

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

TO THE DIRECTOR OF TRADEMARK

APPLICANT: Kent G. Anderson

MARK: FUTURE

Petition continuing to the Director of Trademarks. in closed is \$100.00

Applicant request a global investigation into the egreement of Sept. 2004 and all other applicants applied for and companies connected to and associated with hereby a global investigation into the tactics and the misiaading ethics used to set up this agreement to take the global ideas and FUTURE's voice of the people and the applicant. The applicant prays for the stopping of the suspension to all of Pep Boys attacks and future attacks. Investigation into Chantecaille and Pep Boys business practices is needed.

Note in the e-mails that are enclosed shows that Paul took the side of Chantecaille, and in the e-mail of April 24, 2005, the applicant had asked for the files, and was reluctant to send applicant anything. This is when applicant didn't have the Chantecaille

agreement of 2004. When the applicant did receive the agreement two years later, the applicant indicated that he didn't understand it. When all of the goods and services were added which I was advised to do, I though it was intended that they couldn't touch the rights to goods and services of FUTURE. It seems like this was arranged between Paul and Hoffman. I had received no compensation for this and feel that I was set up. In vislting with another attorney, the window of opportunity was lost. It seems that Avon was willing to work with me, but lost that on Paul's watch. Also 76133905 was abandoned, and he advised me to get rid of all of my registered trademarks. 76133905 was reinstated later with help of another attorney. In the e-mail of Friday 24, 2004, Paul wanted to handle all of the other cases. My hopes are that the trademark office sees what happened. I had trusted the attorney. I didn't understand what they were planning and the application is being used against ma and people and there ideas and global rights to FUTURE. The applicant asked the United States Patent and Tradamark Office to void the agreement with Chantecaille...

Respectfully submitted,

Kent G. Anderson  
FUTURE sm/tm  
925 North Griffin  
Bismarck, ND 58501  
ph. 701-223-0639  
web page [www.futurevisionarias.com](http://www.futurevisionarias.com)

Kent G. Anderson  
925 North Griffin  
Bismarck, North Dakota 58501

Oct 24 07

Janis C. Long  
Staff Attorney  
Office of the Commissioner for Trademarks

Dear Janis Long:

Your reply of October 19, 2007 was noted as the applicant was disappointed. My request is to have the Chantecalle agreement be voided as it was made under false pretenses. It is my understanding that this agreement was accepted by the USPTO. Can the United States Patent and Trademark Office or the Office of the Commissioner for Trademarks take action on voiding the agreement? On behalf of all the people and all the countries that have been done a global injustice To done by the Fraud agreement and all people involved inclosed is again evidence ..

SUBMITTED BY,

~~KENT G ANDERSON~~

FUTURESM/TM  
925 N GRIFFIN  
BISMARCK ND  
58501  
701-223-0639  
WWW.FUTUREVISIONARIES.COM



Commissioner for Trademarks  
P.O. Box 1451  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1451  
www.uspto.gov

October 19, 2007

Mr. Kent G. Anderson  
925 N. Griffin  
Bismarck, MN 58501

Re: Trademark Application Serial Nos. 76/133,905 and 76/459,532  
Registrant: Kent G. Anderson  
Mark: Future

Dear Mr. Anderson:

This acknowledges receipt of your correspondences received on July 27, 2007 and August 2, 2007, respectively. Although your correspondences were identified as Petitions to the Director, the issues raised are not proper subject matter for petitions.

Under 37 C.F.R. §2.146, a petition may be taken to the Director: (1) from any repeated or final formal requirement of the examiner in the ex parte prosecution of an application if permitted by §2.63(b); (2) in any case for which the Act of 1946, or Title 35 of the United States Code, or this Part of Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations specifies that the matter is to be determined directly or reviewed by the Director; (3) to invoke the supervisory authority of the Director in appropriate circumstances; (4) in any case not specifically defined and provided for by this Part of Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations; (5) in an extraordinary situation, when justice requires and no other party is injured thereby, to request a suspension or waiver of any requirement of the rules not being a requirement of the Act of 1946. TMEP §1702. As the issues raised in your letters are beyond the scope of the statute, they are not considered appropriate subject matter for petitions to the Director.

~~It appears that you are complaining about issues that arose through your relationship with a previous attorney. You may therefore want to contact your local bar association for assistance with such matters, as such issues are beyond the authority of the United States Patent and Trademark Office. Enclosed please find a refund for the fees submitted with your petitions.~~

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

*Janis C. Long*  
Staff Attorney  
Office of the Commissioner for Trademarks  
Tel: 571-272-8258  
Fax: 571-273-8950

United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Trademark Trial and Appeal Board  
P.O. Box 1451  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1451

Mailed: October 26, 2007

In re ANDERSON, KENT G

Serial No. 76585316

Filed: 4/6/04

KENT G ANDERSON  
FUTURE SMITH  
925 N GRIFFIN  
BISMACK, ND 58501

Applicant's request for suspension, filed September 12, 2007, is noted. Applicant has not provided a valid basis for such suspension request, and it is therefore denied. In particular, applicant is advised that the Board does not undertake any investigations of the type indicated by applicant. Nor has applicant specifically identified any current proceedings in a Court or at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office that would warrant suspension of proceedings in the appeal.

It is also noted that applicant has asserted that there "needs to be a non final [sic]." Applicant is advised that simply because he has raised new arguments or claims does not make the previous final refusal premature. The sole

ground for refusal--likelihood of confusion based on Registration No. 2876223--was raised in the Office action mailed January 11, 2006, and was made final in the Office action mailed January 3, 2007. Because applicant had an opportunity to respond to the January 11, 2006 Office action (and did), the final refusal that issued on January 3, 2007 was not premature, and the appeal was properly instituted.

As for the other comments made by applicant, we note that many of these were made in the request for reconsideration filed on June 29, 2007, and were considered by the Examining Attorney in the August 8, 2007 Office action. There is no basis for remanding the application at this point, nor has the applicant demonstrated good cause for such a remand.

In conclusion, applicant's request for suspension is denied. Applicant is allowed 60 days from the mailing date of this order in which to file his appeal brief, failing which the application will be deemed abandoned. We note that applicant's request for suspension includes a large number of exhibits. Applicant is advised that, unless these exhibits were made of record during prosecution of the application, e.g., as part of a response to an Office action, the inclusion of them with the request to suspend does not make them of record. See Trademark 2.142(d) (the file in an application must be complete as of the filing of the appeal). Further, applicant is advised that no new evidence should be submitted with his appeal brief, and that

it is not necessary to include with a brief evidence that is already properly of record, since that evidence already is part of the application file.

***By the Trademark Trial  
and Appeal Board***

8

not