

Chapter 700

Procedure for Examining Applications

701 Statutory Authority for Examination

702 Order of Work

702.01 Order of Examination

702.02 “Special” Applications

702.03 Related Applications

702.03(a) Companion Applications

702.03(a)(i) Companion Applications Not Previously Assigned for the Same or Similar Marks

702.03(a)(ii) Companion Applications Previously Assigned

702.03(a)(iii) Companion Registrations

702.03(a)(iv) Classification and Identification in Companion Applications That Have Registered or Been Published for Opposition

702.03(b) Conflicting Applications

703 Office Does Not Issue Duplicate Registrations

704 Initial Examination

704.01 Initial Examination Must be Complete

704.02 Examining Attorney’s Search

704.03 Supervisory Examining Attorney May Indicate Action for Non-Signatory Examining Attorney

705 The Examining Attorney’s Letter or Action

705.01 Language in Examining Attorney’s Letter

705.02 Examining Attorneys Should Not Volunteer Statements

705.03 Citation of Conflicting Marks

705.04 Reference to Matter in Printed or Online Publications

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

705.05 Citation of Decisions and Office Publications

705.06 Reviewing and Signing of Letters

705.07 Processing Outgoing Office Actions

705.08 Six-Month Response Clause

706 New Matter Raised by Examining Attorney After First Action

707 Examiner's Amendment

707.01 Approval of Examiner's Amendment by Applicant or Applicant's Attorney

707.02 Examiner's Amendment Without Prior Authorization by Applicant or Applicant's Attorney

707.03 Form of the Examiner's Amendment

708 Priority Action

708.01 Priority Action Defined

708.02 Discussion of Issues and Agreements

708.03 Form of the Priority Action

708.04 Refusal of Registration in Priority Action

708.05 Combined Examiner's Amendment/Priority Action

709 Interviews

709.01 Personal Interviews

709.02 Persons Who May Represent Applicant in an Interview

709.03 Making Substance of Interview of Record

709.04 Telephone Communications

709.05 Informal Submissions

709.06 Interviews Prior to Filing Application

710 Evidence

710.01 Evidence Supporting Refusal or Requirement

710.01(a) Evidence From Research Database

710.01(b) Internet Evidence

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

710.01(c) Record Must Be Complete Prior to Appeal

710.02 Evidence Indicating No Refusal or Requirement Necessary

710.03 Evidence of Third-Party Registrations

711 Deadline for Response to Office Action

711.01 Time May Run from Previous Action

711.02 Supplemental Office Action Resetting Response Period

712 Signature on Response to Office Action

712.01 Persons Who Can Sign Response

712.01(a) Guidelines on Who Should Sign Response to Office Action

712.01(a)(i) Signature By Joint Applicants

712.01(a)(ii) Signature By Partnership

712.01(a)(iii) Signature By Joint Venture

712.01(a)(iv) Signature By Corporation

712.01(a)(v) Signature By Foreign Companies and Corporations

712.01(a)(vi) Signature By Unincorporated Association

712.01(a)(vii) Signature By Limited Liability Company

712.01(a)(viii) Signature By Limited Liability Partnership

712.02 Unsigned Response

712.03 Response Signed by an Unauthorized Person

713 Examination of Amendments and Responses to Office Actions

713.01 Previous Action by Different Examining Attorney

713.02 Noting All Outstanding Requirements

713.03 Response to Applicant's Arguments

714 Final Action

714.01 Not Permissible on First Action

714.02 Not Permissible on Suspension

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

714.03 When Final Action is Appropriate

714.04 Form of the Final Action

714.05 Delineating New Issues Requiring Issuance of Nonfinal Action

714.05(a) Unacceptable Amendment Proposed By Applicant

714.05(a)(i) Amendment to Supplemental Register or Submission of Claim of Acquired Distinctiveness

714.05(a)(ii) Amendment of Identification of Goods and Services

714.05(b) Section 2(d) Refusal Based on Prior-Filed Application That Has Matured Into Registration

714.05(c) Advisory Statement Cannot Serve as Foundation for Final Refusal or Requirement

714.05(d) Submission of Consent Agreement or Assertion of Unity of Control in Response to §2(d) Refusal

714.06 Applicant's Recourse When Final Action is Premature

715 Action After Issuance of Final Action

715.01 Proper Response to Final Action

715.02 Action After Final Action

715.03 Request for Reconsideration After Final Action

715.03(a) Examining Attorney's Action When No New Issue is Presented in Request for Reconsideration and No Notice of Appeal Has Been Filed

715.03(b) Examining Attorney's Action When New Issue or New Evidence is Presented in Request for Reconsideration and No Notice of Appeal Has Been Filed

715.03(c) Time for Appeal Runs from Mailing Date of Final Action

715.04 Request for Reconsideration Filed in Conjunction With Notice of Appeal

715.04(a) Examining Attorney's Action Denying Reconsideration of Final Action When Notice of Appeal Has Been Filed

715.04(b) Examining Attorney's Action When New Issue or New Evidence is Presented and Notice of Appeal Has Been Filed

716 Suspension of Action by Office

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

- 716.01 Form of Suspension Notice
- 716.02 Circumstances Under Which Action May Be Suspended
 - 716.02(a) Applicant's Petition to Cancel Cited Registration
 - 716.02(b) Submission of Copy of Foreign Registration in §44(d) Application
 - 716.02(c) Conflicting Marks in Pending Applications
 - 716.02(d) *Inter Partes* or Court Proceeding
 - 716.02(e) Suspension Pending Cancellation or Expiration of Cited Registration
- 716.03 Applicant's Request to Remove Application from Suspension
- 716.04 Suspended Docket Checked
- 716.05 Inquiry by Examining Attorney Regarding Suspended Application
- 716.06 Suspension After Final Action

717 Reissuing an Office Action

- 717.01 Returned Office Action
- 717.02 Non-Receipt of Office Action

718 Abandonment

- 718.01 Express Abandonment by Applicant or Applicant's Attorney
- 718.02 Failure by Applicant to Take Required Action During Statutory Period
 - 718.02(a) Partial Abandonment
- 718.03 Incomplete Response
 - 718.03(a) Holding of Abandonment for Failure to Respond Completely
 - 718.03(b) Granting Additional Time to Perfect Response
 - 718.03(c) Reconsideration of Holding of Abandonment
- 718.04 Failure to File Statement of Use
- 718.05 Failure to Perfect Appeal
- 718.06 Notice of Abandonment for Failure to Respond

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

718.07 Ordering Abandoned Application Files

718.08 Revival or Reinstatement of Abandoned Application - New Search Required

719 Non-Responsive Communications

720 Fraud Upon the Office

701 Statutory Authority for Examination

Extract from 15 U.S.C. §1062.

(a) Upon the filing of an application for registration and payment of the prescribed fee, the Director shall refer the application to the examiner in charge of the registration of marks, who shall cause an examination to be made....

(b) If the applicant is found not entitled to registration, the examiner shall advise the applicant thereof and of the reason therefor. The applicant shall have a period of six months in which to reply or amend his application, which shall then be reexamined. This procedure may be repeated until (1) the examiner finally refuses registration of the mark or (2) the applicant fails for a period of six months to reply or amend or appeal, whereupon the application shall be deemed to have been abandoned, unless it can be shown to the satisfaction of the Director that the delay in responding was unintentional, whereupon such time may be extended.

702 Order of Work

702.01 Order of Examination

In general, examining attorneys should examine applications in the order in which they are received in the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO"), unless the application is made "special." See TMEP §702.02 regarding "special" applications.

Generally, amended applications (*i.e.*, applications that contain a response from the applicant), remands from the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board, and statements of use are also reviewed in the order in which they are received in the USPTO.

Examining attorneys should act on applications that have been suspended as soon as they are removed from suspension. See TMEP §§716 *et seq.* regarding suspension.

Examining attorneys should immediately act on inquiries regarding applications approved for publication or issue that are returned to the examining attorney to take action or provide information.

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

Where appropriate, the managing attorney may direct that a particular case be given special handling.

When an examining attorney resigns, the examining attorney should spend any remaining time in the Office getting his or her amended cases (including statements of use under 15 U.S.C. §1051(d) and appeal briefs), especially those with involved records, ready for final disposition.

702.02 “Special” Applications

While the USPTO normally processes applications in the order in which they are received, there is a procedure whereby an application can be made “special,” so that initial examination will be expedited. Initial examination can be expedited in the following circumstances:

- (1) *Petition to Make Special Granted.* Applications made “special” as a result of a petition under 37 C.F.R. §2.146 (see TMEP §§1710 *et seq.*); and
- (2) *Registration Inadvertently Cancelled Under 15 U.S.C. §1058, §1059, or §1141k.* A new application for registration of a mark that was the subject of a previous registration that was inadvertently cancelled or expired under 15 U.S.C. §1058, §1059, or §1141k will be made “special” upon the applicant’s request. No petition fee is required in this situation. However, *the mark in the new application must be identical to the mark in the cancelled or expired registration, and the goods/services in the new application must be identical to or narrower than the goods/services in the cancelled or expired registration.* To ensure that these applications are processed as “special,” the applicant should include a cover letter requesting that the application be made “special,” together with a copy of the cancelled or expired registration, when filing the application.

The examining attorney should promptly examine any application that has been made “special.”

702.03 Related Applications

702.03(a) Companion Applications

The term “companion applications” refers to pending applications filed by the same applicant. An application is pending until it registers or abandons. Pending applications include applications that have been approved for publication or for registration on the Supplemental Register, applications in the Intent-to-Use (“ITU”) Unit of the Office, and revived or reinstated applications.

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

702.03(a)(i) Companion Applications Not Previously Assigned for the Same or Similar Marks

If an applicant has multiple pending applications, the issues in the applications are likely to be similar. When assigned a new application, an examining attorney will be assigned the companion applications filed within three months of the filing date of the first assigned application. If an applicant files more than ten applications within a three-month period, only the first ten will be assigned to one examining attorney. Examining attorneys are encouraged to assign all unassigned companion applications for the same or similar marks to themselves, even if the applications were filed outside the three-month period.

The assignment of companion applications is done electronically, based upon the owner's name as set forth in the application. Therefore, the owner's name should be set forth consistently in all applications.

See TMEP §702.03(a)(iv) regarding classification and identification in companion applications that have been published for opposition.

702.03(a)(ii) Companion Applications Previously Assigned

If TRAM indicates that a companion application has been assigned to a different examining attorney, the examining attorney should **not** transfer his or her application to that person. However, the examining attorney must review the electronic record of the earlier companion application before taking action in a later companion case, and should act consistently, unless it would be clear error to do so. If the examining attorney believes that acting consistently with the prior action(s) would be erroneous, he or she should bring the issue to the attention of the managing attorney or senior attorney.

See TMEP §702.03(a)(iv) regarding classification and identification in companion applications that have been published for opposition.

702.03(a)(iii) Companion Registrations

If the applicant previously filed another application that has matured into a registration, the examining attorney should **not** transfer his or her application to the prior examining attorney. Generally, in the later application, the examining attorney should act consistently with the registration, unless it would be clear error to do so. However, the USPTO is not bound by the decisions of the examiners who examined the applications for the applicant's previously registered marks, based on different records. Eligibility for registration must be determined on the basis of the facts that exist at the time registration is sought. See TMEP §1216.01 and cases cited therein.

See TMEP §702.03(a)(iv) regarding classification and identification in companion registrations.

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

702.03(a)(iv) Classification and Identification in Companion Applications That Have Registered or Been Published for Opposition

If a companion application has been published for opposition or has registered, the examining attorney may presume that the classification and identification of goods or services in the companion application or registration are acceptable, unless the identification or classification is clearly wrong. If the examining attorney accepts the classification and identification of goods or services because they were accepted in a companion application or registration, the examining attorney must note the companion application serial number or registration number in the “Notes to the File” section of the record.

Sometimes, the classification and identification of goods or services in the prior companion application or registration is clearly wrong. For example, identifications and class assignments that were acceptable in the past may no longer be in accord with the current Nice Agreement classification system (see TMEP §§1401.02 *et seq.*) or with Office policy on acceptable identifications, which change periodically. In these cases, the examining attorney cannot adopt the classification and identification listed in the companion application or registration. See TMEP §1402.14.

702.03(b) Conflicting Applications

The term “conflicting applications” refers to two or more pending applications that are filed by different applicants and may ultimately require a refusal of registration under §2(d) of the Trademark Act, 15 U.S.C. §1052(d), due to a likelihood of confusion between the marks. When assigned a new application, the examining attorney must search the USPTO’s automated records to determine whether there are any conflicting applications. If there are conflicting applications, the examining attorney should *not* transfer the conflicting application to the examining attorney who acted on the first conflicting application. Instead, the examining attorney should simply examine the assigned application and issue an Office action that includes a notice to the applicant that there is a prior-filed application to register a mark that may be likely to cause confusion with the applicant’s mark. See TMEP §§1208 *et seq.* The actions of the examining attorney handling the later-filed application should be consistent with the actions of the examining attorney who handled the earlier-filed application, unless it would be clear error to act consistently. If necessary, the examining attorney should review the electronic record of the earlier-filed application before taking an action in the later-filed conflicting application.

703 Office Does Not Issue Duplicate Registrations

The USPTO will not issue two or more identical registrations. If two applications would result in registrations that are exact duplicates, the USPTO will permit only one application to mature into registration, and will refuse registration in the other

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

application. If practicable, the USPTO will permit the applicant to choose which application should mature into registration.

Basis. Applications filed under §1 of the Trademark Act are considered identical if the only difference between them is that one is based on use in commerce under §1(a) and the other is based on intent-to-use under §1(b). However, an application filed under §1 and an application filed under §44 that are otherwise identical are *not* regarded as duplicate registrations, nor is an application under §66(a) of the Trademark Act regarded as a duplicate of an application filed under §1 or §44.

Classification Change. Where the international classification of goods or services has changed, a new application for registration of the same mark for the same goods/services in a different class will not be considered a duplicate. For example, if applicant owns a registration of a mark for legal services in Class 42, and files a new application after January 1, 2007, for registration of the same mark for legal services in Class 45, this is not a duplicate.

Standard Character/Typed Drawing. An application for registration of a mark depicted in standard characters is considered a duplicate of an application for registration of the same mark in “typed” format (see TMEP §807.03(g)) for the same goods/services.

Standard Character/Special Form. A standard character drawing and a special form drawing of the same mark are not considered identical.

Overlapping Goods/Services. Applications/registrations with identifications that include some of the same goods or services, but also different goods or services, are not identical.

Color. A drawing on which the entire mark is lined for color (see TMEP §808.01(d)), is considered a duplicate of a color drawing of the mark, if the colors are identical. See TMEP §§807.07 *et seq.* regarding color drawings.

If the applicant claims different shades of a color (e.g., purple in one and lavender in the other), the marks are not duplicates.

Where one application/registration is not completely lined for color (*i.e.*, if the mark on the drawing includes color(s) in addition to unclaimed or unexplained black, white, and/or gray), this is not considered a duplicate of an application seeking registration that includes a claim of the same color(s) in addition to a claim of color for, or an explanation of the presence of, the black/white/gray in the drawing. See TMEP §§807.07(d) *et seq.* regarding drawings that include black/white/gray.

Principal/Supplemental Register. An application for registration of a mark on the Principal Register is not considered a duplicate of an application for registration of the same mark on the Supplemental Register.

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

Registrations Issued Under Prior Acts. If eligible, marks registered under the Acts of 1881, 1905, and 1920 may also be registered under the Act of 1946 (see §46(b) of the Trademark Act of 1946). Even if the mark and the goods or services in a registration issued under the 1946 Act are identical to the mark and goods or services in a registration issued under a prior Act, the registrations are not considered duplicates. See TMEP §§1601.04, 1601.05, 1602.02 and 1602.03 regarding registrations issued under prior Acts.

When an application is a duplicate of a registration owned by the applicant, and USPTO records show that the registration is still active, the examining attorney must refuse registration. If the registration is subject to cancellation for failure to file an affidavit of continued use or excusable nonuse under 15 U.S.C. §1058 or §1141k, or due to expire for failure to file a renewal application under 15 U.S.C. §1059 (*i.e.*, because the grace period has passed and no affidavit or renewal application has been filed), and the application is otherwise in condition for approval or final refusal, the examining attorney must suspend the application until the TRAM system is updated to show that the registration is cancelled or expired. See TMEP §1611 for information about how a registrant who has not timely filed a §8 affidavit or §9 renewal application may expedite the cancellation or expiration of its own registration.

704 Initial Examination

704.01 Initial Examination Must be Complete

37 C.F.R. §2.61(a). Applications for registration, including amendments to allege use under §1(c) of the Act, and statements of use under §1(d) of the Act, will be examined and, if the applicant is found not entitled to registration for any reason, applicant will be notified and advised of the reasons therefor and of any formal requirements or objections.

The initial examination of an application by the examining attorney must be a *complete* examination. A complete examination includes a search for conflicting marks and an examination of the written application, the drawing and any specimen(s), to determine whether the mark is eligible for the type of registration requested, whether amendment is necessary, and whether all required fees have been paid.

If, on initial examination, the examining attorney finds the mark in an application for registration on the Principal Register to be in condition for publication for opposition, the examining attorney will approve the application for publication. Similarly, if the examining attorney finds the mark in an application for registration on the Supplemental Register to be in condition for registration, the examining attorney will approve the application for registration. The Office will send a notice of publication or certificate of registration to the applicant in due course.

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

If the application is not in condition to be approved for publication or issue, the examining attorney will write, call, or e-mail the applicant, informing the applicant of the reason(s) why the mark may not be registered and of the defect(s) that can be corrected or amended to make the application acceptable.

The examining attorney's first Office action must be complete, so the applicant will be advised of all requirements for amendment and all grounds for refusal, with the exception of use-related issues that are considered for the first time in the examination of an amendment to allege use under 15 U.S.C. §1051(c) or a statement of use under 15 U.S.C. §1051(d) in an intent-to-use application. See TMEP §§1102.01 and 1202 *et seq.* regarding use-related issues that are considered for the first time in the examination of an amendment to allege use or a statement of use. Every effort should be made to avoid piecemeal prosecution, because it prolongs the time needed to dispose of an application. See *also* TMEP §706 regarding new issues raised by the examining attorney after the first Office action.

Examining attorneys must also clearly explain all requirements. For example, if the identification of goods or services is indefinite, the examining attorney should explain why the identification is not acceptable and, if possible, suggest an acceptable identification. See TMEP §§705 *et seq.* for further information about examining attorneys' Office actions.

704.02 Examining Attorney's Search

If the examining attorney finds no conflicting marks, but must write to the applicant about other matters, the examining attorney must inform the applicant that no conflicting marks have been found. This is commonly called the "search clause."

In an application filed under §1 or §44 of the Trademark Act, if the examining attorney cannot make a proper search or cannot examine the application properly due to lack of adequate information, the examining attorney should specifically indicate what information is needed, request that it be furnished, and state that further action on the matter will be taken as soon as the information is received. See TMEP §814 regarding requirements for additional information.

If some but not all of the goods/services in a §66(a) application are so indefinite that the examining attorney cannot make a proper search, the examining attorney may defer the search in part. The examining attorney must specifically indicate the good/services for which a search has been conducted by listing the goods/services for which no conflicting marks have been found, and, if relevant, issuing a §2(d) refusal that is specifically limited to certain goods/services. See TMEP §718.02(a) regarding partial refusals.

If all the goods/services in a §66(a) application are so indefinite that the examining attorney cannot make a proper search, the examining attorney must issue a full refusal, require the necessary amendments to the goods/services, and state that

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

further action on the merits with respect to likelihood of confusion will be considered as soon as a sufficiently definite identification of goods/services is received.

Before issuing a letter deferring action, the examining attorney should consult with the managing attorney or senior attorney.

704.03 Supervisory Examining Attorney May Indicate Action for Non-Signatory Examining Attorney

When a non-signatory examining attorney examines an application, a supervisory examining attorney must thoroughly review the action. The usual procedure is for the non-signatory examining attorney to explain relevant information to the supervisory examining attorney, discussing any reference marks or other grounds for refusal and any requirements or objections. The supervisory examining attorney may indicate the action to be taken.

705 The Examining Attorney's Letter or Action

If an examining attorney determines that a mark is not entitled to registration, or that amendment is required, the examining attorney will notify the applicant in a written Office action, or by a telephone conversation that is normally followed by a written action. This constitutes the examining attorney's official action.

Written Office actions may be of a variety of styles, including: (1) an "examiner's amendment," in which the examining attorney formally makes amendments to the application (see TMEP §§707 *et seq.*); (2) a "priority action," setting forth requirements and/or reasons for refusal discussed by telephone with the applicant or the applicant's attorney (see TMEP §§708 *et seq.*); (3) a letter explaining the bases for refusal and/or requirements; (4) an examiner's amendment combined with a priority action (see TMEP §708.05); or (5) a suspension notice (see TMEP §§716 *et seq.*). Office actions may be prepared through the use of standardized form paragraphs, in combination with language written to address the particular facts relevant to the refusal(s) and requirement(s). The examining attorney may send the Office action by regular mail or e-mail (if the applicant has authorized e-mail communications). See TMEP §§304 *et seq.* regarding e-mail.

The USPTO encourages the use of examiner's amendments and priority actions whenever appropriate.

705.01 Language in Examining Attorney's Letter

The examining attorney must indicate the status of the application at the beginning of each letter.

In first actions, this may be done by stating that the examining attorney has reviewed the application and made the determinations that follow, or by using language such

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

as “Upon examination of this application....” The examining attorney must acknowledge any document received before the first action by identifying the document and the date of its receipt.

In second or subsequent actions, examining attorneys should begin letters with a sentence such as, “This letter responds to the communication filed on [date].” Other papers received, such as supplemental amendments, affidavits, and new drawings, should also be acknowledged.

Refusals to register should be couched in the statutory language of the section of the Trademark Act that is the basis of the refusal, and the examining attorney should cite the appropriate section of the Act. For example, registration of a trademark should not be refused “because it is a surname,” but “because it *consists of matter that is primarily merely a surname under §2(e)(4) of the Trademark Act.*”

Registration must be refused only as to the specific register (*i.e.*, Principal or Supplemental) for which registration is requested. However, when refusing registration on the Principal Register, the examining attorney should also state, to the extent possible, whether the record indicates that an amendment to the Supplemental Register or to seek registration on the Principal Register under §2(f) may be appropriate.

The words “capable” and “incapable” should be reserved for the Supplemental Register.

Examining attorneys are encouraged to use form paragraphs to accelerate the preparation of Office actions and increase the uniformity of the substance and appearance of these actions. However, examining attorneys should use the form paragraphs only if they apply to a particular situation, and should expand on the form paragraphs when necessary to explain and support the relevant requirements or refusals.

705.02 Examining Attorneys Should Not Volunteer Statements

In Office actions, and e-mail and telephone communications, examining attorneys should not volunteer statements about applicants’ rights that are gratuitous and unnecessary to the examination of the matters presented in applications. The examining attorney’s responsibility is limited to evaluating the registrability of the mark presented in the application. *See In re American Physical Fitness Research Institute Inc.*, 181 USPQ 127 (TTAB 1974). *See also* TMEP §1801.

705.03 Citation of Conflicting Marks

When refusing registration under 15 U.S.C. §1052(d) based on a likelihood of confusion with a previously registered mark, the examining attorney must give the registration number(s) and attach to the Office action copies of each cited registration, which will become part of the record. The examining attorney should

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

explain the reasons that the mark in each cited registration is grounds for refusal under §2(d).

If an applicant notifies the USPTO that the USPTO failed to attach a cited registration, the USPTO will reissue the Office action with the relevant registrations and provide the applicant with a new response period.

705.04 Reference to Matter in Printed or Online Publications

When the examining attorney refers to matter in a printed publication, the examining attorney should provide the citation for the publication, and include the relevant material with the Office action. It is not necessary to attach a published legal decision to an Office action. A citation is sufficient. See TMEP §705.05 regarding citation of decisions.

When the examining attorney refers to an article downloaded from the Internet, the examining attorney should provide any information that would aid a party in locating the document, including the complete URL address of the website, the time and date the search was conducted, and the terms searched. See TMEP §710.01(b) for a discussion of the weight accorded to Internet evidence. See *also* TMEP §710.01(a) regarding evidence from a research database.

705.05 Citation of Decisions and Office Publications

When citing court or administrative decisions, the *United States Patents Quarterly* (USPQ or USPQ2d) citation should be given. If possible, a parallel citation to the United States Reports (U.S.), Federal Reporter (F., F.2d, or F.3d) or Federal Supplement (F. Supp. or F. Supp.2d) should also be given. The court or tribunal (2d Cir., C.C.P.A., Fed. Cir., TTAB, etc.) and the date of the decision should always be given.

The examining attorney may cite sections of the *Trademark Manual of Examining Procedure* (“TMEP”) or [Trademark Trial and Appeal Board Manual of Procedure](#) (“TBMP”). The abbreviations “TMEP” and “TBMP” are usually sufficient; however, if the person prosecuting the case appears to be unfamiliar with Office practice, the examining attorney should identify the Manuals by their full names in the first citation to the Manuals. It is not necessary to provide a copy of the relevant section(s) of the Manuals.

When the examining attorney cites a Director’s order or notice, the examining attorney should provide the title and date of the notice, and the specific issue of the *Official Gazette* in which it may be found.

Non-Precedential Decisions. Prior to December 27, 2006, it was the policy of the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board that Board opinions not designated as precedential should not be cited and, if cited, were to be disregarded. *General Mills*

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

Inc. v. Health Valley Foods, 24 USPQ2d 1270, 1275 n.9 (TTAB 1992). The Board has changed that policy. In announcing the change, the Board stated that:

[T]he Board will henceforth permit citation to any TTAB disposition as follows:

- The TTAB will continue its current practice of designating all final decisions as either precedential or not precedential. Unless specifically designated as precedential, an order on a motion should be considered not precedential.
- The TTAB will continue its practice of considering precedential decisions as binding upon the TTAB.
- A decision designated as not precedential is not binding upon the TTAB but may be cited for whatever persuasive value it might have.
- Citation to all TTAB decisions should be to the United States Patent Quarterly, if the decision appears therein; otherwise, to a USPTO public electronic database. If a non-precedential decision does not appear in the United States Patent Quarterly or the USPTO's public electronic databases, the citing party should append a copy of the decision to the motion or brief in which the decision is cited.
- Decisions of other tribunals may be cited to the extent allowed and for the purposes permitted by the tribunal that issued the decision.

See [Citation of Opinions to the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board](#) (TMOG Jan. 23, 2007).

705.06 Reviewing and Signing of Letters

Examining attorneys must review and sign every Office action using an electronic signature. The signature block should include the name, law office and telephone number of the examining attorney. The signature block should be set forth as follows:

/Examining attorney's full name/
Trademark Examining Attorney
Law Office xxx
(571) 272-xxxx

If an examining attorney does not have signatory authority, he or she should sign the action and refer it to an authorized signatory examining attorney, who will review and approve the action. Review by a reviewer should ordinarily be done within two working days after receipt from the non-signatory examining attorney.

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

705.07 Processing Outgoing Office Actions

A date is placed on all copies of paper Office actions when they are being issued. For outgoing e-mail communications, the date is applied automatically when the communication is released to the USPTO's electronic mail system.

One copy of the action signed by the examining attorney, along with any supporting evidence and/or copies of registered marks or pending applications cited as a bar to registration, is sent to the Trademark Image Capture and Retrieval System ("TICRS") and is available for review by the public through the Trademark Document Retrieval ("TDR") portal on the USPTO website at <http://www.uspto.gov>. One copy of the Office action and supporting evidence is sent to the applicant.

705.08 Six-Month Response Clause

Generally, the examining attorney's letter or Office action should include a "six-month response clause" notifying the applicant that the applicant must respond to the action within six months of the mailing date to avoid abandonment under 15 U.S.C. §1062(b). See TMEP §§711 *et seq.* regarding the deadline for response to an Office action.

The examining attorney should *not* include a six-month response clause in an examiner's amendment (see TMEP §§707 *et seq.*) or suspension notice (see TMEP §§716 *et seq.*), or in a situation where the time for response runs from the mailing date of a previous action (see TMEP §§711.01 and 715.03(c)).

706 New Matter Raised by Examining Attorney After First Action

If in the first Office action an examining attorney inadvertently failed to refuse registration on a clearly applicable ground or to make a necessary requirement, the examining attorney must take appropriate action to correct the inadvertent error in a subsequent action. Examining attorneys should exercise great care to avoid these situations, and should take this step only when absolutely necessary. After the first action, supervisors (*e.g.*, supervisors reviewing the quality of the examining attorney's work) should not introduce any new reason for refusal that is not clearly justified under the Act or rules.

Since it is unusual to make a new refusal or requirement that could have been raised in the first action, an examining attorney who does make a new refusal or requirement must clearly explain why the refusal or requirement is necessary, and apologize for the delay in raising the issue, if appropriate. See TMEP §711.02 regarding supplemental Office actions.

Sometimes, the examining attorney must issue a new refusal or requirement because the applicant submits information that raises a new issue.

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

In a §66(a) application, the examining attorney cannot issue a new refusal more than 18 months after the date on which the IB forwards the request for extension of protection to the USPTO. See TMEP §1904.03(a).

See TMEP §1109.08 regarding application of the “clear-error” standard in the examination of statements of use under §1(d) of the Act.

707 Examiner’s Amendment

An examiner’s amendment should be used whenever appropriate to expedite prosecution of an application. An examiner’s amendment is a communication to the applicant in which the examining attorney states that the application has been amended in a specified way. Except in the situations listed in TMEP §707.02, the amendment must be specifically authorized by the applicant or the applicant’s attorney. See TMEP §707.01 regarding the authorization of an examiner’s amendment. Authorization is usually given in a telephone conversation, e-mail communication, or interview between the examining attorney and the applicant or the applicant’s attorney. See TMEP §§304 *et seq.* regarding e-mail.

The examining attorney may issue an examiner’s amendment whenever the required amendment does not have to be verified by the applicant. For example, in appropriate circumstances, an examiner’s amendment may be used to amend the identification of goods or services, enter a disclaimer, add the state of incorporation, or change from the Principal to the Supplemental Register.

The following are examples of matters that may **not** be changed by examiner’s amendment: the dates of use, if verification would be required (see TMEP §903.05); the mark on a special form drawing (see TMEP §807.04), if the changes would require the filing of a substitute special form drawing; and amendments that require the submission of substitute specimen(s) (see TMEP §904.05). An application cannot be expressly abandoned (see TMEP §718.01) by examiner’s amendment.

An authorization to charge a fee to a deposit account cannot be entered by examiner’s amendment, unless the record already contains a written authorization, signed and submitted by someone authorized to charge fees to the account. See TMEP §405.03 regarding deposit accounts.

Examiner’s amendments generally are not used when there are statutory refusals. However, if there is a potential statutory refusal, and an amendment will obviate the refusal, the examining attorney may attempt to resolve the issues through an examiner’s amendment. For example, in appropriate cases, the applicant may overcome a surname refusal of a mark that is in use in commerce by amending the application to the Supplemental Register. See TMEP §708.04 regarding priority actions involving statutory refusals.

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

An examining attorney without partial signatory authority must have proper authorization from the managing attorney, senior attorney, or a reviewing examining attorney before initiating an examiner's amendment.

See TMEP §707.03 regarding the form of an examiner's amendment.

Applicants should **not** file correspondence confirming an examiner's amendment, because this will delay processing of the application. A written response to an examiner's amendment is not required.

If the applicant wishes to object to the examiner's amendment, this should be done immediately (preferably by phone or e-mail), so that the objection can be considered before publication or issue. See TMEP §1402.07(e) regarding an applicant's objection to an examiner's amendment of the identification of goods/services on the ground that the examiner's amendment does not reflect the agreement between the applicant and the examining attorney.

Often an applicant will seek to respond to an outstanding Office action with an amendment or other response by telephone. The examining attorney is encouraged to enter an examiner's amendment if this amendment will immediately place the application in condition for publication for opposition, issuance of a registration, or suspension. See TMEP §§716 *et seq.* regarding suspension. However, an applicant or an applicant's attorney does not have an unlimited right to the entry of an examiner's amendment in response to an Office action. If the applicant does not agree to an amendment that the examining attorney believes will immediately place the application in condition for publication for opposition or issuance of a registration, the applicant must file a complete written response to the outstanding Office action.

See TMEP §708.05 regarding combined examiner's amendment/priority actions.

NOTE: In a §66(a) application, an examiner's amendment may *not* be issued on a first action because the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization ("IB") will not accept such amendments. Examiner's amendments may be issued on second and subsequent actions. See TMEP §1904.02(e) regarding Office actions in §66(a) applications.

707.01 Approval of Examiner's Amendment by Applicant or Applicant's Attorney

Except in the situations enumerated in TMEP §707.02 in which an examiner's amendment is permitted without prior authorization by the applicant or the applicant's attorney, an examining attorney may amend an application by examiner's amendment only after securing approval of the amendment from the applicant or the applicant's attorney by telephone or e-mail, or in person during an interview.

Only the applicant or a practitioner authorized to practice before the Office pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §10.14 can authorize an examiner's amendment. If the applicant has

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

an attorney, the examining attorney must speak directly with the attorney of record. If the applicant is *pro se*, the examining attorney must speak directly with the individual applicant or to someone who has legal authority to bind a juristic applicant (e.g., a corporate officer or general partner of a partnership). 37 C.F.R. §10.14(e). For joint applicants who are not represented by an attorney, each joint applicant must authorize the examiner's amendment. Paralegals and legal assistants cannot authorize examiner's amendments, even if only conveying the appointed attorney's approval by indicating that the appointed attorney has approved the amendment.

An examiner's amendment must be authorized by the applicant or the applicant's attorney. The examining attorney may not leave an e-mail or voicemail message for the applicant or the applicant's attorney indicating that an amendment shall be entered if the applicant or attorney does not respond to the message.

A non-attorney who is authorized to verify facts on behalf of an applicant under 37 C.F.R. §2.33(a)(2) is *not* entitled to authorize an examiner's amendment, unless he or she has legal authority to bind the applicant. See TMEP §§712.01 *et seq.* for guidelines on persons who have legal authority to bind various types of applicants. The broad definition of "persons properly authorized to sign on behalf of an applicant" in 37 C.F.R. §2.33(a) (see TMEP §804.04) does not apply to examiner's amendments.

If an examining attorney contacts an applicant and reaches agreement to issue an examiner's amendment, but later determines that an Office action must be issued instead to state a refusal or requirement, the examining attorney should telephone the applicant immediately to advise the applicant of the change of position.

Examining attorneys without partial signatory authority must advise applicants that issuance of the examiner's amendment is subject to review by a supervisory attorney.

707.02 Examiner's Amendment Without Prior Authorization by Applicant or Applicant's Attorney

Examining attorneys have the discretion to amend applications by examiner's amendment without prior approval by the applicant or the applicant's attorney in the following situations:

- (1) Changes to international classification, either before or after publication (see *Groening v. Missouri Botanical Garden*, 59 USPQ2d 1601 (Comm'r Pats. 1999) regarding amendments to international classification after publication);
- (2) Deletion of "TM," "SM," "©," or "®" from the drawing;

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

- (3) Addition of a formal description of the mark where it is necessary (see TMEP §§808 *et seq.*) and where the record already contains an informal indication of what the mark comprises;

Example - The cover letter accompanying the application refers to the mark as a stylized golf ball design. If appropriate, the examining attorney could enter an amendment that “the mark consists of the stylized design of a golf ball.”

- (4) Amendment of the application to enter a standard character claim when the record clearly indicates that the drawing is intended to be in standard character form (see TMEP §807.03(g));
- (5) Addition of lining and stippling statements, where the statement is necessary (see TMEP §808.01(d)), and where the significance of the lining or stippling is indicated by the specimen or other information of record;
- (6) Correction of obvious misspellings, typographical errors, and redundancies in the identification of goods and services;

Example - The goods are recited as “T-shurtz.” The examining attorney could amend to “T-shirts.” However, “shirtz” could not be amended to “shirts” without calling the applicant, because “shirtz” (without the “T-” prefix) might also be a misspelling of “shorts.”

- (7) When an applicant fails to respond to a requirement to amend some terminology in an otherwise acceptable identification of goods/services, the examining attorney may issue an examiner’s amendment deleting the unacceptable terminology from the identification. See TMEP §§718.02(a) and 1402.13;
- (8) Deletion of bracketed material from an entry taken from the USPTO’s [*Acceptable Identification of Goods and Services Manual*](#). Bracketed material should not be included in an identification of goods, but sometimes appears in the Manual for informational purposes. If this material is entered in an identification, it will be automatically deleted in a TEAS Plus application. In a TEAS or paper application, the bracketed material may be deleted with a no-call examiner’s amendment.

If the examining attorney must contact the applicant or the applicant’s attorney about other matters, or if the record contains any ambiguity as to the applicant’s intent, the examining attorney should advise the applicant that the above changes have been made.

A copy of the examiner’s amendment will be sent to the applicant or applicant’s attorney. Any applicant or applicant’s attorney who disagrees with any of these changes should contact the examining attorney immediately after receipt of the examiner’s amendment, preferably by phone or e-mail.

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

707.03 Form of the Examiner's Amendment

An examiner's amendment should include the following information: the name, law office, and telephone number of the examining attorney; the name of the person interviewed; the date of the interview; the actual amendment; and, if applicable, a statement to the effect that the amendment has been authorized by the applicant or the applicant's attorney.

The examiner's amendment should not include a six-month response clause, because a written response by the applicant is not required for an examiner's amendment.

The examiner's amendment must include a search clause (see TMEP §704.02) if it is a first action, or if the applicant has not previously been advised of the results of a search.

The examining attorney should not state in the examiner's amendment that the application is ready for publication or issue, because some unforeseen circumstance might require that further action be taken in the application.

The examiner's amendment must indicate any refusals and/or requirements that are withdrawn and/or continued by the examining attorney.

708 Priority Action

708.01 Priority Action Defined

A "priority action" is an Office action that is issued following a telephone conversation, personal interview, or e-mail communication in which the examining attorney and the applicant or applicant's attorney discuss the various issues raised in an application. The use of priority actions is encouraged to expedite examination.

A priority action should be issued according to the following procedure: (1) the examining attorney telephones or e-mails the applicant or applicant's attorney and requests that the applicant take some specific action, explaining the reasons; (2) the applicant or applicant's attorney specifically discusses the merits of the application with the examining attorney; (3) the examining attorney prepares and signs a priority action that fully discusses all refusals and/or requirements, includes evidence to support the refusals/requirements, and specifically describes what action the applicant may take in order to place the application in condition for publication or registration; and (4) the Office sends a copy of the priority action to the applicant or applicant's attorney.

If the evidence of record supports a statutory refusal of registration, a priority action may be issued only if the examining attorney believes that an amendment or explanation will obviate the refusal. See TMEP §708.04.

See TMEP §708.03 regarding the form of a priority action.

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

708.02 Discussion of Issues and Agreements

The examining attorney must discuss the issues with the individual applicant, the applicant's attorney, or a person with legal authority to bind a juristic applicant. The broad definition of "persons properly authorized to sign on behalf of an applicant" in 37 C.F.R. §2.33(a) (see TMEP §804.04) does not apply to priority actions. Priority actions are governed by 37 C.F.R. §10.14(e).

Only the applicant or a practitioner authorized to practice before the Office pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §10.14 can agree to a priority action. If the applicant has an attorney, the examining attorney must speak directly to the attorney of record. If the applicant is *pro se*, the examining attorney must speak directly to the individual applicant or to someone with legal authority to bind a juristic applicant (e.g., a corporate officer or general partner of a partnership). Paralegals and legal assistants cannot agree to a priority action even if only conveying the appointed attorney's approval by indicating that the appointed attorney has agreed to the priority action.

A non-attorney who is authorized to verify facts on behalf of an applicant under 37 C.F.R. §2.33(a)(2) is *not* entitled to authorize a priority action, unless he/she also has legal authority to bind the applicant. See TMEP §§712.01 *et seq.* for guidelines on persons who have legal authority to bind various types of applicants.

During the telephone conversation or other communication with the applicant or the applicant's attorney, the examining attorney must fully discuss all refusals and requirements relating to the application, and explain the reason for each refusal or requirement. Whenever possible, the examining attorney should suggest appropriate language for amendments.

A priority action is *not* appropriate when the examining attorney leaves a voice mail or e-mail message for the applicant or the applicant's attorney, but the applicant or attorney does not call back or respond to the message. All the issues in the priority action must be discussed on the merits with the applicant or applicant's attorney in a good faith attempt to resolve any issues and place the application in condition for publication or registration, as appropriate.

An agreement as to precisely how all issues will be resolved is not necessary. For example, the priority action may state that "the applicant will submit an acceptable identification of goods that specifies the common commercial names of the 'computer equipment.'" It is not necessary that there be an agreement that "the applicant will amend the identification of goods to read: computer keyboards, computer monitors and computer printers."

The priority action may state that the applicant will follow one of two alternative courses of action, for example, providing either an amended drawing or a new specimen.

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

708.03 Form of the Priority Action

The priority action should reference the date of the telephone call, e-mail message, or other communication, and the name and title (where appropriate) of the person who authorized the priority action. See TMEP §708.02 for information about who is authorized to agree to a priority action.

A priority action must include a six-month response clause (see TMEP §705.08) so that it is clear that the applicant must timely respond to the issues raised in the priority action to avoid abandonment of the application.

The priority action must include a search clause (see TMEP §704.02) if it is a first action, or if the applicant has not previously been advised of the results of a search.

The priority action must also: (1) fully discuss all refusals and requirements; (2) include sufficient evidence to support all refusals and requirements; and (3) specifically describe what action the applicant may take in order to place the application in condition for publication or registration. See TMEP §708.02 regarding discussion of issues on the merits.

The examining attorney should discuss each issue separately, stating the reason for the requirement and/or citing the relevant sections of the statute, rules, and/or TMEP. The essential nature of the refusal or requirement, and any pertinent advisories relating thereto, must be clearly stated in the priority action, and fully supported by appropriate evidence (if applicable), because the action of the USPTO is based exclusively on the written record. 37 C.F.R. §2.191.

A priority action may be used for a final or nonfinal refusal or requirement. See TMEP §708.04 regarding refusal of registration in a priority action, and TMEP §§714 *et seq.* regarding final actions.

708.04 Refusal of Registration in Priority Action

Priority actions are generally used when there are no statutory refusals. However, if there is sufficient evidence to support a statutory refusal, and the examining attorney believes that an amendment or explanation will obviate the refusal, the examining attorney may attempt to resolve the issues through a priority action. An example would be a surname refusal where it is evident that the mark has been used in commerce for more than five years, and thus the refusal could be overcome by the submission of a claim of acquired distinctiveness under §2(f) of the Trademark Act. See TMEP §§1212 *et seq.* regarding §2(f).

When the applicant agrees to submit evidence to overcome a statutory refusal, the examining attorney should issue the refusal in the priority action, stating the basis for the refusal, citing the relevant sections of the statute and rules, attaching evidence to support the refusal, and indicating the resolutions agreed upon.

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

If the priority action includes a final refusal, the priority action must clearly indicate that the refusal is FINAL, and should contain any additional supporting evidence necessary for a complete record on appeal. See TMEP §§714 *et seq.* regarding final actions.

708.05 Combined Examiner's Amendment/Priority Action

An examining attorney may issue an Office action that combines an examiner's amendment and priority action, if the requirements for both have been met. An examining attorney may not issue a "no-call" examiner's amendment/priority action, because the issues in the priority action portion of the action have not been discussed with the applicant or applicant's attorney.

The action must include a six-month response clause (see TMEP §705.08) so that it is clear that the applicant must timely respond to the issues raised in the priority action to avoid abandonment of the application. The action must also include the subheadings "Priority Action" and "Examiner's Amendment" to facilitate processing. The action should be reported in the USPTO's automated TRAM system as a priority action.

709 Interviews

A discussion between the applicant or applicant's attorney and the examining attorney in which the applicant presents matters for the examining attorney's consideration is considered an interview. An interview can be conducted in person, by telephone, or by e-mail. See TMEP §§304 *et seq.* regarding e-mail.

The application will not normally be processed out of turn as a result of the interview, and the interview does not extend the deadline for response to an outstanding Office action.

The examining attorney may not discuss *inter partes* questions with any of the interested parties. See TMEP §1801.

709.01 Personal Interviews

Personal interviews with examining attorneys concerning applications and other matters pending before the USPTO are permissible on any working day and must be in the office of the respective examining attorney, within office hours that the examining attorney may designate.

Personal interviews should be arranged in advance, preferably by fax, e-mail, or telephone. This will ensure that the assigned examining attorney will be available for the interview at the scheduled time and will have an opportunity to review the application. The unexpected appearance of an attorney or applicant requesting an interview without any previous notice to the examining attorney is not appropriate.

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

An interview should be conducted only when it could serve to develop and clarify specific issues and lead to a mutual understanding between the examining attorney and the applicant. Interviews should not extend beyond a reasonable time.

The examining attorney should not hesitate to state that matter presented for consideration during the interview requires further research, if this is the case. Furthermore, the examining attorney may conclude an interview when it appears that no common ground can be reached.

During an interview with a *pro se* applicant who is not familiar with Office procedure, the examining attorney may in his or her discretion make suggestions that will advance the prosecution of the application, but these interviews should not be allowed to become unduly long.

When an agreement is reached during an interview but it is not possible to resolve all issues through an examiner's amendment, the examining attorney should make a note to the file concerning the agreement and request that the applicant incorporate the agreement in its response.

Sometimes the examining attorney who conducted the interview is transferred, resigns, or retires, and examination of the application is taken over by another examining attorney. If there is an indication in the record that an interview was held, the second examining attorney should endeavor to ascertain whether any agreements were reached during the interview. In the absence of clear error, the second examining attorney should take a position consistent with agreements previously reached.

Except in unusual situations, no interview on the merits is permitted after the brief on appeal is filed, or after an application has been forwarded for publication or issue.

709.02 Persons Who May Represent Applicant in an Interview

In general, interviews are not granted to persons who lack proper authority from the applicant or the attorney of record. See TMEP §§602 *et seq.* regarding persons who may represent an applicant before the USPTO in a trademark matter, and TMEP §§712.01 *et seq.* for information as to persons who have authority to bind various types of juristic applicants.

The examining attorney may request proof of the attorney's authority if there is any reason to suspect that the attorney is not, in fact, the applicant's representative. 37 C.F.R. §2.17(a).

For an interview with an examining attorney who does not have signatory authority, arrangements should be made for the presence of an examining attorney who does have such authority and who is familiar with the application, so that authoritative agreement may be reached, if possible, at the time of the interview.

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

USPTO employees are forbidden to engage in oral or written communication with a disbarred attorney regarding an application, unless the disbarred attorney is the applicant.

Requests for interviews from third parties are inappropriate and should be directed to the Office of the Commissioner for Trademarks. See TMEP §1801.

709.03 Making Substance of Interview of Record

The substance of an interview must always be made of record in the application, since the action of the USPTO is based exclusively on the written record. 37 C.F.R. §2.191. This should be done promptly after the interview while the matters discussed are fresh in the minds of the parties.

To ensure that any agreements reached at an interview will be implemented, and to avoid subsequent misunderstanding, the examining attorney should include, in the "Notes-to-the-File" section of the record, a summary of the conclusions reached and of any exhibits considered at an interview.

If possible, agreements reached in the interview may be incorporated in an examiner's amendment or priority action.

The applicant or the applicant's attorney may also make the substance of an interview part of the record by incorporating a summary of the interview in the applicant's response to the Office action. If there is any disagreement between the examining attorney and the applicant as to the substance of the interview, the written record governs. 37 C.F.R. §2.191.

709.04 Telephone Communications

Use of the telephone is encouraged. Examining attorneys should initiate telephone interviews whenever possible to expedite prosecution of an application. Similarly, applicants and attorneys for applicants may telephone examining attorneys, if they feel that a call will advance prosecution of an application.

All amendments and other papers filed in the USPTO should include the telephone number of the applicant or the applicant's attorney.

The examining attorney should return telephone calls within a reasonable time, normally the same working day and never later than the next working day.

Generally, the examining attorney who prepared the action, and not the supervisory or reviewing examining attorney, should be the person contacted in a telephone interview. However, a non-signatory examining attorney must secure proper authorization from the managing attorney, senior attorney, or reviewing examining attorney before approving an amendment.

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

The action of the USPTO is based exclusively on the written record. 37 C.F.R. §2.191. Therefore, the examining attorney must use an examiner's amendment (see TMEP §§707 *et seq.*), priority action (see TMEP §§708 *et seq.*), memo to the file, or notation in the "Notes to the File" section of the record to make the substance of the call or the resolution of any issue part of the record. See TMEP §709.03.

709.05 Informal Submissions

An applicant may conduct informal communications with an examining attorney regarding a particular application by fax, e-mail (see TMEP §§304 *et seq.*), or other means. Informal communications should be conducted only if they serve to develop and clarify specific issues and lead to a mutual understanding between the examining attorney and the applicant.

Informal communications must be made part of the record, because the USPTO uses them in decision making, and anything used in decision making must be made of record. 37 C.F.R. §2.191. When a communication is informal, the applicant should clearly identify it as such. If it is unclear whether a communication is an informal inquiry or a response to an Office action, the USPTO will process the communication as a response.

Filing an informal communication does not extend the deadline for response to an outstanding Office action.

709.06 Interviews Prior to Filing Application

No interviews are permitted before the filing of an application. If a party has general questions, he or she can call the Trademark Assistance Center at (571) 272-9250 or (800) 786-9199. See TMEP §108.02.

USPTO employees cannot give advice on trademark law. It is inappropriate for USPTO personnel to give legal advice, to act as a counselor for individuals, or to recommend an attorney.

710 Evidence

710.01 Evidence Supporting Refusal or Requirement

In general, the examining attorney should always support his or her action with relevant evidence.

All evidence that the examining attorney relies on in making any requirement or refusal to register must be placed in the record and copies must be sent to the applicant.

In appropriate cases, the examining attorney may also present evidence that may appear contrary to the USPTO's position, with an appropriate explanation as to why

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

this evidence was not considered controlling. In some cases, this may foreclose objections from an applicant and present a more complete picture if there is an appeal. *Cf. In re Federated Department Stores Inc.*, 3 USPQ2d 1541, 1542 n.2 (TTAB 1987).

710.01(a) Evidence From Research Database

If evidence is obtained from a research database, the record should include an indication of the specific search that was conducted. The record should indicate the libraries and/or files that were searched and the results. If the examining attorney does not review all of the documents the search locates, the record should indicate the number of documents that were reviewed. The search summary should be made a part of the record and will provide most of this information. Information not indicated on the summary, such as the number of documents viewed, should be stated in narrative in the Office action. The Office action should include a citation to the research service, indicating the service, the library and the file searched, and the date of the search (e.g., "LEXIS®, New and Business, All News (June 5, 2007)").

When evidence is obtained from a research database, the examining attorney does not have to make all stories of record. It is sufficient to include only a portion of the search results, as long as that portion is a representative sample of what the entire search revealed. *In re Vaughan Furniture Co. Inc.*, 24 USPQ2d 1068, 1069 n.2 (TTAB 1992). *See also In re Federated Department Stores Inc.*, 3 USPQ2d 1541, 1542 n.2 (TTAB 1987).

See TMEP §710.01(b) regarding evidence originating in foreign publications.

710.01(b) Internet Evidence

Articles downloaded from the Internet are admissible as evidence of information available to the general public, and of the way in which a term is being used by the public. However, the weight given to this evidence must be carefully evaluated, because the source is often unknown. *See In re Total Quality Group Inc.*, 51 USPQ2d 1474, 1475-76 (TTAB 1999); *Raccioppi v. Apogee Inc.*, 47 USPQ2d 1368, 1370-71 (TTAB 1998). When making Internet evidence part of the record, the examining attorney should provide complete information as to the source or context of the evidence. Any information that would aid a party in locating the relevant document should be included in the citation (e.g., the complete URL address of the website, the time and date the search was conducted, and the terms searched).

A list of Internet search results has little probative value, because such a list does not show the context in which the term is used on the web page that could be accessed by the link. *See In re Bayer Aktiengesellschaft*, 488 F.3d 960, 82 USPQ2d 1828 (Fed. Cir. 2007) (GOOGLE® search results that provided very little context of the use of ASPIRINA deemed to be "of little value in assessing the consumer public perception of the ASPIRINA mark"); *In re Thomas*, 79 USPQ2d 1021 (TTAB 2006)

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

(Board rejected an applicant's attempt to show weakness of a term in a mark through citation to a large number of GOOGLE® "hits" because the "hits" lacked sufficient context); *In re King Koil Licensing Co. Inc.*, 79 USPQ2d 1048 (TTAB 2006); *In re Remacle*, 66 USPQ2d 1222, 1223 n.2 (TTAB 2002); *In re Fitch IBCA Inc.*, 64 USPQ2d 1058 (TTAB 2002). The examining attorney should attach copies of the website pages that show how the term is actually used.

As long as it is written in the English language, information originating on foreign websites or in foreign news publications that are accessible to the United States public may be relevant to discern United States consumer impression of a proposed mark. The probative value of such evidence will vary depending upon the context and manner in which the term is used. *In Bayer*, NEXIS® evidence that originated in foreign publications was deemed to be of "some probative value with respect to prospective consumer perception in the United States," the Court noting "the growing availability and use of the internet as a resource for news, medical research results, and general medical information." 82 USPQ2d at 1835. In *Remacle*, the Board held evidence from a website in Great Britain admissible, noting that:

[I]t is reasonable to assume that professionals in medicine, engineering, computers, telecommunications and many other fields are likely to utilize all available resources, regardless of country of origin or medium. Further, the Internet is a resource that is widely available to these same professionals and to the general public in the United States. Particularly in the case before us, involving sophisticated medical technology, it is reasonable to consider a relevant article from an Internet web site, in English, about medical research in another country, Great Britain in this case, because that research is likely to be of interest worldwide regardless of its country of origin.

66 USPQ2d at 1224 n.5. However, the weight given to such evidence may vary depending upon the context and manner in which the term is used. In *King Koil*, the Board gave only "limited probative value" to the contents of websites of commercial entities outside the United States showing use of the term "Breathable" in relation to mattresses and bedding, stating that:

We ... disagree with applicant's essential contention that a general consumer in the United States would not turn to foreign web sites when researching products they may be planning to purchase. Such consumers may visit foreign web sites for informational purposes, even if they are more likely to focus on internet retailers that can easily ship items or make items available for pick up in a store in a location convenient to the purchaser. That would appear especially likely in a case such as this, where the item in question, a mattress, is large and potentially more expensive to ship than a smaller item. Accordingly, while we do not discount entirely the impact of foreign

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

web sites in this case, we find them of much more limited probative value than in the *Remacle* case.

79 USPQ2d at 1050. See also *In re Cell Therapeutics, Inc.*, 67 USPQ2d 1795, 1797-98 (TTAB 2003) (relying on several NEXIS® items from foreign wire services to refuse registration of mark and distinguishing earlier decisions that accorded such evidence little probative value given the sophisticated public and the widespread use of personal computers that increase access to such sources).

With respect to evidence taken from the online Wikipedia® encyclopedia, at www.wikipedia.org, the Board has noted that “[t]here are inherent problems regarding the reliability of Wikipedia entries because Wikipedia is a collaborative website that permits anyone to edit the entries,” and has stated as follows:

[T]he Board will consider evidence taken from Wikipedia so long as the non-offering party has an opportunity to rebut that evidence by submitting other evidence that may call into question the accuracy of the particular Wikipedia information. Our consideration of Wikipedia evidence is with the recognition of the limitations inherent with Wikipedia (e.g., that anyone can edit it and submit intentionally false or erroneous information)....

As a collaborative online encyclopedia, Wikipedia is a secondary source of information or a compilation based on other sources. As recommended by the editors of Wikipedia, the information in a particular article should be corroborated. The better practice with respect to Wikipedia evidence is to corroborate applicant’s Wikipedia evidence....

In re IP Carrier Consulting Group, ___ USPQ2d ___, ___, Serial Nos. 78542726 and 78542734 (TTAB June 18, 2007).

The examining attorney must check applicant’s own website for information about the goods or services. See *In re Promo Ink*, 78 USPQ2d 1301, 1303 (TTAB 2006), where the Board rejected applicant’s argument that it was improper for the examining attorney to rely on evidence obtained from applicant’s website when the application was based on intent-to-use and no specimens were yet required. According to the Board, “The fact that applicant has filed an intent-to-use application does not limit the examining attorney’s evidentiary options, nor does it shield an applicant from producing evidence that it may have in its possession.” See also *In re Reed Elsevier Properties Inc.*, 482 F.3d 1376, 82 USPQ2d 1378 (Fed. Cir. 2007).

When a document found on the Internet is not the original publication, the examining attorney or Trademark Law Library staff should try to obtain a copy of the originally published document, if practicable. Electronic-only documents are considered to be original publications, and scanned images are considered to be copies of original publications. See notice at 64 Fed. Reg. 33056, 33063 (June 21, 1999).

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

See also TBMP §1208.03.

710.01(c) Record Must Be Complete Prior to Appeal

The record in any application must be complete prior to appeal. 37 C.F.R. §2.142(d). Accordingly, if an examining attorney or applicant attempts to introduce new evidence at the time of the appeal, the new evidence will generally be excluded from the record. TBMP §§1207 *et seq.* See *Rexall Drug Co. v. Manhattan Drug Co.*, 284 F.2d 391, 128 USPQ 114 (C.C.P.A. 1960); *In re Psygnosis Ltd.*, 51 USPQ2d 1594 (TTAB 1999). However, the Board may consider evidence submitted after appeal, despite its untimeliness, if the nonoffering party: (1) does not object to the evidence; *and* (2) discusses the evidence or otherwise treats it as being of record. See TBMP §1207.03 and cases cited therein. Therefore, examining attorneys and applicants should either consider or object to new evidence.

Whenever an examining attorney objects to evidence submitted by an applicant, the objection should be raised as soon as possible and continued in the examining attorney's brief, or the Board may consider the objection to be waived. *In re Broyhill Furniture Industries, Inc.*, 60 USPQ2d 1511, 1513 n.3 (TTAB 2001).

If the applicant or examining attorney wishes to introduce new evidence at the time of or during appeal, the party seeking to introduce the new evidence may request the Board to suspend the appeal and remand the case. See TMEP §§1504.05 *et seq.* and TBMP §1207.02 regarding requests for remand.

The Board may take judicial notice of definitions from printed dictionaries, even if they are not made of record by the applicant or examining attorney prior to appeal. *In re Dodd International, Inc.*, 222 USPQ 268 (TTAB 1983); *In re Cannon, Inc.*, 219 USPQ 820 (TTAB 1983); TBMP §1208.04. However, the better practice is to attach the relevant material to ensure that it is in the record. The examining attorney must include a copy of the title page of the dictionary. *In re Gregory*, 70 USPQ2d 1792 (TTAB 2004) (Board declined to take judicial notice of dictionary definitions submitted with examining attorney's appeal brief, where neither the photocopied pages nor the examining attorney's brief specified the dictionaries from which the copies were made).

The Board will not take judicial notice of online dictionary definitions that are not available in printed form, unless the dictionary is readily available and verifiable, due to concerns about the reliability of such material. See *In re Red Bull GmbH*, 78 USPQ2d 1375, 1378 (TTAB 2006), where the Board took judicial notice of the *Encarta Dictionary*, because it was a widely known reference that was readily available in specifically denoted editions via the Internet and CD-ROM, holding that it was "the electronic equivalent of a print publication and applicant may easily verify the excerpt." However, it refused to take judicial notice of a definition excerpted from www.wordsmyth.net, where the source of the definition was not identified on the submitted website excerpt or by the examining attorney and thus could not be

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

verified. See also *In re CyberFinancial.Net, Inc.*, 65 USPQ2d 1789 (TTAB 2002) (Board took judicial notice of online dictionary that was also available in printed form); *In re Total Quality Group Inc.*, 51 USPQ2d 1474 (TTAB 1999) (Board refused to take judicial notice of online dictionary that did not exist in printed format, where the source was unknown and the Board was unsure whether the dictionary was readily available or reliable, stating that the evidence should have been made of record **prior to** appeal, so applicant would have the opportunity to check the reliability of the evidence and offer rebuttal evidence).

710.02 Evidence Indicating No Refusal or Requirement Necessary

It is Office practice to indicate the results of a search for evidence when the examining attorney considers an issue and determines that no action will be taken on it. This information is helpful for internal review. The “Notes-to-the-File” section of the record should be used to reflect the results of a search for evidence in any case where the examining attorney determines that no action is required, but that inclusion of the results of the search would be useful in review and approval of the file. The examining attorney should simply note the parameters and results of the search conducted *without stating any opinions or conclusions*.

For instance, in the case of a search of telephone directories for surnames, the record should indicate only the directories investigated and the number of occurrences of the surname. Or, in the case of a search for the meaning of a term, the record should show the sources checked and whether the term was found. Examining attorneys should provide the same information indicated in TMEP §710.01(a) regarding searches of research databases in this type of case.

Examining attorneys should **not** provide any analysis, opinions, or conclusions regarding the evidence when the examining attorney determines that a refusal or requirement is not appropriate. The examining attorney should not place in the record copies of e-mail messages or other communications between the examining attorney and other USPTO personnel concerning the application. Also, the examining attorney should not refer to any registration or pending application that was considered in a §2(d) search, unless the examining attorney determines that there is a conflict and issues an Office action based on the application or registration. The examining attorney should not place copies of marks not cited under §2(d) in the record.

710.03 Evidence of Third-Party Registrations

The Trademark Trial and Appeal Board does not take judicial notice of registrations, and the submission of a list of registrations does not make these registrations part of the record. *In re Duofold Inc.*, 184 USPQ 638 (TTAB 1974). Furthermore, the submission of a copy of a commercial search report is not proper evidence of third-party registrations. *In re Hub Distributing, Inc.*, 218 USPQ 284 (TTAB 1983).

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

To make registrations of record, soft copies of the registrations or the complete electronic equivalent (*i.e.*, printouts or electronic copies of the registrations taken from the electronic search records of the USPTO) must be submitted. *Raccioppi v. Apogee Inc.*, 47 USPQ2d 1368, 1370 (TTAB 1998); *In re Volvo Cars of North America Inc.*, 46 USPQ2d 1455 (TTAB 1998); *In re Broadway Chicken Inc.*, 38 USPQ2d 1559, 1561 n.6 (TTAB 1996); *In re Smith & Mehaffey*, 31 USPQ2d 1531, 1532 n.3 (TTAB 1994); *Weyerhaeuser Co. v. Katz*, 24 USPQ2d 1230, 1231-32 (TTAB 1992).

If the applicant submits improper evidence of third-party registrations, the examining attorney should object to the evidence in the next Office action, or the Board may consider the objection to be waived. See *In re Broyhill Furniture Industries, Inc.*, 60 USPQ2d 1511, 1513 n.3 (TTAB 2001) (objection to evidence waived where it was not interposed in response to applicant's reliance on listing of third-party registrations in response to initial Office action). If the applicant files an appeal, the examining attorney should continue the objection to the evidence in his or her appeal brief.

See TMEP §1207.01(d)(iii) regarding the relevance of third-party registrations to a determination of likelihood of confusion under 15 U.S.C. §1052(d).

711 Deadline for Response to Office Action

The statutory period for response to an examining attorney's Office action is six months. 15 U.S.C. §1062(b); 37 C.F.R. §2.62. The examining attorney has no discretion to shorten or extend this period. The applicant must file a response within six months of the mailing date of the Office action, unless the examining attorney has issued a supplemental action resetting the period for response. See TMEP §711.02 regarding supplemental Office actions.

To expedite processing, the Office recommends that responses to Office actions be filed through TEAS, at <http://www.uspto.gov/teas/index.html>.

Filing an amendment to allege use does not relieve the applicant of the duty to file a response to an outstanding Office action or to take any other action required in an application. 37 C.F.R. §2.64(c)(1); TMEP §1104.

See TMEP §310 for information about computing the response period; TMEP §§305.02 and 306.05 for certificate of mailing and certificate of facsimile transmission procedures to avoid lateness; and TMEP §§718.02 and 718.03 *et seq.* regarding abandonment for failure to respond to an Office action.

711.01 Time May Run from Previous Action

In some situations the examining attorney's letter does not start the beginning of a statutory response period. For example, a notice that an applicant's response was incomplete (see TMEP §§718.03 *et seq.*), or a notice that an applicant's request for

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

reconsideration of a final action fails to overcome a refusal or satisfy an outstanding requirement (see TMEP §§715.03(a) and (c)), does not begin a new response period. In all cases where the statutory response period runs from the date of a previous Office action, the examining attorney should include a statement to that effect in the Office action, and should omit the six-month response clause.

711.02 Supplemental Office Action Resetting Response Period

Sometimes the examining attorney must issue a supplemental Office action that resets the period for response. If the examining attorney discovers after issuing an action that a refusal or requirement that should have been raised was overlooked, the examining attorney must issue a supplemental Office action addressing the issue and resetting the period for response. See TMEP §706. The examining attorney must also issue a supplemental Office action if a new issue arises after the mailing date of the Office action. For example, a new issue might arise during examination of an amendment to allege use. See TMEP §1104.09(h).

If the examining attorney issues a supplemental Office action, a new six-month response period will begin running from the mailing date of the supplemental action. 15 U.S.C. §1062(b). In a supplemental Office action, the examining attorney should indicate that the action is supplemental to the previous action, and should incorporate all outstanding issues by reference to the previous action. The examining attorney should also include the standard six-month response clause.

In a §66(a) application, the examining attorney cannot issue a new refusal more than 18 months after the date on which the IB forwards the request for extension of protection to the USPTO. See TMEP §1904.03(a).

See TMEP §§717 *et seq.* regarding reissuing of Office actions.

712 Signature on Response to Office Action

A response to an Office action must be signed by a practitioner authorized to practice before the Office pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §10.14, or by the individual applicant or someone with legal authority to bind a juristic applicant. 37 C.F.R. §10.18(a). The examining attorney must review the application record to determine whether the applicant is represented by a practitioner meeting the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §10.14, and must ensure that all responses and amendments are properly signed. See TMEP §§712.01 *et seq.* as to persons who can sign the response. See *also* TMEP §§605 *et seq.* regarding signatures on correspondence filed with USPTO.

The signatory must personally sign his or her name. In a TEAS submission, the person identified as the signer must manually enter the elements of the electronic signature.

See TMEP §804.05 regarding signature of electronically filed documents.

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

712.01 Persons Who Can Sign Response

If an applicant is represented by a practitioner who is authorized to practice before the USPTO under 37 C.F.R. §10.14 (see TMEP §602), the practitioner must sign the response. 37 C.F.R. §10.18(a).

If an applicant is not represented by a practitioner meeting the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §10.14, the response must be signed by someone with legal authority to bind the applicant (e.g., a corporate officer or general partner of a partnership). A person who is authorized to verify facts on behalf of an applicant under 37 C.F.R. §2.33(a)(2) (see TMEP §804.04) is *not* entitled to sign responses to Office actions, or to authorize examiner's amendments and priority actions, unless he or she has legal authority to bind the applicant.

Example: A corporate manager might have the firsthand knowledge and implied authority to act on behalf of the applicant that are required to verify facts under 37 C.F.R. §2.33(a)(2) and still not have legal authority to bind the applicant. See TMEP §712.01(a)(iv) regarding signature of responses filed by corporations.

Under 5 U.S.C. §500(d) and 37 C.F.R. §10.14(e), non-attorneys may not represent a party in a trademark proceeding before the USPTO. Authorizing an amendment to an application, or responding to an Office action, constitutes representation of the applicant in a trademark matter. See TMEP §§602.03 and 605 *et seq.*

See TMEP §§712.01(a) *et seq.* for guidelines on persons who have legal authority to bind various types of applicants.

If a response to an Office action appears to be signed by an unauthorized person (e.g., a foreign attorney who is not licensed to practice before the USPTO or a corporate employee who does not have legal authority to bind the applicant), the examining attorney must treat the response as incomplete and require the applicant to submit a properly signed response. The response cannot be ratified by an examiner's amendment. See TMEP §§602.03, 605.05 *et seq.*, and 712.03.

These same principles apply to authorizations of examiner's amendments and priority actions. If the applicant is represented by a practitioner meeting the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §10.14, the examining attorney must speak to the practitioner. If the applicant is *pro se*, the examining attorney must speak to the individual applicant, or to someone with legal authority to bind a juristic applicant. See TMEP §§707.01 and 708.02.

712.01(a) Guidelines on Who Should Sign Response to Office Action

As noted in TMEP §712.01, if the applicant has an attorney, the attorney must sign the response. 37 C.F.R. §10.18(a). This section provides guidelines for determining who may sign a response to an Office action or authorize an examiner's amendment

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

or priority action on behalf of a juristic applicant who is not represented by an attorney. This section does not apply to verification of an application or other verifications of facts by an applicant. See 37 C.F.R. §2.33(a) and TMEP §804.04 regarding persons who can verify facts on behalf of an applicant.

In all cases, the examining attorney must determine that the record clearly establishes the authority of the signer of the response. See TMEP §605.04 for examples of authorized and potentially unauthorized signatories.

712.01(a)(i) Signature By Joint Applicants

A response to an Office action by joint applicants who are not represented by an attorney must be signed by each of the applicants, since they are individual parties and not a single entity.

See TMEP §§803.03(d) and 804.04 regarding signature of a verification of facts on behalf of joint applicants.

712.01(a)(ii) Signature By Partnership

A response to an Office action by a partnership that is not represented by an attorney must be signed by a general partner of the applicant. Signature by all the general partners is not necessary. If the partnership is comprised of general partners who are juristic entities (*e.g.*, the general partners are corporations), a response to an Office action must be signed by someone with legal authority to bind that type of juristic entity.

In appropriate cases, a response by a partnership may be signed by an official other than a general partner, if the record contains an explanation or documentation indicating that the person signing the response has legal authority to bind the partnership.

712.01(a)(iii) Signature By Joint Venture

A response to an Office action by a joint venture that is not represented by an attorney must be signed by each party to the venture. Although a joint venture has many attributes of a partnership, it is a special partnership, which is very limited in nature and scope. Generally, signature by each party to the joint venture is necessary.

In appropriate cases, a response by a joint venture may be signed by a general manager or other official rather than by each of the joint venturers, if the applicant states that the person who signed the response has legal authority to bind the joint venture under relevant state law.

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

712.01(a)(iv) Signature By Corporation

A response to an Office action by a corporation that is not represented by an attorney must be signed by a corporate officer. An officer is a person who holds an office established in the articles of incorporation or corporate bylaws.

The usual titles for officers are President, Vice-President, Secretary, Treasurer, Chief Executive Officer, Chief Operating Officer, and Chief Financial Officer. In some organizations the Treasurer is called a Comptroller or Controller, and those terms are acceptable. In Maine and Massachusetts the term “Clerk” identifies an officer of a corporation.

Modifications of these basic titles are acceptable if they include the officer title. Titles such as Vice-President for Sales, Executive Vice-President, Assistant Treasurer, Executive Secretary, and Administrative Secretary are acceptable.

The signature of the “Chairman” or “Chairman of the Board of Directors” is also acceptable, but not the signature of an individual director (e.g., the Vice-Chairman of the Board). The terms “Executive Secretary” and “Administrative Secretary” are acceptable because they include the officer-title “Secretary.”

Some titles are generally *not* accepted because they usually do not identify officers. For instance, a General Manager, or any other type of manager, is usually merely an employee, not an officer.

If the applicant states that the person who signed the response is authorized to bind the applicant under the articles of incorporation or bylaws, the examining attorney should accept the signature.

A corporation cannot delegate authority to sign responses to someone who is not a corporate officer. *In re Textron, Inc.*, 183 USPQ 301 (Comm'r Pats. 1974). Therefore, documents purporting to authorize representation, even if signed by officers, will not be accepted as establishing authority of a person who does not have authority to legally bind the applicant under its bylaws or articles of incorporation.

712.01(a)(v) Signature By Foreign Companies and Corporations

There are significant differences between the legal entities established under the laws of the United States and legal entities established and recognized under the laws of foreign countries, and the titles and duties of officers of foreign corporations and companies often differ from those in the United States. In the case of foreign entities that are in the nature of corporations, the USPTO will accept the signature of a person considered to be equivalent to an officer under the law of the foreign country. Indication of a title identifying the signer as a type of officer – such as “Legal Officer” or “Information Officer” – is also sufficient.

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

In foreign countries, a person who holds the title “Manager” or “Director” is normally an officer or the equivalent of an officer.

The term “Procurist” is used in a number of countries to indicate an officer. For British companies, the terms “Registrar” and “Confidential Clerk” are the equivalent of officers.

If the applicant or the applicant’s attorney states that the person who signed the response holds a position within the applicant that is the equivalent of an officer of a United States corporation, the USPTO will accept the signature.

Simply stating that a person has been granted authority to act on behalf of the applicant is insufficient. Documents purporting to authorize representation, even if signed by officers, will not be accepted as establishing the authority of a person who is not the equivalent of an officer. The applicant must state that the signatory has authority to legally bind the applicant under its bylaws or articles of incorporation.

See TMEP §803.03(i) and Appendix D regarding terms used to identify a foreign entity as applicant.

712.01(a)(vi) Signature By Unincorporated Association

For organizations that are less formally organized than corporations (*e.g.*, fraternal societies, unions, unincorporated associations, and governmental bodies), the titles for officers are less standardized. These organizations frequently use more individualistic terms for titles than the terms customarily used by corporations, and the officer positions themselves may not be as clearly or as formally provided for as is the case with corporations. Regardless of how unfamiliar the title is or how informal the position seems to be, the USPTO will accept the signature if the applicant states on the record that the signer has, within the framework of the particular organization, authority equivalent to that of an officer to act on behalf of the organization, *i.e.*, has authority to legally bind the applicant under its bylaws or articles of formation. Some titles that have been accepted are Director, National Director, National Commander, Permanent Chairman, International Sponsor, Supreme Ruler, Royal Impresario, and Chairman of the Steering Committee.

712.01(a)(vii) Signature By Limited Liability Company

A limited liability company has attributes of both a corporation and a partnership. See TMEP §803.03(h). Laws vary to some extent as to the authority conferred on various individuals associated with the limited liability company. Generally, a “manager” has authority equivalent to an officer in a corporation. Therefore, anyone identified as a manager, or equivalent, may sign a response to an Office action on behalf of a limited liability company that is not represented by an attorney. In addition, anyone with a corporate-officer-type title may sign. In some states, the

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

members, who are the owners, also have authority to act on behalf of the limited liability company.

712.01(a)(viii) Signature By Limited Liability Partnership

A limited liability partnership (“LLP”) has attributes of both a partnership and a corporation. See TMEP §803.03(k). Laws vary to some extent as to the authority conferred on various partners associated with the limited liability partnership. Generally, all partners are recognized as having general agency authority to bind the partnership in the ordinary course of business. Therefore, anyone identified as a partner may sign a response to an Office action on behalf of a limited liability partnership that is not represented by an attorney.

Many states provide for the filing of a Statement of Partnership Authority which specifically names partners having authority and/or limits the authority of certain individuals. If an individual who is not a named partner of the LLP has been recognized as having authority to bind the LLP, that person may sign a response to an Office action, and should indicate their position as an individual designated in the LLP’s Statement of Partnership Authority.

712.02 Unsigned Response

A response to an Office action must be signed by a practitioner authorized to practice before the Office pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §10.14, or by the individual applicant or someone with legal authority to bind a juristic applicant. See 37 C.F.R. §10.18(a); TMEP §§605.02 and 712. The examining attorney should treat an unsigned response as an incomplete response, and should either call the applicant to obtain permission to enter an examiner’s amendment from an authorized party (if appropriate), or issue a notice of incomplete response granting the applicant additional time to perfect the response, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §2.65(b). See TMEP §718.03(b). If the response does not require a verification that must be signed by the applicant (see TMEP §§804 *et seq.*), the applicant’s attorney or a person with legal authority to bind the applicant may either request that the amendment(s) be entered through an examiner’s amendment, or submit a properly signed copy of the response. If the response requires a verification that must be signed by the applicant, the applicant must submit a signed verification. A duplicate of the original response can be submitted through TEAS (using the response to Office action form) or a properly signed copy of the original document can be submitted by fax (unless it is excluded by 37 C.F.R. §2.195(c)). The examining attorney must defer action on the merits of the response until the applicant files a properly signed response. In a TEAS Plus application, the applicant must file the response through TEAS, or the applicant will lose TEAS Plus status (see TMEP §819.02(b)).

If an applicant fails to submit a properly signed response within the time granted under 37 C.F.R. §2.65(b), the examining attorney must hold the application abandoned for failure to file a complete response. See TMEP §718.03(a). In this

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

situation, the applicant cannot file a petition to revive under 37 C.F.R. §2.66. The applicant's recourse is to file a petition to the Director to reverse the examining attorney's holding of abandonment under 37 C.F.R. §2.146. See TMEP §1713.

712.03 Response Signed by an Unauthorized Person

Notice of Incomplete Response. A response to an Office action must be signed by a practitioner authorized to practice before the Office pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §10.14 (see TMEP §§602 *et seq.*), or by the individual applicant or someone with legal authority to bind a juristic applicant. 37 C.F.R. §10.18; TMEP §§605.02 and 712. When it appears that a response to an Office action was signed by an improper party (e.g., a foreign attorney who is not licensed to practice before the USPTO or a corporate employee who does not have legal authority to bind the applicant), the examining attorney must treat the response as an incomplete response. The examining attorney must issue a notice of incomplete response granting the applicant additional time to perfect the response, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §2.65(b) (see TMEP §718.03(b)), and send the notice to the correspondence address of record. See TMEP §605.05(a). The examining attorney should defer action on the merits of the response until a properly signed response is filed.

Applicant's Reply to Notice of Incomplete Response. If the person who signed the response was authorized to sign, the applicant's reply to the notice of incomplete response should state the nature of the relationship of the signer to the applicant. If the signer has legal authority to bind the applicant, the person should so state, and should set forth his or her title or position. If the signer is an attorney authorized to practice before the USPTO pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §10.14(a), the attorney should identify him or herself as an attorney and indicate the United States state bar of which he or she is a member in good standing. If the signer meets the requirements of either §10.14(b) or (c), the person should explain how he or she meets these requirements. See TMEP §605.05(b) for further information.

If the person who signed the response is not an authorized signer, and all proposed amendments in the improperly signed response can be resolved by an examiner's amendment, a person with legal authority to bind the applicant may telephone the examiner to authorize such an amendment. Otherwise, the applicant must submit a response signed by someone with legal authority to bind the applicant (see TMEP §§712.01 *et seq.*), or by a practitioner meeting the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §10.14. This should be done through TEAS (using the response to Office action form), or may be done by fax (unless it is excluded by 37 C.F.R. §2.195(d)). In a TEAS Plus application, the applicant must file the response through TEAS, or the applicant will lose TEAS Plus status (see TMEP §819.02(b)). See TMEP §804.05 regarding signature of documents submitted through TEAS. When a response is signed by an unauthorized party, it is not acceptable for the applicant to ratify the response through an examiner's amendment.

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

Unsatisfactory Response or No Response. If no acceptable response is received within the time granted under 37 C.F.R. §2.65(b), the examining attorney must hold the application abandoned for failure to file a complete response. See TMEP §718.03(a). In this situation, the applicant cannot file a petition to revive under 37 C.F.R. §2.66. The applicant's recourse is to file a petition to the Director to reverse the examining attorney's holding of abandonment under 37 C.F.R. §2.146. See TMEP §1713.

713 Examination of Amendments and Responses to Office Actions

37 C.F.R. §2.63. Reexamination.

(a) After response by the applicant, the application will be reexamined or reconsidered. If registration is again refused or any formal requirement[s] is repeated, but the examiner's action is not stated to be final, the applicant may respond again.

(b) After reexamination the applicant may respond by filing a timely petition to the Director for relief from a formal requirement if: (1) The requirement is repeated, but the examiner's action is not made final, and the subject matter of the requirement is appropriate for petition to the Director (see §2.146(b)); or (2) the examiner's action is made final and such action is limited to subject matter appropriate for petition to the Director. If the petition is denied, the applicant shall have until six months from the date of the Office action which repeated the requirement or made it final or thirty days from the date of the decision on the petition, whichever date is later, to comply with the requirement. A formal requirement which is the subject of a petition decided by the Director may not subsequently be the subject of an appeal to the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board.

The examining attorney will consider the applicant's response and will determine whether the mark may be approved for publication or registration. The examining attorney must carefully consider all arguments, comments, and amendments made or proposed by the applicant.

If the applicant's response has put the application in condition for approval for publication for opposition or registration on the Supplemental Register, the examining attorney will approve the application for publication or registration, as appropriate.

If the applicant's response has not put the application in condition for publication or registration, the examining attorney will issue an Office action, or call or e-mail the applicant, depending on the circumstances. If the examining attorney's action is not stated to be final, the applicant may respond again, within six months of the mailing date. This procedure may be repeated until the examining attorney's action is made final or until the applicant fails to properly respond to the examining attorney's action. 15 U.S.C. §1062(b).

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

If the applicant's response does not present any new issues, and the applicant has had an opportunity to reply to all points raised by the examining attorney, the examining attorney's next action should be stated to be final. See TMEP §§714 *et seq.*

If the examining attorney has cited a prior-filed conflicting application, and the applicant responds by arguing that there is no likelihood of confusion, the examining attorney should suspend the application pending disposition of the conflicting application, if applicant's arguments are not persuasive. See TMEP §716.02(c) regarding suspension pending disposition of an earlier-filed conflicting application, TMEP §716.03 regarding the applicant's request to remove an application from suspension, and TMEP §§1208 *et seq.* regarding conflicting marks in pending applications.

713.01 Previous Action by Different Examining Attorney

When assigned to act on an application that was previously handled by a different examining attorney, the examining attorney should not take an approach that is entirely different from that of the previous examining attorney, unless it is clearly appropriate to do so.

713.02 Noting All Outstanding Requirements

When acting on an amended application, the examining attorney should note all outstanding refusals and requirements in every Office action. The examining attorney should indicate whether particular refusals or requirements are withdrawn or whether the applicant's response is acceptable, where appropriate.

To prevent any misunderstanding, every refusal or requirement in the prior action that is still outstanding must be repeated or referred to. Even when suspending action on an application, the examining attorney should note all outstanding refusals or requirements.

713.03 Response to Applicant's Arguments

When the applicant submits arguments attempting to overcome a refusal or requirement, the examining attorney should respond to the applicant's arguments.

714 Final Action

37 C.F.R. §2.64. Final action.

(a) On the first or any subsequent reexamination or reconsideration the refusal of the registration or the insistence upon a requirement may be stated to be final, whereupon applicant's response is limited to an appeal, or to a compliance with any requirement, or to a petition to the Director if permitted by §2.63(b).

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

(b) During the period between a final action and expiration of the time for filing an appeal, the applicant may request the examiner to reconsider the final action. The filing of a request for reconsideration will not extend the time for filing an appeal or petitioning the Director, but normally the examiner will reply to a request for reconsideration before the end of the six-month period if the request is filed within three months after the date of the final action. Amendments accompanying requests for reconsideration after final action will be entered if they comply with the rules of practice in trademark cases and the Act of 1946.

(c)(1) If an applicant in an application under §1(b) of the Act files an amendment to allege use under §2.76 during the six-month response period after issuance of a final action, the examiner shall examine the amendment. The filing of such an amendment will not extend the time for filing an appeal or petitioning the Director.

(2) If the amendment to allege use under §2.76 is acceptable in all respects, the applicant will be notified of its acceptance.

(3) If, as a result of the examination of the amendment to allege use under §2.76, the applicant is found not entitled to registration for any reason not previously stated, applicant will be notified and advised of the reasons and of any formal requirements or refusals. The Trademark Examining Attorney shall withdraw the final action previously issued and shall incorporate all unresolved refusals or requirements previously stated in the new non-final action.

714.01 Not Permissible on First Action

A first action by an examining attorney may not be made final. An applicant is entitled to at least one opportunity to reply to any issue raised by the examining attorney.

714.02 Not Permissible on Suspension

A letter of suspension cannot be made final. See TMEP §§716 *et seq.* regarding suspension.

714.03 When Final Action is Appropriate

Final action is appropriate when a clear issue has been developed between the examining attorney and the applicant, *i.e.*, the examining attorney has previously raised all outstanding issues and the applicant has had an opportunity to respond to them.

For a second action to be made final, all requirements or refusals must have been made in the first action. No refusal or requirement may be made final, even if it is a repeated refusal or requirement, unless the entire action is made final. Thus, if the examining attorney makes a new refusal or requirement in a second or subsequent action, a repeated refusal or requirement may not be made final.

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

In a §44(d) application, the examining attorney may not issue a final action until the applicant submits a copy of the foreign registration. When the application is otherwise in condition for final refusal, the examining attorney should suspend action on the application pending receipt of a copy of the foreign registration. The notice of suspension should indicate all outstanding refusals or requirements that will be made final upon receipt of the foreign registration if no new issues are raised. See TMEP §§716.02(b) and 1003.04.

Second actions should be final actions whenever possible. While an applicant is entitled to a full and fair hearing, it is in the interest of the public that prosecution be limited to as few actions as is consistent with proper examination. Neither the Act nor the rules of practice give an applicant the right to an extended prosecution.

See TMEP §§714.05 *et seq.* for further discussion of when an examining attorney should issue a nonfinal action rather than a final action, and TMEP §714.06 regarding final actions that are premature.

714.04 Form of the Final Action

When making an action final, the examining attorney should restate any requirements or refusals that remain outstanding, and should cite the rule(s) and/or statute(s) that provide the basis for these refusals or requirements. The examining attorney should place all evidence in support of his or her refusal in the record at the time the final action is issued.

The final action should include a clear and unequivocal statement that the refusal or requirement is final. When there is more than one ground set out as the basis for the final action, the action may conclude with a paragraph containing wording such as “This action is made FINAL” or “This is a FINAL action,” which covers all grounds.

The final action should also mention any refusals or requirements that have been withdrawn.

The examining attorney must include a statement that the only proper response to a final action is an appeal (or a petition, if permitted under 37 C.F.R. §2.63(b)), or compliance with an outstanding requirement. 37 C.F.R. §2.64(a).

A final action must include a six-month response clause (see TMEP §705.08) so that is it clear that the applicant must file a timely response to avoid abandonment of the application.

714.05 Delineating New Issues Requiring Issuance of Nonfinal Action

It is sometimes difficult to determine what constitutes a new issue requiring a new nonfinal action, rather than a final action, after receipt of a response. See TMEP §§714.05(a) through 714.05(d) regarding the propriety of issuing a final action in

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

specific situations, and TMEP §§715.03(b) and 715.04(b) regarding new issues presented in a request for reconsideration of an examining attorney's final action.

In a §66(a) application, the examining attorney cannot issue a new refusal more than 18 months after date on which the IB forwards the request for extension of protection to the USPTO. See TMEP §1904.03(a).

714.05(a) Unacceptable Amendment Proposed By Applicant

Generally, an amendment that is unacceptable raises a new issue requiring a nonfinal action, unless the amendment is a direct response to a previous requirement.

If an amendment was not offered in direct response to a requirement, and the amendment is not acceptable, the examining attorney generally must issue a new, nonfinal action addressing the issues raised by the amendment and continuing all other refusals and requirements. The following are examples of amendments that would require a new nonfinal action:

- (1) Amendments to the drawing, unless the examining attorney had previously required that the drawing be amended;
- (2) Amendments to the Supplemental Register and amendments to assert acquired distinctiveness under 15 U.S.C. §1052(f), unless the amendment is irrelevant to an outstanding refusal (see TMEP §714.05(a)(i));
- (3) Amendments to disclaim the entire mark (see TMEP §1213.06);
- (4) Amendments to the drawing that materially alter the mark, if the examining attorney had required a new drawing because the original drawing was of poor quality that could not be reproduced, but had not previously raised the issue of material alteration. See TMEP §714.05(c) regarding advisory statements.

However, evidence or amendments that are merely cumulative and are not significantly different from material previously submitted do *not* raise a new issue that requires the examining attorney to issue a nonfinal action. See *In re GTE Education Services*, 34 USPQ2d 1478 (Comm'r Pats. 1994) (examining attorney properly determined that no new issue had been raised in request for reconsideration of final refusal based on inadequate specimens, where the substitute specimens submitted with the request were deficient for same reason as the original specimens). Generally, the examining attorney may issue a final action if the same refusal or requirement was made before.

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

714.05(a)(i) Amendment to Supplemental Register or Submission of Claim of Acquired Distinctiveness

If registration is refused under §2(e)(1), §2(e)(2), or §2(e)(4) of the Trademark Act, 15 U.S.C. §1052(e)(1), §1052(e)(2), or §1052(e)(4), or on grounds pertaining to other non-inherently distinctive subject matter (e.g., product or container configurations (see TMEP §§1202.02(b)(i) and (ii)), color marks (see TMEP §§1202.05 *et seq.*), or marks that comprise matter that is purely ornamental (see TMEP §§1202.03 *et seq.*)), an amendment to the Supplemental Register or to claim acquired distinctiveness under 15 U.S.C. §1052(f) presents a new issue. This is true even if the examining attorney previously issued an advisory statement indicating that the examining attorney believed the mark to be unregistrable on the Supplemental Register or under §2(f).

If the examining attorney determines that the amendment does not overcome the refusal, the examining attorney should issue a nonfinal refusal of registration. See TMEP §816.04 regarding refusal of registration after an amendment to the Supplemental Register, and TMEP §1212.02(h) regarding refusal of registration after an applicant submits a claim of acquired distinctiveness under §2(f).

However, if the amendment is irrelevant to an outstanding refusal, the examining attorney may issue a final refusal or requirement. For example, if registration is refused under §2(a) (see TMEP §§1203 *et seq.*), §2(b) (see TMEP §1204), §2(d) (see TMEP §§1207 *et seq.*), §2(e)(3) (see TMEP §1210.01(b)), or §2(e)(5) (see TMEP §§1202.02(a) *et seq.*) of the Trademark Act, an amendment to the Supplemental Register or a claim of distinctiveness under §2(f) does *not* raise a new issue, and the examining attorney may issue a final refusal. See *In re Juleigh Jeans Sportswear Inc.*, 24 USPQ2d 1694, 1696 (TTAB 1992) (amendment to the Supplemental Register in response to a refusal of registration under §2(a) does not raise a new issue). Likewise, in a request for extension of protection of an international registration to the United States under §66(a) of the Trademark Act, an amendment to the Supplemental Register does not raise a new issue. A mark in a §66(a) application cannot be registered on the Supplemental Register. Section 68(a)(4) of the Trademark Act, 15 U.S.C. §1141h(a)(4). Thus, an amendment to the Supplemental Register cannot overcome the refusal.

Exception: An amendment to the Supplemental Register in a §1(b) application for which no allegation of use has been filed does raise a new issue, because the examining attorney must refuse registration under §23 of the Trademark Act, 15 U.S.C. §1091, on the ground that the mark is not in lawful use in commerce. 37 C.F.R. §2.75(b); TMEP §1102.03. In this situation, if the applicant files a proper amendment to allege use or statement of use, the examining attorney will consider the amendment to the Supplemental Register.

See TMEP §§715.03(b) and 715.04(b) regarding new issues presented in a request for reconsideration of an examining attorney's final action.

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

714.05(a)(ii) Amendment of Identification of Goods and Services

If the applicant responds to a nonfinal Office action requiring an amendment to the identification of goods and services, and the examining attorney determines that the identification is still unacceptable, generally the examining attorney must issue a final requirement to amend the identification of goods and services. There are only two exceptions to this rule:

- (1) If the amended identification is broader in scope than the original identification, *and* the prior Office action failed to advise the applicant that amendments broadening the identification are prohibited under 37 C.F.R. §2.71(a), the examining attorney cannot issue a final Office action.
- (2) If the amended identification sets forth goods and services in multiple classes, but the applicant has not submitted all the requirements for a multiple-class application (*e.g.*, specimens and fees for all classes), *and* the prior Office action failed to advise the applicant that the missing elements were required, the examining attorney cannot issue a final Office action. See TMEP §§1403 *et seq.* regarding multiple-class applications.

If the examining attorney issues a *nonfinal* action requiring amendment of the identification because it is indefinite, and the applicant responds with an amended identification that is definite, but is otherwise unacceptable (*e.g.*, because it includes a registered trademark or service mark (see TMEP §1402.09)), this is not considered a new issue, and the examining attorney must issue a final Office action requiring amendment of the identification. However, if the examining attorney issues a *final* action requiring amendment of the identification because it is indefinite, and the applicant responds with an amended identification that is definite but is otherwise unacceptable (*e.g.*, because it includes a registered mark), the examining attorney should treat the response as incomplete, and grant the applicant additional time to cure this deficiency, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §2.65(b). See TMEP §718.03(b) for further information about granting an applicant additional time to perfect an incomplete response. *Examining attorneys are encouraged to try to resolve these issues by examiner's amendment.*

714.05(b) Section 2(d) Refusal Based on Prior-Filed Application That Has Matured Into Registration

The examining attorney must issue a nonfinal action when first refusing registration under §2(d) of the Trademark Act, 15 U.S.C. §1052(d), even if the applicant had been advised of the existence of the prior-filed application before it matured into the registration on which the refusal is based.

In a §66(a) application, a nonfinal refusal under §2(d) of the Act may be issued more than 18 months after the date on which the IB forwards the request for extension of protection to the USPTO, provided that the USPTO had notified the IB of the conflicting application prior to expiration of the 18-month period.

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

714.05(c) Advisory Statement Cannot Serve as Foundation for Final Refusal or Requirement

Except as provided in TMEP §714.05(a)(ii), an advisory statement in an Office action indicating that a refusal or requirement will be issued if specified circumstances arise cannot serve as the foundation for issuing a final requirement or refusal in the next action. To establish the foundation for issuing a final refusal or requirement in the next Office action, an initial requirement or refusal must relate to matter that is of record at the time of the action.

714.05(d) Submission of Consent Agreement or Assertion of Unity of Control in Response to §2(d) Refusal

Consent Agreement. If an applicant files a consent agreement in response to a *nonfinal* refusal under §2(d) of the Trademark Act, and the examining attorney finds the consent agreement insufficient to overcome the refusal, the examining attorney should issue a final refusal, assuming the application is otherwise in condition for final refusal.

If an applicant files a consent agreement in response to a *final* refusal under §2(d) of the Trademark Act, and the examining attorney finds the consent agreement insufficient to overcome the refusal, the examining attorney should issue a *new final* refusal. However, the examining attorney should not issue a new final refusal if the applicant merely states that it is negotiating a consent agreement.

Assertion of Unity of Control. If an applicant asserts unity of control (see TMEP §§1201.07 *et seq.*) in response to a *nonfinal* refusal under §2(d), and the examining attorney determines that unity of control has not been established, the examining attorney should issue a final refusal, assuming that the application is otherwise in condition for final refusal.

If an applicant asserts unity of control in response to a *final* refusal under §2(d), and the examining attorney determines that unity of control has not been established, the examining attorney should issue a *new final* refusal.

714.06 Applicant's Recourse When Final Action is Premature

If an applicant believes that a refusal to register or a requirement has been made final prematurely, the applicant must raise the issue while the application is still pending before the examining attorney. It is not a ground for appeal to the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board. TBMP §1201.02. The applicant may raise the matter by filing a request for reconsideration with the examining attorney, or by contacting the managing attorney or senior attorney in the examining attorney's law office. If the examining attorney does not withdraw the finality, the applicant may file a petition to the Director under 37 C.F.R. §2.146. See TMEP Chapter 1700 regarding petitions.

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

If, on request for reconsideration, the examining attorney finds the final action to have been premature, the examining attorney should issue a new nonfinal action.

715 Action After Issuance of Final Action

715.01 Proper Response to Final Action

An applicant must respond to a final action within six months of the mailing date. 15 U.S.C. §1062(b); 37 C.F.R. §2.62.

In general, the only proper response to a final action is a notice of appeal, a petition if permitted under 37 C.F.R. §2.63(b)(2), or compliance with an outstanding requirement. 37 C.F.R. §2.64(a).

After a final refusal to register on the Principal Register, an amendment requesting registration on the Supplemental Register or registration on the Principal Register under §2(f) of the Trademark Act may be a proper response in some circumstances. See TMEP §§714.05(a)(i), 816.04 and 1212.02(h).

715.02 Action After Final Action

Once an action has been properly made final, the examining attorney normally should not change his or her position. However, this does not mean that an applicant's amendment or argument will not be considered after final action. An amendment may be accepted and entered if it places the application in condition for publication or registration, or will put the application in better form for appeal (*i.e.*, reduce the issues on appeal). For example, an amendment requesting registration on the Supplemental Register or on the Principal Register under §2(f) may be a proper response to a final refusal of registration on the Principal Register in some circumstances. See TMEP §§714.05(a)(i), 816.04, and 1212.02(h).

If the examining attorney believes that an examiner's amendment (see TMEP §§707 *et seq.*) will immediately put the application in condition for publication or registration, or reduce the issues on appeal, the examining attorney should issue an examiner's amendment.

If the applicant files a response that complies with all outstanding requirements and overcomes all outstanding refusals, the examining attorney should approve the application for publication or registration, as appropriate.

The applicant may request reconsideration after final action, within six months of the mailing date of the final action. However, filing a request for reconsideration does *not* extend the time for filing an appeal or other proper response to the final action. 37 C.F.R. §2.64(b).

See TMEP §716.06 regarding suspension after final action.

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

715.03 Request for Reconsideration After Final Action

Under 37 C.F.R. §2.64(b), the applicant may file a request for reconsideration before the deadline for filing an appeal.

However, filing a request for reconsideration does *not* extend the deadline for appeal. 37 C.F.R. §2.64(b); TMEP §715.03(c). The USPTO cannot extend the statutory deadline for filing an appeal. 15 U.S.C. §1062(b); 37 C.F.R. §2.142(a). Therefore, if an applicant files a request for reconsideration of a final action and wants to preserve the right to appeal if the request is unsuccessful, the applicant must file a notice of appeal (with the fee required by 37 C.F.R. §2.6) before the expiration of the six-month period for response to the final action or the application will be abandoned. See TMEP §§715.04 *et seq.* for information about processing a request for reconsideration filed with a notice of appeal. If the request for reconsideration is unsuccessful, and the applicant has not timely filed a notice of appeal, the application will be abandoned for incomplete response. 15 U.S.C. §1062(b); 37 C.F.R. §2.65(a).

The examining attorney should construe any paper filed after final action which responds to the outstanding refusal(s) or requirement(s) as a request for reconsideration. When responding to a request for reconsideration, the examining attorney must issue a written action that advises the applicant of the status of the application. The Office action should discuss any new evidence submitted with a request for reconsideration.

Regardless of whether an applicant submits new evidence with a request for reconsideration, the examining attorney may introduce additional evidence directed to the issue(s) for which reconsideration is sought. TBMP §1207.04. See *In re Giger*, 78 USPQ2d 1405 (TTAB 2006). If the evidence is significantly different from the evidence currently of record, the examining attorney must issue a new, subsequent final action with a six-month response clause.

In determining the appropriate action to take upon receipt of a request for reconsideration, the examining attorney must determine whether: (1) the applicant has timely filed a notice of appeal; and (2) the request for reconsideration presents a new issue. See TMEP §§715.03(a), 715.03(b), and 715.04 *et seq.* for further information as to how examining attorneys should handle requests for reconsideration.

715.03(a) Examining Attorney's Action When No New Issue is Presented in Request for Reconsideration and No Notice of Appeal Has Been Filed

If an examining attorney is not persuaded by the request for reconsideration and no new issues have been raised, the examining attorney should deny the request. See TMEP §715.03(b) regarding requests for reconsideration that raise a new issue, and

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

TMEP §§715.04 *et seq.* regarding requests for reconsideration filed in conjunction with a notice of appeal.

If there is time remaining in the response period, the examining attorney must issue an action continuing the final refusal that: acknowledges the request for reconsideration; indicates that it is denied; restates the final refusal; and advises the applicant that the time for appeal runs from the mailing date of the final Office action. The examining attorney should advise the applicant that the applicant has the remainder of the response period to comply with any outstanding requirement and/or to notice an appeal. The Office action should *not* include a six-month response clause (see TMEP §705.08).

If the six-month period for response to the final action has expired, and the applicant has not timely filed a notice of appeal, the examining attorney should issue an Office action indicating that the request for reconsideration is denied and the application is abandoned due to an incomplete response. 15 U.S.C. §1062(b); 37 C.F.R. §2.65(a).

If the examining attorney denies the request for reconsideration and holds the application abandoned, the applicant may file a petition to the Director under 37 C.F.R. §2.146 to reverse the examining attorney's holding of abandonment. However, the Director will reverse the examining attorney's action on petition only if there is clear error or abuse of discretion. *In re GTE Education Services*, 34 USPQ2d 1478 (Comm'r Pats. 1994); *In re Legendary, Inc.*, 26 USPQ2d 1478 (Comm'r Pats. 1992). See TMEP §1713. The unintentional delay standard of 37 C.F.R. §2.66 does not apply in this situation. See TMEP §1714.01(f)(ii).

If the request for reconsideration convinces the examining attorney that a refusal or requirement should be withdrawn, the examining attorney may withdraw the refusal or requirement and approve the application for publication or registration, if it is in condition for such action.

If the applicant makes a good faith but incomplete attempt to comply with all outstanding requirements and to overcome all outstanding refusals, the examining attorney has discretion under 37 C.F.R. §2.65(b) to issue an action that continues the final action and gives the applicant additional time to resolve the matters that remain outstanding. See TMEP §718.03(b). This should be done *only* if the record indicates that the applicant can place the application in condition for approval by completing the response. If the examining attorney grants the applicant additional time to complete a response under 37 C.F.R. §2.65(b), the deadline for appeal is *not* extended. 15 U.S.C. §1062(b); 37 C.F.R. §2.142(a).

If the examining attorney believes that an examiner's amendment (see TMEP §§707 *et seq.*) will immediately put the application in condition for publication or registration, the examining attorney should issue an examiner's amendment.

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

715.03(b) Examining Attorney's Action When New Issue or New Evidence is Presented in Request for Reconsideration and No Notice of Appeal Has Been Filed

If the request for reconsideration includes an amendment that presents a new issue, the examining attorney must issue a nonfinal or a new final action. For example, in the case of an amendment that asserts a claim of acquired distinctiveness under §2(f) for the first time, or an amendment to the Supplemental Register for the first time, but fails to place the application in condition for approval, a nonfinal action may be appropriate. See TMEP §714.05(a)(i).

When the examining attorney issues a *nonfinal* action after review of the applicant's request for reconsideration, the Office action should explain that the applicant must respond to all requirements or refusals within six months of the mailing date of the action, but that the applicant should not file an appeal because an appeal would be premature under 15 U.S.C. §1070 and 37 C.F.R. §2.141.

Evidence or amendments that are merely cumulative and are not significantly different from material previously submitted do *not* raise a new issue that requires the examining attorney to issue a new final or nonfinal action. *In re GTE Education Services*, 34 USPQ2d 1478 (Comm'r Pats. 1994) (examining attorney properly determined that no new issue had been raised in request for reconsideration of final refusal based on inadequate specimens, where the substitute specimens submitted with the request were deficient for the same reason as original specimens).

If the request for reconsideration does not raise a new issue, but presents new evidence that is significantly different from evidence previously submitted, the examining attorney should issue a new final action.

Example: If an applicant files a consent agreement in response to a final refusal under §2(d) of the Trademark Act, and the examining attorney finds the consent agreement insufficient to overcome the refusal, the examining attorney must issue a new *final* refusal. However, the examining attorney should not issue a new final refusal if the applicant merely states that it is negotiating a consent agreement. See TMEP §714.05(d).

Example: The examining attorney should issue a new *final* refusal if the applicant asserts unity of control (see TMEP §§1201.07 *et seq.*) in response to a final refusal under §2(d), and the examining attorney determines that unity of control has not been established. See TMEP §714.05(d).

Submission of new arguments in response to the same refusal or requirement does not raise a new issue that requires the examining attorney to issue a new final or nonfinal action. Generally, if the same refusal or requirement was made before, the examining attorney does not have to issue a new final or nonfinal action.

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

See TMEP §§714.05 *et seq.* for further information about delineating new issues that require issuance of a nonfinal action.

When an application has been suspended after final action, and the grounds for refusal remain operative after the application is removed from suspension and no new issues have been raised, the examining attorney must issue a new, subsequent *final* action. See TMEP §716.06.

In a §66(a) application, the examining attorney cannot issue a new refusal more than 18 months after the date the IB forwards the request for extension of protection to the USPTO. See TMEP §1904.03(a).

715.03(c) Time for Appeal Runs from Mailing Date of Final Action

Filing a request for reconsideration does not stay the time for responding to a final refusal. 15 U.S.C. §1062(b); 37 C.F.R. §2.142(a). If the examining attorney denies an applicant's request for reconsideration, the deadline for appeal runs from the mailing date of the final action. If this deadline has expired and the applicant has not filed a notice of appeal, the application will be abandoned due to an incomplete response. 15 U.S.C. §1062(b); 37 C.F.R. §2.65(a). The applicant may not file a petition to revive under the unintentional delay standard of 37 C.F.R. §2.66. See TMEP §1714.01(f)(ii). The applicant's recourse is to file a petition to the Director under 37 C.F.R. §2.146 to reverse the examining attorney's holding of abandonment. However, the Director will reverse the examining attorney's action on petition only if there is clear error or abuse of discretion. See TMEP §1713.

715.04 Request for Reconsideration Filed in Conjunction With Notice of Appeal

If an applicant files a notice of appeal with a request for reconsideration, the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board will acknowledge the appeal, suspend further proceedings with respect to the appeal, including the applicant's time to file an appeal brief, and remand the application to the examining attorney for review of the request for reconsideration. TBMP §1204. See TMEP §§1501 *et seq.* and TBMP Chapter 1200 for further information about *ex parte* appeals.

If, upon remand, the examining attorney determines that the outstanding refusal or requirement should be withdrawn, the examining attorney may approve the application for publication or registration. In this situation, the appeal is moot. If there are remaining unresolved refusals, the Board should be notified to resume the appeal.

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

715.04(a) Examining Attorney's Action Denying Reconsideration of Final Action When Notice of Appeal Has Been Filed

If the examining attorney is not persuaded by the request for reconsideration, and no new issue is presented therein, the examining attorney should issue an Office action that acknowledges the request for reconsideration and indicates that it is denied, restates the final refusal(s), and advises the applicant that the Board will be notified to resume the appeal. An Office action denying reconsideration of the final action should *not* include a six-month response clause.

715.04(b) Examining Attorney's Action When New Issue or New Evidence is Presented and Notice of Appeal Has Been Filed

If the request for reconsideration includes an amendment that presents a new issue, the examining attorney must issue a new nonfinal Office action with a six-month response clause. For example, in the case of an amendment that asserts a claim of acquired distinctiveness under §2(f) for the first time, or an amendment to the Supplemental Register for the first time, but fails to place the application in condition for approval, a nonfinal action may be appropriate. See TMEP §714.05(a)(i).

If the request for reconsideration does not raise a new issue, but presents new evidence that is significantly different from evidence previously submitted, the examining attorney must issue a new final action. For example, if an applicant files a consent agreement in response to a final refusal under §2(d) of the Trademark Act, and the examining attorney finds the consent agreement insufficient to overcome the refusal, the examining attorney must issue a new *final* refusal that discusses applicant's new evidence. However, the examining attorney should not issue a new final refusal if the applicant merely states that it is negotiating a consent agreement. See TMEP §714.05(d).

When the examining attorney issues a new action, the Office action should explain that the applicant must respond to all requirements or refusals within six months of the mailing date of the action and that the appeal will remain suspended while the application is on remand.

Evidence or amendments that are merely cumulative and are not significantly different from material previously submitted do *not* raise a new issue that requires the examining attorney to issue a new action. *In re GTE Education Services*, 34 USPQ2d 1478 (Comm'r Pats. 1994) (examining attorney properly determined that no new issue had been raised in request for reconsideration of final refusal based on inadequate specimens, where the substitute specimens submitted with the request were deficient for the same reason as the original specimens).

Submission of new arguments in response to the same refusal or requirement does not raise a new issue that requires the examining attorney to issue a new action. Generally, if the same refusal or requirement was made before, the examining attorney may issue an Office action denying reconsideration of the final action.

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

See TMEP §§714.05 *et seq.* for further information about delineating new issues that require issuance of a nonfinal action.

When an application has been suspended after final action, and the grounds for refusal remain operative after the application is removed from suspension and no new issues have been raised, the examining attorney must issue a new, subsequent *final* action. See TMEP §716.06.

In a §66(a) application, the examining attorney cannot issue a new refusal more than 18 months after the date the IB forwards the request for extension of protection to the USPTO. See TMEP §1904.03(a).

716 Suspension of Action by Office

37 C.F.R. §2.67. Suspension of action by the Patent and Trademark Office.

Action by the Patent and Trademark Office may be suspended for a reasonable time for good and sufficient cause. The fact that a proceeding is pending before the Patent and Trademark Office or a court which is relevant to the issue of registrability of the applicant's mark, or the fact that the basis for registration is, under the provisions of Section 44(e) of the Act, registration of the mark in a foreign country and the foreign application is still pending, will be considered prima facie good and sufficient cause. An applicant's request for a suspension of action under this section filed within the 6-month response period (see §2.62) may be considered responsive to the previous Office action. The first suspension is within the discretion of the Examiner of Trademarks and any subsequent suspension must be approved by the Director.

The term “suspension of action” means suspending action *by the examining attorney*. It does not mean suspending or extending an applicant's time to respond. The Trademark Act requires that an applicant respond within six months of an examining attorney's Office action, and the examining attorney has no discretion to suspend or extend the time for the applicant's response. 15 U.S.C. §1062(b).

The examining attorney should suspend an application only after all issues have been resolved or are in condition for final action, except the matter on which suspension is based.

716.01 Form of Suspension Notice

In a suspension notice, the examining attorney must specifically state that action is suspended and must omit any reference to a six-month response period. The examining attorney should also inform the applicant of the status of the application, *i.e.*, that the mark appears to be otherwise entitled to be approved for publication or issue, or that the application is in condition for a final action.

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

If the application is in condition for a final action but for the matter necessitating suspension, the notice of suspension should clearly indicate which refusal(s) or requirement(s) will be made final when the application is removed from suspension. When the application is removed from suspension, the examining attorney should promptly issue a final action, assuming that no new issues have arisen.

716.02 Circumstances Under Which Action May Be Suspended

Under 37 C.F.R. §2.67, an examining attorney has the discretion to suspend an application “for good and sufficient cause.” The most common reasons for suspension of an application are discussed below.

As a general rule, the USPTO will not suspend an application to give an applicant time to secure a consent agreement.

Any request to stay a deadline for responding to an Office action pending disposition of a petition to the Director should be directed to the Commissioner for Trademarks. If such a request is sent to the examining attorney, the examining attorney should forward it to the Office of the Commissioner for Trademarks. The examining attorney should *not* suspend action on an application pending a decision on petition. See 37 C.F.R. §2.146(g); TMEP §1705.06.

716.02(a) Applicant’s Petition to Cancel Cited Registration

If the examining attorney refuses registration under §2(d) of the Trademark Act in view of the mark in a prior registration, the applicant may file a petition to cancel the registration under 15 U.S.C. §1064 and, within a proper response period, inform the examining attorney that the petition to cancel has been filed. This will constitute a proper response to the §2(d) refusal, and may be done by phone, if there are no other outstanding issues that require a written response. The examining attorney will then suspend further action until the termination of the cancellation proceeding, if the application is otherwise in condition for approval or final refusal. The applicant should provide the number of the cancellation proceeding, if available; however, if the applicant does not provide the cancellation number, the examining attorney may ascertain it from Office records.

The examining attorney should suspend only if the applicant states that the cancellation proceeding has already been filed or is being filed concurrently with the response to the Office action.

Although the examining attorney will determine the status of the cancellation proceeding through a routine status check (see TMEP §716.04), the applicant may call or e-mail to advise the examining attorney when the proceeding is terminated, in order to avoid any possible delay in removing the application from suspension.

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

See TMEP §716.02(e) regarding suspension pending cancellation of a cited registration under §8 of the Act or expiration of a cited registration for failure to renew under §9 of the Act.

716.02(b) Submission of Copy of Foreign Registration in §44(d) Application

When an applicant who claims the benefit of a prior foreign application under 15 U.S.C. §1126(d) is required to submit a copy of a foreign registration, the applicant may respond to the requirement by stating that the foreign application is still pending. The examining attorney should then suspend further action pending receipt of a copy of the foreign certificate, if the application is otherwise in condition for approval or final refusal. See TMEP §1003.04.

If an applicant claims §44(d) in addition to another basis, before suspending the application, the examining attorney must inquire whether the applicant wishes to retain §44(e) as a second basis for registration (based on the foreign registration that will issue from the application on which the applicant relied for priority). This inquiry should be made in the first Office action, or by telephone if no Office action is issued. If the examining attorney is unable to reach the applicant by telephone, the examining attorney should issue an Office action requiring a copy of the foreign registration, advising applicant that it may retain the priority filing date even if it does not perfect the §44(e) basis, and inquiring as to whether the applicant wishes to retain §44(e) as a second basis for registration. See 37 C.F.R. §§2.35(b)(3) and (4) and TMEP §§806.02(f) and 806.04(b).

If the applicant responds that it does want to assert a dual basis for registration and the application is otherwise in condition for publication or final refusal, the examining attorney should suspend further action pending receipt of a copy of the foreign registration.

During the suspension period, the examining attorney will issue an Office action approximately every six months after suspension to inquire as to the status of the foreign application. If the applicant does not respond to the inquiry, the application will be abandoned. See TMEP §716.05.

The examining attorney may suspend pending receipt of a copy of a foreign registration only in a §44(d) application. In a §44(e) application, the examining attorney will not suspend the application pending submission of a copy of the foreign registration, unless the applicant establishes that it cannot obtain a copy of the foreign registration due to extraordinary circumstances (*e.g.*, war or natural disaster). TMEP §1004.01. However, the examining attorney may suspend a §44(e) application pending receipt of proof of renewal of the foreign registration. TMEP §1004.01(a).

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

716.02(c) Conflicting Marks in Pending Applications

When there are conflicting marks in pending applications, action on the application with the later effective filing date will be suspended (after examination on all other issues is concluded or the application is in condition for a final action) until the mark in the conflicting application with the earlier effective filing date is either registered or abandoned. 37 C.F.R. §2.83(c). See TMEP §§1208 *et seq.* for more information about conflicting marks in pending applications.

If the examining attorney has cited a prior-filed pending application, the applicant may respond by arguing that there is no likelihood of confusion between the marks. If the examining attorney is not persuaded by the applicant's arguments, the examining attorney should suspend the later-filed application pending disposition of the conflicting application. The suspension notice should include a statement that the applicant's arguments were not persuasive. It is not necessary to address the merits of the applicant's arguments prior to the initial suspension. See TMEP §716.03 regarding the applicant's request to remove an application from suspension.

If the examining attorney discovers that a prior-filed pending application was abandoned, but that a petition to revive is pending, the examining attorney should suspend the later-filed application pending disposition of the petition to revive. If the petition to revive is granted, the later-filed application will remain suspended until the mark in the earlier-filed application is registered or the earlier-filed application is again abandoned.

When an application is suspended pending the disposition of more than one earlier-filed conflicting application, and one of the conflicting applications matures into registration, the examining attorney will normally not issue a refusal of registration until the remaining conflicting application(s) are registered or abandoned, in order to avoid issuing piecemeal refusals. However, if deemed appropriate, the examining attorney does have the discretion to issue a refusal of registration under §2(d) in this situation.

716.02(d) *Inter Partes* or Court Proceeding

When an examining attorney learns that a proceeding relevant to the registrability of an applicant's mark is pending before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board or a court, the examining attorney should call the proceeding to the applicant's attention. If the applicant is not a party to the *inter partes* or court proceeding, the examining attorney must explain why the proceeding is relevant to the registrability of the applicant's mark. If the examining attorney believes the proceeding may result in a decision that supports a refusal of registration of the applicant's mark, the examining attorney must issue the refusal and give the applicant an opportunity to respond before suspending the application.

An applicant may request suspension because a proceeding relevant to the registrability of the applicant's mark is pending before the Office or a court. The

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

applicant must submit a copy of the relevant pleadings, the docket number of the proceeding, and a written explanation of why the proceeding is relevant to the registrability of the mark. Normally, a court proceeding is not considered relevant to the registrability of a mark, unless the remedy requested in the proceeding is cancellation, abandonment, or amendment of a relevant application or registration. However, when resolution of the court action requires the court to consider questions of Office policy or procedure, the examining attorney should not assume that the court would prefer to decide such questions absent the Office's decision in the consideration of an application. In these instances, action on an application should generally not be suspended. It is important to review the relevant pleadings, including the complaint and answer, before determining whether suspension is appropriate. The Office of the Solicitor may be consulted if there is a question as to whether suspension of the application is appropriate.

Before an application is suspended, the applicant must respond to all outstanding issues raised in the examining attorney's Office action that are not related to the proceeding. The examining attorney should not suspend the application unless all matters not related to the proceeding are resolved or in condition for final action.

See TMEP §716.02(a) regarding suspension pending disposition of an applicant's petition to cancel a cited registration under 15 U.S.C. §1064, and TMEP §716.03 regarding the applicant's request to remove an application from suspension.

716.02(e) Suspension Pending Cancellation or Expiration of Cited Registration

When the applicant submits a timely affidavit or declaration of continued use or excusable nonuse under 15 U.S.C. §1058 ("§8 affidavit") and/or an application for renewal under 15 U.S.C. §1059, the USPTO's automated records are updated to indicate receipt of the paper and the action taken on the paper. The USPTO's automated records are updated three months after the grace period expires to indicate that a registration is cancelled or expired if:

- (1) No §8 affidavit has been filed before the end of the six-month grace period following the sixth year after the date of registration or publication under §12(c) of the Trademark Act, 15 U.S.C. §1062(c); or
- (2) No §8 affidavit has been filed before the end of the six-month grace period following the end of any ten-year period after the date of registration; or
- (3) No §9 renewal application has been filed before the end of the six-month grace period following the expiration of the previous term of registration.

See TMEP §§1602 *et seq.* regarding the duration of a registration, TMEP §1604.04 regarding the due dates for §8 affidavits, and TMEP §1606.03 regarding the due dates for §9 renewal applications.

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

To avoid inadvertent cancellation or expiration of a registration due to a delay in matching a timely filed affidavit or renewal application with the registration file, the USPTO waits until three months *after* the expiration of the grace period for filing the §8 affidavit or renewal application before updating its records to show that the registration is cancelled or expired.

The examining attorney must confirm the status of the cited registration to ensure that it is still active before issuing any refusal of registration under Trademark Act §2(d) or filing a brief on appeal of a §2(d) refusal.

If the examining attorney is ready to issue a *nonfinal* refusal of registration under §2(d), and TRAM shows that the registration is still active, the examining attorney must issue the refusal even if the grace period for filing a §8 affidavit and/or a §9 renewal application for the cited registration has passed and TRAM does not indicate that the registrant has filed a §8 affidavit and/or renewal application. The examining attorney should not suspend the application, but should advise the applicant that the grace period for filing the §8 affidavit or renewal application has passed and that it appears that the registration may be subject to cancellation under §8 or expiration under §9.

If the examining attorney is ready to issue a *final* refusal of registration under §2(d), and the grace period for filing a §8 affidavit and/or a §9 renewal application for the cited registration has *not passed*, the examining attorney must issue the final refusal. The examining attorney should not suspend action, because the cited registration is still active and the registrant has until the end of the grace period to submit the §8 affidavit and/or a §9 renewal application.

If the grace period for filing a §8 affidavit and/or a §9 renewal application for the cited registration has passed, and the examining attorney is ready to issue a *final* refusal of registration under §2(d), the examining attorney should not issue the final refusal until the USPTO's automated records indicate that the registrant has filed the §8 affidavit or renewal application, and the USPTO has accepted the §8 affidavit or granted renewal. Instead, the examining attorney should suspend action for six months pending final disposition of the cited registration.

If the grace period for filing a §8 affidavit and/or a §9 renewal application for the cited registration has passed, and the examining attorney is ready to write an appeal brief, the examining attorney should request a remand so the application can be suspended pending final disposition of the cited registration. The Board will issue an order suspending the appeal and remanding the case to the examining attorney. If the cited registration is cancelled or expires, the examining attorney should withdraw the §2(d) refusal and notify the applicant that it has been withdrawn. If an appropriate affidavit or renewal application is filed for the cited registration, the examining attorney should notify the Board and return the file to the Board; the Board will resume proceedings and reset the time for filing the examining attorney's appeal brief. Similarly, if the cited registration is cancelled or expires, but the §2(d) refusal is only one of the issues on appeal, the examining attorney should notify the

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

Board of the status of the cited registration and return the file to the Board. The Board will resume proceedings and reset the time for filing a brief. See TBMP §1213 regarding the suspension of an *ex parte* appeal pending cancellation of the cited registration under §8 or §9 of the Act.

The examining attorney cannot withdraw a refusal of registration under §2(d) until the TRAM system shows that the registration has actually been cancelled or expired.

See TMEP §1611 for information about how a registrant who has not timely filed a §8 affidavit or §9 renewal application may expedite the cancellation or expiration of its own registration.

716.03 Applicant's Request to Remove Application from Suspension

If an examining attorney suspends action on an application, and the applicant believes the suspension is improper, the applicant may file a request to remove the application from suspension. The applicant should state the reasons for the belief that the suspension is improper and attach any relevant evidence.

If persuaded by the request, the examining attorney should remove the application from suspension, resume examination of the application, and take appropriate action.

If not persuaded by the request, the examining attorney should issue a new suspension action *that addresses the applicant's arguments and explains the reasons why the request is not granted*. The applicant's recourse is to file a petition to the Director to review the examining attorney's action continuing the suspension. The Director will reverse the examining attorney's action only if there is clear error or abuse of discretion. See TMEP Chapter 1700 for information about petitions.

716.04 Suspended Docket Checked

A legal instruments examiner ("LIE") will review each case in the suspended docket at least every six months to determine whether continued suspension is appropriate. If the LIE determines that the application should remain suspended, he or she should perform the appropriate TRAM transaction to report the suspension check. If suspension is no longer necessary, the LIE will notify the examining attorney and the examining attorney will take the appropriate action.

716.05 Inquiry by Examining Attorney Regarding Suspended Application

In certain circumstances, if the application has been suspended for six months or more, the examining attorney will issue an Office action inquiring as to the status of the matter on which suspension was based, unless the information is available to the

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

examining attorney in the USPTO's databases. If the applicant does not respond to the Office action, the application will be abandoned.

For example, if action is suspended pending the receipt of a copy of a foreign registration, or pending the renewal of a foreign registration, the examining attorney will inquire every six months during the suspension period as to the status of the foreign application or registration. Similarly, for applications that are suspended pending the outcome of a civil action, the examining attorney will inquire every six months as to the status of the proceeding. If the foreign application or the civil action is still pending, a statement by the applicant to this effect is a proper response.

The examining attorney should *not* issue any inquiry about the status of a proceeding pending in the USPTO (e.g., an *inter partes* proceeding).

716.06 Suspension After Final Action

If the examining attorney determines that action on an application should be suspended after issuance of a final refusal, the examining attorney must issue a suspension notice. This may occur, for example, when the applicant files a petition to cancel a cited registration. See TMEP §716.02(a). The examining attorney should not “withdraw the finality” of the refusal in order to suspend; however, in the suspension notice, the examining attorney should inform the applicant that the refusal of registration is continued but that it is not necessary to respond to the final refusal until the application is removed from suspension.

If the application is eventually removed from suspension and the grounds for refusal remain operative, the examining attorney should reissue the final refusal, and the applicant will have six months to respond to the final refusal. It is inappropriate to remove the case from suspension and immediately declare the application abandoned.

717 Reissuing an Office Action

Sometimes an Office action must be reissued because the action has been returned as undeliverable and/or because the applicant notifies the USPTO that the applicant did not receive the Office action. In these situations, the USPTO will not extend the deadline for response, unless the Office action was sent to the wrong address due to an Office error.

If there was an Office error, the USPTO will issue an Office action notifying the applicant that it may view and print the Office action via the TDR portal on the USPTO website at <http://www.uspto.gov>. The applicant will be given a new response period.

If there was no Office error, the USPTO will issue an Office action notifying the applicant that it may view and print the original Office action via the TDR portal on

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

the USPTO website, but that the deadline for applicant's response will not be extended.

An "Office error in sending the Office action to the wrong address" means that the USPTO either entered the correspondence address incorrectly or failed to enter a proper notice of change of address filed *before* the date on which the action was issued. The transmittal of a response on letterhead bearing a new address is *not* a proper notice of change of address. The applicant or applicant's attorney must specifically instruct the USPTO to change the correspondence address. Applicants and attorneys should be especially diligent in updating e-mail addresses and authorizations to correspond by e-mail. See TMEP §§603.02 *et seq.* regarding changes of address.

See TMEP §717.01 regarding Office actions returned as undeliverable, and TMEP §717.02 regarding non-receipt of Office actions.

717.01 Returned Office Action

If an Office action is returned to the Office because the United States Postal Service has not been able to deliver it, or because an outgoing e-mail communication was undeliverable, Office personnel will review the file to determine whether the correspondence address was entered correctly and/or whether the applicant has filed a notice of change of address. See TMEP §717 regarding the reissuance of an Office action sent to the wrong address due to an Office error.

If the USPTO is ultimately unsuccessful in delivering or redelivering the Office action, the returned action and envelope should be scanned into the TICRS database. If no communication from the applicant is received within the period for response, the application will be abandoned.

If outgoing e-mail is returned as undeliverable, the USPTO will send a paper copy to the correspondence address of record. See TMEP §§304 *et seq.* regarding e-mail.

See TMEP §403 for more information about returned correspondence.

717.02 Non-Receipt of Office Action

If an applicant or applicant's attorney notifies the USPTO that the applicant did not receive an action, either before or after the expiration of the response period, the examining attorney must check to determine whether the action was sent to the correspondence address of record. See TMEP §§603 *et seq.*

If the Office action was sent to the correspondence address of record, and there is time remaining in the response period, the examining attorney should direct the applicant to view the full file on the TDR portal on the USPTO website, and advise the applicant that the deadline for response runs from the original mailing date, and that a response must be received in the USPTO before this deadline to avoid

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

abandonment. If the response period has expired, the examining attorney should advise the applicant that the application is abandoned, and that the applicant may file a petition to revive under 37 C.F.R. §2.66. See TMEP §§1714 *et seq.* regarding petitions to revive. In either situation, the examining attorney should make an appropriate note to the file.

If there is evidence in the file that the USPTO sent the Office action to the wrong address due to an Office error (see TMEP §717), the USPTO will reissue the action and provide the applicant with a new response period. The examining attorney should first ensure that the correspondence address has been corrected, and then advise the internal TM Clerical Support mailbox by e-mail that the action was sent to the wrong address, and request that the action be reissued with a new response period. The deadline for response will run from the new mailing date. If the application had been abandoned, it will be reinstated. See TMEP §1712.01 regarding reinstatement of applications that are abandoned due to Office error.

718 Abandonment

An abandoned application is an application for registration that is removed from the USPTO docket of pending applications because of express abandonment or because the applicant failed to take appropriate action within a specified response period.

718.01 Express Abandonment by Applicant or Applicant's Attorney

37 C.F.R. §2.68. Express abandonment (withdrawal) of application.

An application may be expressly abandoned by filing in the Patent and Trademark Office a written statement of abandonment or withdrawal of the application signed by the applicant, or the attorney or other person representing the applicant. Except as provided in §2.135, the fact that an application has been expressly abandoned shall not, in any proceeding in the Patent and Trademark Office, affect any rights that the applicant may have in the mark which is the subject of the abandoned application.

To expedite processing, the Office recommends that letters of express abandonment be filed through TEAS, at <http://www.uspto.gov/teas/index.html>. All express abandonments filed via TEAS will be processed electronically and the TRAM database will be automatically updated to indicate that the application has been expressly abandoned. TRAM will generate a notice to the applicant that the application is abandoned.

All letters of express abandonment must be signed by the applicant or by a practitioner who is authorized to practice before the USPTO under 37 C.F.R. §10.14. See TMEP §§602.03 and 605.02. The same rules that govern the signature of responses to Office actions apply to the signature of express abandonments. See

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

TMEP §§712 *et seq.* The examining attorney must ensure that the letter of express abandonment is signed by a proper party. If the applicant is represented by a practitioner who is authorized to practice before the USPTO pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §10.14, the practitioner must sign the letter of express abandonment. 37 C.F.R. §10.18(a). If the applicant is *pro se*, the letter of express abandonment must be signed by someone with legal authority to bind the applicant, *e.g.*, an officer of a corporation or general partner of a partnership. See TMEP §§712.01 *et seq.* for more information about persons who can sign responses to Office actions on behalf of various types of entities when the entity is not represented by an attorney, and TMEP §§605.05 *et seq.* regarding papers signed by unauthorized parties.

An application cannot be expressly abandoned by examiner's amendment.

When an applicant files a letter of express abandonment on paper that meets the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §2.68, the examining attorney should perform a transaction expressly abandoning the application in TRAM, effective as of the filing date of the letter of express abandonment. TRAM will generate a letter notifying the applicant that the application is abandoned.

If it is unclear whether a document is a letter of abandonment, the examining attorney should contact the applicant to inquire about his or her intention before abandoning the application.

If an applicant files an express abandonment of an application that is not the subject of an *inter partes* proceeding before the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board, and wants to withdraw the abandonment to resume prosecution of the application, the applicant must petition the Director under 37 C.F.R. §2.146(a)(3) to request withdrawal of the express abandonment, within two months of the effective date of abandonment. 37 C.F.R. §2.146(d). However, such a petition will be granted only in an extraordinary situation. *In re Glaxo Group Limited*, 33 USPQ2d 1535 (Comm'r Pats. 1993).

If an applicant whose application is the subject of an opposition proceeding files an express abandonment of the application after the commencement of the opposition proceeding, but before receipt of the Board's notice of the filing of the opposition, the Board will allow the applicant an opportunity to withdraw the abandonment because the abandonment, if not withdrawn, may result in entry of judgment against the applicant in the opposition. 37 C.F.R. §2.135. See TBMP §§218 and 602.01.

In a §66(a) application, an applicant may file a letter of express abandonment either with the USPTO or with the IB.

718.02 Failure by Applicant to Take Required Action During Statutory Period

15 U.S.C. §1062(b). If the applicant is found not entitled to registration, the examiner shall advise the applicant thereof and of the reason therefor. The applicant shall have

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

a period of six months in which to reply or amend his application, which shall then be reexamined. This procedure may be repeated until (1) the examiner finally refuses registration of the mark or (2) the applicant fails for a period of six months to reply or amend or appeal, whereupon the application shall be deemed to have been abandoned, unless it can be shown to the satisfaction of the Director that the delay in responding was unintentional, whereupon such time may be extended.

Under 15 U.S.C. §1062(b) and 37 C.F.R. §2.65(a), an application becomes abandoned if the applicant fails to respond, or fails to respond completely, within the six-month statutory response period. See TMEP §§718.03 *et seq.* regarding incomplete responses.

The examining attorney has no authority to accept a late response. If an applicant files a late response, the examining attorney should immediately send a notice to the applicant stating that the response was untimely; that the application is abandoned; and that the applicant may file a petition to revive under 37 C.F.R. §2.66 if the failure to respond on time was unintentional. See TMEP §§1714 *et seq.* regarding petitions to revive.

See TMEP §718.02(a) regarding partial abandonment.

718.02(a) Partial Abandonment

General Rule. Trademark Rule 2.65(a), 37 C.F.R. §2.65(a), provides that if a refusal or requirement is expressly limited to certain goods/services, and the applicant fails to file a response to the refusal or requirement, the application shall be abandoned only as to those particular goods/services. The rule applies only to Office actions issued on or after November 2, 2003. See notice at 68 Fed. Reg. 55748 (Sept. 26, 2003).

Office Action Must State That Refusal Applies Only to Certain Goods, Services or Classes. If the examining attorney issues a refusal or requirement that applies only to certain goods/services/class(es), this must be expressly stated in the Office action. Partial abandonment applies only where the Office action expressly states that a refusal or requirement is limited to only certain goods/services/class(es). Unless the action includes a **clear and explicit** statement that the refusal or requirement applies to only certain goods/services/class(es), the refusal or requirement will apply to all the goods/services/class(es), and failure to respond to the action will result in abandonment of the entire application.

Incomplete Response to Partial Refusal. Partial abandonment may also occur when an applicant fails to file a complete response to a final refusal or final requirement that is expressly limited to only certain goods/services/class(es). If an applicant files an incomplete response to a nonfinal action that is limited to only certain goods/services/class(es), the examining attorney should generally issue an action making all outstanding requirements and refusals final rather than partially

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

abandoning the application. See TMEP §§718.03 *et seq.* regarding incomplete responses. When an examining attorney holds an application abandoned for failure to file a complete response, the applicant's recourse is to file a petition the Director under 37 C.F.R. §2.146 to reverse the holding. See TMEP §1713.

Failure to Respond to Partial Refusal or Requirement. When an applicant fails to respond to a refusal or requirement that is expressly limited to only certain goods/services/class(es), the examining attorney should issue an examiner's amendment deleting (abandoning) the goods/services/classes to which the refusal or requirement pertained. The examiner's amendment should clearly set forth the changes that will be made to the identification of goods/services in the application. No prior authorization from the applicant or the applicant's attorney is needed to issue an examiner's amendment in this situation. TMEP §707.02. If the failure to respond to the partial refusal or requirement was unintentional, the applicant may file a petition to revive the deleted goods/services/classes under 37 C.F.R. §2.66, within two months of the mailing date of the examiner's amendment. See TMEP §§1714 *et seq.* regarding petitions to revive.

Use of Headings in Office Actions. When issuing a partial refusal or requirement, the examining attorney is encouraged to use the heading "Partial Refusal" or "Partial Requirement," so the record is clear that the refusal or requirement applies only to certain goods/services/class(es).

Requirements for Amendment of Identification of Goods/Services. See TMEP §1402.13 regarding an examining attorney's requirement for amendment of an identification of goods/services that includes some terminology that is indefinite and some terminology that is acceptable, and the processing of applications in which an applicant fails to respond to such a requirement.

Requirements for Fees to Cover All Classes in a Multiple Class Application. If the fees paid in a multiple-class application are sufficient to cover one class but insufficient to cover all the classes, the examining attorney will require that the applicant submit the additional fees or specify the classes to which the original fee(s) should be applied. If the applicant does not respond to the Office action, the entire application will be abandoned.

718.03 Incomplete Response

Extract from 37 C.F.R. §2.65.

(a) If an applicant fails to respond, or to respond completely, within six months after the date an action is mailed, the application shall be deemed abandoned unless the refusal or requirement is expressly limited to only certain goods and/or services. If the refusal or requirement is expressly limited to only certain goods and/or services, the application will be abandoned only as to those particular goods and/or services. A timely petition to the Director pursuant to §§ 2.63(b) and 2.146, if appropriate, is a response that avoids abandonment of an application.

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

(b) When action by the applicant filed within the six-month response period is a bona fide attempt to advance the examination of the application and is substantially a complete response to the examiner's action, but consideration of some matter or compliance with some requirement has been inadvertently omitted, opportunity to explain and supply the omission may be given before the question of abandonment is considered.

Under 15 U.S.C. §1062(b) and 37 C.F.R. §2.65(a), an applicant must respond completely to each issue raised in the examining attorney's Office action to avoid abandonment. A response is incomplete if it: (1) does not address one or more of the requirements or refusals made in the Office action; (2) is unsigned; or (3) is signed by an unauthorized person.

Unsigned Responses. If a response is unsigned, the examining attorney must obtain a properly signed copy before acting on the merits of the response, regardless of whether the Office action was final or nonfinal. The examining attorney should issue a notice of incomplete response, granting the applicant additional time to perfect the response pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §2.65(b). See TMEP §718.03(b). The applicant must submit a properly signed copy of the response, or, if all issues raised are proper subject matter for an examiner's amendment, the applicant or someone with legal authority to bind the applicant may authorize the examining attorney to enter an examiner's amendment. The applicant may not ratify the unsigned response through an examiner's amendment. See TMEP §712.02. If the applicant fails to submit a properly signed response within the time granted under 37 C.F.R. §2.65(b), the examining attorney should hold the application abandoned for failure to file a complete response. See TMEP §718.03(a).

Responses Signed by Unauthorized Persons. If a response is signed by an unauthorized party (e.g., a foreign attorney who is not qualified to practice before the USPTO under 37 C.F.R. §10.14, or a corporate employee who does not have legal authority to bind the applicant), the examining attorney must obtain a properly signed copy before acting on the merits of the response, regardless of whether the Office action was final or nonfinal. The examining attorney should issue a notice of incomplete response, granting the applicant additional time to perfect the response pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §2.65(b), and send the notice to the correspondence address of record. The applicant must submit a response signed by someone with legal authority to bind the applicant (see TMEP §§712.01 *et seq.*), or by a practitioner authorized to practice before the Office pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §10.14 (see TMEP §§602 *et seq.*). Where a response was signed by an unauthorized party, it is not acceptable for the applicant to ratify the response through an examiner's amendment. See TMEP §§605.05 *et seq.* and 712.03 for further information. If the applicant fails to submit a properly signed response within the time granted under 37 C.F.R. §2.65(b), the examining attorney should hold the application abandoned for failure to file a complete response. See TMEP §718.03(a).

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

Properly Signed but Incomplete Responses to Nonfinal Actions. When an applicant files an incomplete response to a nonfinal action (*i.e.*, does not address one or more of the requirements or refusals made in the Office action), the examining attorney should not hold the application abandoned. Instead, the examining attorney has the discretion to: (1) issue a final action, if the application is in condition for final action; or (2) issue a notice of incomplete response granting the applicant additional time to complete the response, if the response meets the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §2.65(b) (*see* TMEP §718.03(b)). If the application is not in condition for final action, and the response does not meet the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §2.65(b), the examining attorney should issue another nonfinal action, explaining why the response was incomplete, and continuing all outstanding refusals and requirements.

A written disagreement with the examining attorney's refusal or requirement may be a complete response to a nonfinal action with respect to that refusal or requirement.

Properly Signed but Incomplete Responses to Final Actions. When an applicant files an incomplete response to a final action, the examining attorney has the discretion to: (1) hold the application abandoned for failure to respond completely (*see* TMEP §718.03(a)); or (2) issue a notice of incomplete response granting the applicant additional time to perfect the response, if the applicant meets the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §2.65(b) (*see* TMEP §718.03(b)). *See* TMEP §715.01 regarding a proper response to a final refusal, and TMEP §§715.03 *et seq.* regarding the examining attorney's response to an applicant's request for reconsideration of a final Office action.

Non-Responsive Communications. An inquiry, a request to extend the response period, or a communication on a matter unrelated to the preceding Office action should be treated as a non-responsive communication, not as an incomplete response. *See* TMEP §719 for further information.

See TMEP §717.02 regarding the procedure for handling an applicant's claim that the applicant did not receive the Office action.

718.03(a) Holding of Abandonment for Failure to Respond Completely

The examining attorney should not hold an application abandoned when an applicant files an incomplete response to a nonfinal action. *See* TMEP §718.03. However, the examining attorney may hold an application abandoned if the applicant files an incomplete response to a final action, and the time for responding to that action has expired. In such cases, the examining attorney should issue a written action, without a six-month response clause (*see* TMEP §705.08), stating that the application is abandoned due to an incomplete response, and explaining why. *See* TMEP §718.03(c) regarding an applicant's request for reconsideration of an examining attorney's holding of abandonment for failure to file a complete response, and TMEP §1713 regarding a petition to the Director for review of the examining attorney's holding of abandonment for failure to file a complete response.

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

If the examining attorney acts on an incomplete response to a final action before the response period has expired, the examining attorney cannot abandon the application. Instead, the examining attorney should issue a notice of incomplete response, without a six-month response clause, explaining why the response is incomplete, and advising the applicant that to avoid abandonment, a proper response must be filed within the period for response to the previous Office action. If there are less than 30 days remaining in the response period, and the response meets the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §2.65(b), the examining attorney has discretion to give the applicant an additional 30 days to perfect the response. See TMEP §718.03(b).

718.03(b) Granting Additional Time to Perfect Response

Under 37 C.F.R. §2.65(b), the examining attorney has discretion to give an applicant additional time to perfect the response if:

- (1) the response was filed within the six-month period; and
- (2) the response was a bona fide attempt to advance the examination; and
- (3) the response was a substantially complete response to the examining attorney's action; and
- (4) consideration of some matter or compliance with some requirement was inadvertently omitted.

If the examining attorney decides that the response meets all four criteria, he or she should issue a notice of incomplete response explaining why the response is incomplete and granting the applicant 30 days, or to the end of the response period set forth in the action, whichever is longer, to complete the response. The examining attorney should not include a six-month response clause in the action.

If the examining attorney grants the applicant additional time to complete a response under 37 C.F.R. §2.65(b), the time for filing an appeal to the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board (or a petition to the Director under 37 C.F.R. §2.63(b)) is not extended. The applicant must file a notice of appeal (or petition) within six months of the mailing date of the final action. 15 U.S.C. §1062(b); 37 C.F.R. §§2.64(b) and 2.142(a).

If the applicant fails to complete the response within the time granted pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §2.65(b), the examining attorney should hold the application abandoned for failure to file a complete response. See TMEP §718.03(a). In this situation, the applicant cannot file a petition to revive under the unintentional delay standard of 37 C.F.R. §2.66. The applicant's recourse is to file a petition to the Director under 37 C.F.R. §2.146 to reverse the examining attorney's holding of abandonment. The Director will reverse the examining attorney's action on petition only if there is clear error or abuse of discretion. See TMEP §1713.

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

If an applicant does not receive an action granting additional time to complete a response, or if the applicant is unable to respond to the action due to some other extraordinary circumstance, the applicant may file a petition to the Director. If the petition is granted, the USPTO will send a notice to the applicant directing the applicant to view the action on the TDR portal on the USPTO website at <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/tow>. The applicant will receive a new 30-day period in which to perfect the response. This does *not* extend the time for appeal (or petition under 37 C.F.R. §2.63). 15 U.S.C. §1062(b); 37 C.F.R. §2.142(a).

718.03(c) Reconsideration of Holding of Abandonment

If an examining attorney holds an application abandoned for failure to file a complete response, the applicant may file a request for reconsideration of the examining attorney's holding, arguing that the response was not incomplete. While the examining attorney has no authority to act on an application if no response was filed, the examining attorney does have the authority to reverse his or her holding as to whether or not a response received during the statutory period was a complete response. If the examining attorney reverses his or her holding of abandonment for failure to file a complete response, the TRAM System must be updated to withdraw the abandonment and show the correct status of the application.

The applicant may also contact the managing attorney or senior attorney and request review of the examining attorney's action. If the managing attorney or senior attorney believes that the holding of abandonment was improper, he or she will direct the examining attorney to reverse the holding of abandonment.

If the examining attorney does not reverse the holding of abandonment, the applicant may petition the Director to reverse the holding. A petition to reverse a holding of abandonment is not the same as a petition to revive an abandoned application. The Director will reverse the examining attorney's holding of abandonment only if there is clear error or abuse of discretion. The "unintentional delay" standard does not apply. See TMEP §1713.

718.04 Failure to File Statement of Use

Under 15 U.S.C. §1051(d)(4), an application under §1(b) of the Act is abandoned if the applicant fails to timely file a statement of use or request for an extension of time to file a statement of use. 37 C.F.R. §§2.65(c) and 2.88(h); TMEP §§1108.01 and 1109.04.

The ITU Unit will abandon the application if the applicant fails to file a statement of use or request for an extension of time to file a statement of use within six months of the mailing date of the notice of allowance, or within a previously granted extension period. The USPTO will send a computer-generated notice of abandonment to the applicant.

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

If the failure to timely file the statement of use or extension request was unintentional, the applicant may file a petition to revive under 15 U.S.C. §1051(d)(4) and 37 C.F.R. §2.66. See TMEP §§1714 *et seq.*

718.05 Failure to Perfect Appeal

An application may become abandoned because of withdrawal of, or failure to prosecute, an appeal to the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board. 15 U.S.C. §1062(b); TBMP §1203.02(a); TMEP §1501.

An application may also become abandoned because of failure to perfect an appeal, or dismissal of an appeal, to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or civil court.

718.06 Notice of Abandonment for Failure to Respond

If no response is received by the USPTO within six months of the mailing date of an Office action, the application is sent to the examining attorney to be abandoned or partially abandoned, as appropriate. The examining attorney should check the record to ensure that there is no response and that the Office action was sent to the correspondence address of record. See TMEP §§717 *et seq.* regarding reissuing an Office action that was sent to the wrong address due to an Office error. The examining attorney must also check to see whether the Office action contained a partial refusal or requirement. See TMEP §718.02(a) regarding partial abandonment.

An application is considered to be abandoned as of the day after the date on which a response was due, although the examining attorney performs the TRAM transaction that reports the abandonment at a later date. The USPTO sends a computer-generated notice of abandonment to the correspondence address listed in the application file.

Applications that are abandoned after *ex parte* appeals or *inter partes* proceedings are considered abandoned as of the date of the action by the Board that caused the application to abandon (*e.g.*, affirming the examining attorney's refusal or sustaining an opposition). However, the TRAM transaction reporting the abandonment is not performed until a month after expiration of the period for appeal from the Board's decision.

718.07 Ordering Abandoned Application Files

The USPTO destroys abandoned application files and cancelled or expired registration files two years after they become abandoned, cancelled, or expired.

Where necessary, USPTO personnel may order abandoned application files through the file-ordering system on the USPTO's computer network, if they have not been

TRADEMARK MANUAL OF EXAMINING PROCEDURE

destroyed. See TMEP §109.01 regarding electronic image files that are available to the public on the USPTO website, and TMEP §109.02 regarding the ordering of paper application files by the public.

Paper files should be returned promptly when no longer needed.

Some abandoned application files may be viewed through TICRS, on the premises of the USPTO, or through the TDR portal on the USPTO website at <http://www.uspto.gov>.

718.08 Revival or Reinstatement of Abandoned Application - New Search Required

When an abandoned application is revived or reinstated, the examining attorney must conduct a new search of USPTO records for conflicting marks. If the search shows that the same examining attorney handled a later-filed conflicting application that has been approved for publication, the examining attorney should request jurisdiction (TMEP §1504.04(a)) and suspend the later-filed application pending disposition of the earlier-filed (revived) application. 37 C.F.R. §2.83(c); TMEP §1208.02(c).

If the new search shows that the same examining attorney handled a later-filed conflicting application that has been approved for registration, the examining attorney should withdraw the application from issue (if possible) and suspend it. However, if a later-filed conflicting application is already registered, the USPTO is without authority to cancel the registration. The examining attorney must refuse registration of the earlier-filed (revived) application under 15 U.S.C. §1052(d). In this situation, an applicant has the option of filing a petition to cancel the registration under Section 14 of the Trademark Act, 15 U.S.C. §1064.

If the later-filed conflicting application is being handled by a different examining attorney, the examining attorney handling the earlier-filed (revived) application should e-mail the other examining attorney to notify him/her of the revival or reinstatement. The examining attorney handling the later-filed application will follow the procedures set forth above.

See TMEP §§1714 *et seq.* regarding petitions to revive, TMEP §1712.01 regarding reinstatement of applications abandoned due to Office error, and TMEP §1713 regarding petitions to reverse a holding of abandonment.

719 Non-Responsive Communications

An inquiry, a request to extend the response period, or a communication on a matter unrelated to the outstanding Office action should be treated as a “non-responsive communication,” not as an incomplete response to an outstanding Office action. If the applicant files a non-responsive communication while an Office action is outstanding, the examining attorney should send the applicant a letter

PROCEDURE FOR EXAMINING APPLICATIONS

acknowledging receipt of the communication, noting that the communication is non-responsive, and advising the applicant that a response to the outstanding Office action must be received within six months of the mailing date to avoid abandonment. The examining attorney should perform the TRAM transaction indicating that an acknowledgment of receipt of a non-responsive communication has been sent to the applicant. If no response to the Office action is received within six months of the mailing date, the application must be abandoned for failure to respond.

720 Fraud Upon the Office

If an examining attorney suspects the possibility of fraud upon the Office in the *ex parte* examination of a trademark application, the following procedure must be followed.

- (1) The examining attorney must bring the matter to the attention of the managing attorney in his or her law office.
- (2) If the managing attorney concurs with the examining attorney as to the possibility of fraud upon the Office, the managing attorney will bring the matter to the attention of the Administrator for Trademark Policy and Procedure.
- (3) If the Administrator believes that the matter warrants further action, he or she will make an appropriate recommendation to the Commissioner for Trademarks.

Under no circumstances should any Office communication pertaining to fraud be made, either orally or in writing, by anyone in the Trademark Examining Operation, except as set forth in paragraphs 1 and 2 above.

These issues may ultimately be referred to the Office of Enrollment and Discipline.