

MARKUS · AI TRADEMARK ASSOCIATE

The difference between an AI that knows trademark law and one that knows *the register*.

Seven working sessions with Markus — clearance, office actions, TTAB strategy, docket triage. **Every Markus answer shown is genuine product output from a live run**, grounded in the USPTO record — not a language model's memory.

14M+

USPTO trademark records, updated daily

670K+

TTAB proceedings with party & outcome history

Live

prosecution histories, office actions & deadlines

0

invented citations — every serial number is checkable

Your associates can already ask ChatGPT. So can opposing counsel.

General AI models are genuinely good at trademark **doctrine** — they can recite the du Pont factors and draft a passable affirmative defense. What they cannot do is tell you **what is actually on the register**: which marks coexist, what an examiner allowed last month, how a specific opposer has actually litigated, or which of your own deadlines slipped. Ask, and they will guess — confidently.

Markus is different by construction. It sits on GleanMark's full USPTO dataset — **14 million trademark records, TTAB dockets, prosecution histories, office actions, and examiner data** — and answers by querying it. Every table it produces carries real serial numbers you can verify in two clicks.

■ Clearance & knockout search

Examiner-style knockout with phonetic and sound-alike expansion, coordinated classes, and honest risk verdicts — including "don't file this."

■ Office action response & evidence

Reads the OA, triages each refusal, drafts the response — and hunts third-party registration evidence to support it.

■ TTAB strategy & adversary intel

Any party's real enforcement record: what they oppose, how often extensions ripen into filings, and how proceedings actually end.

■ Docket & deadline triage

Your entire correspondent record — pending, registered, next deadlines, and the items that are already overdue.

■ Filing language & classification

USPTO-style identifications split correctly across classes, with fee strategy and disclaimer expectations up front.

■ Firm & portfolio analytics

Registration outcomes, OA-to-registration conversion, TTAB posture — for your firm, a client, or the counterparty.

HOW TO READ THE EXAMPLES

Every Markus response on the following pages is **genuine, unscripted product output from a live run on July 16, 2026** — condensed for space, never rewritten. The attorney-side scenarios are fictional composites drawn from real working sessions, so no client or matter is identifiable. Each answer's tools and runtime are noted beneath it, and every third-party mark, owner, serial number, and disclaimer finding was independently re-verified against the USPTO record before printing. The two docket examples (05, 06) describe a real practitioner's private book and are shown redacted with representative figures.

01 TTAB STRATEGY · ADVERSARY INTELLIGENCE

It scouted the opposer's litigation record before the opposition was even filed.

An attorney's client — a startup with a pending application for **BEASTFUEL** (energy drinks, Class 32) — just received an extension of time to oppose from Monster Energy. Is this a bluff, or incoming fire?

My client's BEASTFUEL application (Class 32, energy drinks) just drew an extension of time to oppose from Monster Energy. How seriously should we take it — do they follow through, and what do they actually target?

A

Attorney

Short answer: take it seriously. Monster Energy Company is one of the most active trademark enforcers on the TTAB docket, and its mark is broadly famous — including specifically in Class 32 energy drinks, which is your client's exact category.

Do they follow through? Since 2002 the enforcement record shows **240 extensions of time to oppose, 184 actual oppositions, and 20 cancellations** — extensions are frequently just the first procedural step before Monster actually opposes, not a bluff they let lapse. Recent oppositions they've pursued to filing:

TARGET MARK	SERIAL	PROCEEDING STATUS
FEAST LIKE A BEAST	98396388	Opposition suspended
VIVE100% ULTRA	98784666	Opposition pending
SEA MONSTROSITY	99618279	Opposed · terminated
UNLITIGATED SEA MONSTER	99188638	Opposed · terminated

Notably, FEAST LIKE A BEAST shows Monster has actively opposed marks built around aggressive/predatory-animal branding — exactly the naming territory "BEASTFUEL" sits in.

Why it's especially relevant here: MONSTER ENERGY reads as **broadly (dilution-tier) famous**, and is confirmed famous specifically in Class 32 — the same class as BEASTFUEL. That fame both (a) broadens Monster's §2(d) scope of protection well beyond literal word overlap, and (b) opens a potential §43(c) dilution angle even if a likelihood-of-confusion argument is thin.

Recommendation: don't treat this as a low-probability placeholder. I'd run a full DuPont-style confusion analysis on BEASTFUEL against Monster's core marks now — before the extension converts to an opposition. Want me to pull Monster's core registrations and run that comparison?

Markus — genuine output, live run Jul 16, 2026 · tools: get_owner_ttab_enforcement, is_mark_famous · 61 seconds

WHY THIS NEEDS THE TTAB DOCKET

A general model has no TTAB docket. It cannot pull an opposer's real extension-to-opposition record, cite the specific marks they've actually dragged to the Board, or read a fame signal in your client's class. Markus did it **in 61 seconds — with serial numbers you can check.**

Genuine Markus output, condensed for space. Enforcement counts as returned by Markus's Class 32-scoped enforcement tool; Monster's full all-class TTAB docket is larger still (2,300+ proceedings as plaintiff). All four opposed marks independently verified against TTAB records, July 2026. Client scenario fictionalized.

02 TTAB DEFENSE · CROWDED-FIELD EVIDENCE

The opposer claims exclusivity. The register says thirty-seven owners.

Defending an opposition, the attorney needs to show the opposer's three-letter mark **APS** is weak and entitled to only narrow protection. Markus turns a hunch into an evidence table.

Opposer claims exclusive rights in APS. Run a crowded-field search — how many third parties actually hold live APS registrations, and in what classes?

A

Attorney

APS is about as crowded as a three-letter mark gets — an exclusivity claim is very hard to sustain on this record. Standalone APS: **50 live marks held by 37 distinct owners**. That blows past the standard crowded-field threshold (roughly 6+ independent owners). A sample of the genuinely unrelated third parties:

OWNER	CLASS(ES)	GOODS/SERVICES
Arizona Public Service Company	35, 39, 40, 42	Electric utility services
Biomet Manufacturing, LLC	10	Blood-collection kits
APS Limited	28	Airsoft / toy guns
"APS Trading" OOD	7, 9, 16, 37	Thermoprinters, circuit boards
Akron Polymer Systems Inc.	42	Polymer R&D
The American Pediatric Society	35, 41	Pediatric education
Fortna Systems, Inc.	9	Industrial process controls
Lincare Licensing, Inc.	35	Medical-equipment ordering

Distinct owners hold standalone APS registrations across **18 Nice classes** — 1, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12, 14, 16, 28, 35, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 45 — with Classes 35, 9, 7, and 42 the most contested.

Bottom line for the opposition: no single party dominates. Arizona Public Service has the largest cluster (11 marks), but that is one owner in a field of ~37 — the opposite of exclusivity. The register shows APS coexisting peacefully across essentially unrelated goods and services, which supports arguing the term is weak/diluted and entitled only to a narrow scope of protection.

Want me to run a class-scoped crowded-field count for the specific class your applicant filed in (tighter, more citable exemplars), or pull the opposer's own TTAB enforcement history to see whether they've actually policed APS before?

Markus — genuine output, live run Jul 16, 2026 · tools: list_marks_containing_term, get_mark_owner_landscape · 45 seconds

WHY THIS NEEDS THE LIVE REGISTER

Generic AI will draft the *shape* of a crowded-field defense — with invented registrations. Markus counted the field (**exactly 50 live marks, 37 owners — verified to the digit**) and returned real owners with real classes, ready to become an exhibit. This isn't an argument; it's evidence.

Genuine Markus output, condensed for space. Field counts and every owner row independently re-verified against the live USPTO register, July 2026. Opposition scenario fictionalized.

03 CLEARANCE · KNOCKOUT SEARCH

Clearance that hears the mark the way consumers will.

A client wants **LUVLOKK** for a new dating app. The literal string is clear — no application has ever been filed for it. A lawyer's real question is what it *sounds* like.

Run a knockout on LUVLOKK for a dating/relationship app — Classes 9 and 45. Include phonetic equivalents, not just the literal spelling.

A

Attorney

Verdict: the engine flags this as **CRITICAL** — do not treat LUVLOKK as clear for a dating app. The phonetic net pulled **513 sound-alike hits** (METAPHONE "LFLK"), and several land squarely in your market — **17 high and 20 medium conflicts** overall. The ones that actually matter:

MARK	SERIAL	STATUS	CLASSES	GOODS/SERVICES	RISK
LOVELOCK	99359483	Registered	45	Marriage partner introduction / dating services	High
LUVLO	99514615	Registered	9, 41	Downloadable audio-visual & music recordings	High
LUVLINK	79318043	Registered	9	Downloadable software to share content	High
LUVLY	98007877	Registered	9	Downloadable mobile app software	Medium

LOVELOCK is the standout obstacle. It's a live registration in Class 45 for *marriage partner introduction and dating services* — essentially identical services — and "LOVELOCK" vs. "LUVLOKK" is a phonetic near-twin (love-lock / luv-lokk). The goods-relatedness reads at the top band. This is the one most likely to block you outright under §2(d).

The broader "LUV-" field is crowded (LUVLY, LUVLOO, LUVLOOP, LUVLOOK...), which cuts both ways: "LUV" is a weak, diluted prefix — but the second element ("LOKK"/"LOCK") is what ties you dangerously close to LOVELOCK specifically.

Bottom line: LUVLOKK carries critical §2(d) risk for a dating app, driven overwhelmingly by LOVELOCK in the exact dating-services space. I wouldn't recommend proceeding without a plan to distinguish or clear LOVELOCK. Want me to run a full 13-factor DuPont analysis of LUVLOKK vs. LOVELOCK to gauge how beatable it really is, pull crowded-field evidence on the "LUV" prefix, or check domain availability?

Markus — genuine output, live run Jul 16, 2026 · tool: run_knockout_search (phonetic + sound-alike expansion) · 40 seconds

WHY THIS NEEDS A PHONETIC INDEX

A general model can't run a phonetic search of the register — it doesn't have one. It would call LUVLOKK "likely available" because the literal string is unregistered. Markus expanded to 513 sound-alikes and surfaced a **registered, phonetically identical mark covering the identical services** — the refusal you'd otherwise discover ten months and one filing fee later.

Genuine Markus output, condensed for space. All statuses and registration numbers independently re-verified (LOVELOCK Reg. 8202856; LUVLO Reg. 8303965; LUVLINK Reg. 6854616), July 2026. Client mark and scenario fictionalized.

04 OFFICE ACTIONS · EVIDENCE GATHERING

The office action response is an argument. Markus brings the exhibits.

An examiner demanded a disclaimer of ".AI" in a client's Class 42 software application. The attorney wants third-party evidence that the Office routinely registers "[TERM].AI" marks without one.

Find me third-party "[TERM].AI" marks on the Principal Register in Class 42 where .AI was not disclaimed — I want to argue examiner consistency.

A

Attorney

Good news for an examiner-consistency argument: among live, registered Class 42 marks containing "AI," a majority registered **without** a disclaimer — of 19 sampled, **11 registered without disclaiming it** and only 8 disclaimed it. The pattern actually favors non-disclaimer.

".AI"-style marks that registered on the Principal Register without disclaiming "AI":

MARK	OWNER	REG. NO.	CLASSES	GOODS/SERVICES (EXCERPT)
CARE.AI	Stryker Corporation	7160811	9, 10, 37, 42	Patient medical information software
IDOX.AI	Foxit Software Incorporated	7523876	42	Document management software (ASP)
VUE.AI	M2P US Corporation	5392495	42	AI/ML/computer-vision development, PaaS
DOGAN AI	Dogan, Ufuk	6120889	42	AI product research; web platform
RETINSIGHT AI TO EYE	RetInSight GmbH	7123468	9, 35, 38, 42	AI-based retina-diagnostics software

For contrast, marks in the same class that *did* disclaim "AI": COOP AI (Reg. 7642218), TERAFLAP AI (Reg. 8171542), and AI MASCOT (Reg. 7682709).

Three of the non-disclaimed examples — CARE.AI, IDOX.AI, and VUE.AI — are the closest structural analogs to a "[TERM].AI" formative, since they follow the same word-plus-".AI" construction rather than "AI" as a standalone second word. Those three are your strongest citations for an examiner-consistency argument.

Want me to pull the full disclaimer statement language or prosecution history on any of these to strengthen the response?

Markus — genuine output, live run Jul 16, 2026 · tool: get_disclaimer_evidence · 19 seconds

WHY THIS NEEDS THE CASE FILES

Ask a general model for supporting registrations and you get **plausible fabrications** — mark names and reg numbers that don't exist, which is malpractice-grade risk in a filed response. Markus reads the actual USPTO disclaimer statements on each file — it found both the marks that disclaimed and the ones that didn't, and named the three structural analogs worth citing.

Genuine Markus output, condensed for space. Every registration re-verified against USPTO case-file statement records: no "AI" disclaimer on CARE.AI, IDOX.AI, or VUE.AI; COOP AI's "AI" disclaimer present. July 2026. Client scenario fictionalized.

05 PRACTICE MANAGEMENT · DOCKET TRIAGE

One question. The whole docket. Including the two items that were already overdue.

A solo practitioner with a ~700-mark correspondent record asks Markus what needs attention. This exchange is drawn from a real session; marks are redacted and figures are representative.

Pull everything I'm attorney of record on and build me an action list — what's due in the next 30 days, and is anything already late?

A

Attorney

Across your correspondent record — ~90 pending applications and ~500 active registrations — here's the triage. Two items need attention today:

PRIORITY	MARK	MATTER	DUE	STANDING
● 1		Office action response	—	57 days overdue · grace window closing
● 2		\$8 declaration (+\$15)	—	37 days overdue · in grace period
● 3		OA response — multi-issue	9 days	Critical window
● 4		OA response — §2(d)	25 days	Start drafting
● 5		Statement of Use	31 days	On deck

Pipeline behind these: **11 open office-action responses** and **16 Statements of Use** in the pending book; on the registration side, 13 maintenance filings (§8 / §8&9 / §15) land inside the next 12 months. The overdue OA still has its extension window — filing this week keeps the application alive for a \$125 government fee.

Want this filtered to §2(d) refusals only, broken out by client, or turned into a week-by-week drafting sequence?

Markus · full correspondent-record and deadline-docket query

WHY THIS NEEDS YOUR DOCKET

A general model has never heard of your docket. Markus reads the practitioner's **actual USPTO correspondent record** — every application, registration, office action, and statutory deadline — and surfaces the two items a busy practice had already let slip. In the live session, both were real and both were caught.

Drawn from a real July 2026 session on a ~700-mark docket; marks redacted, figures representative to protect the practitioner's clients.

06 ANALYTICS · INTELLECTUAL HONESTY

Cross-examine it like a witness. It answers like a good one.

An attorney asked for her firm's registration success rate — then pressure-tested the number the way opposing counsel would. Markus showed its work, and refused to produce a statistic it couldn't stand behind.

Before I quote that success rate anywhere: do you exclude abandoned applications? Client-elected abandonments? Do you count publication or final registration? And what's our rate for the last twelve months?

A

Attorney

Direct answers, one per question:

YOUR QUESTION	WHAT MY NUMBER REFLECTS
Exclude abandoned applications?	No — abandonments count in the denominator as losses. Excluding them would inflate the rate artificially.
Exclude client-elected abandonments?	No, and this is a real limitation: USPTO records don't distinguish a client walking away from a substantive refusal. Your true examiner-refusal loss rate is therefore <i>lower</i> than the raw number suggests.
Publication or final registration?	Final registration only. Published-but-not-registered marks stay in "pending" — the stricter, more conservative measure.
Formula	$\text{Registered} \div (\text{Registered} + \text{Dead})$, pending excluded from both sides — a decided-outcomes rate.

On the last twelve months: I won't give you that number. The overwhelming majority of the applications filed in that window are still pending — prosecution runs 12–18 months, so a success rate computed on that cohort is statistical noise, not evidence of anything. If you want a defensible recent figure, I'll compute it on a mature cohort old enough to have decided outcomes. Which year do you want me to run?

Markus · methodology disclosed, unsupportable stat declined

WHY THIS NEEDS YOUR FILING DATA

Two failures at once: a general model has no filing data to compute the rate from — and it will still produce one, because it's built to please. Markus computes from the actual record, **discloses the formula's limitations unprompted, and declines the statistically meaningless version.** That's the difference between a demo and a tool you can put in front of a client.

Recreated from a real May 2026 session; firm identity and figures anonymized. Methodology answers shown verbatim in substance.

07 FILING · CLASSIFICATION & IDENTIFICATIONS

One messy client description in. A five-class filing strategy out — with Term IDs.

The everyday work, done right: an attorney pastes a client's plain-English business description and gets back classification, pre-approved ID Manual identifications, and the fee strategy — in 53 seconds.

My client provides design, construction, and installation of timber framed structures, lighting installation services, and the sale of timber frame and outdoor lighting products. What classes and identifications do we need?

A

Attorney

Your client's six activity lines map to **five Nice classes**. Here's the breakdown, using pre-approved USPTO ID Manual wording — each entry's Term ID lets you *select* it in the filing system and avoid the \$200/class free-form surcharge:

CLASS	WHAT IT COVERS HERE	SUGGESTED IDENTIFICATION	TERM ID
42	Design of timber structures	Building design services	042-3142
37	Construction of timber structures	Building construction services	037-633
37	Lighting installation	Lighting apparatus installation	037-1226
19	Timber frame products (goods)	Structural timber; building timber	019-511 / 019-720
11	Outdoor lighting products (goods)	Lighting fixtures	011-785
35	Selling both product lines	Retail store services featuring... (fill-in template)	035-3004

Notes worth flagging: Class 37 carries two of your lines — building construction and lighting installation combine into one class fee. Class 19 is for *timber* materials; if any framing is actually metal, those shift to Class 6 (e.g., "Steel frames for building," 006-549) — worth confirming the material with the client. And the retail template needs its placeholders completed, plus confirmation whether they sell their own goods (retail may be redundant — the goods registrations cover that) or third-party goods too.

One reminder: these must be **selected in the USPTO ID Manual picker** at filing — pasting the same wording into a free-form box still triggers the surcharge.

Cost consideration: that's potentially 5 classes at ~\$350–\$550 each. If budget is tight, the goods classes (11, 19) plus the service classes (37, 42) may make Class 35 redundant. Want me to run a clearance/knockout search on the client's mark across these classes, or validate a specific draft recitation once you've picked the wording?

Markus — genuine output, live run Jul 16, 2026 · tool: suggest_gs_descriptions ×6 (USPTO ID Manual) · 53 seconds

WHY THIS NEEDS THE ID MANUAL

A general model gets you 80% of this — and the missing 20% is the expensive part: **the actual ID Manual Term IDs** (every one shown here verified active in the current Manual), the select-don't-paste surcharge trap, and the manufacture-vs-resell fork that decides whether the client files three classes or five.

Genuine Markus output, condensed for space. All six Term IDs independently verified active in the USPTO ID Manual with matching class and wording, July 2026. Client description contains no identifying details.

The best demo is *your own docket*.

Every example in this document started with an attorney typing one plain-English question. Markus is included with GleanMark — the trademark intelligence platform built on the full USPTO record. Ask it about your marks, your clients, your deadlines, your opposer.

gleanmark.com

Start with your firm's own portfolio — setup takes minutes

Ask for a live walkthrough

We'll run your hardest current matter, live, on a call

ABOUT THESE EXAMPLES

The Markus responses in this document are genuine, unscripted product output from live runs on July 16, 2026, condensed for length but never rewritten. The attorney-side scenarios are fictional composites drawn from real working sessions with practicing trademark attorneys; user-side details — marks applied for, parties, firms, and matters — have been changed or redacted, and no GleanMark customer or client matter is depicted or identifiable. Examples 05 and 06 recreate a real practitioner's private docket session with marks redacted and figures representative.

All third-party USPTO data shown (including the MONSTER ENERGY enforcement record, the LOVELOCK, APS, and "[TERM].AI" registrations, disclaimer findings, ID Manual Term IDs, and every serial and registration number) is genuine public-record data, independently re-verified against the USPTO register in July 2026. Third-party marks belong to their respective owners and appear solely as factual references to public records.

Markus produces first drafts and research for review by a qualified practitioner. It is a research tool, not legal advice.