

NOTE: This order is nonprecedential.

United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

2008-1569
(Opposition No. 91/164,582)

LEO STOLLER CENTRAL MFG. CO.,

Appellant,

v.

JOVAN POCEKOVIC,

Appellee.

Appeal from the United States Patent and Trademark Office,
Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

2008-1570
(Opposition Nos. 91/154,585 and 91/154,617)

LEO STOLLER CENTRAL MFG. CO.,

Appellant,

v.

THE SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF TRADEMARK ABUSE LLC
(substituted for Leo Stoller Central Mfg. Co.),

Appellee,

and

MEDTRONIC SOFAMOR DANEK, INC.,

Appellee.

Appeal from the United States Patent and Trademark Office,
Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

2008-1571
(Opposition No. 91/092,085)

LEO STOLLER,

Appellant,

v.

THE SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF TRADEMARK ABUSE LLC
(substituted for Leo Stoller),

Appellee,

and

THE SOUTHERN NEW ENGLAND TELEPHONE COMPANY,

Appellee.

Appeal from the United States Patent and Trademark Office,
Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

2008-1572
(Opposition No. 91/159,950)

LEO STOLLER,

Appellant,

v.

THE SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF TRADEMARK ABUSE LLC
(substituted for Central Mfg. Co.),

Appellee,

and

PREMIUM PRODUCTS, INC.,

Appellee.

Appeal from the United States Patent and Trademark Office,
Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

2008-1573
(Opposition No. 91/117,894)

LEO STOLLER,

Appellant,

v.

THE SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF TRADEMARK ABUSE LLC
(substituted for Leo Stoller d/b/a Central Mfg. Co.),

Appellee,

and

SUTECH U.S.A., INC.,

Appellee.

Appeal from the United States Patent and Trademark Office,
Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

2008-1574
(Opposition No. 91/093,601)

LEO STOLLER,

Appellant,

v.

THE SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF TRADEMARK ABUSE LLC
(substituted for Leo Stoller),

Appellee,

and

GEORGE C. KASBOSKE,

Appellee.

Appeal from the United States Patent and Trademark Office,
Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

2008-1575
(Opposition No. 91/167,658)

LEO STOLLER,

Appellant,

v.

THE SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF TRADEMARK ABUSE LLC
(substituted for Central Mfg. Co.),

Appellee,

and

SURGICAL NAVIGATION TECHNOLOGIES, INC.,

Appellee.

Appeal from the United States Patent and Trademark Office,
Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

2008-1576
(Opposition No. 91/169,502)

LEO STOLLER CENTRAL MFG. CO.,

Appellant,

v.

THE SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF TRADEMARK ABUSE LLC

(substituted for Leo Stoller Central Mfg. Co.),

Appellee,

and

LOVELAND PRODUCTS, INC.,

Appellee.

Appeal from the United States Patent and Trademark Office,
Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

ON MOTION

Before MICHEL, Chief Judge, GAJARSA and LINN, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

ORDER

Leo Stoller moves for reconsideration of the court's January 22, 2009 order dismissing his appeal for failure to comply with the court's January 5, 2009 order. Stoller also submits a response seeking reconsideration of the January 5 order.

Stoller moved for leave to proceed in forma pauperis in each of the eight above-captioned appeals. The court denied the motions on November 17, 2008, determining that Stoller had not provided required information concerning his income and assets. Stoller's motion for reconsideration of the November 17 order was denied on January 5, 2009. In the January 5 order, the court stated that no additional extensions would be granted and that the appeals would be dismissed if Stoller did not pay the filing fees within 14 days.

Stoller did not pay the filing fees within 14 days and thus the clerk dismissed the appeals on January 22, 2009. Stoller now seeks reconsideration of the clerk's dismissal

order and submits a \$450 check for the filing fee in appeal no. 2008-1572. Stoller has not paid the fee for any of the other seven appeals listed above.

When the court states "no further extensions," it means it. These words are not lightly or routinely added to orders. Because Stoller failed to pay the filing fee for appeal no. 2008-1572 within the time set by the court's January 5 order, his motion for reconsideration with respect to that appeal is denied and his check is returned herewith. With respect to the other seven above-captioned appeals, Stoller has not paid the fee or offered any reason why the motion for reconsideration should be granted. Thus, with respect to those seven appeals, Stoller's motion for reconsideration is frivolous and is denied on that basis.

In addition, Stoller's submission entitled "Response to Court Order Dated January 5, 2009" seeks reconsideration of the January 5 order, which itself denied Stoller's reconsideration motion of the court's order denying his in forma pauperis motion. Repetitive reconsideration motions are not permitted by the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure or the Federal Circuit Rules. Stoller submits what he deems "new evidence" in support of his in forma pauperis request. Stoller's "new evidence" consists of orders issued by other courts granting his in forma pauperis motions in other proceedings. This court determines that these rulings are irrelevant to whether Stoller is entitled to proceed in forma pauperis in this court. Stoller's repetitive reconsideration requests border on frivolous. Stoller is cautioned that if he continues to submit frivolous and repetitive motions and other submissions to this court, the court may impose sanctions and filing restrictions. Any future submissions received from Stoller concerning these appeals will be placed in the file without further response.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

The motion is denied.

FOR THE COURT

MAY - 7 2009

Date

/s/ Jan Horbaly

Jan Horbaly

Clerk

FILED
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR
THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

MAY - 7 2009

**JAN HORBALY
CLERK**

cc: Leo Stoller (check enclosed)
Lance G. Johnson, Esq.
Charles J. Meyer, Esq.
Phillip B. Philbin, Esq.
H. Jay Spiegel, Esq.
Alan B. Samlan, Esq.
John S. Mortimer, Esq.

s17