

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

Mailed: February 26, 2004

In re DSM IP ASSETS B.V.

Serial No. 76437267

Filed: 07/31/2002

JAMES R. MENKER
PILLSBURY WINTHROP LLP
P.O. BOX 10500
MCLEAN, VA 22102

Denise M. DeGizzi, Paralegal Specialist

Applicant filed, on February 18, 2004, an amendment and a notice of appeal.

The basis of the final refusal, issued on August 26, 2003, is the unacceptability of the identification of goods, and the amendment is an attempt by applicant to submit an acceptable identification.

Accordingly, action on the appeal 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 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 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, or the identification 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 are prohibited under Trademark Rule 2.71(a).