

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Trademark Trial and Appeal Board
2900 Crystal Drive
Arlington, Virginia 22202-3513

Johnson

Mailed: January 24, 2003

In re Virtual Component
Exchange

Serial No. 76096623

Filed: 07/26/2000

W. THAD ADAMS, III,
ADAMS, SCHWARTZ & EVANS, P.A.
2180 TWO FIRST UNION CENTER
CHARLOTTE, NC 28282

LaToya C. Johnson, Paralegal:

Applicant filed, on December 16, 2002, an amendment and a notice of appeal.

The basis of the final refusal, issued on June 13, 2002, is the unacceptability of the identification of goods/recitation of services, and the amendment is an attempt by applicant to submit an acceptable identification/recitation. Accordingly, the appeal is hereby instituted but action on it is suspended and the file is remanded to the Trademark Examining Attorney for consideration of the amendment.

If the amendment is accepted, the appeal will be moot. If the amendment is found unacceptable, the Examining

Serial No. 76096623

Attorney should issue an Office Action indicating the reasons why the proposed amendment is unacceptable and return the file to the Board, which will then allow applicant time to file its appeal brief.¹ However, if the Examining Attorney believes that the problems with the proposed identification/recitation can be resolved, the Examining Attorney is encouraged to contact applicant, either by telephone or written Office Action, in an attempt to do so.

¹ If the Examining Attorney believes that the proposed amendment is unacceptable because it exceeds the scope of the original identification/recitation, or the identification/recitation as it has subsequently been amended, then the Examining Attorney may not issue a final refusal unless application was previously advised that amendments broadening the identification/recitation are prohibited under Trademark Rule 2.71(a).