

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

In the Matter of	)	
	)	
Curtis Ray Hussey,	)	Proceeding No. D2025-19
	)	
Respondent	)	
_____	)	

**FINAL ORDER**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.27(b), the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO” or “Office”) received for review and approval from the Director of the Office of Enrollment and Discipline (“OED Director”) an Affidavit of Resignation Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.27 executed by Curtis Ray Hussey (“Respondent”) on March 18, 2025. Respondent submitted the 2-page Affidavit of Resignation to the USPTO for the purpose of being excluded on consent pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.27.

For the reasons set forth herein, Respondent’s Affidavit of Resignation shall be approved, and Respondent shall be excluded on consent from practice before the Office in trademark and other non-patent matters commencing on the date of this Final Order.<sup>1</sup>

**Jurisdiction**

Respondent of Florence, Alabama, is an attorney admitted to practice law in Alabama (Bar No. 7684 S57C), Hawaii (Bar No. 008296), Mississippi (N/A), and Utah (Bar No. 5488). Respondent has practiced before the Office in trademark matters, but he is not registered and not otherwise eligible to represent other persons before the Office in patent matters. Respondent is a

---

<sup>1</sup> Respondent is not a registered patent practitioner and not otherwise eligible to represent other persons before the Office in patent matters.

“practitioner” pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.1. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.19(a), Respondent is subject to the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct, 37 C.F.R. § 11.101 *et seq.*

Pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §§ 2(b)(2)(D) and 32 and 37 C.F.R. § 11.27, the USPTO Director has the authority to approve Respondent’s Affidavit of Resignation and to exclude Respondent on consent from practice before the Office in trademark and other non-patent matters.

### **Respondent’s Affidavit of Resignation**

Respondent acknowledges in his March 18, 2025 Affidavit of Resignation that:

1. His consent is freely and voluntarily rendered, and he is not being subjected to coercion or duress.
2. He is aware that, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.22, the OED Director opened an investigation of allegations that he violated the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct (“Investigation”). The Investigation delved into and obtained information, *inter alia*, about:
  - a. The manner in which trademark applications and other documents were prepared, signed, and filed with the USPTO on behalf of foreign-domiciled applicants;
  - b. Respondent’s association with a non-attorney entity: Brealant, Inc., or Brealant, Ltd. (“Brealant”) (<https://www.brealant.com/>) (located at Kai Centre, 36 Hung To Road, Suite 9D, Kwun Tong, Kowloon, Hong Kong and elsewhere (*e.g.*, Lake Tahoe, Nevada)) including allegations that:
    - (i) Respondent was identified as the attorney of record and his purported electronic signature was entered on the trademark filings by someone other than Respondent, and
    - (ii) such trademark filings are associated with Brealant; and
  - c. Allegations that Respondent violated 37 C.F.R. § 11.804(d) by engaging in acts and omissions prejudicial to the USPTO federal trademark registration process.
3. He is aware that, based on the Investigation, the OED Director is of the opinion that he violated the following provision of the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct:  
37 C.F.R. § 11.804(d) (It is professional misconduct for a practitioner to engage in conduct that

is prejudicial to the administration of justice) by, *inter alia*, authorizing non-practitioners at Brealant to prepare, approve, and file trademark applications, without his input, oversight or supervision, including allowing others to enter his electronic signature on trademark applications and other trademark documents.

4. Without admitting to violating any of the disciplinary rules of the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct investigated by the OED Director in the Investigation, he acknowledges that, if and when he applies for reinstatement under 37 C.F.R. § 11.60 to practice before the USPTO in trademark and/or other non-patent matters, the OED Director will conclusively presume, for the purpose of determining the application for reinstatement, that:

(a) the facts regarding him in the Investigation are true, and

(b) he could not have successfully defended himself against the allegations embodied in the opinion of the OED Director that he violated 37 C.F.R. § 11.804(d).

5. He has fully read and understands 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.5(b), 11.27, 11.58, 11.59, and 11.60, and is fully aware of the legal and factual consequences of consenting to exclusion from practice before the USPTO in trademark and other non-patent matters.

6. He consents to being excluded from practice before the USPTO in trademark and other non-patent matters.

#### **Exclusion on Consent**

Based on the foregoing, the USPTO Director has determined that Respondent's Affidavit of Resignation complies with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 11.27(a). Accordingly, it is hereby ORDERED that:

7. Respondent's Affidavit of Resignation shall be, and is hereby approved;

8. Respondent shall be, and is hereby excluded on consent from practice before the Office in trademark and other non-patent matters commencing on the date of this Final Order;

9. Respondent shall be granted limited recognition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.58(f) for thirty (30) days starting on the date of this Final Order so that Respondent may endeavor to conclude work on behalf of clients on any matters pending before the Office and, if such work cannot be concluded within such thirty (30) days, Respondent shall so advise each such client so that the client may make other arrangements;

10. The OED Director shall electronically publish the Final Order at the Office of Enrollment and Discipline's electronic FOIA Reading Room, which is publicly accessible at <https://foiadocuments.uspto.gov/oed/>;

11. The OED Director shall publish a notice in the *Official Gazette* that is materially consistent with the following:

**Notice of Exclusion on Consent**

This notice concerns Curtis Ray Hussey, an attorney admitted to practice law in the states of Alabama (Bar No. 7684 S57C), Hawaii (Bar No. 008296), Mississippi (N/A), and Utah (Bar No. 5488). The Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO" or "Office") has accepted Mr. Hussey's affidavit of resignation and ordered his exclusion on consent from practice before the Office in trademark and other non-patent matters. Mr. Hussey is not registered and not otherwise eligible to represent other persons before the Office in patent matters.

Mr. Hussey voluntarily submitted his affidavit at a time when a disciplinary investigation was pending against him. The investigation concerned the manner in which trademark applications and other documents were prepared, signed, and filed with the USPTO on behalf of foreign-domiciled applicants; Mr. Hussey's association with a non-attorney entity: Brealant, Inc., or Brealant, Ltd. ("Brealant") (<https://www.brealant.com/>) (located at Kai Centre, 36 Hung To Road, Suite 9D, Kwun Tong, Kowloon, Hong Kong and elsewhere (e.g., Lake Tahoe, Nevada)) including allegations that: (i) Mr. Hussey was identified as the attorney of record and his purported electronic signature was entered on the trademark filings by someone other than Mr. Hussey, and (ii) such filings are associated with Brealant; and allegations that Mr. Hussey violated 37 C.F.R.

§ 11.804(d) by engaging in acts and omissions prejudicial to the USPTO federal trademark registration process. Mr. Hussey acknowledged that the OED Director was of the opinion that his conduct violated 37 C.F.R. § 11.804(d) (It is professional misconduct for a practitioner to engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice and to the USPTO federal trademark registration process).

While Mr. Hussey did not admit to violating any of the disciplinary rules of the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct as alleged in the pending investigation, he acknowledged that, if and when he applies for reinstatement, the OED Director will conclusively presume, for the limited purpose of determining the application for reinstatement, that (i) the facts set forth in the OED investigation against him are true, and (ii) he could not have successfully defended himself against the allegations embodied in the opinion of the OED Director that he violated 37 C.F.R. § 11.804(d).

This action is taken pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §§ 2(b)(2)(D) and 32, and 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.27 and 11.59. Disciplinary decisions involving practitioners are posted for public reading at the Office of Enrollment and Discipline Reading Room, available at: <https://foiadocuments.uspto.gov/oed/>;

12. Respondent shall comply fully with 37 C.F.R. § 11.58;
13. Effective the date of the expiration of the 30-day period of limited recognition afforded to Respondent under 37 C.F.R. § 11.58(f), the USPTO is hereby authorized to disable or suspend any USPTO.gov accounts registered to Respondent as of the date of this Final Order (including, but not limited to, all accounts that Respondent has ever established, sponsored, used in connection with any trademark matter);
14. Respondent shall not apply for a USPTO verified Electronic System account, shall not obtain a USPTO verified Electronic System account, nor shall he have his name added to a USPTO verified Electronic System account, unless and until he is reinstated to practice before the USPTO;
15. Immediately upon expiration of the 30-day period of limited recognition afforded to Respondent under § 11.58(f), Respondent is prohibited from using, assessing, or assisting

others in using or accessing any USPTO.gov account(s) or other USPTO filing systems for preparing or filing documents with the USPTO;

16. Until a petition seeking Respondent's reinstatement to practice before the USPTO is granted pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.60, Respondent is prohibited, and the USPTO is authorized to disallow Respondent, from the following: (1) opening or activating any USPTO.gov account(s) to be used for preparing or filing documents with the USPTO; (2) applying for, or attempting to apply for any USPTO.gov account(s) to be used for preparing or filing documents with the USPTO; (3) verifying, or attempting to verify, any other person's credentials in connection with USPTO.gov account(s) to be used for preparing or filing documents with the USPTO; and (4) sponsoring or attempting to sponsor USPTO.gov account(s) to be used for preparing or filing documents with the USPTO;

17. Nothing herein shall obligate the USPTO to take action, *sua sponte*, to re-activate any USPTO.gov account disabled or suspended pursuant to this Final Order; rather, it is Respondent's sole responsibility to initiate any such re-activation of any such USPTO.gov account; and

18. Respondent shall comply fully with 37 C.F.R. § 11.60 upon any request for reinstatement.

(signature page follows)

(signature page – Final Order D2025-19)

Users,

Choe, Tricia

Digitally signed by

Users, Choe, Tricia

Date: 2025.05.14

08:35:14 -04'00'

Tricia Choe

Associate General Counsel for General Law

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Date

on delegated authority by

Coke Morgan Stewart

Acting Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and

Acting Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that the foregoing Final Order was sent, on this day, to the parties in the manner indicated below -


Via first-class certified mail, return receipt requested:

Mr. Curtis Ray Hussey  
Gulf Coast ADR, LLC  
139 Cox Creek Parkway, #310  
Florence, Alabama 35630  
*Respondent*

Via email:

Sydney Johnson  
Sydney.Johnson@USPTO.gov  
*Counsel for OED Director*

5/14/2025  
Date

  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450