

Providing false, fictitious, or fraudulent attorney information in a trademark submission 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).

Based upon the activity referred to in the Show Cause Order, Respondent's submission of a trademark document, containing false representations of fact, has been deemed both willful and fraudulent by the USPTO. See, e.g., *In re Bose Corp.*, 580 F.3d 1240, 1243, 91 USPQ2d 1938, 1939 (Fed. Cir. 2009); *Chutter, Inc. v. Great Mgmt. Grp., LLC*, 2021 USPQ2d 1001 at *13 (TTAB 2021), *appeal filed*, No. 22-1212 (Fed. Cir. Nov. 30, 2021). As a result, Respondent's 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 FR 431 (Jan. 5, 2022).

Here, Respondent provided no response to address the USPTO's evidence and finding that Respondent violated the USPTO Rules. The USPTO informed Respondent that failure to respond could result in striking the offending paper and other appropriate sanctions, yet Respondent 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."); accord *Chutter*, 2021 USPQ2d 1001, at *25 ("The agency, as well as applicants and registrants, and all who rely on the accuracy of the Registers of marks and the submissions made to the USPTO in furtherance of obtaining or maintaining registration, must be able to rely on declarations and the truth of their contents.").

Because of the nature of the rule violations, none of the submissions made by Respondent may be relied upon to support or maintain a trademark registration and

(TTAB 1981) ("Even if the affidavit was prepared by its attorney, [Applicant] must be held accountable for any false or misleading statement made therein.").

therefore may not be given any weight. Additionally, the application filed by Respondent is fatally defective because it contains false material information and involved fraud on the USPTO. 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). A trademark registration obtained by fraud is not valid. Under the facts presented, because the circumstances suggest a pattern of activity intended to defraud the USPTO and circumvent USPTO rules, the application filing is effectively void, and the defect 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*, 506 F. 3d at 341 ("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 application proceeding for Serial No. 88582660 (AIEMOK with a filing date of August 17, 2019) is ordered terminated. The USPTO's electronic records will be updated in due course to include the sanctions order and an appropriate entry in the application prosecution history in the Trademark Status and Document Retrieval System (TSDR) to indicate that the application was terminated upon entry of 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 Respondent's continued improper activity, including issuing additional orders or referring Respondent's conduct to relevant law enforcement agencies.

So ordered,

David S. Gooder
Commissioner for Trademarks

May 16, 2022
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 May 16, 2022, the foregoing Final Order was emailed to Respondent at the following address:

Shenzhen Ruinuode Technology Co., Ltd.
21st Floor, No. 88, Lane 5, Hekan Villag
Bantian Street, Longgang District,
Shenzhen CHINA 518129
email: **RuiNDeu@aliyun.com**

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