

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE DIRECTOR**

In re:)
)
Dongguan Ohm Card Industrial Co., Ltd.)
)
)
)
Respondents)
_____)

FINAL ORDER FOR SANCTIONS

In a Show Cause Order dated March 7, 2024, the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO” or “Office”) informed Dongguan Ohm Card Industrial Co., Ltd.¹ (“Respondents”) of evidence indicating that it violated the USPTO rules of practice in trademark matters (“USPTO Rules”). See *generally* 15 U.S.C. § 1051 *et seq.*; 37 C.F.R. Parts 2, 11. Respondents were ordered to show cause why certain sanctions should not be imposed based on Respondents’ conduct.² A response was required within 14 days. The USPTO did not receive a substantive or timely response from Respondents.

The Director has authority to sanction those filing trademark submissions in violation of the USPTO Rules and has delegated to the Commissioner for Trademarks (“Commissioner”) the authority to impose such sanctions and otherwise exercise the Director’s authority in trademark matters. 35 U.S.C. § 3(a)-(b); 37 C.F.R. § 11.18(c); see *also In re Yusha Zhang, et al.*, 2021 TTAB LEXIS 465, at *10, *23-24 (Dir. USPTO Dec. 10, 2021). The authority to issue administrative sanctions orders has been further delegated to the Deputy Commissioner for Trademark Examination Policy (“Deputy Commissioner”). Accordingly, based on Respondents’ rule violations discussed below, the Deputy Commissioner orders that the sanctions herein are warranted and are hereby imposed.

I. Overview of Respondents’ acts in violation of USPTO Rules

The previously issued Show Cause Order details the conduct that forms the basis for imposing sanctions and is incorporated by reference in this final order. The following summary of the facts is provided for background.

¹ As noted below, U.S. Trademark Application Serial No. 88652743 is affected by this order.

² Links to orders issued under the authority of the Commissioner for Trademarks are available at <https://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/trademark-updates-and-announcements/orders-issued-commissioner-trademarks>

The application record and available evidence demonstrates that Respondents are responsible for providing false or fictitious signature information in violation of 37 C.F.R. § 11.18.³ In TEAS form filings, Respondents, or someone acting on Respondents' behalf, impermissibly entered the electronic signature of an attorney who neither consented to the representation of Respondents nor personally entered the electronic signature on the filing. These impermissible signatures appeared in the signature block of a trademark form, which falsely identified the attorney as attorney of record.

Entering the electronic signature of another violates 37 C.F.R. § 2.193, which requires that the signature be handwritten in permanent ink by the person named as the signatory or the signatory must personally enter the combination of letters, numbers, spaces and/or punctuation that the signatory has adopted as a signature directly in the signature block on the electronic form. 37 C.F.R. §§ 2.193(a) and (c). Notably, this improperly signed declaration stated that the entry of false information within the form "may jeopardize the validity of the application or submission or any registration resulting therefrom."⁴

Further, as a foreign-domiciled applicant, Respondents were required to be represented by a U.S.-licensed attorney in trademark matters before the USPTO ("U.S. Counsel Rule"). 37 C.F.R. § 2.11.

Respondents or someone acting on Respondents' behalf knowingly provided false attorney information in a submission, presumably to circumvent the U.S. Counsel Rule. Providing false, fictitious, or fraudulent attorney information in formal trademark correspondence to the USPTO constitutes submission of a document for an improper purpose in violation of 37 C.F.R. § 11.18(b) and is subject to the sanctions and actions provided in 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.18(c). See 37 C.F.R. § 2.11(e). As explained in the Show Cause Order and declaration attached thereto, the named attorney confirmed that (i) he is not the attorney of record in the application; (ii) he did not consent to be listed as such; (iii) he has no ongoing relationship with the applicant named in the application; and (iv) he has never used the email address listed in the application. Additionally, the named attorney stated in this declaration that he did not sign the submission.

Based upon this pattern of activity, Respondents' submission of trademark documents containing false representations of fact and an improperly signed submission has been deemed willful by the USPTO. See, e.g., *In re Bose Corp.*, 580 F.3d 1240, 1243, 91 USPQ2d 1938, 1939 (Fed. Cir. 2009); *Chutter v. Great Concepts, LLC*, 2021 USPQ2d 1001 at *25 (TTAB 2021)(holding that "willful" includes reckless behavior and "as a matter of law that reckless disregard satisfies the requisite intent for fraud on the USPTO in

³ To the extent that Respondents may have authorized a third party to file submission(s) on their behalf, false and misleading statements in a trademark submission are attributable to the applicant or registrant when signed or submitted on that party's behalf. Cf. *Fuji Med. Instruments Mfg. Co., Ltd. v. Am. Crocodile Int'l Grp., Inc.*, 2021 USPQ2d 831 (TTAB July 28, 2021) citing *Smith Int'l v. Olin Corp.*, 209 USPQ 1033, 1048 (TTAB 1981) ("Even if the affidavit was prepared by its attorney, [Applicant] must be held accountable for any false or misleading statement made therein.").

⁴ See 37 C.F.R. § 2.20; see also 37 C.F.R. § 11.18(b)(1).

trademark matters”), *rev’d on other grounds*, 2023 USPQ2d 1215 at *9 (Fed. Cir. 2023). As a result, Respondents’ acts may not be corrected or cured. *See, e.g., Univ. of Ky. v. 40-0, LLC*, 2021 USPQ2d 253 (TTAB 2021); *G&W Labs. Inc. v. GW Pharma Ltd.*, 89 USPQ2d 1571, 1573 (TTAB 2009); *cf. Therasense, Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson and Co.*, 649 F. 3d 1276, 1288-89 (Fed. Cir. 2011).

II. Sanctions ordered

In determining appropriate sanctions, the USPTO considers many factors, including any response received to the issued Show Cause Order, whether the conduct was willful or negligent, whether it was part of a pattern of activity or an isolated event, whether it infects the entire record or is limited to a single submission, whether the conduct was intended to injure a party, what effect the conduct has on the agency, and what is needed to deter similar conduct by others. *See* 73 Fed. Reg. 47650, 47653 (Aug. 14, 2008); 87 Fed. Reg. 431 (Jan. 5, 2022).

Here, Respondents provided no response to address the USPTO’s evidence and finding that Respondents violated USPTO Rules. The USPTO informed Respondents that failure to respond could result in termination of the application and other appropriate sanctions, yet Respondents made no effort to rebut the USPTO’s evidence or explain why sanctions are not merited. Accordingly, there is no basis to find that sanctions should not be imposed.

The USPTO and the public rely on the truth and accuracy of the contents of documents and declarations submitted in support of registration. *See Norton v. Curtiss*, 433 F.2d 779, 794, 167 USPQ 532, 544 (CCPA 1970) (“With the seemingly ever-increasing number of applications before it, the [USPTO] . . . must rely on applicants for many of the facts upon which its decisions are based.”).

Because of the nature of the rule violations, the submission made by Respondents may not be relied upon to support or maintain a trademark registration and therefore may not be given any weight. Specifically, the application proceedings contain fatal defects because an improperly signed trademark document containing material false representations of fact cannot be relied upon to support or maintain a trademark registration. *See Zhang*, 2021 TTAB LEXIS 465, at *13; *see also Ex parte Hipkins*, 20 USPQ2d 1694, 1969-97 (BPAI 1991); *In re Cowan*, 18 USPQ2d 1407, 1409 (Comm’r Pats.1990). Under the facts presented, and because the circumstances suggest a pattern of activity intended to mislead the USPTO and circumvent USPTO rules, the application proceeding is effectively void and the defects in the proceedings cannot be cured. It does not benefit the applicants, registrants, or the USPTO to devote time and resources to further examine applications or post-registration filings known to have such fatal defects. *Cf. The Last Best Beef, LLC v. Dudas*, 506 F.3d 333, 341 (4th Cir. 2007) (“It hardly makes sense for the USPTO to conduct administrative proceedings on [the] applications if registration, at the culmination of those proceedings, would run afoul of the statute.”).

Accordingly, the trademark proceeding for Serial No. 88652743 is hereby ordered terminated. The USPTO's electronic records will be updated to include this order and an appropriate entry in the prosecution history indicating that the application was subject to an order for sanctions. The sanctions ordered herein are immediate in effect and are without prejudice to the USPTO taking any subsequent appropriate actions to protect its systems and users from Respondents' continued improper activity, including issuing additional orders or referring Respondents' conduct to relevant law enforcement agencies.

So ordered,

Amy P. Cotton
Deputy Commissioner for
Trademark Examination Policy

April 25, 2024
Date

on delegated authority by

Kathi Vidal
Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and
Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on April 25, 2024, the foregoing Final Order was emailed to Respondents at the following address:

Dongguan Ohm Card Industrial Co., Ltd
Helu Village, Huangjiang Town
2nd Floor, No. 29, He'an 1st Street
Dongguan China 523000
btctown@gmail.com

United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450