

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

Mailed: December 2, 2004

In re Williams Products, Inc

Serial No. 76469860

Filed: 11/25/2002

ARNOLD S. WEINTRAUB  
THE WEINTRAUB GROUP PLC  
32000 NORTHWESTERN HWY SUITE 240  
FARMINGTON HILLS, State148334

**Amy Matelski, Paralegal Specialist**

The Board's order dated November 23, 2004 was issued in error and is hereby vacated.

Applicant's appeal brief and proposed amendment filed September 20, 2004 are noted.

Applicant seeks remand in order for the Examining Attorney to consider the proposed amendment. Good cause having been shown, 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 a supplemental appeal brief, if it so wishes. 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.