

**To:** Cameron Mitchell([cmitchell@counxel.com](mailto:cmitchell@counxel.com))  
**Subject:** U.S. Trademark Application Serial No. 97120567 - HASTE - 00969  
**Sent:** August 24, 2022 09:59:49 AM EDT  
**Sent As:** [tmng.notices@uspto.gov](mailto:tmng.notices@uspto.gov)

---

**Attachments**

[5784070](#)

**United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO)  
Office Action (Official Letter) About Applicant's Trademark Application**

**U.S. Application Serial No.** 97120567

**Mark:** HASTE

**Correspondence Address:**

Cameron Mitchell  
Counxel Legal Firm  
2222 South Dobson Road, Suite 1104  
Mesa AZ 85202 UNITED STATES

**Applicant:** Haste, Inc.

**Reference/Docket No.** 00969

**Correspondence Email Address:** [cmitchell@counxel.com](mailto:cmitchell@counxel.com)

**NONFINAL OFFICE ACTION**

**The USPTO must receive applicant's response to this letter within six months of the issue date below or the application will be [abandoned](#).** Respond using the Trademark Electronic Application System (TEAS). A link to the appropriate TEAS response form appears at the end of this Office action.

**Issue date:** August 24, 2022

The referenced application has been reviewed by the assigned trademark examining attorney. Applicant must respond timely and completely to the issue(s) below. 15 U.S.C. §1062(b); 37 C.F.R. §§2.62(a), 2.65(a); TMEP §§711, 718.03.

## **SUMMARY OF ISSUES:**

- Partial Section 2(d) Refusal - Likelihood of Confusion with Regard to Class 36
- Classification and Identification of Services

## **PARTIAL SECTION 2(d) REFUSAL - LIKELIHOOD OF CONFUSION WITH REGARD TO CLASS 36**

### **THIS PARTIAL REFUSAL APPLIES TO CLASS 36 ONLY**

Applicant has applied to register HASTE in standard characters for "Payment exchange services of micro- and nano-transactions of cryptocurrency utilizing blockchain technology" in Class 36, and "Providing online gaming platform for competitive video games" in Class 41.

The stated refusal refers to International Class 36 only and does not bar registration in the other class.

Registration of the applied-for mark is partially refused because of a likelihood of confusion with the mark HASTEE in U.S. Registration No. 5784070. Trademark Act Section 2(d), 15 U.S.C. §1052(d); *see* TMEP §§1207.01 *et seq.* See the attached registration.

Trademark Act Section 2(d) bars registration of an applied-for mark that is so similar to a registered mark that it is likely consumers would be confused, mistaken, or deceived as to the commercial source of the goods and/or services of the parties. *See* 15 U.S.C. §1052(d). Likelihood of confusion is determined on a case-by-case basis by applying the factors set forth in *In re E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 476 F.2d 1357, 1361, 177 USPQ 563, 567 (C.C.P.A. 1973) (called the “*du Pont* factors”). *In re i.am.symbolic, llc*, 866 F.3d 1315, 1322, 123 USPQ2d 1744, 1747 (Fed. Cir. 2017). Any evidence of record related to those factors need be considered; however, “not all of the *DuPont* factors are relevant or of similar weight in every case.” *In re Guild Mortg. Co.*, 912 F.3d 1376, 1379, 129 USPQ2d 1160, 1162 (Fed. Cir. 2019) (quoting *In re Dixie Rests., Inc.*, 105 F.3d 1405, 1406, 41 USPQ2d 1531, 1533 (Fed. Cir. 1997)).

Although not all *du Pont* factors may be relevant, there are generally two key considerations in any likelihood of confusion analysis: (1) the similarities between the compared marks and (2) the relatedness of the compared goods and/or services. *See In re i.am.symbolic, llc*, 866 F.3d at 1322, 123 USPQ2d at 1747 (quoting *Herbko Int’l, Inc. v. Kappa Books, Inc.*, 308 F.3d 1156, 1164-65, 64 USPQ2d 1375, 1380 (Fed. Cir. 2002)); *Federated Foods, Inc. v. Fort Howard Paper Co.*, 544 F.2d 1098, 1103, 192 USPQ 24, 29 (C.C.P.A. 1976) (“The fundamental inquiry mandated by [Section] 2(d) goes to the cumulative effect of differences in the essential characteristics of the goods [or services] and differences in the marks.”); TMEP §1207.01.

Marks are compared in their entirety for similarities in appearance, sound, connotation, and commercial impression. *Stone Lion Capital Partners, LP v. Lion Capital LLP*, 746 F.3d 1317, 1321, 110 USPQ2d 1157, 1160 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (quoting *Palm Bay Imps., Inc. v. Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin Maison Fondee En 1772*, 396 F.3d 1369, 1371, 73 USPQ2d 1689, 1691 (Fed. Cir. 2005)); TMEP §1207.01(b)-(b)(v). “Similarity in any one of these elements may be sufficient to find the marks confusingly similar.” *In re Inn at St. John’s, LLC*, 126 USPQ2d 1742, 1746 (TTAB 2018) (citing *In re Davia*, 110 USPQ2d 1810, 1812 (TTAB 2014)), *aff’d per curiam*, 777 F. App’x 516, 2019 BL 343921 (Fed. Cir. 2019); TMEP §1207.01(b).

### **Similarity of the Marks**

The applicant has applied for the mark HASTE. The cited mark is HASTEE, owned by Hastee Technologies Ltd.

Marks are compared in their entireties for similarities in appearance, sound, connotation, and commercial impression. *Stone Lion Capital Partners, LP v. Lion Capital LLP*, 746 F.3d 1317, 1321, 110 USPQ2d 1157, 1160 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (quoting *Palm Bay Imps., Inc. v. Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin Maison Fondee En 1772*, 396 F.3d 1369, 1371, 73 USPQ2d 1689, 1691 (Fed. Cir. 2005)); TMEP §1207.01(b)-(b)(v). “Similarity in any one of these elements may be sufficient to find the marks confusingly similar.” *In re Inn at St. John’s, LLC*, 126 USPQ2d 1742, 1746 (TTAB 2018) (citing *In re Davia*, 110 USPQ2d 1810, 1812 (TTAB 2014)), *aff’d per curiam*, 777 F. App’x 516, 2019 BL 343921 (Fed. Cir. 2019); TMEP §1207.01(b).

When comparing marks, “[t]he proper test is not a side-by-side comparison of the marks, but instead whether the marks are sufficiently similar in terms of their commercial impression such that [consumers] who encounter the marks would be likely to assume a connection between the parties.” *Cai v. Diamond Hong, Inc.*, 901 F.3d 1367, 1373, 127 USPQ2d 1797, 1801 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (quoting *Coach Servs., Inc. v. Triumph Learning LLC*, 668 F.3d 1356, 1368, 101 USPQ2d 1713, 1721 (Fed. Cir. 2012)); TMEP §1207.01(b). The proper focus is on the recollection of the average purchaser, who retains a general rather than specific impression of trademarks. *In re Ox Paperboard, LLC*, 2020 USPQ2d 10878, at \*4 (TTAB 2020) (citing *In re Bay State Brewing Co.*, 117 USPQ2d 1958, 1960 (TTAB 2016)); *In re Inn at St. John’s, LLC*, 126 USPQ2d 1742, 1746 (TTAB 2018); TMEP §1207.01(b); *see In re St. Helena Hosp.*, 774 F.3d 747, 750-51, 113 USPQ2d 1082, 1085 (Fed. Cir. 2014).

Here, the applicant's mark, HASTE, is confusingly similar to the registrant's mark, HASTEE. Specifically, the marks share the wording "HASTE".

First, the marks are similar because they share the wording "HASTE". Marks may be confusingly similar in appearance where similar terms or phrases or similar parts of terms or phrases appear in the compared marks and create a similar overall commercial impression. *See Crocker Nat’l Bank v. Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce*, 228 USPQ 689, 690-91 (TTAB 1986), *aff’d sub nom. Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce v. Wells Fargo Bank, Nat’l Ass’n*, 811 F.2d 1490, 1495, 1 USPQ2d 1813, 1817 (Fed. Cir. 1987) (holding COMMCASH and COMMUNICASH confusingly similar); *In re Corning Glass Works*, 229 USPQ 65, 66 (TTAB 1985) (holding CONFIRM and CONFIRMCELLS confusingly similar); *In re Pellerin Milnor Corp.*, 221 USPQ 558, 560 (TTAB 1983) (holding MILTRON and MILLTRONICS confusingly similar); TMEP §1207.01(b)(ii)-(iii).

Further, the additional wording in the registered mark does not sufficiently differentiate the marks, as the entirety of the applied-for mark appears within the registered mark. Incorporating the entirety of one mark within another does not obviate the similarity between the compared marks, as in the present case, nor does it overcome a likelihood of confusion under Section 2(d). *See Wella Corp. v. Cal. Concept Corp.*, 558 F.2d 1019, 1022, 194 USPQ 419, 422 (C.C.P.A. 1977) (holding CALIFORNIA CONCEPT and surfer design and CONCEPT confusingly similar); *Coca-Cola Bottling Co. v. Jos. E. Seagram & Sons, Inc.*, 526 F.2d 556, 557, 188 USPQ 105, 106 (C.C.P.A. 1975) (holding BENGAL LANCER and design and BENGAL confusingly similar); *Double Coin Holdings, Ltd. v. Tru Dev.*, 2019 USPQ2d 377409, at \*6-7 (TTAB 2019) (holding ROAD WARRIOR and WARRIOR (stylized) confusingly similar); *In re Mr. Recipe, LLC*, 118 USPQ2d 1084, 1090 (TTAB 2016) (holding JAWS DEVOUR YOUR HUNGER and JAWS confusingly similar); TMEP §1207.01(b)(iii). In the present

case, the marks are identical in part.

Thus, because the marks share the wording "HASTE", the marks are considered similar for likelihood of confusion purposes.

#### Relatedness of the Services

The applicant's services at issue are "Payment exchange services of micro- and nano-transactions of cryptocurrency utilizing blockchain technology" in Class 36.

The registrant's relevant services are "financial services, namely, money lending, installment loans, temporary loans, short term loans, payroll factoring services, charge card and credit card payment processing services, cryptocurrency payment processing" in Class 36.

The services are compared to determine whether they are similar, commercially related, or travel in the same trade channels. *See Coach Servs., Inc. v. Triumph Learning LLC*, 668 F.3d 1356, 1369-71, 101 USPQ2d 1713, 1722-23 (Fed. Cir. 2012); *Herbko Int'l, Inc. v. Kappa Books, Inc.*, 308 F.3d 1156, 1165, 64 USPQ2d 1375, 1381 (Fed. Cir. 2002); TMEP §§1207.01, 1207.01(a)(vi).

The compared services need not be identical or even competitive to find a likelihood of confusion. *See On-line Careline Inc. v. Am. Online Inc.*, 229 F.3d 1080, 1086, 56 USPQ2d 1471, 1475 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Recot, Inc. v. Becton*, 214 F.3d 1322, 1329, 54 USPQ2d 1894, 1898 (Fed. Cir. 2000); TMEP §1207.01(a)(i). They need only be "related in some manner and/or if the circumstances surrounding their marketing are such that they could give rise to the mistaken belief that [the goods and/or services] emanate from the same source." *Coach Servs., Inc. v. Triumph Learning LLC*, 668 F.3d 1356, 1369, 101 USPQ2d 1713, 1722 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (quoting *7-Eleven Inc. v. Wechsler*, 83 USPQ2d 1715, 1724 (TTAB 2007)); TMEP §1207.01(a)(i).

Determining likelihood of confusion is based on the description of the goods and/or services stated in the application and registration at issue, not on extrinsic evidence of actual use. *See In re Detroit Athletic Co.*, 903 F.3d 1297, 1307, 128 USPQ2d 1047, 1052 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (citing *In re i.am.symbolic, llc*, 866 F.3d 1315, 1325, 123 USPQ2d 1744, 1749 (Fed. Cir. 2017)).

In this case, the registration use broad wording to describe "cryptocurrency payment processing", which presumably encompasses all services of the type described, including applicant's more narrow "Payment exchange services of micro- and nano-transactions of cryptocurrency utilizing blockchain technology". *See, e.g., In re Solid State Design Inc.*, 125 USPQ2d 1409, 1412-15 (TTAB 2018); *Sw. Mgmt., Inc. v. Ocinomled, Ltd.*, 115 USPQ2d 1007, 1025 (TTAB 2015). Thus, applicant's and registrant's services are highly related *See, e.g., In re i.am.symbolic, llc*, 127 USPQ2d 1627, 1629 (TTAB 2018) (citing *Tuxedo Monopoly, Inc. v. Gen. Mills Fun Grp., Inc.*, 648 F.2d 1335, 1336, 209 USPQ 986, 988 (C.C.P.A. 1981); *Inter IKEA Sys. B.V. v. Akea, LLC*, 110 USPQ2d 1734, 1745 (TTAB 2014); *Baseball Am. Inc. v. Powerplay Sports Ltd.*, 71 USPQ2d 1844, 1847 n.9 (TTAB 2004)).

Additionally, the goods and/or services of the parties have no restrictions as to nature, type, channels of trade, or classes of purchasers and are "presumed to travel in the same channels of trade to the same class of purchasers." *In re Viterra Inc.*, 671 F.3d 1358, 1362, 101 USPQ2d 1905, 1908 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (quoting *Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Packard Press, Inc.*, 281 F.3d 1261, 1268, 62 USPQ2d 1001, 1005 (Fed. Cir. 2002)). Thus, applicant's and registrant's goods and/or services are related.

Thus, applicant's and registrant's services are considered related for likelihood of confusion purposes. *See, e.g., In re Davey Prods. Pty Ltd.*, 92 USPQ2d 1198, 1202-04 (TTAB 2009); *In re Toshiba Med. Sys. Corp.*, 91 USPQ2d 1266, 1268-69, 1271-72 (TTAB 2009).

The overriding concern is not only to prevent buyer confusion as to the source of the services, but to protect the registrant from adverse commercial impact due to use of a similar mark by a newcomer. *See In re Shell Oil Co.*, 992 F.2d 1204, 1208, 26 USPQ2d 1687, 1690 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Therefore, any doubt regarding a likelihood of confusion determination is resolved in favor of the registrant. TMEP §1207.01(d)(i); *see Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Packard Press, Inc.*, 281 F.3d 1261, 1265, 62 USPQ2d 1001, 1003 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *In re Hyper Shoppes (Ohio), Inc.*, 837 F.2d 463, 464-65, 6 USPQ2d 1025, 1026 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Accordingly, because the marks are significantly similar and the services are highly related, purchasers are likely to be confused as to the source of the services. Thus, registration is partially refused pursuant to Section 2(d) of the Trademark Act.

Although applicant's mark has been refused registration, applicant may respond to the refusal(s) by submitting evidence and arguments in support of registration. Applicant should note the following advisory.

#### **ADVISORY: PARTIAL REFUSAL RESPONSE OPTIONS**

Applicant may respond to the stated refusal by submitting evidence and arguments against the refusal. In addition, applicant may respond by doing one of the following:

- (1) Deleting the class to which the refusal pertains;
- (2) Filing a [Request to Divide Application form](#) (form #3) to divide out the goods and/or services that have not been refused registration, so that the mark may proceed toward publication for opposition in the class to which the refusal does not pertain. *See* 37 C.F.R. §2.87. *See generally* TMEP §§1110 *et seq.* (regarding the requirements for filing a request to divide). If applicant files a request to divide, then to avoid abandonment, applicant must also file a timely response to all outstanding issues in this Office action, including the refusal. 37 C.F.R. §2.87(e); or
- (3) Amending the basis for that class, if appropriate. TMEP §806.03(h). (The basis cannot be changed for applications filed under Trademark Act Section 66(a). TMEP §1904.01(a).)

Applicant must address the following requirement.

#### **CLASSIFICATION AND IDENTIFICATION OF SERVICES**

The identification of services in Classes 36 and 42 is indefinite and/or misclassified and must be clarified or reclassified to ensure proper analysis.

In Class 36, the wording "Providing online gaming platform for competitive video games" in the identification of services is indefinite and must be clarified to further specify the nature of the services, as set forth below. *See* 37 C.F.R. §2.32(a)(6); TMEP §1402.01. Additionally, this wording is misclassified, as such software is classified in Class 42.

In Class 41, the wording “Payment exchange services of micro- and nano-transactions of cryptocurrency utilizing blockchain technology” in the identification of services is indefinite and must be clarified to further specify the nature of the services, as set forth below. *See* 37 C.F.R. §2.32(a)(6); TMEP §1402.041

Applicant may adopt the following suggestions, if accurate:

036: Payment exchange services **in the nature of cryptocurrency exchange services, namely, processing** micro- and nano-transactions of cryptocurrency utilizing blockchain technology

**042:** Providing **temporary use of online non-downloadable software in the nature of an** online gaming platform for **playing** competitive video games

Applicant may amend the identification to clarify or limit the services, but not to broaden or expand the services beyond those in the original application or as acceptably amended. *See* 37 C.F.R. §2.71(a); TMEP §1402.06. Generally, any deleted services may not later be reinserted. *See* TMEP §1402.07(e).

For assistance with identifying and classifying goods and services in trademark applications, please see the USPTO’s online searchable [U.S. Acceptable Identification of Goods and Services Manual](#). *See* TMEP §1402.04.

## **RESPONSE GUIDELINES**

Please call or email the assigned trademark examining attorney with questions about this Office action. Although an examining attorney cannot provide legal advice, the examining attorney can provide additional explanation about the refusal(s) and/or requirement(s) in this Office action. *See* TMEP §§705.02, 709.06.

The USPTO does not accept emails as responses to Office actions; however, emails can be used for informal communications and are included in the application record. *See* 37 C.F.R. §§2.62(c), 2.191; TMEP §§304.01-.02, 709.04-.05.

**How to respond.** [Click to file a response to this nonfinal Office action.](#)

/Nathaniel Pettican/  
Nathaniel Pettican  
Trademark Examining Attorney  
Law Office 108  
(571) 272-1087  
nathaniel.pettican@uspto.gov

## **RESPONSE GUIDANCE**

- **Missing the response deadline to this letter will cause the application to [abandon](#).** The response must be received by the USPTO before midnight **Eastern Time** of the last day of the response period. TEAS maintenance or [unforeseen circumstances](#) could affect an applicant's ability to timely respond.
- **[Responses signed by an unauthorized party](#)** are not accepted and can **cause the application to [abandon](#)**. If applicant does not have an attorney, the response must be signed by the individual applicant, all joint applicants, or someone with [legal authority to bind a juristic applicant](#). If applicant has an attorney, the response must be signed by the attorney.
- If needed, **find [contact information for the supervisor](#)** of the office or unit listed in the signature block.

**(4) STANDARD CHARACTER MARK****HASTEE****Mark Punctuated**

HASTEE

**Translation****Goods/Services**

- IC 009. US 021 023 026 036 038.G & S: computer software, computer programs, and application development software used to process, conduct, and manage consumer and employee financial transactions, payroll factoring, and cryptocurrency wallets and used for applying for and managing personal short term loans; computer hardware, programs and software for the provision of banking services, financial services, insurance services, loan services, bank account management services, monetary transfer services, payment services, financial analysis and financial reports, financial management services and for the provision of information relating to banking and finance; computer software for processing electronic payments and for transferring funds to and from others; authentication software for controlling access to and controlling communications with computers and computer networks; magnetically encoded cards for carrying data, namely, magnetically encoded blank bank cards for issuance by financial institutions; multifunction encoded magnetic cards for financial services, namely, magnetically encoded charge cards, cash cards, bank cards, cheque cards, credit cards, and debit cards; computer application software for mobile phones, tablets and handheld devices used to process, conduct, and manage consumer and employee financial transactions, payroll factoring, and cryptocurrency wallets and used for applying for and managing personal short term loans; computer software for financial transaction authentication and verification; electronic publications, namely, newsletters and educational articles in the fields of consumer and employee financial transactions, payroll factoring, banking transaction and provision of personal short term loans, recorded on computer media; downloadable electronic publications, namely, newsletters and educational articles in the fields of consumer and employee financial transactions, payroll factoring, banking transaction and provision of loans; electronic databases in the field of payroll and employee benefits and incentives information recorded on computer media; computer software and computer programs for machine learning, namely, for running artificial intelligence algorithms relating to financial transactions, payroll and employee benefits and incentives
- IC 035. US 100 101 102.G & S: data processing services in the field of payroll; administration of business payroll for others; business management; business administration services; collection of business data and information relating to payroll and employee benefits and incentives
- IC 036. US 100 101 102.G & S: financial services, namely, money lending, installment loans, temporary loans, short term loans, payroll factoring services, charge card and credit card payment processing services, cryptocurrency payment processing; banking services; loan services, namely, providing money lending, installment loans, temporary loans, short term loans, and payroll factoring services; mortgage services namely, mortgage financing services and mortgage banking services; real estate services, namely, real estate lending services; insurance services, namely, insurance consultancy, insurance administration, insurance claims processing and insurance brokerage; private banking services; commercial banking services; merchant banking services; investment banking services; international banking services; savings bank services; payment processing services, namely, processing of debit card, credit card, and prepaid card payments; online banking services; internet banking services; telephone



banking services; financial management services; financial planning and investment advisory services; provision of finance services, namely, financial planning, payroll factoring services, provision of short term loans, processing and administration of employee benefit plans concerning insurance and finance, money exchange services and money transmission services, namely, money transfer; financial research services; automated banking services; financial services provided via the telephone, the internet and via computers, mobile phones, tablets and handheld devices, namely, money lending, installment loans, temporary loans, short terms loans, payroll factoring services, and processing and administration of employee benefit plans concerning finance; electronic banking services; electronic funds transfer payment services; electronic funds transfer services via the telephone, the internet and via computers, mobile phones, tablets and handheld devices; automated payment services, namely, automated credit card and debit card transaction processing services; electronic payment services involving the electronic processing and subsequent transmission of bill payment data; clearing and reconciling financial transactions; debit card services, namely, processing of debit card payments; credit card services, namely, processing of credit card payments; providing electronic mobile payment services for others, namely, providing electronic transmission of contactless payment data via the internet; commercial mortgage services, namely, commercial mortgage banking; mortgage issuing services being mortgage lending; financing of mortgage loans; mortgage lending services; mortgage brokerage services; mortgage refinancing services; mortgage financing services; mortgage investment management; loans financing; loan advice services, namely, advisory services relating to financing of loans; arrangement of loans; loan procurement being arranging of loans; financing and loan services, namely, financing services for the securing of funds for others and for the financing and arranging of loans; home loan financing services; rent collection; financial information, advisory and consultancy services relating to all the aforementioned services

- IC 042. US 100 101.G & S: technological services, namely, development and testing of computing methods, algorithms for others; development, testing, analysis and monitoring of technology solutions in the nature of algorithms and computing methods used for collating, processing and analyzing consumer, financial, banking, real estate and insurance data; development, testing, analysis and monitoring of technology solutions in the nature of algorithms and computing methods used for data mining; development, testing, analysis and monitoring of technology solutions in the nature of algorithms and computing methods used for statistical pattern recognition; development, testing, analysis and monitoring of technology solutions in the nature of algorithms used for the analysis of data and making predictions from data; technological services, namely, development and testing of computing methods, algorithms for others in the field of machine learning; information, advisory and consultancy services relating to all the aforesaid services
- IC 045. US 100 101.G & S: licensing of proprietary data obtained from market research, consumer research, analysis of financial statistics, finance research, banking research, and insurance research

**Mark Drawing Code**

(4) STANDARD CHARACTER MARK

**Design Code****Serial Number**

79224503

**Filing Date**

20170728

**Current Filing Basis**

66A

**Original Filing Basis**

66A

**Publication for Opposition Date**

20190409

**Registration Number**

5784070

**Date Registered**

20190625

**Owner**

(REGISTRANT) HASTEE TECHNOLOGIES LTD Limited company ENGLAND 15th Floor 6 Bevis Marks,  
Bury Court London EC3A 7BA UNITED KINGDOM

**Priority Date**

20170131

**Disclaimer Statement**

**Description of Mark**

**Type of Mark**

TRADEMARK. SERVICE MARK

**Register**

PRINCIPAL

**Live Dead Indicator**

**LIVE**

**Attorney of Record**

Rachel Rudensky

## United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO)

### USPTO OFFICIAL NOTICE

Office Action (Official Letter) has issued  
on August 24, 2022 for  
**U.S. Trademark Application Serial No. 97120567**

A USPTO examining attorney has reviewed your trademark application and issued an Office action. You must respond to this Office action in order to avoid your application abandoning. Follow the steps below.

- (1) **[Read the Office action](#)**. This email is NOT the Office action.
- (2) **Respond to the Office action by the deadline** using the Trademark Electronic Application System (TEAS). Your response must be received by the USPTO on or before 11:59 p.m. **Eastern Time** of the last day of the response period. Otherwise, your application will be **[abandoned](#)**. See the Office action itself regarding how to respond.
- (3) **Direct general questions** about using USPTO electronic forms, the USPTO **[website](#)**, the application process, the status of your application, and whether there are outstanding deadlines to the **[Trademark Assistance Center \(TAC\)](#)**.

After reading the Office action, address any question(s) regarding the specific content to the USPTO examining attorney identified in the Office action.

### GENERAL GUIDANCE

- **[Check the status](#) of your application periodically** in the **[Trademark Status & Document Retrieval \(TSDR\)](#)** database to avoid missing critical deadlines.
- **[Update your correspondence email address](#)** to ensure you receive important USPTO notices about your application.
- **[Beware of trademark-related scams](#)**. Protect yourself from people and companies that may try to take financial advantage of you. Private companies may call you and pretend to be the USPTO or may send you communications that resemble official USPTO documents to trick you. We will never request your credit card number or social security number over the phone. And all official USPTO correspondence will only be emailed from the domain “@uspto.gov.” Verify the correspondence originated from us by using your Serial Number in our database, **[TSDR](#)**, to confirm that it appears under the “Documents” tab, or contact the **[Trademark Assistance Center](#)**.

- **Hiring a U.S.-licensed attorney.** If you do not have an attorney and are not required to have one under the trademark rules, we encourage you to hire a U.S.-licensed attorney specializing in trademark law to help guide you through the registration process. The USPTO examining attorney is not your attorney and cannot give you legal advice, but rather works for and represents the USPTO in trademark matters.

User: Nathaniel Pettican

Statistics for Case 97120567						
#	Search	Total Marks	Dead Marks	Live Viewed Docs	Live Viewed Images	Status/Search Duration
1	"haste inc"[on]	7	0	6	6	0:01
2	*h{v}{ "iey"0:1 } { "sz" } t* [bi,ti] and live[lid]	8356	0	0	0	0:02
3	*{v}r{ "ckqx":2 } {v}d{v} * [bi,ti] and live[lid]	1074	0	0	0	0:17
4	2 and 3	2	0	2	2	0:27
5	2 and ("036" "042")[cc]	4262	0	0	0	0:03
6	2 and ("036" "042" "009" a b "200")[ic]	1900	0	0	0	0:13
7	*ha{ "iey"0:1 } { "sz" } t* [bi,ti] and live[lid]	441	0	0	0	0:02
8	7 and ("036" "042")[cc]	175	0	175	175	0:02
9	3 and ("036" "042")[cc]	570	0	0	0	0:14
10	3 and ("036" "042" "009" a b "200")[ic]	351	0	351	351	0:23
11	(260121 circle)[dc] and live[lid]	114659	0	0	0	0:01
12	11 and 2	262	0	3	262	0:03

Session started 08/24/2022 9:24 am

Session ended 08/24/2022 9:57 am

Total search duration 108.00

Session duration 33 minutes 12 seconds

Adjacency Level 1

Near Level 1