

United States Patent and Trademark Office
Trademark Trial and Appeal Board
P.O. Box 1451
Alexandria, VA 22313-1451

Mailed: August 1, 2005

In re Arthrex, Inc.

Serial No. 78328696

Filed: 11/17/2003

Charles P. LaPolla
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
7th Floor 1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036-8403

Millicent Canady, Paralegal Specialist

Applicant's notice of appeal filed July 26, 2005 and request for reconsideration filed July 27, 2005 are noted.

The request for reconsideration requires consideration by the Trademark Examining Attorney. Accordingly, the appeal is instituted, but action on it is suspended and the file is herewith remanded to the Examining Attorney.

The basis of the final refusal is that the mark is merely descriptive. In the response applicant has traversed this refusal and has also, in the alternative, amended the application to seek registration pursuant to Section 2(f).

In the event the Examining Attorney finds the alternative claim of acquired distinctiveness persuasive, the Examining Attorney should inquire whether applicant wishes to proceed with the appeal regarding the Section 2(e)(1) ground of refusal. If not, the appeal will be moot.

If, however, applicant wishes to pursue the appeal on the Section 2(e)(1) refusal, the file should be returned to the Board, and action in the appeal will be resumed.

Finally, if the Examining Attorney is not persuaded by applicant's Section 2(f) claim, the Examining Attorney is reminded that the alternative claim of acquired distinctiveness should be treated as raising a new issue, such that any refusal to accept registration under Section 2(f) cannot be made final until applicant has been given an opportunity to respond.

If another final refusal ultimately issues, the "six-month response" clause should be omitted from the paper in which such action is taken; the file of this case should be returned to the Board; proceedings will be resumed; and applicant will be allowed time in which to file its brief on appeal.