

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

Mailed: August 10, 2004

In re UMICORE

Serial No. 76361192

Filed: 01/23/2002

JAMES M. SLATTERY
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH LLP
P.O. BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

Rochelle Ricks, Paralegal Specialist:

Applicant filed, on July 8, 2004 a motion to extend its time to file its brief, than on August 5, 2004 by facsimile a copy of its request for remand (originally filed on June 23, 2004), along with an amendment, all which are hereby noted.

The basis of the final refusal 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, 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, then the Examining Attorney may not issue a final refusal unless application was previously advised that amendments broadening the identification are prohibited under Trademark Rule 2.71(a).