

To: David Gulbransen(david@gulbransenlaw.com)
Subject: U.S. Trademark Application Serial No. 97120871 - BLAZIN' CYCLE
Sent: August 24, 2022 07:32:23 PM EDT
Sent As: tmng.notices@uspto.gov

Attachments

[5204737](#)
[88335240](#)
[88275374](#)
[97046653](#)

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

U.S. Application Serial No. 97120871

Mark: BLAZIN' CYCLE

Correspondence Address:

DAVID GULBRANSEN
LAW OFFICE OF DAVID GULBRANSEN
805 LAKE STREET, SUITE 172
OAK PARK IL 60301 UNITED STATES

Applicant: Blazin' Cycle LLC

Reference/Docket No. N/A

Correspondence Email Address: david@gulbransenlaw.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 issues below. 15 U.S.C. §1062(b); 37 C.F.R. §§2.62(a), 2.65(a); TMEP §§711, 718.03.

SUMMARY OF ISSUES:

- SECTION 2(d) REFUSAL – LIKELIHOOD OF CONFUSION
- ADVISORY: PRIOR-FILED APPLICATIONS
- DISCLAIMER REQUIRED

SECTION 2(d) REFUSAL – LIKELIHOOD OF CONFUSION

Registration of the applied-for mark is refused because of a likelihood of confusion with the mark in U.S. Registration No. 5204737. 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 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 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.

Comparison of the Marks

The applied-for mark is: BLAZIN' CYCLE

The registered mark is: BLAZE

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). Notably, applicant’s mark and registrant’s mark share the similar wording BLAZIN' and BLAZE in each of their respective marks.

Although marks are compared in their entireties, one feature of a mark may be more significant or dominant in creating a commercial impression. *See In re Detroit Athletic Co.*, 903 F.3d 1297, 1305, 128 USPQ2d 1047, 1050 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (citing *In re Dixie Rests.*, 105 F.3d 1405, 1407, 41 USPQ2d 1531, 1533-34 (Fed. Cir. 1997)); TMEP §1207.01(b)(viii), (c)(ii). Greater weight is often given to this dominant feature when determining whether marks are confusingly similar. *See In re Detroit Athletic Co.*, 903 F.3d at 1305, 128 USPQ2d at 1050 (citing *In re Dixie Rests.*, 105 F.3d at 1407, 41 USPQ2d at 1533-34).

Consumers are generally more inclined to focus on the first word, prefix, or syllable in any trademark or service mark. *See Palm Bay Imps., Inc. v. Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin Maison Fondée En 1772*, 396 F.3d 1369, 1372, 73 USPQ2d 1689, 1692 (Fed. Cir. 2005) (finding similarity between VEUVE ROYALE and two VEUVE CLICQUOT marks in part because “VEUVE . . . remains a ‘prominent feature’ as the first word in the mark and the first word to appear on the label”); *Century 21 Real Estate Corp. v. Century Life of Am.*, 970 F.2d 874, 876, 23 USPQ2d 1698, 1700 (Fed. Cir. 1992) (finding similarity between CENTURY 21 and CENTURY LIFE OF AMERICA in part because “consumers must first notice th[e] identical lead word”); *see also In re Detroit Athletic Co.*, 903 F.3d 1297, 1303, 128 USPQ2d 1047, 1049 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (finding “the identity of the marks’ two initial words is particularly significant because consumers typically notice those words first”). In this case the first wording in the applied-for mark is the wording BLAZIN’ therefore, it is the dominant wording in the mark and it is similar in meaning and commercial impression of the registered mark.

Although marks are compared in their entireties, one feature of a mark may be more significant or dominant in creating a commercial impression. *See In re Detroit Athletic Co.*, 903 F.3d 1297, 1305, 128 USPQ2d 1047, 1050 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (citing *In re Dixie Rests.*, 105 F.3d 1405, 1407, 41 USPQ2d 1531, 1533-34 (Fed. Cir. 1997)); TMEP §1207.01(b)(viii), (c)(ii). Matter that is descriptive of or generic for a party’s services is typically less significant or less dominant in relation to other wording in a mark. *See Anheuser-Busch, LLC v. Innvopak Sys. Pty Ltd.*, 115 USPQ2d 1816, 1824-25 (TTAB 2015) (citing *In re Chatam Int’l Inc.*, 380 F.3d 1340, 1342-43, 71 USPQ2d 1944, 1946 (Fed. Cir. 2004)). In the present case, the wording CYCLE in the applied-for mark is merely descriptive of or generic for applicant’s services. Thus, this wording is less significant in terms of affecting the mark’s commercial impression, and renders the wording BLAZIN’ the more dominant element of the mark.

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 Inn at St. John’s, LLC*, 126 USPQ2d 1742, 1746 (TTAB 2018) (citing *In re St. Helena Hosp.*, 774 F.3d 747, 750-51, 113 USPQ2d 1082, 1085 (Fed. Cir. 2014); *Geigy Chem. Corp. v. Atlas Chem. Indus., Inc.*, 438 F.2d 1005, 1007, 169 USPQ 39, 40 (C.C.P.A. 1971)), *aff’d per curiam*, 777 F. App’x 516, 2019 BL 343921 (Fed. Cir. 2019); TMEP §1207.01(b). In the present case, registrant’s mark is “BLAZE” and applicant’s applied-for mark is “BLAZIN’”. Both marks use conjugations of the word “BLAZE”, where registrant uses the root form of the noun and verb and the applicant uses the present participle of the word. Thus, the marks have a similar commercial impression in connection to the goods.

Consumer confusion has been held likely for marks that do not physically sound or look alike but that

convey the same idea, stimulate the same mental reaction, or may have the same overall meaning. *Proctor & Gamble Co. v. Conway*, 419 F.2d 1332, 1336, 164 USPQ 301, 304 (C.C.P.A. 1970) (holding MISTER STAIN likely to be confused with MR. CLEAN on competing cleaning products); *see In re M. Serman & Co.*, 223 USPQ 52, 53 (TTAB 1984) (holding CITY WOMAN for ladies' blouses likely to be confused with CITY GIRL for a variety of female clothing); *H. Sichel Sohne, GmbH v. John Gross & Co.*, 204 USPQ 257, 260-61 (TTAB 1979) (holding BLUE NUN for wines likely to be confused with BLUE CHAPEL for the same goods); *Ralston Purina Co. v. Old Ranchers Canning Co.*, 199 USPQ 125, 128 (TTAB 1978) (holding TUNA O' THE FARM for canned chicken likely to be confused with CHICKEN OF THE SEA for canned tuna); *Downtowner Corp. v. Uptowner Inns, Inc.*, 178 USPQ 105, 109 (TTAB 1973) (holding UPTOWNER for motor inn and restaurant services likely to be confused with DOWNTOWNER for the same services); TMEP §1207.01(b).

In sum, for the foregoing reasons, the marks are confusingly similar.

Comparison of the Services

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 goods and/or 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).

The applicant's identified services are: "Indoor cycling instruction; Organizing, arranging, and conducting cycling events; Physical fitness studio services, namely, providing exercise classes, body sculpting classes, and group fitness classes

The registrant's identified services are: "Fitness boot camps; Business training; Consulting services in the fields of fitness and exercise; Personal fitness training services; Personal fitness training services and consultancy; Personal fitness training services featuring aerobic and anaerobic activities combined with resistance and flexibility training; Personal training services, namely, strength and conditioning training and speed training; Personal trainer services; Physical fitness consultation; Physical fitness training of individuals and groups; Physical fitness training services; Providing a website featuring information on exercise and fitness; Providing information in the field of exercise training; Providing personal fitness training for firefighters; Providing personal training and physical fitness consultation to corporate clients to help their employees make physical fitness, strength, conditioning, and exercise alterations in their daily living; Providing personal training and physical fitness consultation to individuals to help them make physical fitness, strength, conditioning, and exercise improvement in their daily living; Sports training services"

Determining likelihood of confusion is based on the description of the 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 uses broad wording to describe fitness training services, which presumably encompasses all services of the type described, including applicant's more narrow specific types of training services. *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 legally identical. *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 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 services are related.

The foregoing demonstrates that a consumer familiar with registrant's mark used on registrant's services, upon encountering applicant's mark used on applicant's services would likely be confused and mistakenly believe that the services emanate from a common source. Therefore, registration is refused under Section 2(d) of the Lanham Act.

Although applicant's mark has been refused registration, applicant may respond to the refusal by submitting evidence and arguments in support of registration.

ADVISORY: PRIOR-FILED APPLICATIONS

The filing dates of pending U.S. Application Serial Nos. 88335240, 88275374, and 97046653 precede applicant's filing date. See attached referenced applications. If one or more of the marks in the referenced applications register, applicant's mark may be refused registration under Trademark Act Section 2(d) because of a likelihood of confusion with the registered mark(s). *See* 15 U.S.C. §1052(d); 37 C.F.R. §2.83; TMEP §§1208 *et seq.* Therefore, upon receipt of applicant's response to this Office action, action on this application may be suspended pending final disposition of the earlier-filed referenced applications.

In response to this Office action, applicant may present arguments in support of registration by addressing the issue of the potential conflict between applicant's mark and the marks in the referenced applications. Applicant's election not to submit arguments at this time in no way limits applicant's right to address this issue later if a refusal under Section 2(d) issues.

If applicant responds to the refusal, applicant must also respond to the requirement set forth below.

DISCLAIMER REQUIRED

Applicant must disclaim the wording "CYCLE" because it is merely descriptive of an ingredient, quality, characteristic, function, feature, purpose, or use of applicant's services. *See* 15 U.S.C. §1052(e)(1); *DuoProSS Meditech Corp. v. Inviro Med. Devices, Ltd.*, 695 F.3d 1247, 1251, 103 USPQ2d 1753, 1755 (Fed. Cir. 2012); TMEP §§1213, 1213.03(a).

This wording is encompassed by applicant's identification of services.

Applicant may respond to this issue by submitting a disclaimer in the following format:

No claim is made to the exclusive right to use "CYCLE" apart from the mark as shown.

For an overview of disclaimers and instructions on how to provide one using the Trademark Electronic Application System (TEAS), see the [Disclaimer webpage](#).

RESPONSE GUIDELINES

Please 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](#).

/John Salcido/
John Salcido
Trademark Examining Attorney
Law Office 122
(571) 272-7549
john.salcido@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

BLAZE

Mark Punctuated

BLAZE

Translation

Goods/Services

- IC 041. US 100 101 107.G & S: Fitness boot camps; Business training; Consulting services in the fields of fitness and exercise; Personal fitness training services; Personal fitness training services and consultancy; Personal fitness training services featuring aerobic and anaerobic activities combined with resistance and flexibility training; Personal training services, namely, strength and conditioning training and speed training; Personal trainer services; Physical fitness consultation; Physical fitness training of individuals and groups; Physical fitness training services; Providing a website featuring information on exercise and fitness; Providing information in the field of exercise training; Providing personal fitness training for firefighters; Providing personal training and physical fitness consultation to corporate clients to help their employees make physical fitness, strength, conditioning, and exercise alterations in their daily living; Providing personal training and physical fitness consultation to individuals to help them make physical fitness, strength, conditioning, and exercise improvement in their daily living; Sports training services. FIRST USE: 20160213. FIRST USE IN COMMERCE: 20160831

Mark Drawing Code

(4) STANDARD CHARACTER MARK

Design Code

Serial Number

87199606

Filing Date

20161011

Current Filing Basis

1A

Original Filing Basis

1A

Publication for Opposition Date

20170228

Registration Number

5204737

Date Registered

20170516

Owner

(REGISTRANT) Blaze, LLC LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY WISCONSIN 4417 Blackwolf Run

Middleton WISCONSIN 53597

Priority Date

Disclaimer Statement

Description of Mark

Type of Mark

SERVICE MARK

Register

PRINCIPAL

Live Dead Indicator

LIVE

Attorney of Record

Thomas Arnon Allen

(4) STANDARD CHARACTER MARK

Blaze Body Fitness

Mark Punctuated

BLAZE BODY FITNESS

Translation

Goods/Services

- IC 041. US 100 101 107.G & S: Dance and fitness studio services, namely, providing exercise classes, group workshops and one-on-one training
- IC 044. US 100 101.G & S: Providing a website featuring information about health, wellness and nutrition

Mark Drawing Code

(4) STANDARD CHARACTER MARK

Design Code

Serial Number

88335240

Filing Date

20190311

Current Filing Basis

1B

Original Filing Basis

1B

Publication for Opposition Date

Registration Number

Date Registered

Owner

(APPLICANT) FocusWorks Training LLC LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY MINNESOTA 601 Concord Street West Concord MINNESOTA 55985

Priority Date

Disclaimer Statement

NO CLAIM IS MADE TO THE EXCLUSIVE RIGHT TO USE "BODY FITNESS" APART FROM THE MARK AS SHOWN

Description of Mark

Type of Mark

SERVICE MARK

Register

PRINCIPAL

Live Dead Indicator

LIVE

Attorney of Record

C. Russell Riddle

(4) STANDARD CHARACTER MARK

BLAZE

Mark Punctuated

BLAZE

Translation

Goods/Services

- IC 016. US 002 005 022 023 029 037 038 050.G & S: Bumper stickers; Decals. FIRST USE: 20220718. FIRST USE IN COMMERCE: 20220718
- IC 018. US 001 002 003 022 041.G & S: Duffle bags, excluding all military-style duffle bags; luggage tags. FIRST USE: 20220718. FIRST USE IN COMMERCE: 20220718
- IC 041. US 100 101 107.G & S: Providing facilities for sports and physical fitness training; Providing fitness training services in the field of sports and physical fitness. FIRST USE: 20220718. FIRST USE IN COMMERCE: 20220718

Mark Drawing Code

(4) STANDARD CHARACTER MARK

Design Code

Serial Number

88275374

Filing Date

20190124

Current Filing Basis

1B

Original Filing Basis

1B

Publication for Opposition Date

20210511

Registration Number

Date Registered

Owner

(APPLICANT) Enspire 365, LLC LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY WISCONSIN 230 S. McCarthy Road
Appleton WISCONSIN 54914

Priority Date

Disclaimer Statement

Description of Mark

Type of Mark

TRADEMARK. SERVICE MARK

Register

PRINCIPAL

Live Dead Indicator

LIVE

Attorney of Record

Nicholas A. Kees

Print: Wed Aug 24 2022

97046653

(4) STANDARD CHARACTER MARK

BLAZE CYCLING STUDIO

Mark Punctuated

BLAZE CYCLING STUDIO

Translation

Goods/Services

- IC 041. US 100 101 107.G & S: This is a fitness studio. Our service is providing customers with cycling classes

Mark Drawing Code

(4) STANDARD CHARACTER MARK

Design Code

Serial Number

97046653

Filing Date

20210927

Current Filing Basis

1B

Original Filing Basis

1B

Publication for Opposition Date

Registration Number

Date Registered

Owner

(APPLICANT) Burt, Deanna INDIVIDUAL UNITED STATES 7950 Lincoln Highway Frankfort ILLINOIS 60423

Priority Date

Disclaimer Statement

Description of Mark

Type of Mark

SERVICE MARK

Register

PRINCIPAL

Live Dead Indicator

LIVE

Attorney of Record

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. 97120871

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: John Salcido

Statistics for Case 97120871						
#	Search	Total Marks	Dead Marks	Live Viewed Docs	Live Viewed Images	Status/Search Duration
1	*b{"l":2>{"a":2}{v0:2}{ "scz":2}*[bi,ti]not dead[ld]	14987	0	0	0	0:01
2	*b{"l":2>{"a":2}{v0:2}{ "scz":2}{v:2}n*[bi,ti]not dead[ld]	311	0	311	311	0:02
3	b{"l":2>{"a":2}z*[bi,ti]not dead[ld]	1040	0	0	0	0:01
4	3 and "041"[cc]	372	0	372	372	0:01

Session started 08/24/2022 6:20 pm

Session ended 08/24/2022 6:48 pm

Total search duration 5.00

Session duration 27 minutes 9 seconds

Adjacency Level 1

Near Level 1