

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

GLOBALAW LIMITED,

Plaintiff,

v.

CARMON & CARMON LAW OFFICE and  
GLOBALAW, INC.,

Defendants and Counterclaim Plaintiffs,

v.

GLOBALAW LIMITED, BALLARD  
SPAHR ANDREWS & INGERSOLL, LLP,  
JACKSON WALKER L.L.P., and GARVEY  
SCHUBERT BARER,

Counterclaim Defendants.

Civil Action No. 03-950 (CKK)

**ORDER**

For the reasons set forth in the accompanying Memorandum Opinion, it is, this 11th day of September, 2006, hereby

**ORDERED** that [171] Counterclaim Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment is GRANTED as to all counts contained within C&C's Counterclaim; it is further

**ORDERED** that [181] C&C's Motion for Further Discovery Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56(f) is DENIED; it is further

**ORDERED** that [183] C&C's Motion to Reconsider the November 14, 2005 Opinion and Order of Magistrate Judge Alan Kay is DENIED; it is further

**ORDERED** that Counterclaim Defendants' Objections and Motion to Strike Evidence

Submitted in Support of C&C's Response to Counterclaim Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment is DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE as MOOT; it is further

**ORDERED** that because this ruling effectively decides Counterclaim Defendants' potential liability prior to any court action in C&C's new action against third-party Dennis Campbell, [197] Counterclaim Defendants' Motion to Stay Related Case must be DENIED AS MOOT; it is further

**ORDERED** that because C&C's Counterclaim is wholly without merit, and is now dismissed, there is no need to consolidate this case with C&C's action against Dennis Campbell; accordingly, [199] C&C's Motion to Consolidate this case with *Carmon & Carmon v. Dennis Campbell*, Civ. A. No. 06-769 (CKK) is DENIED AS MOOT; it is further

**ORDERED** that (1) given the contours of the Court's ruling, i.e., that "GLOBALAW" is a generic term or is – at best – descriptive with no secondary meaning and no likelihood of confusion, and (2) given the general thrust of Counterclaim Defendants' own evidence and argument, it is reasonable to question whether Counterclaim Defendant/original Plaintiff GLOBALAW Limited can continue to insist that it has a protectable interest in the mark. *See* Compl. ¶¶ 19-20. By September 25, 2006, GLOBALAW Limited is to provide the Court with a report that either shows cause why this case should not be completely dismissed in light of this Court's ruling or accedes to the dismissal of this action in its entirety.

**SO ORDERED.**

/s/  
\_\_\_\_\_  
COLLEEN KOLLAR-KOTELLY  
United States District Judge