

From: Singh, Tejbir

Sent: 3/21/2012 3:33:47 PM

To: TTAB EFiling

CC:

Subject: U.S. TRADEMARK APPLICATION NO. 85171068 - E-SKIN - 2010102T -
Request for Reconsideration Denied - Return to TTAB

Attachment Information:

Count: 1

Files: 85171068.doc

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (USPTO)
OFFICE ACTION (OFFICIAL LETTER) ABOUT APPLICANT'S TRADEMARK APPLICATION

APPLICATION SERIAL NO. 85171068

MARK: E-SKIN



CORRESPONDENT ADDRESS:
HYUNHO PARK
DICKINSON WRIGHT PLLC
1875 EYE STREET, NW SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

GENERAL TRADEMARK INFORMATION:
<http://www.uspto.gov/main/trademarks.htm>

APPLICANT: NANOBRICK CO., Ltd.

CORRESPONDENT'S REFERENCE/DOCKET NO:
2010102T

CORRESPONDENT E-MAIL ADDRESS:
hparkip@gmail.com

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION DENIED

ISSUE/MAILING DATE: 3/21/2012

The trademark examining attorney has carefully reviewed applicant's request for reconsideration and is denying the request for the reasons stated below. *See* 37 C.F.R. §2.64(b); TMEP §§715.03(a), 715.04(a). The requirement(s) and/or refusal(s) made final in the Office action dated 9/19/11 are maintained, in part, and continue to be final. *See* TMEP §§715.03(a), 715.04(a).

The following wording is acceptable in Class 17: "Plastic films containing material which changes optical characteristics and color in the presence of an electric field, the plastic films being used in the manufacture of displays and screens; Plastic sheets containing material which changes optical characteristics and color in the presence of an electric field, the plastic sheets being used in the manufacture of displays and screens."

In the present case, applicant's request has not resolved all the outstanding issue(s), nor does it raise a new issue or provide any new or compelling evidence with regard to the outstanding issue(s) in the final Office action. In addition, applicant's analysis and arguments are not persuasive nor do they shed new light on the issues. Accordingly, the request is denied.

The requirement for an acceptable identification is continued. The Class 1 goods remain unclear and indefinite. The type of ingredient is unclear. Applicant has not clarified

what the “particle suspensions” refers to. The “paper” goods remain unclear and indefinite. Paper is typically classified in Class 16. Most of the Class 17 goods remain unclear and indefinite. The type of material remains unclear, and particle suspensions remains unclear.

The filing of a request for reconsideration does not extend the time for filing a proper response to a final Office action or an appeal with the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board (Board), which runs from the date the final Office action was issued/mailed. *See* 37 C.F.R. §2.64(b); TMEP §§715.03, 715.03(a), (c).

If time remains in the six-month response period to the final Office action, applicant has the remainder of the response period to comply with and/or overcome any outstanding final requirement(s) and/or refusal(s) and/or to file an appeal with the Board. TMEP §715.03(a), (c). However, if applicant has already filed a timely notice of appeal with the Board, the Board will be notified to resume the appeal when the time for responding to the final Office action has expired. *See* TMEP §715.04(a).

/Tejbir Singh/
Trademark Attorney
Law Office 106
(571) 272-5878
(571) 273-9106 (fax)
Tejbir.Singh@uspto.gov (informal inquiries
only)