

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Trademark Trial and Appeal Board
2900 Crystal Drive
Arlington, Virginia 22202-3513

Mailed: April 24, 2002

In re AQUAFIL S.P.A.

Serial No. 76011121

Filed: 03/28/2000

HERBERT DUBNO
KARL F. ROSS, P. C.
5676 RIVERDALE AVENUE, BOX 900
RIVERDALE (BRONX), NY 10471-0900

LaToya C. Johnson, Paralegal

Applicant's amendment (filed November 30, 2001) and notice of appeal (filed December 17, 2001) are noted.

The basis of the final refusal, issued on June 15, 2001, is the unacceptability of the identification of goods, and the amendment is an attempt by applicant to submit an acceptable identification.

Accordingly, action on the appeal is suspended and the file is remanded to the Trademark Examining Attorney for consideration of the amendment. If the amendment is accepted, the appeal will be moot. If the amendment is found unacceptable, the Examining Attorney should issue an Office Action indicating the reasons why the proposed amendment is unacceptable and return the file to the Board,

Serial No. 76/011,121

which will then allow applicant time to file its appeal brief.¹ However, if the Examining Attorney believes that the problems with the proposed identification can be resolved, the Examining Attorney is encouraged to contact applicant, either by telephone or written Office Action, in an attempt to do so.

¹ If the Examining Attorney believes that the proposed amendment is unacceptable because it exceeds the scope of the original identification, or the identification as it has subsequently been amended, this would raise a new issue, and the applicant should be given an opportunity to respond to this issue before the refusal may be made final. In this circumstance, therefore, the Examining Attorney should issue a non-final action, and retain the "six-month response" clause.