

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

In the Matter of)	
)	
Evelyn C. Ufomadu)	Proceeding No. D2025-20
)	
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”) a six-page Affidavit of Resignation Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.27 executed by Evelyn C. Ufomadu (“Respondent”) on June 25, 2025. Respondent submitted the six-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.

Jurisdiction

Respondent of Atlanta, Georgia, is an attorney admitted to practice in Alabama and currently in good-standing in that jurisdiction. Respondent has practiced before the Office in trademark matters, but she is not registered and is not otherwise eligible to represent other persons before the Office in patent matters. Respondent is a “practitioner” pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.1. 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 the practice of trademark and other non-patent law before the Office.

Respondent's Affidavit of Resignation

Respondent acknowledges in her June 25, 2025 Affidavit of Resignation that:

1. Her consent is freely and voluntarily rendered, and she is not being subjected to coercion or duress.
2. She is aware that, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.22, the OED Director opened an investigation of allegations that she violated the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct ("the Investigation"). She is aware that the Investigation, *inter alia*, obtained information regarding her alleged misconduct, including:
 - a. Respondent was admitted to practice law in Alabama in September 2013;
 - b. Respondent was Principal Attorney at Evelyn C. Ufomadu, LLC, from November 2013 through January 2023;
 - c. In August 2019, Respondent answered an online advertisement by Brealant Ltd. ("Brealant") for a part-time attorney;
 - d. Brealant is a business headquartered in Hong Kong with offices in Hong Kong, Mexico, and the Philippines, and a website at "brealant.com."
 - e. In August 2019, after consulting colleagues with trademark experience as to the expectations of trademark practice before the USPTO, Respondent accepted a part-time attorney position doing contract trademark work at Brealant and began engaging in trademark practice before the USPTO;
 - f. Prior to August 2019, Respondent had no experience or training in trademark matters, nor did she have an understanding of the U.S. Counsel Rule, the USPTO trademark signature rules, or the USPTO.gov account rules;
 - g. Despite making a request to Brealant in August 2019, Respondent never received substantive trademark law training from Brealant, did not make a further request to Brealant for such training, and did not make a personal effort to learn trademark law;

- h. Respondent's August 2019 engagement agreement with Brealant included, in part, the following terms, that she will:
- i. Act as attorney of record for the filings that Brealant chooses to file;
 - ii. Not respond to any opposition notices or USPTO refusals against her clients' trademark applications;
 - iii. Receive compensation of \$10 for each trademark filing made to the USPTO where Brealant enters her signature as attorney of record;
 - iv. Allow Brealant to draft and submit responses to Office actions under her name and signature after she reviewed five initial such responses;
 - v. Not contact her trademark applicant clients and allow Brealant to handle all communications with foreign trademark companies that Brealant receives trademark applicant referrals from;
 - vi. Allow only Brealant's contact information on USPTO filings made under her name and signature; and
 - vii. Agree that Brealant is solely responsible for the quality of work performed by Brealant for her trademark applicant clients and that Brealant will correct all errors.
- i. Respondent agreed to a revised engagement agreement in February 2021 that reduced compensation for most uses of her signature on trademark filings from \$10 to \$5 per filing and added a non-compete provision;
- j. Despite the terms of her engagement agreements, she understood that in late 2019 Brealant changed her compensation rate of \$10 (and later \$5) from a signature use fee to a general retainer fee, for her future availability to assist Brealant's customers with legal issues related to their trademark matters. She further understood that this "retainer fee" was not a fee for each use of her signature on trademark filings made to the USPTO;
- k. Respondent's primary points of contact at Brealant were [REDACTED], Brealant's [REDACTED], and [REDACTED], Brealant's [REDACTED], neither of whom to her knowledge are (or were) licensed to practice law in the U.S. or otherwise authorized to represent individuals before the USPTO;
- l. Respondent's association with Brealant spanned at least a five (5) year period from August 2019 through September 2024. During this time, numerous trademark filings were made to the USPTO under her name and from her USPTO.gov account; she never ended her association with Brealant;

- m. Respondent estimates receiving approximately \$11,050 in total compensation from Brealant, with payments being made in each year from 2019 through 2024;
- n. In September 2019, Respondent allowed Brealant to create a USPTO.gov account in her name for Brealant to file trademark documents with the USPTO under her name and signature as the applicant's attorney of record. Respondent did not intend to use this account;
- o. Respondent never reviewed her USPTO.gov account information as completed by Brealant;
- p. Respondent never reviewed the USPTO's website Terms of Use to understand that account holders are responsible for maintaining the confidentiality of their account login information and are not permitted to share their account credentials with others;
- q. Respondent never used the USPTO.gov account created in her name to prepare or to file a trademark document with the USPTO;
- r. Beginning in December 2021, Brealant's [REDACTED], [REDACTED] repeatedly advised Respondent that, if she wished to continue working as a contract attorney for Brealant, she must complete an identity verification process for her USPTO.gov account;
- s. On January 29, 2022, [REDACTED] also requested that Respondent sponsor [REDACTED] USPTO.gov account and the USPTO.gov account of [REDACTED], Brealant's [REDACTED], both of whom, to her knowledge, were not attorneys and were not supervised or employed by her;
- t. On February 10, 2022, following instructions from [REDACTED], Respondent accessed her USPTO.gov account for the first time, completed the identity verification process, and sponsored [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] (Brealant's [REDACTED]) USPTO.gov accounts;
- u. At the USPTO.gov account sign in page, Respondent was warned that by signing in, she certified to the USPTO's Terms of Use and USPTO Privacy Policy; however, despite her certification, she did not review the USPTO's Terms of Use or the USPTO Privacy Policy;
- v. During the identity verification process, Respondent viewed an on-screen warning that the Terms of Use for USPTO websites expressly prohibit users from sharing their USPTO.gov account; Respondent did not then take steps to prevent Brealant's continued use of her account;

- w. Subsequently, on August 10, 2022, Respondent's USPTO.gov account was used, by another person, to impermissibly sponsor additional USPTO.gov accounts for two individuals at Brealant that Respondent did not know and did not employ or supervise;
- x. When using the USPTO's sponsorship tool on February 10, 2022, Respondent certified that the individuals to be sponsored, namely [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], worked under her direction and control and that she had read and agreed to abide by the Terms of Use for USPTO websites; neither of those certifications were true;
- y. After sponsoring the USPTO.gov account of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], Respondent did not implement the means to monitor or periodically review if and how [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] were utilizing the USPTO.gov accounts that she sponsored for them;
- z. From 2019 through 2024, Respondent did not periodically check USPTO public records to determine whether individuals at Brealant were filing trademark documents using her credentials without her permission;
- aa. In early 2024, Respondent was made aware that the USPTO's public trademark search tools allow a practitioner to check for applications and registrations where they are listed as attorney of record;
- bb. Respondent is now aware that between late 2019 through September 2024, 3,426 trademark documents were filed from her USPTO.gov account with her name as the attorney of record and many with her purported electronic signature;
- cc. Respondent is now aware that from April 26, 2021, through September 13, 2024, her name appeared as the named signatory, along with her electronic signature, on approximately 1,843 trademark documents filed with the USPTO;
- dd. Respondent has never entered her signature on a trademark document filed with the USPTO, nor has she ever prepared or reviewed any trademark document filed with the USPTO from her USPTO.gov account;
- ee. In August and September of 2019, prior to Brealant creating her USPTO.gov account, Respondent reviewed and approved 13 draft trademark applications from Brealant; Respondent understood that Brealant entered her signature as the named attorney of record on each of the 13 trademark applications and filed them with the USPTO;
- ff. Outside of the 13 trademark applications, she did not review, and was never asked by Brealant to review, other filings for Brealant's trademark customers;

- gg. From 2019 through early 2023, Brealant repeatedly requested, and Respondent provided, her Alabama attorney bar card and letters of good standing from the Alabama State Bar, knowing on one occasion that Brealant filed her bar card with the USPTO;
- hh. Respondent understood that her estimated \$11,050 in compensation from Brealant between 2019 and 2024 represented "retainer fees" for up to 2,150 clients that did not require her legal services and for whom Brealant had not made any filings in her name;
- ii. Respondent has never used the USPTO's trademark search tools to check the number of trademark applications and registrations where she is currently listed as the attorney of record;
- jj. Respondent has not informed any affected trademark client of the potential harm to their respective intellectual property rights in their pending applications or issued registrations as a result of filings made under her name as attorney of record, purportedly without her knowledge, and with improper signatures that she did not personally enter; and
- kk. Respondent has not directed Brealant to stop making improper trademark filings with the USPTO under her signature and never questioned Brealant regarding the prior trademark filings for which she claims that Brealant purportedly made without her authorization or knowledge.

3. She is aware that the OED Director is of the opinion based on this investigation that she violated at least the following provisions of the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct:

- a. 37 C.F.R. § 11.101 (A practitioner shall provide competent representation to clients) by, *inter alia*, serving as attorney of record in trademark matters while (i) not understanding and/or violating the U.S. Counsel Rule; (ii) violating the USPTO trademark signature rules; (iii) violating the USPTO account agreements; (iv) sponsoring USPTO.gov accounts for unauthorized individuals; (v) practicing before the USPTO without adequate training; and (vi) sharing or otherwise providing access to her USPTO.gov account with others;
- b. 37 C.F.R. § 11.505 (A practitioner shall not assist another in practicing law in a jurisdiction in violation of the regulation of the legal profession in that jurisdiction) by, *inter alia*, (i) allowing Brealant to create a USPTO.gov account in her name and use it to prepare, sign and file trademark documents with the USPTO; (ii) accepting compensation for use of her attorney credentials and signature by others on trademark filings; (iii) entering into business relationships with, and sponsoring USPTO.gov accounts for, Brealant officials who were not employed or supervised by Respondent nor authorized practitioners; (iv) not implementing means to supervise [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] or to monitor or

periodically review how or if they were utilizing the sponsored USPTO.gov accounts; and (v) not conducting a search using a USPTO search system for unauthorized trademark applications filed by Brealant, thus allowing Brealant to continue to use her credentials, signature, and USPTO.gov account to prepare, sign, and file trademark documents with the USPTO (*i.e.*, engage in unauthorized practice);

- c. 37 C.F.R. § 11.804(c) (It is professional misconduct to engage in conduct involving misrepresentation) by, *inter alia*, allowing other persons to enter her signature on trademark documents that identified Respondent as the named signatory and attorney of record, as filed with the USPTO;
- d. 37 C.F.R. § 11.804(d) (It is professional misconduct to engage in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice) by, *inter alia*, (i) allowing others to create a USPTO.gov account in her name and use it to prepare, sign and file trademark documents with the USPTO; (ii) improperly sharing or otherwise providing access to her own USPTO.gov account with individuals, resulting in impermissible filings; (iii) entering into business relationships with, and sponsoring accounts for non-practitioners who respectively utilized (or allowed others to utilize) those accounts to engage in the unauthorized practice of law; (iv) allowing other persons to enter her signature on trademark documents that identified Respondent as the named signatory and that were filed with the USPTO; and (v) not conducting a search in the Trademark Search system for unauthorized trademark applications filed by Brealant, thus allowing Brealant to continue to use her credentials, signature, and USPTO.gov account to prepare, sign, and file trademark documents with the USPTO (*i.e.*, engage in unauthorized practice); and
- e. 37 C.F.R. § 11.804(i) (It is professional misconduct to engage in other conduct that adversely reflects on the practitioner's fitness to practice before the USPTO) to the extent that her acts and omissions in connection with her representation in trademark matters before the Office do not constitute a violation of the provisions of USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct as set forth in paragraphs a. through e., above.

4. Without admitting to violating any of the disciplinary rules of the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct investigated by the OED Director, she acknowledges that, if and when she 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 her in OED's investigation are true, and

(b) she could not have successfully defended herself against the allegations embodied in the opinion of the OED Director that she violated at least 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101, 11.505, 11.804(c), 11.804(d), and 11.804(i).

5. She 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. She 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:

1. Respondent's Affidavit of Resignation shall be, and hereby is, approved;
2. Respondent shall be, and hereby is, excluded on consent from practice before the Office in trademark and other non-patent matters commencing on the date of this Final Order;
3. 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/>;
4. 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 Evelyn C. Ufomadu of Atlanta, Georgia, an attorney licensed in the State of Alabama, who engaged in trademark practice before the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO" or "Office"). The USPTO Director has accepted Ms. Ufomadu's Affidavit of Resignation and ordered her exclusion on consent from practice

before the Office in trademark and non-patent matters. Ms. Ufomadu is not registered and not otherwise eligible to represent other persons before the Office in patent matters.

Ms. Ufomadu voluntarily submitted her affidavit at a time when a disciplinary investigation was pending against her. 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 under Ms. Ufomadu's name as attorney of record, as a result of her association with the company Brealant, Ltd. ("Brealant") headquartered in Hong Kong, with locations that include the Philippines and Mexico, and with a website at "brealant.com." This investigation also gathered evidence that Ms. Ufomadu assisted non-attorney individuals at Brealant, whom she did not supervise or otherwise employ, to engage in the improper practice of trademark law. Ms. Ufomadu's primary Brealant points of contact were [REDACTED], Brealant's [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED], Brealant's [REDACTED], neither of whom to her knowledge were licensed to practice law in the U.S. or otherwise authorized to represent individuals in trademark matters.

In August 2019, Ms. Ufomadu accepted a part-time attorney position doing contract trademark work at Brealant, without prior experience in federal trademark matters. Ms. Ufomadu's 2019 and 2021 engagement agreements show that she was hired by Brealant as an attorney of record in name only for Brealant's foreign-domiciled trademark applicant customers. She had no role in the preparation, signing, or filing of trademark documents, leaving such tasks to staff at Brealant. She allowed individuals at Brealant to enter her signature on trademark filings for which she was paid \$10 (later reduced to \$5) for each use of her signature. She agreed not to respond to USPTO correspondence and not to contact her trademark applicant clients. Brealant was solely responsible for the quality of work performed.

Ms. Ufomadu's assistance to Brealant also included, *inter alia*, impermissibly allowing Brealant in September 2019 to create and to use a USPTO.gov account in her name to make trademark filings (she never personally used the account to prepare, review, or sign a trademark filing with the USPTO); impermissibly sponsoring in February 2022 the USPTO.gov accounts of [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] at Brealant (where she falsely certified that they worked under her direction and control as required); and identity verifying her USPTO.gov account in February 2022, as required by Brealant to continue working for them (during this verification she was warned that USPTO.gov accounts may not be shared; however, she did not stop Brealant from using her account). Subsequently, in August 2022, Ms. Ufomadu's USPTO.gov account was used without her knowledge to impermissibly sponsor two further USPTO.gov accounts associated with individuals at Brealant that she did not know.

From late 2019 through September 2024, approximately 3,426 trademark filings were made from Ms. Ufomadu's USPTO.gov account without her pre-filing review, where she was the attorney of record, and where many had her purported electronic signature. As Ms. Ufomadu never personally signed a trademark filing made to the USPTO, all such

signatures were impermissible and made in violation of the USPTO's trademark signature rules that require a named signatory to personally sign each filing.

In 2019, prior to Brealant creating a USPTO.gov account in her name, Ms. Ufomadu reviewed 13 trademark applications for Brealant. Ms. Ufomadu understood that Brealant then entered her signature on those 13 trademark applications and filed them with the USPTO. In return, Brealant paid Ms. Ufomadu \$130, a figure consistent with the \$10 per signature rate in her engagement agreement.

Ms. Ufomadu states that Brealant never sent further trademark filings for her review and that she was unaware of the 3,426 subsequent filings from her USPTO.gov account. Despite her engagement agreements linking her compensation to each use of her signature on a trademark filing, Ms. Ufomadu purportedly believed that the estimated \$11,050 she received from Brealant between 2019 and 2024 represented "retainer fees" at the \$10 (and later \$5) rate for up to 2,150 clients, for whom Brealant had not made any filings with the USPTO under her signature. Ms. Ufomadu never checked USPTO public records to determine if Brealant was filing trademark documents using her credentials.

The allegations under consideration in this investigation include: (i) practicing before the USPTO without adequate training and without understanding the U.S. Counsel Rule, the USPTO's trademark signature rules, and the USPTO.gov account agreement rules; (ii) improperly allowing individuals at Brealant to enter her signature on trademark documents filed with the USPTO in violation of the USPTO's trademark signature rules in 37 C.F.R. § 2.193; (iii) improperly allowing individuals at Brealant to create a USPTO.gov account in her name and access it to make trademark filings with the USPTO in violation of the USPTO account agreements and website Terms of Use; (iv) improperly sponsoring USPTO.gov accounts for Brealant officials, namely [REDACTED] and [REDACTED], who were neither employed nor supervised by her as required by USPTO trademark account sponsorship rules; and (v) assisting non-attorney individuals at Brealant to engage in the unauthorized of trademark practice by improperly allowing others to use her signature, attorney credentials, and USPTO.gov account to prepare and file trademark documents with the USPTO, by identity-verifying her USPTO.gov account, and by improperly sponsoring USPTO.gov accounts for individuals at Brealant.

Ms. Ufomadu acknowledged that the OED Director was of the opinion that her conduct violated 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101 (requiring a practitioner to provide competent representation); 11.505 (assisting another in the unauthorized practice of law); 11.804(c) (engaging in conduct involving misrepresentation); 11.804(d) (engaging in conduct that is prejudicial to the administration of justice); and 11.804(i) (engaging in other conduct that adversely reflects on the practitioner's fitness to practice before the USPTO).

While Ms. Ufomadu did not admit to violating the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct as alleged in the pending investigation, she acknowledged that, if and when she 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 her are true, and (ii) she could not have successfully defended herself against the allegations embodied in the opinion of the OED Director that she violated at least the following provisions of the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct: 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.101, 11.505, 11.804(c), 11.804(d), and 11.804(i).

The USPTO has published ample, readily available information for practitioners regarding what is competent practice before the Office in trademark matters. In particular, the agency maintains a webpage regarding important trademark information including specific links to relevant laws, rules, regulations, and rulemaking. (*Available at* www.uspto.gov/trademarks.)

The agency publishes online and regularly updates its Trademark Manual of Examining Procedure (“TMEP”) (*Available at* tmap.uspto.gov/RDMS/TMEP/current). The TMEP is a guidance document that provides trademark practitioners, *inter alia*, with a reference work on the practices and procedures relative to prosecution of applications to register marks with the USPTO. For example, TMEP § 611.01 provides clear guidance on the agency’s signature rules, including that (a) the person(s) identified as the signatory must personally sign the document (*e.g.*, a paralegal, legal assistant, or secretary may not sign or enter the name of an attorney or other authorized signatory), (b) a person may not delegate their authority to sign, and (c) no person may use document-signing software to enter or electronically generate someone else’s signature. A trademark submission that is signed by a person other than the named signatory is improperly executed and cannot be relied upon to support registration. *See In re Yusha Zhang*, 2021 Commr. Pat. LEXIS 2 at *10 (Dir. USPTO 2021); *Ex parte Hipkins*, Appeal No. 90-2250, 1991 Pat. App. LEXIS 14, at *10-13 (BPAI 1991); *In re Cowan*, Reg. No. 1225389, 1990 Commr. Pat. LEXIS 24, at *5-6 (Comm’r Pats. 1990). A signature that does not meet the “personally signed” or “personally entered” requirements, *see* 37 C.F.R. §§2.193(a), (f), 11.18(a), “may jeopardize the validity of [an] application or registration.” 37 C.F.R. §2.193(f). Thus, these signature requirements are not merely technical in nature but rather are substantive. *In re Stelcore Management Services, LLC*, 2025 Comm’r. Pat. at *3 (USPTO Final Order for Sanctions June 13, 2025).

“Submitting a document that includes false, misleading, fictitious, or fraudulent information or representations violates 37 C.F.R. §11.18(b)(1). This includes, for example, false or misleading domicile information, attorney information, signatory information (*e.g.*, where the named signatory did not personally enter his or her signature on the document), applicant information, or claims of use (or intent to use). Submitting a document without undertaking a reasonable inquiry into the factual basis for the averments, without evidentiary support, in an effort to circumvent USPTO Rules, or coupled with other rule or Terms of Use violations constitutes an improper purpose and violates 37 C.F.R. §11.18(b)(2).” *In re Stelcore Management Services, LLC*, 2025 Comm’r. Pat. at *6 (USPTO Final Order for Sanctions June 13, 2025).

“Any party who uses USPTO systems, including the USPTO.gov website and electronic filing systems, is bound by both the Terms of Use for USPTO websites and the USPTO Trademark Verified USPTO.gov Account Agreement. Under the Terms of Use, registration for, and use of, a USPTO.gov account is limited to the individual to whom the account is registered, and the registered individual is responsible for all activities occurring under that account and any sponsored accounts. Use of a USPTO.gov account to submit, access, or alter information exceeding one’s authority not only breaches the Terms of Use, but may also violate other USPTO Rules including but not limited to 37 C.F.R. §§2.193(f) and 11.18(b).” *In re Stelcore Management Services, LLC*, 2025 Comm’r. Pat. at *6-7 (USPTO Final Order for Sanctions June 13, 2025).

Therefore, practitioners who represent applicants, registrants, or others before the USPTO in trademark matters—including those who serve as U.S. counsel for foreign-domiciled clients—are reasonably expected to know (a) the applicable trademark prosecution and signature rules, (b) the provisions of the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct implicated by such representation, and (c) the potential disciplinary consequences when such provisions of the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct are violated. The USPTO Director has issued numerous orders imposing discipline on trademark practitioners who violated the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct based on not complying with USPTO trademark signature rules, not adequately supervising non-attorneys, and/or not fulfilling obligations under 37 CFR § 11.18 to conduct an inquiry reasonable under the circumstances in support of factual assertions made in trademark documents presented to the USPTO, including the following:

In re Erik B. Jensen, Proceeding No. D2009-46 (USPTO Feb. 18, 2010)
In re Allen A. Meyer, Proceeding No. D2010-41 (USPTO Sep. 7, 2011)
In re Matthew Swyers, Proceeding No. D2016-20 (USPTO Jan. 26, 2017)
In re Reyner Meikle, Proceeding No. D2019-17 (USPTO Mar. 21, 2019)
In re Travis Crabtree, Proceeding Nos. D2018-31 & -47 (USPTO Apr. 25, 2019)
In re Heather Sapp, Proceeding No. D2019-31 (USPTO May 15, 2019)
In re Deborah Sweeney, Proceeding No. D2019-33 (USPTO June 19, 2019)
In re Anita Mar, Proceeding No. D2019-11 (USPTO Aug. 2, 2019)
In re Renuka Rajan, Proceeding No. D2019-30 (USPTO Sep. 5, 2019)
In re Thomas C. Caraco, Proceeding No. D2019-50 (USPTO Sep. 12, 2019)
In re Lenise Williams, Proceeding No. D2019-23 (USPTO Sep. 20, 2019)
In re Charles Caldwell II, Proceeding No. D2020-12 (USPTO Mar. 17, 2020)
In re Jamie Bashtanyk, Proceeding No. D2020-09 (USPTO Apr. 17, 2020)
In re Yiheng Lou, Proceeding No. D2021-04 (USPTO May 12, 2021)
In re Andrei Mincov, Proceeding No. D2020-30 (USPTO Aug. 23, 2021)
In re Devasena Reddy, Proceeding No. D2021-13 (USPTO Sep. 9, 2021)
In re Bennett David, Proceeding No. D2021-08 (USPTO Sep. 24, 2021)
In re Di Li, Proceeding No. D2021-16 (USPTO Oct. 7, 2021)
In re Tony C. Hom, Proceeding No. D2021-10 (USPTO Dec. 17, 2021)
In re Elizabeth Yang, Proceeding No. D2021-11 (USPTO Dec. 17, 2021)
In re Elizabeth Pasquine, Proceeding No. D2019-39 (USPTO Mar. 28, 2022)

In re Yi Wan, Proceeding No. D2022-04 (USPTO Apr. 1, 2022)
In re Kathy Hao, Proceeding No. D2021-14 (USPTO Apr. 27, 2022)
In re Weibo Zhang, Proceeding No. D2022-16 (USPTO July 11, 2022)
In re Daoyou Liu, Proceeding No. D2022-03 (USPTO Aug. 9, 2022)
In re Zhihua Han, Proceeding No. D2022-23 (USPTO Jan. 6, 2023)
In re Jingfeng Song, Proceeding No. D2023-10 (USPTO May 1, 2023)
In re Kevin R. Gallagher, Proceeding No. D2023-28 (USPTO June 23, 2023)
In re Puja Jabbour, Proceeding No. D2023-33 (USPTO Sep. 6, 2023)
In re Jing Wang, Proceeding No. D2023-38 (USPTO Nov. 21, 2023)
In re Yue Niu, Proceeding No. D2023-32 (USPTO Jan. 3, 2024)
In re Grace Lee Huang, Proceeding No. D2023-37 (USPTO Jan. 8, 2024)
In re Ryan A. Bethell, Proceeding No. D2019-42 (USPTO Jan. 27, 2024)
In re Francis Koh, Proceeding No. D2024-07 (USPTO Feb. 7, 2024)
In re Che-Yang Chen, Proceeding No. D2024-01 (USPTO Mar. 20, 2024)
In re Julian A. Haffner, Proceeding No. D2023-35 (USPTO May 21, 2024)
In re Harrison B. Oldham, Proceeding No. D2024-11 (USPTO May 29, 2024)
In re Wayne Harper, Proceeding Nos. D2020-10 & D2024-15 (USPTO Aug. 13, 2024)
In re Lan Yu, Proceeding No. D2024-24 (USPTO Aug. 20, 2024)
In re Ruth K. Khalsa, Proceeding No. D2019-38 (USPTO Sep. 5, 2024)
In re Weitao Chen, Proceeding No. D2024-21 (USPTO Sep. 11, 2024)
In re Alexis Campbell, Proceeding No. D2019-41 (USPTO Oct. 10, 2024)
In re Jie Luo, Proceeding No. D2024-02 (USPTO Oct. 25, 2024)
In re Qinghe Liu, Proceeding No. D2023-39 (USPTO Nov. 21, 2024)
In re Angus Ni, Proceeding No. D2024-20 (USPTO Dec. 19, 2024)
In re Afamefuna Okeke, Proceeding No. D2024-18 (USPTO Jan. 6, 2025)
In re Nyall S. Engfield, Proceeding No. D2025-12 (USPTO Mar. 10, 2025)
In re Shan Zhu, Proceeding No. D2024-19 (USPTO Mar. 18, 2025)
In re Phillip T. Horton, Proceeding No. D2025-15 (USPTO Mar. 20, 2025)
In re Andrew S. Rapacke, Proceeding No. D2025-16 (USPTO Mar. 20, 2025)
In re Hao Ni, Proceeding No. D2025-14 (USPTO Mar. 31, 2025)
In re Curtis Ray Hussey, Proceeding No. D2025-19 (USPTO May 14, 2025)
In re Xiaofang Zhong, Proceeding No. D2025-18 (USPTO May 21, 2025)

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/>;

5. Respondent shall comply fully with 37 C.F.R. § 11.58;
6. 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, or used in connection with any trademark matter);

7. Respondent shall not apply for a USPTO verified Electronic System account, shall not obtain a USPTO verified Electronic System account, nor shall she have her name added to a USPTO verified Electronic System account, unless and until she is reinstated to practice before the USPTO;

8. Respondent shall be 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;

9. Until a petition seeking Respondent's reinstatement to practice before the USPTO is granted pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.60, Respondent shall be 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;

10. 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

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

Users,
Choe, Tricia

Digitally signed by
Users, Choe, Tricia
Date: 2025.06.25
14:25:31 -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

cc:

Director of the Office of Enrollment and Discipline
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Evelyn C. Ufomadu

Atlanta, GA

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:

Evelyn C. Ufomadu

Atlanta, GA

Respondent


Via email:

Sydney Johnson

Sydney.Johnson@USPTO.gov

Counsel for OED Director

6/25/2025
Date


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