

RK/dmd

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK  
OFFICE  
Trademark Trial and Appeal Board  
P.O. Box 1451  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1451  
General Contact Number: 571-272-8500

Mailed: January 27, 2016

Opposition No. **91225113**

*RE/MAX, LLC*

*v.*

*Shenzhen Remax Co., Ltd*

**Denise M. DelGizzi,  
Chief Clerk of the Board**

On December 8 and December 29, 2015, Opposer informed the Board that service of the notice of opposition on Applicant at the correspondence address of record was ineffective.<sup>1</sup> As part of the notices, Opposer provided five separate correspondence addresses for Applicant to which it served the notice of opposition but as noted in the footnote, *supra*, service was only successful at two of the addresses, neither of

---

<sup>1</sup> It is noted that Applicant filed a change of correspondence in the involved application on November 9, 2015, prior to the November 12, 2015, filing date (under a certificate of service) of the notice of opposition. Although the notice of opposition was first served on the prior correspondence address on Huaning Road in Shenzhen, China (as well as a second address in Houston, Texas based on a putatively related application, i.e., Application Serial No. 79157528), Opposer attempted to re-serve the notice at the updated correspondence in San Diego, California on November 18, 2015. Neither attempt on the correspondence address of record was successful. Although service at the Houston address was successful, it is not wholly clear that the Houston address is the correct correspondence for Applicant. Opposer subsequently obtained two additional addresses: one from a website “believed to be associated with Applicant” and another from the State Administration for Industry & Commerce of the People’s Republic of China. Both addresses are located in Mingjung Industrial Park in Shenzhen, China, with the only difference being the particular subdivision, i.e., “1/F, B1 Building” for the former and “3/F, Factory Block B1” for the latter. Service at the former was unsuccessful but service at the latter proved successful. Again, it is unclear whether this address is the correct correspondence for Applicant.

which was provided by Applicant. However, the Board's order of December 1, 2015, instituting this proceeding and a copy of the notice of opposition were forwarded to Applicant at the updated correspondence address in San Diego, California. They appear to have been delivered as they have not been returned to the Board as undeliverable. Furthermore, the Board has conducted a search of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) database of Applicant's putatively related application and has discovered two additional addresses to where service may be effected.

As such, this order is mailed to all of the following:

**Eric Wang**  
**Shenzen Remax Co., Ltd**  
**6640 Lusk Blvd, Suite A205A**  
**San Diego, CA 92121**

**Liang Gong**  
**10685-B Hazelhurst Dr. #14729**  
**Houston, TX 77043**

**Shenzen Remax Co., Ltd**  
**3/F, Factory Block B1**  
**Mingjun Industrial Park**  
**Huarong Rd., Baoan Area**  
**Shenzhen 518109**  
**China**

**Shenzhen Zhonggangxing**  
**Trademark Agency Company Limited**  
**Rm. 1911 F.19 International Trade,**  
**Center Building People South Rd.,**  
**Luohu District Shenzhen City**  
**Guangdong Province, China**

**Shenzhen Remax Co., Limited**  
**3/F B1 Plant,**  
**Ming Jun Industrial Park,**

**Huaning Road, Dalang Community,  
Dalang Street, Baoan District  
Shen Zhen City, Guangdong Province  
China**

In view of the confusion surrounding Applicant's correspondence address, **proceedings herein are SUSPENDED and Applicant is allowed until FEBRUARY 26, 2016, to inform the Board of its current correspondence address<sup>2</sup>, failing which the Board may issue an order to show cause why default judgment should not be entered against Applicant based on Applicant's apparent loss of interest in the proceeding.**

If there has been any transfer of interest in the involved application, Applicant must so advise the Board and Applicant must submit copies of the appropriate documents. *See* Section 10 of the Trademark Act and Patent and Trademark Rules 3.71 and 3.73.

As to Applicant's filing of January 8, 2016, it is noted that the document appears to be largely in Chinese without a translation.<sup>3</sup> It is further noted that Applicant's filing fails to indicate proof of service on Opposer as required by Trademark Rule 2.119.

Applicant is reminded that Board proceedings are conducted in English. If a party intends to rely on any documents that are in a language other than English,

---

<sup>2</sup> Applicant is reminded of its responsibility to ensure that the Board has its current correspondence address. *See* TBMP § 117.07.

<sup>3</sup> Opposer may view and obtain a copy of the filing at <http://ttabvue.uspto.gov/ttabvue/v?pno=91225113&pty=OPP&eno=7>. Notwithstanding, strict compliance with Trademark Rule 2.119 is required by Applicant in all future papers filed with the Board.

the party should also submit a certified translation of the documents. If a translation is not submitted, the documents may not be considered. *See* TBMP § 104. Furthermore, every paper filed in the United States Patent and Trademark Office in a Board *inter partes* proceeding must be served on all other parties and proof of such service must be made before the paper will be considered by the Board. *See* Trademark Rule 2.119(a). **Inasmuch as Applicant's submission of January 8, 2016, is untranslated and unserved, the filing will receive no further consideration.**

\* \* \*