

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
Trademark Trial and Appeal Board
2900 Crystal Drive
Arlington, Virginia 22202-3513

Mailed: August 21, 2002

Opposition No. 117,378

OMEGA, S.A.

v.

SHAWN PANCHACHARAM

Cindy B. Greenbaum, Attorney:

Opposer's motion (filed July 11, 2001) to extend, with an allegation of applicant's consent, does not indicate proof of service thereof on counsel for applicant, as Trademark Rule 2.119 requires. In order to expedite this matter, a copy of said motion to extend is forwarded herewith to counsel for applicant. Applicant has until THIRTY DAYS from the mailing date hereof to file any objection to the enclosed motion, failing which the motion to extend will be granted.

Opposer is reminded that pursuant to the December 7, 2001 Board order, the Board will not entertain any motions to extend by opposer absent applicant's signature indicating applicant's consent to the extension, and a report to the Board on the progress of the parties' settlement negotiations. The Board has made an exception with regard to opposer's July 11, 2001 motion to extend, but will not do

Opposition No. 117,378

so again. If opposer files another motion to extend in violation of the terms of the December 7, 2001 Board order, the motion will not be considered, and opposer will not have the opportunity to cure the defect.

This case remains otherwise suspended.