

mark by comparing the proposed amendment with the description or drawing of the mark in the international application on file at the IB.

The Office proposes to amend § 2.73(a) to add references to applications under sections 44 and 66(a) of the Act. Section 2.73 sets forth the requirements for amendment of an application to recite concurrent use under section 2(d) of the Act.

The Office proposes to add a new § 2.75(c), stating that in an application under section 66(a) of the Act, the applicant may not amend the application to the Supplemental Register. As noted above, section 68(a)(4) of the Act provides that registration of an extension of protection of an international registration shall be refused to any mark not eligible for registration on the Principal Register.

The Office proposes to revise §§ 2.84(a) and (b) to add references to the new filing basis under section 66(a) of the Act. The provisions with respect to jurisdiction over published section 66(a) applications are the same as those in applications under sections 1(a) and 44 of the Act.

The Office proposes to amend §§ 2.101(a), 2.111(a), 2.118 and 2.145(c)(4) to refer to the United States Patent and Trademark Office as Office.

The Office proposes to amend § 2.101(b) to substitute “person” for “entity” to track the statutory language; to make the rule gender neutral; to clarify the definitions of “attorney” and “other authorized representative” by reference to §§ 10.1(c) and 10.14(b), respectively; to clarify that an opposition must be signed; and to indicate that electronic signatures are required for electronically filed oppositions.

The Office proposes to add a new § 2.101(b)(1) and a new § 2.101(b)(2) stating that an opposition to an application based on section 1 or 44 of the Act may be filed either on paper or electronically through ESTTA, but that an opposition to an application based on section 66(a) of the Act may be filed only through ESTTA.

The Office proposes to revise § 2.101(d)(1) through § 2.101(d)(3) and to add new § 2.101(d)(3)(i) through § 2.101(d)(3)(iii) to indicate that the Office will not accept an opposition submitted through ESTTA that does not include fees to cover all named party opposers and all classes opposed; that the Office will not institute an opposition proceeding if an opposition submitted on paper does not include a fee sufficient to pay for one person to oppose the registration of a mark in at least one class; and that the Office will

no longer correspond with an opposer in an opposition submitted on paper to permit submission of additional fees or designation of party opposers and/or classes where an opposition is submitted with insufficient fees to pay for opposition by all party opposers and/or in all classes. The revision explains how the Office will apply a fee accompanying a paper submission that is insufficient to cover all classes and/or to cover all party opposers.

The Office proposes to amend § 2.102(a) to make the rule gender neutral; to clarify the definitions of “attorney” and “authorized representative” by reference to §§ 10.1(c) and 10.14(b), respectively; to clarify that a request to extend the time for filing an opposition must be signed; and to indicate that electronic signatures are required for electronically filed requests to extend the time for filing oppositions.

The Office proposes to add a new § 2.102(a)(1) and a new § 2.102(a)(2) stating that a written request to extend the time for filing an opposition to an application based on section 1 or 44 of the Act may be filed either on paper or electronically through ESTTA, but stating that a request to extend the time for filing an opposition to an application based on section 66(a) of the Act may be filed only through ESTTA.

The Office proposes to revise § 2.102(c) to set out the time frames for extensions of time to oppose and to indicate that the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board will no longer extend a potential opposer's time to file an opposition beyond 120 days from the date the mark is published for opposition. The Office proposes to add §§ 2.102(c)(1) and (2) to state the requirements concerning the filing of permitted requests to extend the time for filing an opposition.

The Office proposes to remove § 2.102(d), which requires submission of extension requests in triplicate.

The Office proposes to revise § 2.104(a) to remove the requirement that a duplicate copy of the opposition, including exhibits, be filed with an opposition.

The Office proposes to reword the heading for § 2.105 to specify that notification of opposition proceedings is to the parties.

The Office proposes to revise § 2.105 to clarify the definitions of “attorney” and “authorized representative” by reference to §§ 10.1(c) and 10.14(b), respectively; and to indicate that, if no attorney or other authorized representative is appointed, notification will be sent to a party's domestic representative, or, if there is no

domestic representative, notification will be sent to the party.

The Office proposes to redesignate § 2.107 as § 2.107(a); to limit this paragraph to oppositions against an application filed under section 1 or 44 of the Act; and to state in the rule the Board practice which prohibits an opposer in a proceeding against an application filed under section 1 or 44 of the Act from adding to the goods or services in an opposition after the period for filing the opposition has closed.

The Office proposes to add a new § 2.107(b) to state that pleadings in an opposition proceeding against an application filed under section 66(a) of the Act may be amended in the same manner and to the same extent as in a civil action in a United States district court; except that, once filed, such opposition may not be amended to change or add to the grounds for opposition or to add to the goods or services opposed.

The Office proposes to revise § 2.111(b) to substitute “person” for “entity” to track the statutory language; to make the rule gender neutral; to clarify the definitions of “attorney” and “authorized representative” by reference to §§ 10.1(c) and 10.14(b), respectively; to clarify that an opposition must be signed; and to indicate that electronic signatures are required for electronically filed oppositions.

The Office proposes to revise § 2.111(c) to divide it into four paragraphs; to state that the Office will not accept a petition submitted through ESTTA that does not include fees to cover all named party petitioners and all classes; that the Office will not institute a cancellation proceeding if a petition submitted on paper does not include a fee sufficient to pay for one person for a cancellation in at least one class; and that the Office will no longer correspond with a petitioner in a cancellation submitted on paper to permit submission of additional fees or designation of party petitioners and/or classes where a cancellation is submitted with insufficient fees to pay for cancellation by all party petitioners and/or in all classes. The revision explains how the Office will apply a fee accompanying a paper submission that is insufficient to cover all classes and/or to cover all party petitioners.

The Office proposes to amend § 2.112(a) to substitute “person” for “entity” to track the statutory language; to make the rule gender neutral; and to remove the requirement that a duplicate copy of the petition, including exhibits, be filed with the petition.