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

Mailed: April 2, 2002

In re SURECOM TECHNOLOGY CORPORATION

Serial No. 76/055965

Filed: 05/19/2000

BRUCE H TROXELL
TROXELL LAW OFFICE PLLC
5205 LEESBURG PIKE, SUITE 1404
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22041

Amy King, Paralegal Specialist

Applicant filed, on March 18, 2002, a notice of appeal and a request for reconsideration.

The appeal is hereby instituted. However, the request for reconsideration requires consideration by the Trademark Examining Attorney. Accordingly, action on the appeal is suspended and the file is remanded to the Examining Attorney for consideration of the request for reconsideration.

One basis of the final refusal was the unacceptability of the identification of goods, and the request contains a proposed amendment to the identification. If the amendment is accepted and the mark is found registrable on the basis of this paper, the appeal will be moot. If the amendment is accepted but the refusal to register is maintained, the

Examining Attorney should issue an Office Action so indicating, and return the file to the Board. The appeal will then be resumed and applicant allowed time in which to file its appeal brief. If the Examining Attorney determines that the amendment to the identification is not acceptable, the Examining Attorney should indicate in the Office Action the reasons why the proposed amendment is unacceptable, and return the file to the Board for resumption of proceedings in the appeal.[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.