishment of the [New York Oneidas].” Appellant Br. 24–25. That argument is misguided. While we accept as true undisputed *factual* allegations in a complaint, we “are not bound to accept as true a legal conclusion couched as a factual allegation.” *Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007); *see also Fountain v. Karim*, 838 F.3d 129, 134 (2d Cir. 2016). Whether an alleged injury supports standing is a question of law, and in order to decide that question a court must assess whether (1) “the plaintiff [has] suffered an ‘injury in fact’—an invasion of a legally protected interest which is (a) concrete and particularized; and (b) actual or imminent, not conjectural or hypothetical;” (2) there is “a causal connection between the injury and the conduct complained of—the injury has to be fairly traceable to the challenged action of the defendant, and not the result of the independent action of some third party not before the court;” and (3) it is “likely, as opposed to merely speculative, that the injury will be redressed by a favorable decision.” *Lujan v. Defs. of Wildlife*, 504 U.S. 555, 560-61 (1992) (internal quotation marks, citations, and alterations omitted). In making that assessment, the District Court was not required to accept as true the conclusory allegation that Appellant would be harmed by DOI’s approval and publication of the Wisconsin Oneidas’ chosen

name.²

Appellant principally argues that it has standing based on three categories of injury: (A) harms related to the TTAB proceeding; (B) actual and potential confusion; and (C) reputational and dignity harm. We address these alleged harms in turn.

A. TTAB Proceeding

Appellant argues that the TTAB proceeding constitutes a cognizable injury because DOI's approval of the name change "might be understood to give the Wisconsin tribe at least an equal right to use a similar name," thereby prejudicing Appellant in the proceeding, Appellant Br. at 57, and because the TTAB proceeding "require[s] [Appellant] to retain and pay counsel, a concrete and direct monetary injury," *id.* at 32.³ Even if the litigation costs and potential prejudice in the TTAB proceeding are deemed cognizable injuries, and even if those injuries

² As plaintiff points out, the district court appears to have incorrectly suggested that all 12(b)(1) motions present fact-based challenges to a complaint. However, if that is error, we see no impact of it on the District Court's reasoning or ours.

³ Appellant also asserts that it meets the injury in fact requirement based on the Wisconsin Oneidas' cease-and-desist demand and threats to sue. Regardless of whether the Wisconsin Oneidas' cease-and-desist demand and threat to sue were cognizable injuries, those injuries are not redressable by the relief sought in this action. *See* J. App. 31 (seeking declaratory and injunctive relief).

are fairly traceable to DOI's recognition of the Wisconsin Oneidas' new name, the TTAB proceeding fails as a basis for standing because those injuries are not redressable by a favorable decision in this case.

Although the Wisconsin Oneidas' amended TTAB petition touts DOI's federal recognition to lend credibility to the Wisconsin Oneidas' claim of superior rights to the marks, *see, e.g.*, J. App. 100, 139, 145, the asserted grounds for cancellation of the marks "Oneida" and "Oneida Indian Nation" are independent of the name change. The amended petition asserts the following grounds for cancellation: fraud in the procurement of the registrations on the basis that Appellant had no bona fide intent to use to the marks in commerce; fraud in the renewals of or statements about the registration on the basis Appellant was not actually using the marks on all of the goods and services that it listed; fraud based on Appellant's awareness of the Wisconsin Oneidas' rights to use the marks; abandonment of registrations; and the potential for confusion between (i) Appellant's "Oneida" mark and (ii) the Wisconsin Oneidas' use of that name, which preexisted Appellant's 2006 registration application.

Because the Wisconsin Oneidas' prior name also included "Oneida," and the Wisconsin Oneidas asserts that it used the "Oneida" mark in commerce well

before its DOI-sanctioned name change, any argument in the TTAB proceeding as to confusion is not dependent on the name change. Oneida Indians have long been separated into two groups: a group that has remained in upstate New York and a group that split long ago from the New York Oneidas and moved to Wisconsin. The group of New York Oneidas, the plaintiff here, claims primacy to the name “Oneida Nation,” and claims exclusive status as the descendants of the original Oneida Indians. The Wisconsin Oneidas contest these claims. A declaratory judgment invalidating DOI’s recognition of the Wisconsin Oneida’s name change is therefore not likely to end the TTAB proceeding or materially strengthen Appellant’s position in it. Appellant thus fails to show that it is “likely, as opposed to merely speculative,” that any injury relating to the TTAB proceeding would be redressed by a favorable decision. *Lujan*, 504 U.S. at 561.

Appellant argues that the TTAB’s decision to stay the cancellation proceeding reflects the TTAB’s judgment that the trademark proceeding is redressable by a favorable decision in this case, and that we should defer to the TTAB as the experts on trademark law. That argument fails because even if we agree that it would be appropriate to defer to such a determination by the TTAB, the TTAB has made no such determination. The TTAB suspended the proceeding

because “[i]t is the policy of [TTAB] to suspend proceedings when the parties are involved in a civil action, which may be dispositive of or have a bearing on the Board case.” J. App. 162. The TTAB’s decision to stay the cancellation proceeding in accordance with its internal policy does not mean that the outcome of this case necessarily will or is likely to affect the cancellation proceeding.

B. Confusion

Appellant also contends that the likelihood of confusion between the tribes’ names, both by government officials and the public, is a sufficient injury to confer standing. Not every allegation of confusion, even if plausible, amounts to a concrete harm.

The New York Oneidas’ allegations are conjectural. The bulk of their allegations simply recite “injury” or “harm” resulting from confusion, without specifying what the injury or harm actually is. During briefing to the District Court, Appellant provided two examples of “confusion” that could give rise to injury – a request for a Corrective Action Plan from the Department of Health and Human Services that was intended for the Wisconsin Oneidas but was sent to the New York Oneidas in error and an invoice that was addressed to the Wisconsin Oneidas but inadvertently emailed to the New York Oneidas. Appellant does not

explain how the confusion resulting in the request for a Corrective Action Plan could give rise to a concrete injury and the theory of harm that could result from the mistaken invoice—"the risk for reputational and financial injury"—is hypothetical at best. And Appellant's allegation that confusion results in an injury because of Appellant's need "to pay consultants and lawyers to attempt to limit [] confusion," J. App. 38, still does not explain what harm could be caused by that confusion that requires limiting in the first instance. Incurring costs in anticipation of potential future harm that is not concrete or imminent is insufficient to create an injury that will confer standing. *See Clapper v. Amnesty Int'l USA*, 568 U.S. 398, 416 (2013) ("[Plaintiffs] cannot manufacture standing merely by inflicting harm on themselves based on their fears of hypothetical future harm that is not certainly impending.").

Even assuming this federally recognized name change caused confusion with a concrete commercial effect sufficient to support an injury, the record does not demonstrate that such commercial confusion is fairly traceable to DOI's action. The Wisconsin Oneidas have been referring to themselves as the "Oneida Nation" in their relationships with the public and on internal government documents for decades. There is no evidence in the record that any confusion between the two

tribes has increased as a result of DOI's name change approval, or that parties with whom the tribes deal rely on the Federal Register's listing for identification of various tribes. The supposed harm caused by confusion is similarly not redressable by a favorable decision in this case. There is no indication that the Wisconsin Oneidas will cease using the name "Oneida Nation" in their dealings with the public and the government if DOI's actions are set aside. The Wisconsin Oneidas are also now permitted to amend their constitution without DOI's approval. Thus, were DOI's decision vacated, the Wisconsin Oneidas may simply amend their constitution to change their name to "Oneida Nation."

Appellant does not plead any injury which, even if concrete, is fairly traceable to DOI's action or redressable by vacating the same. The District Court properly found that the "confusion" pled by Appellant cannot support standing.

C. Reputational and Dignity Harm

Appellant argues that DOI's name change "vindicated the Wisconsin tribe's erroneous claim to the Oneida Nation legacy" and thereby "diminished the [New York Oneidas'] status and reputation as the original Oneida Nation, or its direct successor." Appellant Br. 38–39.⁴ To support its reputational injury argument,

⁴ The District Court did not address this argument because it understood Appellant to be asserting only two injuries in fact: the TTAP proceeding and confusion. The Complaint

Appellant cites cases in which a plaintiff successfully asserted reputational injury based on a derogative or negatively perceived label applied to the plaintiff by the government. Appellant Br. 41–42 (citing, *inter alia*, *Meese v. Keene*, 481 U.S. 465, 473–77 (1987) (state senator seeking to exhibit films had standing to challenge the Department of Justice’s characterization of films as “political propaganda”); *Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Comm. v. McGrath*, 341 U.S. 123, 139–40 (1951) (certain nonprofit organizations designated as “Communist,” injuring their right to be free from defamatory statements); *Parsons v. United States Dep’t of Justice*, 801 F.3d 701, 711–12 (6th Cir. 2015) (group labeled “hybrid gang” in a government report entitled “National Gang Threat Assessment”)).

Those cases are distinguishable. In each of them, the government attached a derogatory label to the plaintiff, whereas here the government has said nothing about the New York Oneidas, let alone anything derogatory. *See Meese*, 481 U.S. at 469–70 (the Department of Justice applied label “political propaganda” to films pursuant to statutory definition); *McGrath*, 341 U.S. at 125 (government entities purported to act pursuant to Presidential authorization to designate organizations

does, however, assert injury to Appellant’s reputation or dignity, albeit not in a highly developed way. *See* J. App. 38 (Compl. ¶ 65) (asserting injury “by reason of the cultural and political diminishment of [Appellant]”); *id.* at 43 (Compl. ¶ 78); *id.* at 44 (Compl. ¶ 80).

as Communist “after appropriate investigation and determination”); *Parsons*, 801 F.3d at 707 (government agency described group as “hybrid gang” in threat assessment report).

In any event, that DOI published the new name does not imply that the federal government regards Appellant as lesser. As Appellant admits, DOI’s policy is to approve automatically any name chosen by a tribe. By contrast, *Meese*, *McGrath*, and *Parsons* involved negative labels applied by the Government based on certain statutory criteria or the Government’s own analysis.

At bottom, reputational harm arises from the perception of outsiders, but here there is no allegation that anyone now views the New York Oneidas as somehow inferior in light of DOI’s actions.

IV.

We have considered all of the Appellant’s remaining arguments and have found them to be without merit. Accordingly, we **AFFIRM** the judgment of the District Court.

FOR THE COURT:

Catherine O’Hagan Wolfe, Clerk of Court

A circular official seal of the United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit is stamped over the signature. The seal contains the text "UNITED STATES", "SECOND CIRCUIT", and "COURT OF APPEALS".

**United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit
Thurgood Marshall U.S. Courthouse
40 Foley Square
New York, NY 10007**

ROBERT A. KATZMANN
CHIEF JUDGE

Date: October 21, 2019
Docket #: 18-2607cv
Short Title: Oneida Indian Nation v. United States
Department of th

CATHERINE O'HAGAN WOLFE
CLERK OF COURT

DC Docket #: 17-cv-913
DC Court: NDNY (SYRACUSE)
DC Judge: D'Agostino
DC Judge: Dancks

BILL OF COSTS INSTRUCTIONS

The requirements for filing a bill of costs are set forth in FRAP 39. A form for filing a bill of costs is on the Court's website.

The bill of costs must:

- * be filed within 14 days after the entry of judgment;
- * be verified;
- * be served on all adversaries;
- * not include charges for postage, delivery, service, overtime and the filers edits;
- * identify the number of copies which comprise the printer's unit;
- * include the printer's bills, which must state the minimum charge per printer's unit for a page, a cover, foot lines by the line, and an index and table of cases by the page;
- * state only the number of necessary copies inserted in enclosed form;
- * state actual costs at rates not higher than those generally charged for printing services in New York, New York; excessive charges are subject to reduction;
- * be filed via CM/ECF or if counsel is exempted with the original and two copies.

**United States Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit
Thurgood Marshall U.S. Courthouse
40 Foley Square
New York, NY 10007**

ROBERT A. KATZMANN
CHIEF JUDGE

Date: October 21, 2019
Docket #: 18-2607cv
Short Title: Oneida Indian Nation v. United States
Department of th

CATHERINE O'HAGAN WOLFE
CLERK OF COURT

DC Docket #: 17-cv-913
DC Court: NDNY (SYRACUSE)
DC Judge: D'Agostino
DC Judge: Dancks

VERIFIED ITEMIZED BILL OF COSTS

Counsel for

respectfully submits, pursuant to FRAP 39 (c) the within bill of costs and requests the Clerk to
prepare an itemized statement of costs taxed against the

and in favor of

for insertion in the mandate.

Docketing Fee _____

Costs of printing appendix (necessary copies _____) _____

Costs of printing brief (necessary copies _____) _____

Costs of printing reply brief (necessary copies _____) _____

(VERIFICATION HERE)

Signature