

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
Trademark Trial and Appeal Board
P.O. Box 1451
Alexandria, VA 22313-1451

RK/am

Mailed: May 11, 2012

Opposition No. 91193067

Heidelberg University

v.

Heidelberg University

Yong Oh (Richard) Kim, Interlocutory Attorney:

On April 11, 2012, applicant filed a consented motion to extend all remaining dates in the schedule set forth in applicant's consented motion of December 9, 2011, by thirty days. Prior to the Board taking action on the motion to extend, opposer filed on May 10, 2012, a consented motion to extend all remaining dates in the same schedule of December 9, 2011, by sixty days, and which motion the Board construes as superseding the motion of April 11, 2012.¹

As it appears from the latest motion that the parties have proceeded with the mandatory discovery conference, opposer's motion to extend is **GRANTED**. Dates are **RESET** in

¹ Accordingly, applicant's motion to extend filed April 11, 2012, is moot and will be given no further consideration. As an aside, the parties should note that after an answer is filed, the Board will not find good cause to delay the mandatory discovery conference for the purpose of settlement discussions because the conference itself provides an opportunity to discuss settlement. See "Miscellaneous Changes to Trademark Trial and Appeal Board Rules," 72 Fed. Reg. 42242, 42245 (Aug. 1, 2007).

Opposition No. 91193067

accordance with the schedule set forth in opposer's motion
of May 10, 2012.

* * *