

THIS OPINION IS NOT A
PRECEDENT OF THE TTAB

Mailed:
June 4, 2007

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Trademark Trial and Appeal Board

In re Robert M. Pirnie

Serial No. 76555048

ON REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION

Theodore A. Breiner of Breiner & Breiner, L.L.C. for
Robert M. Pirnie.

Toni Y. Hickey, Trademark Examining Attorney, Law Office
115 (Tomas V. Vlcek, Managing Attorney).

Before Quinn, Grendel and Zervas, Administrative Trademark
Judges.

Grendel, Administrative Trademark Judge:

This case now comes up on applicant's April 2, 2007
request for reconsideration of the Board's March 2, 2007
decision affirming the Trademark Examining Attorney's
refusal to register the mark **CONFERENCE AMERICA** (in

standard character form) for services recited in the application (as amended) as:

promoting the use of telecommunication services through the administration of an incentive award program; managing a secure telecommunications network for others, in Class 35;

telecommunications services, namely audio, video and data teleconferencing; streaming of audio and video material on the Internet, in Class 38; and

design and implementation of a secure telecommunications network for others and support services therefor, in Class 42.

The ground for the refusal affirmed on appeal was that applicant's mark is primarily geographically descriptive of applicant's recited services in all three classes.

Trademark Act Section 2(e)(2), 15 U.S.C. §1052(e)(2).¹

In its request for reconsideration, applicant essentially repeats the arguments it previously made in its briefs and at the oral hearing, arguments which the Board found unpersuasive and still finds unpersuasive. For the reasons set forth at length in our March 2, 2007 decision, we remain of the opinion that applicant's mark is primarily geographically descriptive of the recited services in all three classes. Contrary to applicant's repeated argument,

¹ The Board's March 2, 2007 decision also affirmed the Trademark Examining Attorney's requirement for an acceptable recitation of services in Class 35. Applicant has not requested reconsideration on that issue.

Ser. No. 7655048

the evidence of record² does not suffice to raise any doubt as to the registrability of applicant's mark.

Having discerned no error in our previous decision, we deny applicant's request for reconsideration.

² The additional evidence applicant has submitted with its request for reconsideration is manifestly untimely and has been given no consideration.