United States Patent and Trademark Office
*Office of the Commissioner for Trademarks*

August 8, 2023

Ms. Mandy Valentin
Via Email: fameoz@yahoo.com

*In re Mandy Valentin*

**SHOW CAUSE ORDER**

Dear Ms. Valentin:

For the reasons set forth below, the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO" or "Office") has preliminarily determined that the administrative sanctions set forth below are warranted because you ("Respondent") have failed to conduct yourself with decorum and courtesy, have used your USPTO.gov account to file multiple trademark submissions for an improper purpose, and have thus violated USPTO regulations and the USPTO.gov Verified Account Agreement.

The Director has authority to sanction those filing trademark submissions in violation of the USPTO regulations and has delegated to the Commissioner for Trademarks the authority to impose such sanctions and to 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 Zhang*, 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.

As discussed below, the USPTO will consider a response from you if emailed to **TMPolicy@uspto.gov** by **5:00 PM (Eastern Time) August 22, 2023**.

## I. USPTO Rules and Requirements

All submissions to the USPTO in trademark matters are governed by the regulations regarding practice in trademark matters before the USPTO (collectively, "USPTO Rules"). *See generally* 37 C.F.R. Parts 2, 11. All parties who sign or present documents to the USPTO are bound by the USPTO Rules. *See Lewis Silkin LLP v. Firebrand LLC*, 129 USPQ2d 1015, 1020 n.8 (TTAB 2018); 37 C.F.R. §11.18(b); TMEP §611.01(a).

Under the USPTO Rules, all parties conducting business before the Office, including individual trademark applicants, are required to act with "decorum and courtesy." 37

C.F.R. §2.192. Complaints by applicants against trademark examining attorneys and other employees may not be placed in the record, but instead must be made in correspondence separate from documents submitted in connection with a trademark application. *Id.*

In addition, a party who presents a trademark submission to the USPTO is certifying that, "[t]o the best of the party's knowledge, information and belief, formed after an inquiry reasonable under the circumstances, . . . the paper is not being presented for any improper purpose" and "[t]he allegations and other factual contentions have evidentiary support." 37 C.F.R. § 11.18(b)(2). A document may be deemed to have been submitted for an improper purpose in violation of 37 C.F.R. § 11.18(b)(2) if it includes abusive remarks without direct relevance to the prosecution of the application, threats against USPTO employees, offensive language, or any other communications intended to harass or cause unreasonable delay. Such violations may jeopardize the validity of the application and may result in the imposition of sanctions under 37 C.F.R. §11.18(c), including terminating proceedings, striking correspondence, and giving no weight to submissions. *See* 37 C.F.R. §§2.193(f), 11.18(c).

## II. USPTO.gov Verified Account Agreement

In order to access and file electronic forms and submit trademark documents through the Trademark Electronic Application System ("TEAS"), trademark applicants or their attorneys must register for and use a USPTO.gov account. Users who wish to file documents through TEAS must have their identities verified, and are further bound by the USPTO Trademark Verified USPTO.gov Account Agreement ("Verified Account Agreement"). *See* **https://www.uspto.gov/sites/default/files/documents/TM-verified-account-agreement.pdf**.

Individuals are responsible for all activities that occur under their registered USPTO.gov account. Misuse of trademark systems that constitute violations of the Verified Account Agreement may result in immediate termination, suspension, and/or revocation of all related USPTO.gov accounts, particularly when the accounts are used to make submissions that are unauthorized under USPTO Rules. *See* Verified Account Agreement, pp.3, 5-6.

## III. Respondent's USPTO Rule Violations and USPTO.gov Verified Account Agreement Violations

On March 28, 2021, Respondent signed and submitted U.S. Trademark Application Serial No. 90608020,[1] for the mark FAMEOZ, as president of Fameoz Inc., a Pennsylvania corporation. The application named Fameoz Inc. as the applicant and identified various services in International Class 35. As explained below, Respondent filed 17 formal submissions in this one trademark application via TEAS between December 20, 2021,

[1] The public may view and print images of the contents of trademark application and registration records through the Trademark Status and Document Retrieval (TSDR) database on the USPTO website at **http://tsdr.uspto.gov/**.

and March 3, 2022. Throughout the course of prosecution, Respondent has also sent over 30 email messages to various USPTO email addresses regarding this application.[2] Despite the courteous and professional nature of the repeated responses by USPTO employees to these inquiries,[3] Respondent's submissions and email communications frequently contained disparaging statements about USPTO employees and in several cases, apparent threats against USPTO employees and their families.[4]

The application was assigned to an examining attorney who reviewed the application and issued an Office action on November 15, 2021, requiring Respondent to provide its domicile address and noting that the application may be suspended pending final disposition of U.S. Application Serial Nos. 88939306, 88939314, 88939326, 88939341, 88939349, and 88939358. Respondent subsequently filed a Change Address or Representation form on November 17, 2021, a Response to Office Action on November 18, 2021, and Voluntary Amendment on November 19, 2021. The examining attorney reviewed these submissions and, on December 20, 2021, accepted Respondent's provided domicile address and suspended further prosecution on the application pending final disposition of the potentially conflicting applications, in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §2.83(c) and *Trademark Manual of Examining Procedure* (TMEP) §716.02(c).

Hours after the Suspension Notice issued, Respondent filed a Response to Office Action through TEAS, repeating several arguments made in Respondent's response on November 18, 2021, and included numerous unsupported complaints and allegations about the examining attorney, alleging that the examining attorney was "negligent," "violated [their] duty of care and fiduciary responsibility," and that the examining attorney "was biased." (Resp. to Letter of Suspension, December 20, 2021).

Before the examining attorney could take action on this response, Respondent filed 13 more responses or amendments through TEAS between December 20, 2021, and February 17, 2022, mainly consisting of duplicative specimens, repetitive arguments, and unsupported assertions, such as arguing that the owner of the cited pending marks had not paid the fees for its trademark applications and does not legally exist.[5]

---

[2] A representative sample of these emails are attached as Exhibits A-I, with each email chain appearing in chronological order as a separate exhibit. The names and references to individual USPTO employees have been redacted. Otherwise the text and formatting of these messages appear as they were received, including any grammatical or spelling errors.

[3] *See, e.g.,* Exhibits A, B.

[4] *See, e.g.,* Exhibits F-G; Resp. to Letter of Suspension, Mar. 3, 2022.

[5] Respondent was informed by the examining attorney via an email dated December 21, 2021 and via an email from the Office of the Deputy Commissioner for Trademark Examination Policy dated December 24, 2021 that *ex parte* prosecution is not the appropriate venue for assertions regarding the validity of third-party applications and/or registrations. *See* Exhibits A, B. Nonetheless, Respondent continued to repeat the same unsupported and irrelevant assertions regarding the cited applications in numerous filings and email correspondence as to U.S. Application Serial No. 90608020.

Several of these 13 TEAS submissions included lengthy attachments of no relevance to the outstanding examination issues, ranging from dozens to over 150 pages in length. During this same time period, Respondent also sent emails to USPTO employees, including the examining attorney, the examining attorney's senior attorney, the examining attorney assigned to the cited applications, and other USPTO email addresses.[6] Both the TEAS filings and email communications contained unfounded allegations, and disparaged or threatened the examining attorney and other USPTO employees, including:

- "A formal complaint against [the examining attorney] [sic] license will be filed for violating the rules and regulations that govern [the examining attorney's] license" (Resp. to Letter of Suspension, December 20, 2021);
- "Examining attorney . . . was biased and prejudicial to the applicant because the applicant was not [sic] attorney." (Resp. to Letter of Suspension, December 20, 2021);
- IF YOU FAIL TO APPROVE OUR TRADEMARK APPLICATION FOR USE OF FAMOZ AND ALLOW US TO MOVE FORWARD IN THE PROCESS, WE WILL BE HOLDING YOU LEGALLY ACCOUNTABLE FOR ANY AND ALL DAMAGES WE INCCUR AS A RESULT OF YOUR NEGLIGENCE AND YOUR EFFORTS TO CONCEAL THE FACT THAT THE 6 APPLICATIONS WERE ILLEGALLY PROCESSED IN THE US (Resp. to Letter of Suspension, December 27, 2021);
- "GET THIS BIASED REJUDICIAL [sic] ATTORNEY REMOVED FROM OUR APPLICATION AND ASSIGN US AN EXAMING [sic] ATTORNEY WHO NOT [sic] OBSTRUCTING JUSTICE." (Resp. to Letter of Suspension, January 3, 2022);
- "We are asking you once again to reassign us a new examiner that is NOT a WHITE RACIST." (Resp. to Letter of Suspension, January 5, 2022); and
- "[USPTO] AND [THE EXAMINING ATTORNEY] AND [THE SENIOR ATTORNEY] HAVE ILLEGALLY COMMITTED BANK FRAUD AND FRAUD." (Resp. to Letter of Suspension, January 5, 2022).

These inappropriate communications continued in Respondent's subsequent TEAS filings. In the submissions on February 27 and 28, 2022, Respondent attempted to change the mark drawing to GO FUCK YOURSELF [EXAMINING ATTORNEY] YOU STUPID BITCH and GO FUCK YOURSELF [EXAMINING ATTORNEY], respectively. Respondent's submissions on February 28 and March 3, 2022, also contained the following threats and personal attacks:

- "ATTACHED IS THE DRAWING .... THE DOMAIN NAME IS COMING AND [THE EXAMINING ATTORNEY'S] PUBLIC INFORMATION WILL BE DISPLAYED ON THIS WEBSITE SO THAT THE WORLD CAN SEE WHAT A FUCKED UP WHITE RACIST BITCH [THE EXAMINING ATTORNEY] IS." (Resp. to Letter of Suspension, Feb. 28, 2022);
- "NOW LETS [sic] SEE HOW [THE EXAMINING ATTORNEY] FEELS ABOUT HAVING [THE EXAMINING ATTORNEY'S] LYING PIECE SHIT OF AN ASS BLASTED ONLINE." (Resp. to Letter of Suspension, Feb. 28, 2022);

[6] *See* Exhibits A-H.

- "AND AS FOR [THE SENIOR ATTORNEY] [THE EXAMINING ATTORNEY'S SUPERVISOR ... [THE SENIOR ATTORNEY]S [sic] NEXT." (Resp. to Letter of Suspension, Feb. 28, 2022);
- "WE'RE GOING TO PURCHASE [THE EXAMINING ATTORNEY'S] FAMILY'S PUBLIC INFO AND BLAST THAT OVER THE INTERNET AS WELL." (Resp. to Letter of Suspension, Feb. 28, 2022);
- "HOW IS [REDACTED] WE KNOW WHERE YOU LIVE :)" (Resp. to Letter of Suspension, Mar. 3, 2022).

Likewise, the attached examples of email correspondence further demonstrate that Respondent frequently made abusive remarks directed towards USPTO employees without direct relevance to the prosecution of the application, repeatedly made threats against USPTO employees, and sent messages intended to harass or cause unreasonable delay via formal and informal communications.[7]

On January 9, 2023, the Deputy Commissioner for Trademark Examination Policy issued a letter to Respondent's email address of record regarding Respondent's conduct before the Office. In this letter, Respondent was informed that because Respondent has continually violated the requirement under 37 C.F.R. §2.192 to conduct business with decorum and courtesy, any future communication between Respondent and the USPTO with respect to U.S. Trademark Application Serial No. 90608020 must be submitted in formal, written communications via TEAS to be considered. Letter from Amy Cotton, Deputy Commissioner for Trademark Examination Policy, U.S. Patent & Trademark Office, to Mandy Valentin (Jan. 9, 2023) (on file with U.S. Application Serial No. 90608020).

In response to this letter and despite being instructed to file correspondence through TEAS, Respondent replied informally via email on January 10, 2023, and again failed to conduct business with decorum and courtesy. The email included the following statements and personal attacks: [8]

- "YOU OWE ME FOR DAMAGES.";
- "There is enough documentation to support that you violated the law and in regards to [the Deputy Commissioner for Trademark Examination Policy]'s remarks go hire an attorney.";
- "And in regards to [the examining attorney] who discrminated [sic] against me because I was hispanic [the examining attorney] is NOT fit for [the examining attorney's] position. [The examining attorney] denied my application WITHOUT CAUSE after I filed a discrmination [sic] complaint with USPTO about [the examining attorney's] racist-slurs.";

[7] *See, generally,* Exhibits A-I.

[8] *See* Exhibit I for the full email.

- "[USPTO Employee] is another one -- another attorney hired by USPTO - who collects a paycheck - sits on [USPTO Employee's] as [sic] and does absolutely nothing but deny applications so he can continue collecting money.";
- "And your system and your trademarks and processes are NOT worth the toilet tissue they are issued on."; and
- "In short, you're a joke."

The filings and communications sent during the period from December 20, 2021, through January 10, 2023, lack decorum and courtesy, contain distressing threats against USPTO employees, and use offensive language. They are plainly harassing and violate the USPTO Rules regarding decorum and courtesy in communications. *See* 37 C.F.R. §2.192.

In threatening to publish the examining attorney's information on the internet and inundating the examining attorney with offensive language, Respondent has used USPTO submissions to harass a USPTO employee. These harassing submissions are papers submitted for an improper purpose under 37 C.F.R. §11.18(b)(2). The submissions made during this period further violate this rule because they contain numerous unsupported accusations, such as allegations of bank fraud. *See* 37 C.F.R. §11.18(b)(2)(ii). Additionally, the sheer volume and size of the filings, which contain duplicative arguments and disparaging and threatening statements, needlessly caused delay and increased the cost of proceedings due to the number of USPTO employees required to review the frivolous and improper submissions. Therefore, the evidence of record supports a finding that Respondent had a pattern and practice of submitting trademark correspondence for an improper purpose in violation of 37 C.F.R. §11.18(b)(2).

## IV. Show Cause Requirement

Based on the present record and the foregoing findings and considerations, the USPTO has made a preliminary determination that sanctions are warranted to address and deter the egregious conduct at issue. In determining appropriate sanctions, various considerations may be taken into account, including whether: the improper conduct was willful, part of a pattern of activity or an isolated event, infected an entire application or one particular submission, the party has engaged in similar conduct in other matters, the conduct was intended to injure, the effect of the conduct on the administrative process in time and expense, and what is needed to deter the conduct by the party and by others. 73 Fed. Reg. 47650, 47653 (2008).

Here, Respondent willfully and repeatedly engaged in a pattern of activity that appears intended to harass and delay, and unnecessarily burden the USPTO in terms of time and resources expended. Respondent has also repeatedly made submissions regarding U.S. Trademark Application Serial No. 90608020 with an apparent intent to injure USPTO and its employees, which has infected the entire application. Given the severity and pattern of Respondent's actions, USPTO has made a preliminary determination that sanctions are necessary to deter such conduct.

**Applying these considerations, it has been determined that the following sanctions are warranted and Respondent is hereby ordered to show cause why the USPTO should not**:

(1) Permanently preclude Respondent from submitting any trademark-related documents to the USPTO on Respondent's own behalf or on behalf of any company of which Respondent is an officer;
(2) Require Respondent to be represented in any pending or future trademark matter before the USPTO by an attorney qualified to practice under 37 C.F.R. §11.14(a);[9]
(3) Give no weight to trademark-related submissions regarding U.S. Trademark Application Serial No. 90608020 and terminate proceedings relating thereto; and
(4) Direct the USPTO's Office of the Chief Information Officer to permanently terminate or deactivate any USPTO.gov accounts in which Respondent's name or contact information appears.[10]

**How to respond.** The USPTO will consider a single[11] written response to this show cause order in determining whether and what sanctions should be imposed. The response is due by **5:00pm (Eastern Time) on August 22, 2023** and must be sent via email to **TMPolicy@uspto.gov**.

The response must be supported with evidence and explanations that rebut the USPTO's preliminary determination that the sanctions set forth above are warranted. Respondent's response should not include any arguments as to the merits of Respondent's trademark application(s).

**If Respondent does not respond by the above due date, all of the sanctions set forth above shall be imposed, including but not limited to, termination of application Serial No. 90608020 and termination or deactivation of Respondent's account(s).**

This order is issued without prejudice to the USPTO taking all appropriate actions to protect its systems from any continued improper activity, including referring Respondent's conduct to relevant state and federal law enforcement agencies.

[9] Under USPTO Rules, U.S.-domiciled applicants may generally represent themselves, or companies in which they are officers, in trademark matters without using an attorney. *See* 37 C.F.R. §§2.193(e)(2)(ii), 11.14(e).

[10] Sanctions (1), (2) and (4) shall be imposed as to any trademark applications or registrations in which Respondent personally conducts business before the Office. This includes, but is not limited to, U.S. Trademark Application Serial Nos. 97225150, 97200056, 97199430, 97196181, 97198033, 97195302, 97199769, 97199724, 97194215, 97198712, 97198272, 97193648, 90852416, 90864334, 90859627, 90864448, 90861675, 90859585, 90608020.

[11] Given the history of Respondent's conduct and communications, the Office will only consider Respondent's first timely response to this order.

So ordered,

Users, Cotton, Amy
Digitally signed by Users, Cotton, Amy
Date: 2023.08.08 12:00:09 -04'00'

August 8, 2023
Date

Amy P. Cotton
Deputy Commissioner for
Trademark Examination Policy

on delegated authority by

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

[THIS SPACE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

# Exhibit A

**EXHIBIT A**

**From:** Mandy Valentin <mandyvalentin@ymail.com>
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 22, 2021 6:18 PM
**To:** [Examining Attorney] <[Examining Attorney]@USPTO.GOV>
**Cc:** [Senior Attorney] <[Senior Attorney]@USPTO.GOV>; TEAS <TEAS@USPTO.GOV>; [Redacted] <[Redacted]@USPTO.GOV>; Trademark Assistance Center <TrademarkAssistanceCenter@USPTO.GOV>
**Subject:** Re: 90608020 - PLEASE APPROVE REQUEST TO HAVE MARK PUT BACK IN IT'S ORIGINAL STATE

Hey [Examining Attorney] -

Get a clue. I am holding you legally responsible and going after your license.

I have litigated and won cases before. Your patent excuse to have me hire an attorney will NOT wash so cut the patent replies.

You will NOT be exonerate from teh rules and regulations and laws that govern your license.

SO CEASE AND DESIST FROM TELLING ME TO HIRE AN ATTORNEY OR FILE AN OPPOSITION.

IF THE USPTO FAILED TO DO IT'S JOB YOU - THEM AND EVERY ATTORNEY ON THE CORESPONDENCE WILL BE HELD

LEGALLY ACCOUNTABLE. HIDING BEHIND SOP TO FILE OPPOSITIONS IN THIS CASE WILL NOT WASH ...

You processed 6 application on behalf of a company that did NOT file the applications.... that is called fraud.

NOW do your job and approve the change to have our mark put back to FAMEOZ.

And when those marks for FAMEOS INC. are regsitered expect complaint violations placed on your license.... you rsupervsiors license and the examining attorney as well.

You are ALL legaly liable to me and my cmopany and every other company impacted by your sheer negaligence and failure to do your job.

IF YOU WNT TO COMMIT FRAUD THAT'S YOUR CHOICE, BUT YOU BETTER BELIEVE THAT I AM AND EVERY OTHER COMPANYIS GOING TO HOLD YOU LEGALLY ACCOUNTABLE.

# Mandy Valentin

On Wednesday, December 22, 2021, 06:05:38 PM EST, [Examining Attorney] <**[Examining Attorney]@uspto.gov**> wrote:

Dear Ms. Valentin,

Please note that Responses filed through the TEAS system are typically not uploaded for a day and must be processed before an Examining attorney can respond.

Again examining attorneys **may not** receive evidence from Third Parties or discuss applications with third parties. *See* TMEP 1806 ("An examining attorney or other USPTO employee may not discuss the merits of any particular application or registration with a third party."). **No examining attorney** can discuss the merits of another party's application with you.

The **only way** to challenge the validity of ownership of a registration is to file a Cancellation Proceeding, which is filed with the Trademark Trial Appeal Board and allows the registrant an opportunity to respond.

Again, this is a legal process, and I recommend you consider hiring an attorney to assist you with this application.

Thank you,

[Examining Attorney]

/[Examining Attorney]/

Examining Attorney

Law Office [Redacted]

(571) [Redacted]

**[Examining Attorney]@uspto.gov**

*Please note: All relevant e-mail communications may be uploaded to the official application record in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §2.191 and TMEP §§709.04 - .05.*

**From:** Mandy Valentin <**mandyvalentin@ymail.com**>
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 22, 2021 4:52 PM
**To:** [Examining Attorney] <[**Examining Attorney]@USPTO.GOV**>
**Cc:** [Senior Attorney] **<[Senior Attorney]@USPTO.GOV>**; [Redacted] <**[Redacted]@USPTO.GOV**>; Trademark Assistance Center <TrademarkAssistanceCenter@USPTO.GOV>
**Subject:** Re: 90608020 - PLEASE APPROVE REQUEST TO HAVE MARK PUT BACK IN IT'S ORIGINAL STATE

To: USPTO

1. My request to have my mark mark put back to Fameoz has been submitted. PLEASE APPROVE THIS REQUEST.

2. Attached is PROOF that the AZOR CORPORATION filed all 6 applications that you were legally bound to void,

when they were legaly disolved. You were legally required to void all 6 applications submitted by AZOR and mandate that FAMEOS Inc. file 6 new applications, if they wanted to use another company's mark. They are 2 different companies. You cannot legally apporve all 6. You cannot legally state these 6 applications are legally valid. you are legally responsible to void all 6 of AZOR's trademarks even if they have been approved.

3. THIS IMPACTS ME AND EVERY OTHER COMPANY who came before FAMEOS Inc. You are using these 6 invalid trademarks against my company Fameoz Inc. to deny my company the right to use my company's legal name. My company Fameoz Inc. filed our trademark application 90608020 FIRST. You are violated our rights to have our application 90608020 processed. You are violated our rights to use the mark Fameoz ... our own company name.

Mandy Valentin

President

Fameoz Inc.

On Wednesday, December 22, 2021, 04:14:13 PM EST, Mandy Valentin <**mandyvalentin@ymail.com**> wrote:

[Examining Attorney] -

1. Thank you for the quick reply.

2. We will be submitting a request to have our mark put back to Fameoz our original application mark. Please approve the change to have our mark revert back to its original name.

3. We will be holding the USPTO legally responsible and will be formal complaint against your license for allowing fraudulent and legally invalid trademarks to exist.

4. We are standing behind our legal argument that if the application was filed in the name of an individual or entity that was not the legal owner of the trademark on the application filing date, you may not amend the application to substitute the correct owner.  The application is void and a new application must be filed.

5. We are standing behind our legal argument that the USPTO was legally bound to require FAMEOS Inc. to file new trademark applications, if it wished to use the mark FAMEOS and that the USPTO was legally bound to void the AZOR CORPORATION'S trademark, when the company legally ceased to exist on 7-29-2020. You cannot allow a completely different company to assume ownership of a mark orassume ownership of another company's application. In doing so you violated my company right's and every other company's rights who had first position.

6. We are standing behind our legal argument that it is still theresponsibility of the USPTO and USPTO attorney to correct this error and to mandate that the applications be voided immediately (even if it is found that these applications and marks have already been registered).

7. We are standing behind our legal argument that it is violation of any attorney's license if they so knowingly do nothing about it. The excuse that you are not the examining attorney assigned to those 6 applications is no excuse. You are legaly bound to notify your supervisor and the examing attorney assigned to those 6 applications of the material discrepency and material violation of law and error made by the USPTO, if it can be proven that you

have been given evidence that you were made aware of it, which it can be. I have can you the state legal documents on several occassions proving that the AZOR CORPORATION filed those 6 applications and that legally ceased to exist on 7-29-2020.

8. We are standing behind our legal argument that it is NOT our responsibsility Fameoz Inc. or even myself respnsibility to oppose those 6 applications. The responsibility to correct the error made by the USPTO is the USPTO and yes even [Examining Attorney].

9. We are standing behind our legal argument that [Examining Attorney] was notified well over a month ago of the illegality that exists in those 6 applications and that [Examining Attorney] was legally bound by the rules and ethics of [the Examining Attorney's] license to notify the other examing attorney of the material defect in all 6 of those applications.

10. We are standing behind our legal argument that the marks are competely different different and do NOT cause a likelihood of confusion. We are standing by a legal argument that fameoz and FAMEOS are two completely different marks. We are standing by a legal argument that

fameoz and FAMEOS THE CELEBRITY OPERATING SYSTEM are two completely different marks.

- fameoz
- FAMEOS
- FAMEOS THE CELEBRITY OPERATING SYSTEM

A. They are different in LOOK.

B. They are in two completely different industries.

C. They are selling two completely different goods and services.

D. They are completely different in commercial impressions.

E. Two completey different markets with two completey different customers.

F. They are selling software and we are selling a service.

G. The two websites using the marks provided to you in the original offcie action clearly show that two marks are completely different in look, in use, in commercial impression, in customers and that FAMEOS even stated on their website and in their mark that are looking to use their mark for an OPERATING SYSTEM.

H. The mark fameoz is used to sell marketing and advertsing to other business, so that they can advertise their products on our site where are the mark FAMEOS is being used to sell an mobile operating application to connect consumers to movies stars. The likelihood of confusion is 0. The likelihood that we even have the same customer audience is 0. The likelihood of confusion is 0.

11. We are standing behind our legal argument to hold the USPTO and [Examining Attorney] and [the Examining Attorney's] supervsior legally responsible for any damages we inccur as a reult of you denying our trademark application. [Examining Attorney] has biased and prejudicial from the start. [Examining Attorney] is biased and prejudicial against pro-ses. Any attempts to exonerate yourself with the meritless excuse that we should have consulted with an attorney will NOT exonerate from your repeated refusal to legally address the material defects that exist in those 6 applications.

12. You have violated the rules of conducts and ethics of your license and were legally bond to address the error you made on those 6 applications irrespective of whether or not you were the examing attorney. You werelegally bound to notify that examining attorney and the appropriate supervsiors, so that 6 applications could be voided. Any attempts to falsely state that my actions are malicious or ill-intended are absolutely incorrect.

13. You violdated the standard operaing procedures that exist in allowing a completely different company to assume ownership of applications they never filed instead of following SOP and requiring them to file new application and in doing so caused me and every other company severe damages. I was legally entitled to first position on my mark fameoz and as a result of your negligence and refusal to correct the error you made you have caused me sever damages and are refusing to move my application forward because of your mistake.

14. The request to have the mark changed back to fameoz on my application will be made now. Please approve the request.

15. Yes, we can provide specimen's with an explantion point, but cosidering we are chaning it back to its original

state we do not need to provide specimens with a explanation point.

16. Lastly, we are standing disagree with decision to continue to prevent us from moving forward on our application. You falsely stated that adding an explanation does not change the mark and that it is still considered the same.

Examine FAMOS and FAMOS! ... two approved marks both in the same class 41 ... NOW TELL ME THEY ARE THE SAME. You are biased and prejudicial and are not fit to exmine anything.

88108511 5869694 FAMOS TSDR LIVE 041
86120260 4587711 FAMOS! TSDR LIVE 041
97110530 FAMOUS 003

3 88939326 FAMEOS TSDR LIVE 035
4 88939314 FAMEOS TSDR LIVE 042
5 88939306 FAMEOS TSDR LIVE 009
6 88939349 FAMEOS THE CELEBRITY OPERATING SYSTEM TSDR LIVE 042
7 88939341 FAMEOS THE CELEBRITY

OPERATING SYSTEM TSDR LIVE 009
8 88939358 FAMEOS THE CELEBRITY
OPERATING SYSTEM TSDR LIVE 035

17. Attached is the state document proving that the AZOR CORPORTAION legally ceased to exist 7-30-21 and that you were legally bound to void all 6 trademark application filed by AZOR in 5-2020. The same 6 applications you are now using against me to prevent my trademark from being processed.

18. I am submitting the change back to fameoz. Please approve the change you have all the specimens. We want our application put back in it's original state.

Mandy Valentin

On Wednesday, December 22, 2021, 11:05:07 AM EST, [Examining Attorney] <**[Examining Attorney]@uspto.gov**> wrote:

Dear Ms. Valentin,

Thank you for your email. I have reviewed your emails and the Responses you have filed and have forwarded them to my supervisor.

As I explained previously, I legally cannot consider arguments regarding the validity of Prior Applications. I am not the examining attorney on the Prior Pending Applications and have no ability to reject those applications. In general, examining attorneys can only discuss applications with the applicant and not with third parties. (So for instance, if someone else tried to contact me about your application, I could not discuss it with them.)

If you wish to challenge a Prior Application or Registration, the **only** way to do so is to file an Opposition or Cancellation Proceeding with the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board. **https://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/ttab/initiating-new-proceeding**; **https://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/trademark-trial-and-appeal-board/filing-ttab**. Examining attorneys are not involved with these proceedings and I cannot provide advice on that filing. As this is a more complex process, we do recommend consulting an attorney if you choose to do so.

Regarding the question in your other email, amending the mark to FAMEOZ! Would be acceptable as not being a Material Alteration, but this would create an issue with your Specimen, as punctuation in the Mark Drawing must appear on the Specimen, and your Specimen shows FAMEOZ alone. However, this would not overcome the Potential Likelihood of Confusion.

Therefore, I will be issuing a new Office Action regarding the matching issue.

**Please note:** Because of the legal technicalities and strict deadlines of the trademark application process, you are encouraged to hire a private attorney who specializes in trademark matters to assist in this process. The assigned trademark examining attorney can provide only limited assistance explaining the content of an Office action and the application process. USPTO staff cannot provide legal advice or statements about an applicant's legal rights. TMEP §§705.02, 709.06. See Hiring a U.S.-licensed trademark attorney for more information.

I have copied my Acting Senior Attorney, [Senior Attorney], on this email and you may contact [the Senior Attorney] with any questions. **[Senior Attorney]@USPTO.GOV**

Thank you,
[Examining Attorney]

/[Examining Attorney]/
Examining Attorney
Law Office [Redacted]
(571) [Redacted]
**[Redacted]@uspto.gov**


*Please note: All relevant e-mail communications may be uploaded to the official application record in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §2.191 and TMEP §§709.04 - .05.*

**From:** Mandy Valentin <**mandyvalentin@ymail.com**>
**Sent:** Monday, December 20, 2021 6:56 PM
**To:** [Examining Attorney] <**[Examining Attorney]@USPTO.GOV**>; Trademark Assistance Center <**TrademarkAssistanceCenter@USPTO.GOV**>; [Redacted] <**[Redacted]@USPTO.GOV**>
**Subject:** 90608020 - REQUEST FOR NEW EXAMING ATTORNEY AND NOTICE OF LEGAL ACTION AGAINST ATTORNEY [EXAMINING ATTORNEY]

To USPTO

An offical request is being made to be assigned a new examining attorney for our trademark application:

We will filing a formal complaint against Attorney [Examining Attorney]'s license and are offocially appealing [Examining Attorney's] decision to suspend our trademark application.

The basis for [the Examining Attorney's] decisionis materiall defective. The AZOR CORPORATION WAS NOT LEGALLY IN EXISTENCE EFFECTIVE 7-31-2020 and CANNOT BE USED A LEGAL BASIS TO DENY OUR APPLICATION.

The USPO was legaly bound to void all 6 applications and attorney [Examining

Attorney] was legally bound NOT to use them as all 6 applications as a legal argument to deny and/or suspend our application once [Examining Attorney] became aware of this legal material fact.

We will be seeking legal action against Attorney [Examining Attorney] for the damages [Examining Attorney] has caused.

A formal reply to the suspension notice was filed through the system and we want to move forward in our application.

Attorney [Examining Attorney] is biased and prejudicial and must be removed from our application to prevent any further damage[Examining Attorney] may cause.

Mandy Valentin

---

**From: Mandy Valentin**

**Date: 12/20/2021**

**To: USPTO**

**Re: Reply to 12/20/2021 – Reply Suspension Notice**

**Serial Number: 90608020 @ Filed 12/20/2021**

**Trademark: FAMEOZ**

**The opposing examining attorney legal arguments are materially defect and not persuasive.**

**1. Examining attorney [Examining Attorney] had a fudiciuary responsibility to check the validity of the opposing trademark application (88939326, 88939314, 88939306, 88939349, 88939341, 88939358) which [Examining Attorney] was using as a legal argument to deny us our legal right to a trademark application.**

**2. The company FameOS did not legally exist at the time they submitted the application. All 6 applications**

**(88939326, 88939314, 88939306, 88939349, 88939341, 88939358) are materially defective and NOT legal in the US.**

**3. Attorney [Examining Attorney] was legally bound by US law to examine this argument and to verify the legitimacy of these applications, if [Examining Attorney] was going to use them in [the Examining Attorney's] legal argument. This is a material fact. [Examining Attorney] was legally bound to investigate this material fact the second [Examining Attorney] was notified of this material fact. [Examining Attorney] bound by [the Examining Attorney's] license and by the USPTO laws NOT to use the 6 applications (88939326, 88939314, 88939306, 88939349, 88939341, 88939358) as a weapon to deny us our legal right to move forward with our trademark applications. [Examining Attorney] was bound by US law and USPTO law to notify the USPTO office and the attorney on these 6 applications (88939326, 88939314, 88939306, 88939349, 88939341, 88939358) that a material defect did exist.**

- **CLASS 35 – FAMEOS – FILED BY AZOR CORPORATION – MAY 29, 2020**

- **ALL 6 (88939326, 88939314, 88939306, 88939349, 88939341, 88939358) – FILED BY AZOR CORPORATION – MAY 29, 2020**

- **AZOR CORP CEASED TO LEGALLY EXIST JULY 31, 2020 – LEGAL STATE DOCUMENTS ATTACHED**

- **ALL 6 APPLICATIONS BECAME LEGALLY NULL AND VOID JULY 31, 2020**

- **USPTO WAS LEGALLY OBLIGATED TO VOID ALL 6 APPLICATIONS FILED BY THE AZOR CORPORATION WHO NO LONGER EXISTED IN THE US EFFECTIVE JULY 30, 2020**

-

- **ATTORNEY [EXAMINING ATTORNEY] WAS LEGALLY BOUND NOT TO USE ALL 6 APPLICATIONS AGAINST US AS A LEGAL ARGUMENT TO DENY OUR APPLICATION ONCE [EXAMINING ATTORNEY] BECAME AWARE OF THIS MATERIAL FACT.**

**4. Examining attorney [Examining Attorney] was legally bound to report this to [the Examining Attorney's] supervisor regardless of whether or NOT [Examining Attorney] was going to use these (88939326, 88939314, 88939306, 88939349, 88939341, 88939358) 6 applications against.**

**5. If the USPTO made an error then they are legally bound to correct that error while there I still time.**

**6. If the USPTO granted applications to a company that did NOT exist at the time the applications were submitted, then they are legally bound to correct that error irrespective of whether or not the 6 applications have been approved or not.**

**7. If the USPTO approved any application for a company that did NOT legally exist at the time the applications was submitted, then those applications are considered fraud and not legally binding.**

**8. Examining attorney [Examining Attorney] was negligent.**

**9. Examining attorney [Examining Attorney] violated [the Examining Attorney's] duty of care and fiduciary responsibility to report the potential fraud and report the material defect once notified.**

**10. Examining attorney chose to ignore this material fact and violate the laws that govern US law and [the Examining Attorney's] license.**

**11. Examining attorney can be sued for negligence.**

**12. Examining attorney sole argument for denying us the right to move forward was that the in [the Examining Attorney's] opinion the names "FAMEOS" AND "FAMEOZ" appear similar nature. [The Examining Attorney's] sole argument was not persuasive enough.**

**13. According attorney [Examining Attorney] the USPTO does not account for the differences in industry, does not account for the differences in look, does not account for differences in how the trademarks are being used, does not account for differences in websites, branding, use, color, customer audience, sound. According to attorney [Examining Attorney] the ONLY thing the USPTO looks at is whether or not the words look alike when determining whether or one mark is infringing on another person's rights.**

**14. Attorney [Examining Attorney] arguments for determining whether or not these marks are similar is not only material defects but a violation of USPTO and government trademark laws.**

**15. Whether or not the words look alike cannot be the sole argument in determining whether confusion may exist. Attorney [Examining Attorney]'s opinion that these marks are similar and would likely to cause confusion is hereby denied.**

**16. If FAMEOS INC. DID NOT LEGALLY EXIST at the time the applications were submitted, attorney [Examining Attorney] cannot legally overlook this material fact NOR can [Examining Attorney] legally argue that this material fact "constitutes a collateral attack on a cited registration".**

**17. Any attempts by attorney [Examining Attorney] to state [Examining Attorney] was notified of this fact by ex-parte conversions is a complete lie.**

**18. If FAMEOS INC. DID NOT LEGALLY EXIST at the time the applications were submitted, attorney [Examining Attorney] was legally bound not to use these 6 applications against us when determining on whether or not to proceed with our application.**

**19. Examining attorney's legal argument that "FAMEOS" AND "FAMEOZ" are both in class 35 is not a persuasive argument to deny our application. Here are two approved marks both in the same class, both sounding the same, both spelled the same, both looking the same approved by the USPTO.**

- **88108511 - CLASS 41 - FAMOS**
- **86120260 - CLASS 41 - FAMOS!**

**20. A formal complaint against attorney [Examining Attorney] license will be filed for violating the rules and regulations that govern [the Examining Attorney's] license to not over look the material fact that "FAMEOS INC." did NOT legally exist in the US at the time [Examining Attorney] is citing they submitted the applications and for choosing to ignore this material fact, when denying us our legal right to our application and for causing us financial, physical and emotional harm as a result of [the Examining Attorney's] negligence.**

**21. Examining attorney [Examining Attorney] was biased and prejudicial to the applicant because the applicant was not attorney.**

**22. We are officially requesting a new examining attorney be assigned to our application and we will be filing a complaint against Attorney [Examining Attorney]'s license.**

**23. We will be moving forward with our application to see if it will move forward, so any attempts to deny us this right will be legally addressed.**

**24. Any attempts by attorney [Examining Attorney] to interfere with our application will be legally addressed. We will also be seeking legal action against**

**attorney [Examining Attorney] for the damages [Examining Attorney] has caused.**

**25. We are officially appealing the attorney [Examining Attorney]'s findings and request that the suspension be dismissed. We are hereby asking to be assigned a new examining attorney to examine our application, so that it can move forward in the application process.**

# Exhibit B

**EXHIBIT B**

**From:** Mandy Valentin <mandyvalentin@ymail.com>
**Sent:** Friday, December 24, 2021 11:11 AM
**To:** TM Policy <TMpolicy@USPTO.GOV>
**Cc:** TM Policy <TMpolicy@USPTO.GOV>; [Senior Attorney] <[Senior Attorney]@USPTO.GOV>; [Examining Attorney of Respondent's Application] [<[Examining Attorney]@USPTO.GOV>; [Examining Attorney of Third-party Applications] [<[Examining Attorney]@USPTO.GOV>; TEAS <TEAS@USPTO.GOV>; Trademark Assistance Center <TrademarkAssistanceCenter@USPTO.GOV>; [Redacted] <[Redacted]@USPTO.GOV>
**Subject:** Re: 88939326, 88939314, 88939306, 88939349, 88939341, 88939358 - BANK FRAUD AND WHISTLEBLOWER COMPLAINT

# To: USPTO

1. You and Fameos Inc. will be held liable for infringing on my company's trademark FAMEOZ that has been in existence for 2019.

2. You have knowingly and recklessly published and registered fraudulent trademarks 88939326, 88939314, 88939306, 88939349, 88939341, and 88939358.

3. Fameos Inc. did NOT file the 6 applications Serial Nos. 88939326, 88939314, 88939306, 88939349, 88939341, and 88939358 for the trademark use of FAMEOS in 5-2020. Fameos Inc. did NOT even legally exist in the US on 5-2020. Fameos Inc. did NOT even legally exist in the US on 5-2020.They could NOT have paid for these 6 applications. They cannot be the legal owner of these 6

applications, because they did NOT legally exist at the time these applications were filed. Legally you were require by law to void all 6 applications and require Fameos Inc. tofile new application, if they desired to use the mark FAMEOS.

4. Fameos Inc. did NOT PAY for the 6 applications Serial Nos. 88939326, 88939314, 88939306, 88939349, 88939341, and 88939358 for the trademark use of FAMEOS in 5-2020. Fameos Inc. did NOT even legally exist in the US on 5-2020.They could NOT have paid for these 6 applications. They cannot be the legal owner of these 6 applications, because they did NOT legally exist at the time these applications were filed. Legally you were require by law to void all 6 applications and require Fameos Inc. tofile new application, if they desired to use the mark FAMEOS.

5. The Applicant name on all 6 applications Serial Nos. 88939326, 88939314, 88939306, 88939349, 88939341, and 88939358 is publicly listed under a completely different legal entity AZOR CORPORATION, a company NO LONGER in existence.

6. On 7-30-2020, the AZOR CORPORATION was legally dissolved. On several occasions you were given the state legal documents to support this. The company's dissolution is also public knowledge.

7. By law and by USPT Law, Fameos Inc. cannot be called the legal owner of these trademark applications or these trademark, because they did NOT file or pay for them.

8. By law and by USPT Law, Fameos Inc. cannot be called the legal owner of these trademark applications or these trademark, because they did NOT follow the standard operating procedures to acquire them.

9. Fameos Inc. was legally required to file a statement of use applications, if they wanted to the AZOR Corporations trademark and they were legally required to file those applications and more importantly pay for those application, when they be came legal in the US, which was 7-31-2020, which they failed to do.

10. By law, Fameos Inc. cannot be called the legal owner of any trademark application or any trademark they did NOT file or pay for.

11. By law, Fameos Inc. cannot be called the legal owner of any trademark application or any trademark filed or paid for in 5-2020, if they did NOT legally exist as a legal entity in the US.

12. Fameos Inc. did not legally exist in the US until 7-31-2020.

13. USPTO was legally required to require Fameos Inc. to follow standard operating procedures and file 6 new applications.

14. The USPTO made the mistake and is legaly requiredby law to correct the error irrespective of whether or not those application or marks are actively registered.

15. If marks is actively registered and it is discovered that Fameos Inc. is NOT in fact the legal owner to the trademark applications or the legal owner of the marks at the time the trademark applications were filed, then trademark are void and invalid irrespective of whether or not the USPTO says they are.

16. If marks is actively registered and it is discovered that Fameos Inc. is NOT in fact the legal owner to the trademark applications or the legal owner of the marks at the time the trademark applications were filed and if it is determined that a party was notified that this material defects existed and they did nothing about it, then that party is legally culpable for that fraud. They are legally culpable for concealing the farud. They are legally culpable for damages. This includes the USPTO, any examining attorney, the examining attorney that reviewed those marks.

17. In allowing Fameos Inc. to assume applications filed by another company you have infringed not only my rights, but the rights of every other company by allowing them to cut in line.

18. In allowing these fraudulent marks to continue to be published and registered you have infringed not only my rights, but the

rights of every other company by allowing them to cut in line.

19. In allowing these fraudulent marks to continue to be published and registered you are continuing to commit fraud and are culpable for any and all damages that are incurred.

20. Whether or not these fraudulent marks are registered or not is irrelevant. What is relevant is now that you are of the mistake you made what are you going to do about it. If you chose to do nothing, then you concealing this material defect and liable for any and all damages incurred.

21. You have already caused my company FameoZ Inc. damage, when you refused to process my trademark application, because of these 6 fraudulent trademarks and trademark applications.

22. YOU ARE COMMITTING BANK FRAUD.

23. YOU ARE COMMITTING FRAUD AND FRAUD BY OMISSION.

24. YOU ARE LEGALLY OBLIGATED TO LOOK ATTHE PUBLIC RECORDS, INVESTIGATE IT AND CORRECT YOUR GRAVE ERROR.

25. YOU ARE LEGALLYOBLIGATED TO FOLLOW YOUR OWN SATNDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES GOVERNED BY LAW AND REQUIRE FAMEOS INC TO

FILE 6 NEW APPLICATIONS AND PAY FOR 6 APPLICATIONS AT A TIME THEY ARE LEGALLYIN EXISTENCE WHICH IS NOW.

26. YOU ARE LEGALLY REQUIRED TO VOID THE 6 MARKS IF IT IS DETERMINED THAT AN ERROR OCCURRED.

27.YOU ARE LIABLE AND HAVE OPENEDTHE DOOR TO A CLASS ACTIONLAWSUIT FOR ANY COMPANY THAT SEES THAT YOU WERE NOTIFIED AND DID NOTHING ABOUT IT.

28. AS FAR AS THE EXAMINING ATTORNEYS AND YOUR REPATED EXCUSE THAT THEY CANNOT COMMUNICATE WITH ONE ANOTHER, THAT EXCUSE WILL NOT WASH. SUPERVSORS WERE NOTIFIED. CUSTOMER SREVICE WAS NOTIFIED. ALL EXAMING ATTORNEYS WERE NOTIFIED. THE PUBLIC RECORDS WERE UPDATED TO REFLECT THE NOTIFICATIONS AND NOT THE POLICY DEPT HAS BEEN NOTIFIED.

29. A FORMAL COMPLAINT IS BEING FILED AGAINST ALL ATTORNEY LICENSES WHO INDIRECTLY AND DIRECTLY AIDED AND ABETTED CONCEALING THE MATERIAL IN THE 6 APPLICATIONS AND 6 MARKS AND IN CONCEALING THE FRAUD AND BANK FRAUD.

30. You have been legally notified and are culpable for any and all damages I have incurred.

# 31. IF YOU SO WILLING TO CHOSE TO REGISTER OR CONTINUE TO REGISTER THE 6 MARKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE 6 APPLICATIONS, I CAN'T STOP YOU BUT I CAN SUE YOU AND ANYONE WHO PARTICPATED FORTHE DAMAGES YOU INCURRED.

32. Lastly, there was NO reason for my application to be suspended. The examining attorney has repeatedly shown biasness and prejudices to the fact that my application was submitted on a pro se basis. [Examining Attorney] has repeatedly refused to process my application rather then to let it move forward and allow any other attorney to challenge the mark is they want.

33. I requested a NEW examining attorney and [Examining Attorney] refused to recuse [Examining Attorney] knowing I was filing a complaint against [the Examining Attorney's] license. Bound by the ethics and rules and regulations that govern [the Examining Attorney's] license, [Examining Attorney] should have recused [Examining Attorney] from my application and the USPTO should have assigned me a NEW EXAMINER. It is in [Examining Attorney's] best interest that [the Examining Attorney] conceal he material defects of the 6 applications and continue to suspend my mark to support arguments to cover [Examining Attorney], when I sue [Examining Attorney] for damages.

34. I repeatedly requested a new examiner and you denied me.

35. The USPTO approved 2 marks FAMOS AND FAMOS! IN THE SAME CLASS 41, but [Examining Attorney] has refused to move my application forward if our company changed our mark from FAMEOZ TO FAMEOZ!.

36. [EXAMINING ATTORNEY] SHOULD NOT BE THE ASSIGNED EXAMINER ON MY APPLICATION. THIS IS A CONFLICT OF INTERST. I AM SUING [THE EXAMINING ATTORNEY] AND FILING A COMPLAINT [THE EXAMINING ATTORNEY'S] LICENSE.

37. THE USPTO SHOULD HAVE ALLOWED MY APPLICATION TO MOVE FORWARD AND ALLOWED ANY OTHER ATTORNEY TO CHALLENGE IT, IF THEY SO WISHED.

38. You have been legally notified. You have committed a crime and will be sued by any company who can prove you infringed on their rights.

Mandy Valentin
President
FameoZ Inc.

On Friday, December 24, 2021, 09:54:22 AM EST, TM Policy <**tmpolicy@uspto.gov**> wrote:

Ms. Valentin:

Your emails regarding Trademark Application Serial Nos. 88939326, 88939314, 88939306, 88939349, 88939341, and 88939358 were forwarded to this office for response. We understand that your company, Fameoz Inc., filed Trademark Application Serial Nos. 90861675, 90852416, 90864448, 90859585, 90608020, 90859627, and 90864334.

When there is a likelihood of confusion among pending applications, priority among those applications is determined based on the effective filing dates of the applications, without regard to whether the dates of use in a later-filed application are earlier than the filing date or dates of use of an earlier-filed application, whether the applicant in a later-filed application owns a registration of a mark that would be considered a bar to registration of the earlier-filed application, or whether an application was filed on the basis of use of the mark in commerce or a bona fide intent to use the mark in commerce. See 37 C.F.R. §2.83(a); Trademark Manual of Examining Procedure (TMEP) §1208.01.

In this instance, the effective filing dates of your applications are between 3/28/2021 and 8/4/2021. The effective filing date of the applications referenced in your emails is 5/29/2020. Therefore, the earlier-filed applications have priority with regard to examination and publication for opposition.

Please note that an examining attorney or other USPTO employee may not discuss the merits of any particular application or registration with a third party. TMEP §1806. If you believe that you would be damaged by the registration of any of the earlier-filed marks on the Principal Register, you may oppose registration by **filing a notice of opposition with the Board**, and paying the required fee, within thirty days after the date of publication, or within an extension period granted by the Board for filing an opposition. See 15 U.S.C. §1063; 37 C.F.R. §§2.101 - 2.107; Trademark Trial and Appeal Board Manual of Procedure (TBMP) §303.

Regards,

*Office of the Deputy Commissioner for Trademark Examination Policy*

*United States Patent and Trademark Office*

**From:** Mandy Valentin <**mandyvalentin@ymail.com**>
**Sent:** Wednesday, December 22, 2021 9:59 PM
**To:** TEAS <**TEAS@USPTO.GOV**>; [Senior Attorney] <**[Senior Attorney]@USPTO.GOV**>;

[Redacted] <**[Redacted]@USPTO.GOV**>; Trademark Assistance Center <**TrademarkAssistanceCenter@USPTO.GOV**>; [Examining Attorney of Third-party Applications] [<**[Examining Attorney]@USPTO.GOV**>
**Subject:** 88939326, 88939314, 88939306, 88939349, 88939341, 88939358 - WHISTLEBLOWER COMPLAINT

THIS EMAIL IS BEING SENT, SO THAT A RECORDS EXISTS THAT THE EXAMINING ATTORNEY ([Examining Attorney]) FOR ALL 6 OF AZOR CORPORATION'S APPLICATIONS (88939326, 88939314, 88939306, 88939349, 88939341, 88939358) HAS BEEN NOTIFIED TO HOLD [THE EXAMINING ATTORNEY] AND [THE EXAMINING ATTORNEY'S] LICENSE LEGALLY ACCOUNTABLE.

THE USPTO ATTEMPTS TO CONCEAL THE FACT THAT ALL 6 APPLICATIONS ARE MATERIALLY DEFECTIVE AND LEGALY INVALID IS DOCUMENTED.

A WHISTLEBLOWER COMPLAINT IS BEING FILED AGAINST YOU FOR CONCEALING THIS CIVIL AND CRIMINAL OFFENSE.

If the application was filed in the name of an individual or entity that was not the legal owner of the trademark on the application filing date, you may not amend the application to substitute the correct owner.  The application is void and a new application must be filed.

You have been legally notified.

Mandy Valentin

On Wednesday, December 22, 2021, 10:15:51 PM EST, Mandy Valentin <**mandyvalentin@ymail.com**> wrote:

90608020

APPROVE OUR REQUEST TO HAVE OUR MARK STATE .... fameoZ

WE WANT OUR APPLICATION AMENDED TO HAVE OUR MARK STATE ... fameoZ

TO MATCH OUR SPECIMENS THAT WERE ALREADY SUBMITTED AND TO MATCH THE IRS DOCUMENT SPECIMEN YOU WERE GIVEN PROVING OUR COMPANY NAME is fameoZ .. and legally listed as an advertising marketing company.

YOU HAVE NO EXCUSES NOT TO APPROVE OUR CHANGE REQUEST.

Mandy Valentin

President

Fameoz Inc.

A legally registered advertising marketing agency since 2019

# Exhibit C

**EXHIBIT C**

**From:** Mandy Valentin <mandyvalentin@ymail.com>
**Sent:** Monday, January 3, 2022 11:18 PM
**To:** TEAS <TEAS@USPTO.GOV>; [REDACTED] [REDACTED]@USPTO.GOV>; Trademark Assistance Center <TrademarkAssistanceCenter@USPTO.GOV>; TM Policy <TMpolicy@USPTO.GOV>
**Cc:** [Examining Attorney] <[Examining Attorney]@USPTO.GOV>; [Senior Attorney] <[Senior Attorney]@USPTO.GOV>
**Subject:** 90608020: GET THIS RACIST ATTORNEY [EXAMINING ATTORNEY] REMOVED AND PROCESS OUR APPLICATION

To: USPTO -

GET THIS RACIST WHITE ATTORNEY [EXAMINING ATTORNEY] REMOVED FROM OUR APPLICATION. [EXAMINING ATTORNEY] STATED RACIAL SLURS AFTER FINDING OUT I WAS A MINORITY.

I AM OFFICIALLY FILING A DISCRMINATION AND RETALIATION COMPLAINT AGSINT [EXAMINING ATTORNEY] AND [THE EXAMINING ATTORNEY'S] ACTING SUPERVISOR.

THEY HAVE INTERFERRED WITH APPROVING OUR APPLICATION AND HAVE RETALIATED AGAINST US OBSTRUCTING JUSTICE AND HAVE CAUSED MY COMPANY SEVER ECONMIC LOSS.

[THE EXAMINING ATTORNEY] IS BIASED AND PREJUDICIAL AND A RACIST.

REMOVE [THE EXAMINING ATTORNEY] FROM OUR APPLICTION AND ASSIGN AN ATTORNEY WHO IS NOTA WHITE RACIST.

[The Examining Attorney] is holding our application ransom and refused to lift the unjust suspension [the Examining Attorney] place on our mark, which has since changed.

[The Examining Attorney] issued a suspension against mark FAMEOZ and we have since changed our mark to FamoZ.

GET THIS BIASED REJUDICIAL ATTORNEY REMOVED FROM OUR APPLICATION AND ASSIGN US AN EXAMING ATTORNEY WHO NOT OBSTRUCTING JUSTICE.

Attached are more specimens in the PDF and JPG format supporting our current use of the mark FamoZ.

ALL SPECIMENS ARE IN THE CORRECT FORMAT AND CLEARLY SHOW OUR BRAND.

OUR VENDORS ARE CALLED FAMOZ.

Any attempts by [Examining Attorney] to falsely state that are mark is similiar or confusing to any other mark in CLASS 35 is absoluely incorrect.

There are NO OTHER MARKS IN CLASS 35 even remotely similiar to FamoZ.

We have other marks submitted for FamoZ, for IM Famoz, for IM FameoZ and for fameoZ in other classes and in class 35. Any attempts by the USPTO or [Examining Attorney] to falsely state our own marks are competing

against us will be legally addressed. They are ALL different.

REMOVE THE SUSPENSION ON OUR APPLICATION AND MOVE OUR APPLICATIN FORWARD.

THE SUSPENSION WAS PLACED ON A MARK NO LONGER ON THIS APPLICATION.

YOU CAN NOT LEGALLY HOLD OUR APPLICATION ON THE PREVIOUS REASONS ISSUED ON THE ORIGINAL SUSPENSION.

[Examining Attorney] acts to hold on our application in suspension are being viewed as an act of retaliation.

GET THIS RACIST ATTORNEY REMOVED AND PROCESS OUR APPLICATION. THERE IS NOTHING WRONG WITH OUR MARK OR SPECIMENS.

PROCESS THESE CHANGES AND ASSIGN US AN ATTORNEY WHO IS NOT WHITE.

Mandy Valentin
President
FameoZ Inc.

# Exhibit D

**EXHIBIT D**

**From:** Mandy Valentin <mandyvalentin@ymail.com>
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 5, 2022 11:15 PM
**To:** TEAS <TEAS@USPTO.GOV>; [REDACTED] [REDACTED]@USPTO.GOV>; [Examining Attorney] <[Examining Attorney]@USPTO.GOV>; Trademark Assistance Center <TrademarkAssistanceCenter@USPTO.GOV>; [Senior Attorney] <[Senior Attorney]@USPTO.GOV>; TM Policy <TMpolicy@USPTO.GOV>; TEAS <TEAS@USPTO.GOV>
**Subject:** 90608020: PROCESS OUR CHANGE REQUEST AND REMOVE THIS RACIST EXAMINER FROM OUR APPLICATION

# To: USPTO

Because you have refused to remove this RACIST Examining Attorney [Examining Attorney], we are submitting a request to have our mark changed once again to get this RACIST WHITE Examining Attorney to REMOVE the illegal and fraudulent suspension [Examining Attorney] placed on our original mark FAMEOZ.

You were notified several times that you and [Examining Attorney] committed BANK FRAUD, when you falsely stated that Fameos Inc paid for the 6 trademark applications for FAMEOS and FAMEOS CELEBRITY OPERATION SYSTEM. None of these 6 applications were paid for. They

were paid by a company that NO LONGER exists the AZOR Corporation. YOU ILLEGALLY COMMITTED A CRIMINAL OFFENSE and are holding our trademark application ransom in an attempt to falsely denied us and falsely state our marks are similar to FAMEOS, when in fact they are NOT.

YOU AND [EXAMINING ATTORNEY] AND [THE EXAMINING ATTORNEY'S] SUPERVISOR [SENIOR ATTORNEY] HAVE ILLEGALLY COMMITTED BANK FRAUD AND FRAUD. YOUR CONCEALMENT IS ALSO A CRIMINAL OFFENSE. YOU ARE FARUDULENTLY DECEIVING THE PUBLIC IN FALSELY STATING THESE MARKS ARE REAL, WHEN IN FACT THEY ARE NOT.

You have caused our company Fameoz Inc. extremes damages by infringing on our existing marks FameoZ and FamoZ.

You have caused damaged to all the companies you are denying illegally due to these fraudulent mark or illegal acts to conceal the fact they are fraudulent.

Your refusal to remove the suspension on our application is being deemed retaliation for filing a WHISTLEBLOWER COMPLAINT against you and for filing judicial complaints against [Examining Attorney] and [the Examining Attorney's] license.

We are asking once again for you to REMOVE THE ILLEGAL SUSPENSION you have placed on our application and REMOVE [EXAMINING ATTORNEY] from our application.

We are asking you once again to reassign us a new examiner that is NOT a WHITE RACIST. [EXAMINING ATTORNEY]'s racial slur to our company are a violation of the rules and ethics that govern USPTO law, as well as, [the Examining Attorney's] license.

[EXAMINING ATTORNEY] SHOULD SHOULD BE RECUSED FROM OUR APPLICATION. [Examining Attorney] is obstructing justice knowing [Examining Attorney] is facing a judicial complaint against [the Examining Attorney] license from our company.

APPROVE OUR TRADEMARK CHANGES ...

WE ARE CHANGE OUR MARK FROM FamoZ to FameoZ Redefined in an effort to get this WHITE RACIST ATTORNEY TO MOVE OUR APPLICATION and to combat any false attempts [Examining Attorney] makes to deny our application.

[Examining Attorney] is dead set on denying our application and putting it in a suspended with the sole intent of denying it and false stating it is similar and confusion.

[EXAMINING ATTORNEY] SHOULD BE DISBARRED AND RECUSED FROM THIS APPLICATION.

APPROVE OUR MARK CHANGE.

Irrespective of what we change our mark to at this stage [Examining Attorney] will deny whatever our mark states.

Mandy Valentin
President
Fameoz Inc.

# Exhibit E

**EXHIBIT E**

**From:** Mandy Valentin <fameoz@yahoo.com>
**Sent:** Sunday, February 27, 2022 8:18 PM
**To:** [REDACTED] [REDACTED]@USPTO.GOV>; TEAS <TEAS@USPTO.GOV>; Trademark Assistance Center <TrademarkAssistanceCenter@USPTO.GOV>; TM Policy <TMpolicy@USPTO.GOV>
**Cc:** [Examining Attorney] <[Examining Attorney]@USPTO.GOV>; [Senior Attorney] <[Senior Attorney]@USPTO.GOV>
**Subject:** 90608020 - Request REMOVE SUSPENSION AND [EXAMINING ATTORNEY] - CITING RACIAL PREJUDICE AND RACIAL RETALIATION

90608020 - FameOz Inc

88939341, 88939349, and 88939358 - Fameos The Celebrity Operating System

To USPTO -

In response to [Examining Attorney] suspension on 90608020 [the Examining Attorney] cites that it is [the Examining Attorney's] opinion that:

90608020 - FameOz Inc

88939341, 88939349, and 88939358 - Fameos The Celebrity Operating System

are similiar in sound, look and wouldcause a liklihood of confusion.

Seeveral attempts were to documents and notify the USPTO of this WHITE, RACIST, PREJUDICIAL, BIASED examiner after [Examining Attorney] spouted RACIAL SLURS on the phone and several attempts were made to remove this WHITE RACIST from this application to prevent this MALICE AND INTENT AND ILLEGAL ACTS that took place, when [the Examining Attorney] ILLEGALLY VIOLATED USPTO LAWS and denied our application and maliciously and racially suspended WITHOUT CAUSE.

[Examining Attorney] sat on [the Examining Attorney's] ass on this application knowing [Examining Attorney] was going tosuspend it because is aWHITE RACISTS BITCH who should not be practcing law.

[Examining Attorney] is not fit to do [the Examining Attorney's] job.

ANOTHER REQUEST IS BEING MADE THAT YOU REMOVE THIS RACIST BTCH

FROM THIS APPLICATION AND THE RACIST AND MALICIOUS SUSPENSION FROM THIS APPLICATION.

90608020 - FameOz Inc

88939341, 88939349, and 88939358 - Fameos The Celebrity Operating System

... SOUND NOTHING ALIKE

... LOOK NOTHING ALIKE

.... ARE NOT ALIKE

[Examining Attorney] is absuing [the Examining Attorney's] position with USPTO to retaliate against our company because [Examining Attorney] was pissed that several complaints were filed against [the Examining Attorney] and [the Examining Attorney's] license.

THIS RACIST WHITE BITCH HAS CUASED OUR COMPANY ECONOMIC LOSS AND YOU ARE ALLOWING

[EXAMINING ATTORNEY] TO USPTO TO CONTINUE TO RETALIATE AGAINST OUR COMPANY BECAUSE A WHITE SHEET LOVER WHO HATES MINORITIES.

REMOVE THE RACIST SUSPENSION AND REMOVE THIS WHITE BITCH FROM OUR APPLICATION.

FameOz Inc.

# Exhibit F

**EXHIBIT F**

**From:** Mandy Valentin <fameoz@yahoo.com>
**Sent:** Sunday, February 27, 2022 11:03 PM
**To:** TEAS <TEAS@USPTO.GOV>; [REDACTED] [REDACTED]@USPTO.GOV>; Trademark Assistance Center <TrademarkAssistanceCenter@USPTO.GOV>
**Cc:** [Examining Attorney] <[Examining Attorney]@USPTO.GOV>; [Senior Attorney] <[Senior Attorney]@USPTO.GOV>
**Subject:** Re: Serial Number 90608020: Received Your Response to Suspension Inquiry or Letter of Suspension

NOW TELL ME THE NAMES SOUND THE SAME ... YOU LYING BITCH

YOU SAT ON OUR APPLICATION ONLY TO SUSPEND IT AND THE DENY IT... YOU IYING WHITE RACIST BITCH

DOES THS MARK SOND THE SAME? GO FUCK YOURSELF [EXAMINING ATTORNEY] YOU STUPID BITCH

FUCKING WHITE RACIST

STUPID BITCH

# Exhibit G

**EXHIBIT G**

**From:** Mandy Valentin <fameoz@yahoo.com>
**Sent:** Monday, February 28, 2022 10:34 AM
**To:** TEAS <TEAS@USPTO.GOV>; Trademark Assistance Center <TrademarkAssistanceCenter@USPTO.GOV>; TM Policy <TMpolicy@USPTO.GOV>
**Cc:** [Examining Attorney] [<[Examining Attorney]@USPTO.GOV>; [Senior Attorney] <[Senior Attorney]@USPTO.GOV>
**Subject:** Re: Serial Number 90608020: Received Your Response to Suspension Inquiry or Letter of Suspension

APPROVE OUR TRADEMARK CHANGE

WE'RE CHANGING OUR MARK TO:

GO FUCK YOURSELF [EXAMINING ATTORNEY]

MULTIPLE DOMAINS ARE BEING BLASTED AS WE SPEAK TO ENSURE THE WORLD KNOWS WHAT A WHITE RACIST BITCH [EXAMINING ATTORNEY]

THE NEXT IN LINE IS [SENIOR ATTORNEY] [THE EXAMINING ATTORNEY'S] SUPERVISOR WHO ALSO SAT ON [THE SENIOR ATTORNEY'S] ASS AND DID NOTHING ABOUT IT

DRAWING OF HE MARK WAS ATTACHED.

AND WE HAVE TO BUY A NEW APPLICATION WE WILL BECAUSE AT THE END OF THE DAY BOTH [EXAMINING ATTORNEY] AND [SENIOR ATTORNEY] ARE GOING TO PAY FOR WHAT THEY DID.

BOTH THEIR PUBLIC INFO AND TEH PUBLIC INFO OF THEOR FAMILIES ARE GOING TO BLASTED ALL OVER THE INTERNET.

WE'RE TO MAKE ... GO FUCK YOURSELF [EXAMINING ATTORNEY] .... FAMOUS

# Exhibit H

**EXHIBIT H**

**From:** Mandy Valentin <fameoz@yahoo.com>
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 1, 2022 12:56 PM
**To:** TEAS <TEAS@USPTO.GOV>; Trademark Assistance Center <TrademarkAssistanceCenter@USPTO.GOV>; [Redacted] <[Redacted]@USPTO.GOV>; TM Policy <TMpolicy@USPTO.GOV>
**Cc:** [Examining Attorney] <[Examining Attorney]@USPTO.GOV>; [Senior Attorney] <[Senior Attorney]@USPTO.GOV>
**Subject:** [EXAMINING ATTORNEY] NAME IN LIGHTS

TRADEMARK ... GOFUCKYOURSELF[EXAMINING ATTORNEY] ... HAS A NICE RING TO IT.

THANKS USPTO FOR APPROVE THE TRADEMARK.

HEY [EXAMINING ATTORNEY] ... YOUR NAME IS NOW IN LIGHTS.

PREPARE FOR MORE ONLINE .. AND [SENIOR ATTORNEY] IS SOON TO FOLLOW.

DOES

GO FUC YOURSELF [EXAMINING ATTORNEY]

AND

FAMEOS THE OPERATING SYSTEM SOUND ANYTHING ALIKE?

hMMMM ... I DON'T KNOW BUT ACCORDING TO THE RACIST WHITE BITCH [EXAMINING ATTORNEY] IT DOES.

ENJOY [EXAMINING ATTORNEY]... YOU STUPID BITCH

DON'T WORRY [SENIOR ATTORNEY] ... WE HAVEN'T FORGOTTEN ABOUT YOU.

ENJOY THE INTERNET BECAUSE BOTH YOUR NAMES WILL APPEAR ALOT

# Exhibit I

**EXHIBIT I**

**From:** Mandy Valentin <mandyvalentin@ymail.com>
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 10, 2023 7:43 AM
**To:** TEAS <TEAS@USPTO.GOV>; [Examining Attorney 1] <[Examining Attorney 1]@USPTO.GOV>; TM Policy <TMpolicy@USPTO.GOV>; OEEOD (Office of Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity) <ocr@USPTO.GOV>; [Examining Attorney 2] <[Examining Attorney 2]@uspto.gov>
**Subject:** SECOND POS - Trademark 90608020 -Reply to USPTO

# SECOND POS - Trademark 90608020 - Reply to USPTO

On Tuesday, January 10, 2023 at 07:38:50 AM EST, Mandy Valentin <**mandyvalentin@ymail.com**> wrote:

From: mandy valentin

Re: Application Serial No. 90608020

Re: Reply to [Deputy Commissioner for Trademark Examination Policy] and USPTO letter dated 1-9-2023

1. This email is being sent to document my reply to the UPTO dated 1-9-23.

2. You illegally committed fraud by approving multiple trademarks on behalf a company that did NOT exist when the application was filed.

3. You were repeatedly notified of the invalid trademark applications and given the supporting documentation from the state proving the USPTO had been scammed and that the company did NOT legally exist on the date the applications were filed.

4. You repeatedly ignored your errors and refused to correct your mistakes.

5. FameOs Inc was was NOT legally active in the US and thus the USPTO can NOT legally approve any trademark applications on an applicate that did NOT exist.

6. FameOs Inc. did NOT follow the USPT laws that required them to apply to obtain authorization to use the mark FameOs previously owned by AZOR CORP.

7. The USPTO violated trademark laws and unlawfully discrimnated against EVERY APPLICATANT who filed a trademark application, when you let FameOs Inc. JUMP THE LINE and allowed them to use AZOR Corp

applications WITHOUT REQUIRINGTHEM TO go through the formal process ofownership evaluation.

8. FameOs Inc. was legally required to FILE NEW APPLICATIONS making MY APPLICTAIONS COME FIRST NOT THEM.

9. YOU VIOLATED MY CIVIL RIGHTS AND WRONGFULLY DENIED MY APPLICATION FOR FAMEOZ, WHEN YOU DID NOT REQUIRE NEW APPLICATIONS TO BE FILED ON FAMEOS.

10. YOU OWE ME FOR DAMAGES.

11. YOU OWED EVERY COMPANY DAMAGES ... EVERY COMPANY YOU WRONGFULLY DENIED BECAUSE YOU VIOLATED THE LAW AND FAILED TO CORRECT THE MISTAKES.

12. You had plenty of time to correct your mistakes but you negligently made the decision to approve the invalid paplications.

13. YOUR NEGLIGENCE IMPACTS NOT ONLY ME BUT EVERY OTHER APPLICATNT WRONGFULLY DENIED AT THAT TIME AND IN THE FUTURE.

14. In short, YOU COMMITTED FRAUD AND ARE STILLCOMMITTING FRAUD.

And if you do not like it, too bad.

There is enough legal documentation to support the fact that FameOs Inc did not legally exist when those trademark applications were filed and that were legally notified of the mistake.

There is enough documentation to support that you violated the law and in regards to [the Deputy Commissioner for Trademark Examination Policy]'s remarks go hire an attorney.

And in regards to [Examining Attorney 1] who discrminated against me because I was hispanic she is NOT fit for her position. She denied my application WITHOUT CAUSE after I filed a discrmination complaint with USPTO about her racist-slurs.

NO ONE PAID FOR THE FAMEOS TRADEMARK APPLICATONS.

YOU GAVE THEM TO FAMEOS INC FOR FREE.

THEY DID NOT PAY FOR THEM BECAUSE THEY DID NOT FILE THOSE APPLICATIONS.

THEY DID NOT PAY FOR THEM BECAUSE THEY DID NOT EXIST AS A COMPANY.

THEY WERE FREE.

And you people are facing a CLASS ACTION LAWSUIT FOR IGNORING IT.

If there is one thing that is guaranteed is that you violated your own policies.

And your system and your trademarks and processes are NOT worth the toilet tissue they are issued on.

[Examining Attorney 2] is another one -- another attorney hired by USPTO - who collects a paycheck - sits on his as and does absolutely nothing but deny applications so he can continue collecting money.

In short, you're a joke.

Mandy Valentin

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on August 8, 2023, the foregoing Final Order was emailed to Respondent at the following address:

Ms. Mandy Valentin
Fameoz Inc
PO Box 1279
Langhorne, PA 19047
**Email: fameoz@yahoo.com**

Users, Bednarz, Dustin

Digitally signed by Users, Bednarz, Dustin
Date: 2023.08.08 16:40:05 -04'00'

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