

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

**Mailed: February 4, 2004**

In re Getronics Intellectual  
Property B.V.

Serial No. 76404015

Filed: 05/06/2002

KEITH W. MEDANSKY  
PIPER RUDNICK  
P.O. BOX 64807  
CHICAGO, IL 60664

***Janice D. Hyman, Paralegal Specialist:***

Applicant filed, on December 12, 2003 (certificate of mailing dated December 9, 2003), a request for reconsideration, which included an amendment and a notice of appeal.

The basis of the final refusal, issued on June 9, 2003, 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.<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, 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).