

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

Mailed: September 6, 2002

In re HelpMagic.Com Ltd

Serial No. 76/121865

Filed: 09/05/2000

DOUGLAS R. WOLF  
WOLF GREENFIELD & SACKS P  
600 ATLANTIC AVE  
BOSTON, MA 02210-2211

**Amy King, Paralegal Specialist**

Applicant's request for remand and proposed amendment filed August 28, 2002 is noted.

Applicant seeks remand in order for the Examining Attorney to consider the proposed amendment. Good cause having been shown, the request for remand is granted, action on the appeal is suspended, and the file is remanded to the Trademark Examining Attorney for consideration of the proposed amendment.

One basis of the final refusal was the unacceptability of the identification of goods. 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.<sup>1</sup> 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.