

From: Leipzig, Marc J.

Sent: 1/26/2014 9:17:33 PM

To: TTAB E Filing

CC:

Subject: U.S. TRADEMARK APPLICATION NO. 79119845 - PUREMAG - ACO13403MADU - Request for  
Reconsideration Denied - Return to TTAB

\*\*\*\*\*

Attachment Information:

Count: 1

Files: 79119845.doc

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (USPTO)  
OFFICE ACTION (OFFICIAL LETTER) ABOUT APPLICANT'S TRADEMARK APPLICATION**

**U.S. APPLICATION SERIAL NO.** 79119845

**MARK:** PUREMAG



**CORRESPONDENT ADDRESS:**

MARK D. ALLEMAN

ALLEMAN HALL MCCOY RUSSELL & TUTTLE LLP

806 SW BROADWAYSUITE 600

PORTLAND, OR 97205

**GENERAL TRADEMARK INFORMATION:**

<http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/index.jsp>

**APPLICANT:** Tateho Kagaku Kogyo Kabushiki Kaisha; (d ETC.

**CORRESPONDENT'S REFERENCE/DOCKET NO:**

ACO13403MADU

**CORRESPONDENT E-MAIL ADDRESS:**

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION DENIED**

**ISSUE/MAILING DATE:**

**INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION NO. 1134223**

The trademark examining attorney has carefully reviewed applicant's request for reconsideration and is denying the request for the reasons stated below. See 37 C.F.R. §2.64(b); TMEP §§715.03(a)(2)(B), (a)(2)(E), 715.04(a). The requirement(s) and/or refusal(s) made final in the Office action dated July 6, 2013 are maintained and continue to be final. See TMEP §§715.03(a)(2)(B), (a)(2)(E), 715.04(a).

In the present case, applicant's request has not resolved all the outstanding issue(s), nor does it raise a new issue or provide any new or compelling evidence with regard to the outstanding issue(s) in the final Office action. In addition, applicant's analysis and arguments are not persuasive nor do they shed new light on the issues. Accordingly, the request is denied.

#### **Trademark Act Section 2(e)(1) - Merely Descriptive Mark Refusal**

***THIS PARTIAL REFUSAL APPLIES ONLY TO THE FOLLOWING GOODS:*** "magnesium hydroxide, magnesium oxide, magnesium carbonate; magnesium oxide ceramics in particle and compacted form used as target material for sputtering, electron-beam deposition, evacuated deposition."

Registration is refused because the applied-for mark merely describes features of applicant's goods. Trademark Act Section 2(e)(1), 15 U.S.C. §1052(e)(1); see TMEP §§1209.01(b), 1209.03 *et seq.*

A mark is merely descriptive if it describes an ingredient, quality, characteristic, function, feature, purpose, or use of an applicant's goods and/or services. TMEP §1209.01(b); see, e.g., *DuoProSS Meditech Corp. v. Inviro Med. Devices, Ltd.*, 695 F.3d 1247, 1251, 103 USPQ2d 1753, 1755 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (quoting *In re Oppedahl & Larson LLP*, 373 F.3d 1171, 1173, 71 USPQ2d 1370, 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2004)); *In re Steelbuilding.com*, 415 F.3d 1293, 1297, 75 USPQ2d 1420, 1421 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (citing *Estate of P.D. Beckwith, Inc. v. Comm'r of Patents*, 252 U.S. 538, 543 (1920)).

A mark is merely descriptive if "it immediately conveys knowledge of a quality, feature, function, or characteristic of [an applicant's] goods or services." *In re The Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.*, 675 F.3d 1297, 1300, 102 USPQ2d 1217, 1219 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (quoting *In re Bayer Aktiengesellschaft*, 488 F.3d 960, 963, 82 USPQ2d 1828, 1831 (Fed. Cir. 2007)); TMEP §1209.01(b); see *DuoProSS Meditech Corp. v. Inviro Med. Devices, Ltd.*, 695 F.3d 1247, 1251, 103 USPQ2d 1753, 1755 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (quoting *In re Abcor Dev. Corp.*, 588 F.2d 811, 814, 200 USPQ 215, 218 (C.C.P.A. 1978)).

Applicant seeks registration of PUREMAG for Chemicals and chemical materials used in industry, science and agriculture, namely, magnesium hydroxide, magnesium oxide, magnesium carbonate, calcium hydroxide, calcium oxide, calcium carbonate, zirconium oxide, calcium sulfite, calcium peroxide, silicon carbide, silicon nitride; chemicals used in deposition, namely, chemical source material for the deposition of thin films; magnesium oxide ceramics in particle and compacted form used as target material for sputtering, electron-beam deposition, evacuated deposition; ceramic materials in particle and compacted form used as target material for sputtering, electron-beam deposition, evacuated deposition; ceramic materials for industrial use in powder, particle, and granular form; adhesives, not for stationery or household purposes; plant growth regulating preparations; fertilizing preparations.

“A mark may be merely descriptive even if it does not describe the ‘full scope and extent’ of the applicant’s goods or services.” *In re Oppedahl & Larson LLP*, 373 F.3d 1171, 1173, 71 USPQ2d 1370, 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (citing *In re Dial-A-Mattress Operating Corp.*, 240 F.3d 1341, 1346, 57 USPQ2d 1807, 1812 (Fed. Cir. 2001)); TMEP §1209.01(b). It is enough if a mark describes only one significant function, attribute, or property. *In re The Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.*, 675 F.3d 1297, 1300, 102 USPQ2d 1217, 1219 (Fed. Cir. 2012); TMEP §1209.01(b); see *In re Oppedahl & Larson LLP*, 373 F.3d at 1173, 71 USPQ2d at 1371.

Also, if the individual components of a mark retain their descriptive meaning in relation to the goods and/or services, the combination results in a composite mark that is itself descriptive and not registrable. *In re Phoseon Tech., Inc.*, 103 USPQ2d 1822, 1823 (TTAB 2012); TMEP §1209.03(d); see, e.g., *In re King Koil Licensing Co.*, 79 USPQ2d 1048, 1052 (TTAB 2006) (holding THE BREATHABLE MATTRESS merely descriptive of beds, mattresses, box springs, and pillows where the evidence showed that the term “BREATHABLE” retained its ordinary dictionary meaning when combined with the term “MATTRESS” and the resulting combination was used in the relevant industry in a descriptive sense); *In re Associated Theatre Clubs Co.*, 9 USPQ2d 1660, 1663 (TTAB 1988) (holding GROUP SALES BOX OFFICE merely descriptive of theater ticket sales services, because such wording “is nothing more than a combination of the two common descriptive terms most applicable to applicant’s services which in combination achieve no different status but remain a common descriptive compound expression”).

Only where the combination of descriptive terms creates a unitary mark with a unique, incongruous, or otherwise nondescriptive meaning in relation to the goods and/or services is the combined mark registrable. See *In re Colonial Stores, Inc.*, 394 F.2d 549, 551, 157 USPQ 382, 384 (C.C.P.A. 1968); *In re Positec Grp. Ltd.*, 108 USPQ2d 1161, 1162-63 (TTAB 2013).

In this case, both the individual components and the composite result are descriptive of applicant's goods and/or services and do not create a unique, incongruous, or nondescriptive meaning in relation to the goods and/or services.

As applicant is aware, the determination of whether a mark is merely descriptive is made in relation to an applicant's goods and/or services, not in the abstract. *DuoProSS Meditech Corp. v. Inviro Med. Devices, Ltd.*, 695 F.3d 1247, 1254, 103 USPQ2d 1753, 1757 (Fed. Cir. 2012); *In re The Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.*, 675 F.3d 1297, 1300, 102 USPQ2d 1217, 1219 (Fed. Cir. 2012); TMEP §1209.01(b); see, e.g., *In re Polo Int'l Inc.*, 51 USPQ2d 1061, 1062-63 (TTAB 1999) (finding DOC in DOC-CONTROL would refer to the "documents" managed by applicant's software rather than the term "doctor" shown in a dictionary definition); *In re Digital Research Inc.*, 4 USPQ2d 1242, 1243-44 (TTAB 1987) (finding CONCURRENT PC-DOS and CONCURRENT DOS merely descriptive of "computer programs recorded on disk" where the relevant trade used the denomination "concurrent" as a descriptor of a particular type of operating system).

"Whether consumers could guess what the product [or service] is from consideration of the mark alone is not the test." *In re Am. Greetings Corp.*, 226 USPQ 365, 366 (TTAB 1985).

Determining the descriptiveness of a mark is done in relation to an applicant's goods and/or services, the context in which the mark is being used, and the possible significance the mark would have to the average purchaser because of the manner of its use or intended use. See *In re The Chamber of Commerce of the U.S.*, 675 F.3d 1297, 1300, 102 USPQ2d 1217, 1219 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (citing *In re Bayer Aktiengesellschaft*, 488 F.3d 960, 963-64, 82 USPQ2d 1828, 1831 (Fed. Cir. 2007)); TMEP §1209.01(b). Descriptiveness of a mark is not considered in the abstract. *In re Bayer Aktiengesellschaft*, 488 F.3d at 963-64, 82 USPQ2d at 1831.

Here, as is apparent from the evidence attached to the Office Action November 23, 2012 and attached hereto, the wording "PURE" references the high level of purity of applicant's magnesium products. Indeed, as is apparent from the attached web page (of applicant), applicant's goods are more than 99.99 percent magnesium oxide. See attached. Indeed, the web site states that applicant "developed the high purity magnesium oxide . . . that contain[s] not less than 99.99 percent by using the raw material . . . [and] . . . it hardly contains impurities." See evidence attached to July 6, 2013 Final Office Action. Clearly, applicant's goods are as "pure" magnesium as is commercially available and are referred to by applicant as being "high purity" goods.

Thus, as used in connection with the identified goods, the applied-for mark “PUREMAG” merely describes applicant’s goods to the extent that it references the high level of purity of applicant’s magnesium products. Thus, the applied-for mark is merely descriptive and registration is refused on the Principal Register under Section 2(e)(1) of the Trademark Act.

Although applicant’s mark has been refused registration, applicant may respond to the refusal by submitting evidence and arguments in support of registration.

Application to be Returned to Trademark Trial and Appeal Board

If time remains in the six-month response period to the final Office action, applicant has the remainder of the response period to comply with and/or overcome any outstanding final requirement(s) and/or refusal(s) and/or to file an appeal with the Board. TMEP §715.03(a)(2)(B), (c). However, if applicant has already filed a timely notice of appeal with the Board, the Board will be notified to resume the appeal. *See* TMEP §715.04(a).

/Marc J. Leipzig/

Law Office 115

Trademark Examining Attorney

Phone: (571) 272-2104

marc.leipzig2@uspto.gov