

United States Patent and Trademark Office
Trademark Trial and Appeal Board
P.O. Box 1451
Alexandria, VA 22313-1451

Mailed: January 24, 2005

In re KICKZ AG

Serial No. 76366454

Filed: 02/01/2002

Nicholas G. de la Torre
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO,, IL 60610

Applicant filed, on December 17, 2004, an amendment.

The basis of the refusal, issued on October 27, 2004, 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

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

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.

Karl Kochersperger, Paralegal

unless application was previously advised that amendments broadening the identification are prohibited under Trademark Rule 2.71(a).