

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

Mailed: May 1, 2012

In re Ripasso Energy AB

Serial No. 79086139

Filed: 5/27/10

WARREN A SKLAR
RENNER OTTO BOISSELLE & SKLAR
1621 EUCLID AVE, 19TH FLOOR
CLEVELAND, OH 44115

Karl Kochersperger, Paralegal Specialist:

Applicant filed, on April 23, 2012, an amendment. On April 26, 2012 applicant filed a request to extend time to file its appeal brief.¹

The basis of the final refusal, issued on August 26, 2011, is the unacceptability of the identification of goods, and the amendment is an attempt by applicant to submit an acceptable identification. Accordingly, the appeal is *suspended* and the application is *remanded* to the Trademark Examining Attorney for consideration of the amendment. If the amendment is accepted, the appeal will be moot and proceedings on the appeal will terminate in due course. If the amendment is found unacceptable, the Examining Attorney should issue an Office Action indicating the reasons why the

¹ In light of applicant's proposed amendment, applicant's request to

proposed amendment is unacceptable and notify the Board, which will then allow applicant time to file its appeal brief.² 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.

extend time is moot.

² 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 applicant was previously advised that amendments broadening the identification are prohibited under Trademark Rule 2.71(a).