From: Castro, Giancarlo

Sent: 3/10/2014 1:29:16 PM

To: TTAB EFiling

CC:

Subject: U.S. TRADEMARK APPLICATION NO. 85778638 - NASH AWARDS - 057273-04190 - Request for Reconsideration Denied - Return to TTAB

****

Attachment Information:

Count: 1

Files: 85778638.doc

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

U.S. APPLICATION SERIAL NO. 85778638

MARK: NASH AWARDS

CORRESPONDENT ADDRESS:

ROBERT B BURLINGAME

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP

PO BOX 2824

SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94126-2824

GENERAL TRADEMARK INFORMATION:

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

APPLICANT: Consolidated IP Company LLC

CORRESPONDENT'S REFERENCE/DOCKET NO:

057273-04190

CORRESPONDENT E-MAIL ADDRESS:

sftrademarks@pillsburylaw.com

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION DENIED

ISSUE/MAILING DATE: 3/10/2014

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 10, 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.

The filing of a request for reconsideration does not extend the time for filing a proper response to a final Office action or an appeal with the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board (Board), which runs from the date the final Office action was issued/mailed. *See* 37 C.F.R. §2.64(b); TMEP §715.03, (a)(2)(B), (a)(2)(E), (c).

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).

The following refusal is maintained:

Surname Refusal

The examining attorney has reviewed the applicant's arguments regarding the surname refusal but has found them unpersuasive. Registration is therefore refused because the applied-for mark is primarily merely a surname. Trademark Act Section 2(e)(4), 15 U.S.C. §1052(e)(4); *see* TMEP §1211. The primary significance of the mark to the purchasing public determines whether a term is primarily merely a surname. *In re Kahan & Weisz Jewelry Mfg. Corp.*, 508 F.2d 831, 832, 184 USPQ 421, 422 (C.C.P.A. 1975); *In re Binion*, 93 USPQ2d 1531, 1537 (TTAB 2009); *see* TMEP §§1211, 1211.01.

/Giancarlo Castro/

Giancarlo Castro

Examining Attorney

Law Office 110

571-272-9357

giancarlo.castro@uspto.gov