

To: Matthew D. Asbell(masbell@lippes.com)
Subject: U.S. Trademark Application Serial No. 99872440 - CLAUDE MYTHOS - - ANTH50004502
Sent: October 20, 2026 11:31:40 AM EDT
Sent As: tmng.notices@uspto.gov

Attachments

[6140016](#)
[99141555](#)
[99599765](#)
[screencapture-www-surveymonkey-com-product-features-ai-survey-generator-17924270746651](#)
[screencapture-www-jotform-com-ai-survey-generator-17924271821711](#)
[screencapture-blocksurvey-io-ai-surveys-17924272259901](#)
[screencapture-survalyzer-com-17924273790781](#)
[screencapture-www-sogolytics-com-create-with-ai-17924274427671](#)

United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO)
Office Action (Official Letter) About Applicant's Trademark Application

U.S. Application Serial No. 99872440

Mark: CLAUDE MYTHOS

Correspondence Address:

Matthew D. Asbell
LIPPES MATHIAS LLP
420 Lexington Avenue, Suite 2005
New York NY 10170
United States

Applicant: Anthropic, PBC

Reference/Docket No. ANTH50004502

Correspondence Email Address: masbell@lippes.com

NONFINAL OFFICE ACTION

Response deadline. File a response to this nonfinal Office action within three months of the "Issue date" below to avoid [abandonment](#) of the application. Review the Office action and

respond using one of the links to the appropriate electronic forms in the “How to respond” section below.

Request an extension. For a fee, applicant may [request one three-month extension](#) of the response deadline prior to filing a response. The request must be filed within three months of the “Issue date” below. If the extension request is granted, the USPTO must receive applicant’s response to this letter within six months of the “Issue date” to avoid abandonment of the application.

Issue date: October 20, 2026

The referenced application has been reviewed by the assigned trademark examining attorney. Applicant must respond timely and completely to the issue(s) below. 15 U.S.C. §1062(b); 37 C.F.R. §§2.62(a), 2.65(a); TMEP §§711, 718.03.

SUMMARY OF ISSUES:

- Section 2(d) Likelihood of Confusion Refusal
- Prior Pending Applications May Bar Registration
- Foreign Registration Requirement

SECTION 2(d) REFUSAL – LIKELIHOOD OF CONFUSION

Registration of the applied-for mark is refused because of a likelihood of confusion with the mark in U.S. Registration No. 6140016. Trademark Act Section 2(d), 15 U.S.C. §1052(d); see TMEP §§1207.01 *et seq.* See the attached registration.

Trademark Act Section 2(d) bars registration of an applied-for mark that is so similar to a registered mark that it is likely consumers would be confused, mistaken, or deceived as to the commercial source of the goods and/or services of the parties. 15 U.S.C. §1052(d). Likelihood of confusion is determined on a case-by-case basis by applying the factors set forth in *In re E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 476 F.2d 1357, 1361 (C.C.P.A. 1973) (*DuPont* factors). *In re i.am.symbolic, llc*, 866 F.3d 1315, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 2017). Any evidence of record related to those factors need be considered; however, “not all of the *DuPont* factors are relevant or of similar weight in every case.” *In re Guild Mortg. Co.*, 912 F.3d 1376, 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2019) (quoting *In re Dixie Rests., Inc.*, 105 F.3d 1405, 1406 (Fed. Cir. 1997)).

Although not all *DuPont* factors may be relevant, there are generally two key considerations in any likelihood of confusion analysis: (1) the similarities between the compared marks and (2) the relatedness of the compared goods and/or services. See *Sunkist Growers, Inc. v. Intrastate Distribs., Inc.*, 144 F.4th 1376, 1379 (Fed. Cir. 2025) (quoting *Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Packard Press, Inc.*, 281 F.3d 1261, 1265 (Fed. Cir. 2002)); *Stratus Networks, Inc. v. UBTA-UBET Commc’ns Inc.*, 955 F.3d 994, 999 (Fed. Cir. 2020) (quoting *Han Beauty, Inc. v. Alberto-Culver Co.*, 236 F.3d 1333, 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2001)); *Federated Foods, Inc. v. Fort Howard Paper Co.*, 544 F.2d 1098, 1103 (C.C.P.A. 1976) (“The fundamental inquiry mandated by [Section] 2(d) goes to the cumulative effect of differences in the essential characteristics of the goods [or

services] and differences in the marks.”); TMEP §1207.01.

Applicant has applied to register the mark "CLAUDE MYTHOS" in standard characters for "Information services in the field of software as a service (SAAS); Providing online non-downloadable software using artificial intelligence (AI) for machine learning; Providing a website featuring on-line non-downloadable software that enables users to include, access, use, and interact with an artificial intelligence model to perform generative text AI tasks and natural language processing AI tasks, and to produce written content based on a theme, text summaries, document question-answering and natural conversation simulation; Providing temporary use of on-line non-downloadable software and applications for including, accessing, using, and interacting with an artificial intelligence model to perform generative text AI tasks and natural language processing AI tasks, and for producing written content based on a theme, text summaries, document question-answering and natural conversation simulation; Providing online non-downloadable software using machine learning for including, accessing, using, and interacting with an artificial intelligence model to perform generative text AI tasks and natural language processing AI tasks, and for producing written content based on a theme, text summaries, document question-answering and natural conversation simulation; Providing temporary use of online non-downloadable chatbot software using large language models (LLMs) for computer software code generation; Providing on-line non-downloadable software for including, accessing, using, and interacting with an artificial intelligence model to perform generative text AI tasks and natural language processing AI tasks, and for producing written content based on a theme, text summaries, document question-answering and natural conversation simulation; Application service provider featuring application programming interface (API) software for performing generative text AI tasks and natural language processing AI tasks and for writing content based on a theme, summarizing text, document question-answering and simulating natural conversation; Software as a service (SAAS) services featuring software using artificial intelligence (AI) for performing generative text AI tasks and natural language processing AI tasks and for writing content based on a theme, summarizing text, document question-answering and simulating natural conversation; Providing temporary use of online non-downloadable chatbot software using artificial intelligence (AI) for performing generative text AI tasks and natural language processing AI tasks, and for producing written content based on a theme, text summaries, document question-answering and natural conversation simulation; Providing temporary use of online non-downloadable chatbot software using large language models (LLMs) for performing generative text AI tasks and natural language processing AI tasks, and for producing written content based on a theme, text summaries, document question-answering and natural conversation simulation; Providing on-line non-downloadable software using artificial intelligence (AI) for performing generative text AI tasks and natural language processing AI tasks, and for producing written content based on a theme, text summaries, document question-answering and natural conversation simulation; Providing temporary use of on-line non-downloadable software and applications using artificial intelligence (AI) for performing generative text AI tasks and natural language processing AI tasks, and for producing written content based on a theme, text summaries, document question-answering and natural conversation simulation; Providing a website featuring non-downloadable software using artificial intelligence (AI) for performing generative text AI tasks and natural language processing AI tasks, and for producing written content based on a theme, text summaries, document question-answering and natural conversation simulation" in International Class 042.

The registered mark is "MYTHOS" in standard characters for "Software as a Service (SAAS) services featuring software for creating customizable, searchable databases of information and software for collecting, storing, managing, manipulating, editing, tagging, and sharing user-generated content; Software as a Service (SAAS) services featuring software that enables users to create customizable surveys to facilitate and enhance marketing of content to target audiences" in International Class 42.

Similarity of the Marks

Marks are compared in their entireties for similarities in appearance, sound, connotation, and commercial impression. *In re Charger Ventures LLC*, 64 F.4th 1375, 1380, 2023 USPQ2d 451, at *3 (Fed. Cir. 2023) (citing *Coach Servs., Inc. v. Triumph Learning LLC*, 668 F.3d 1356, 1368, 101 USPQ2d 1713, 1720 (Fed. Cir. 2012); *Palm Bay Imps., Inc. v. Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin Maison Fondee En 1772*, 396 F.3d 1369, 1371-72, 73 USPQ2d 1689, 1692 (Fed. Cir. 2005)); TMEP §1207.01(b)-(b)(v). "Similarity in any one of these elements may be sufficient to find the marks confusingly similar." *In re Inn at St. John's, LLC*, 126 USPQ2d 1742, 1746 (TTAB 2018) (citing *In re Davia*, 110 USPQ2d 1810, 1812 (TTAB 2014)), *aff'd per curiam*, 777 F. App'x 516, 2019 BL 343921 (Fed. Cir. 2019); TMEP §1207.01(b).

Here, applicant's mark, "CLAUDE MYTHOS" in standard characters is confusingly similar to the registered mark, "MYTHOS" in standard characters.

In this case, applicant's mark incorporates the entirety of registrant's mark.

The incorporation of an entire mark within another has often been found to increase the similarity between the compared marks where, as in the present case, the dominant portion of the marks is the same. *See In re Charger Ventures LLC*, 64 F.4th 1375, 1381-82, 2023 USPQ2d 451, at *4-5 (Fed. Cir. 2023) (holding SPARK LIVING and SPARK confusingly similar); *Coca-Cola Bottling Co. v. Jos. E. Seagram & Sons, Inc.*, 526 F.2d 556, 557, 188 USPQ 105, 106 (C.C.P.A. 1975) (holding BENGAL LANCER and design and BENGAL confusingly similar); *Double Coin Holdings, Ltd. v. Tru Dev.*, 2019 USPQ2d 377409, at *6-7 (TTAB 2019) (holding ROAD WARRIOR and WARRIOR (stylized) confusingly similar); *In re Mr. Recipe, LLC*, 118 USPQ2d 1084, 1090 (TTAB 2016) (holding JAWS DEVOUR YOUR HUNGER and JAWS confusingly similar); *Hunter Indus., Inc. v. Toro Co.*, 110 USPQ2d 1651, 1660-61 (TTAB 2014) (holding PRECISION DISTRIBUTION CONTROL and PRECISION confusingly similar); TMEP §1207.01(b)(iii).

The addition of applicant's previously registered mark, "CLAUDE" to another registered mark does not considerably alter the commercial impression of the mark. The addition of a house mark to a registered mark does not generally obviate a likelihood of confusion under Section 2(d). *See In re Bay St. Brewing Co.*, 117 USPQ2d 1958, 1965 (TTAB 2016) (citing *In re Mighty Leaf Tea*, 601 F.3d 1342, 1347-48, 94 USPQ2d 1257, 1260 (Fed. Cir. 2010); *Gen. Mills Inc. v. Fage Dairy Processing Indus. SA*, 100 USPQ2d 1584, 1602 (TTAB 2011); *In re Fiesta Palms LLC*, 85 USPQ2d 1360, 1366-67 (TTAB 2007)); *In re Apparel Ventures, Inc.* 229 USPQ 225, 226 (TTAB 1986); *In re Christian Dior, S.A.*, 225 USPQ 533, 534 (TTAB 1985); TMEP §1207.01(b)(iii). It is likely that goods and/or services sold under these marks would be attributed to the same

source. See *In re Chica, Inc.*, 84 USPQ2d 1845, 1848-49 (TTAB 2007). Thus, the marks in this case are confusingly similar.

Thus, because the marks create the same commercial impression, the marks are considered similar for likelihood of confusion purposes.

Relatedness of Goods and Services

The goods and/or services are compared to determine whether they are similar, commercially related, or travel in the same trade channels. See *Coach Servs., Inc. v. Triumph Learning LLC*, 668 F.3d 1356, 1369-71, 101 USPQ2d 1713, 1722-23 (Fed. Cir. 2012); *Herbko Int'l, Inc. v. Kappa Books, Inc.*, 308 F.3d 1156, 1165, 64 USPQ2d 1375, 1381 (Fed. Cir. 2002); TMEP §§1207.01, 1207.01(a)(vi).

An examining attorney need not establish that every good or service listed in the application is related to the goods and/or services in the cited registration(s). It is sufficient to establish relatedness for one good or service in the refused class(es), including for a good or service “encompassed by the identification of goods [or services] within a particular class in the application.” *In re Samsung Display Co.*, Ser. No. 90502617, 2024 TTAB LEXIS 258, at *7 (2024) (quoting *In re Aquamar, Inc.*, Ser. No. 85861533, 2015 TTAB LEXIS 178, at *9 n.5 (2015)); *In re Info. Builders Inc.*, Ser. No. 87753964, 2020 TTAB LEXIS 20, at *8 (2020) (citing *SquirtCo v. Tomy Corp.*, 697 F.2d 1038, 1041 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *Tuxedo Monopoly, Inc. v. Gen. Mills Fun Grp., Inc.*, 648 F.2d 1335, 1336 (C.C.P.A. 1981)).

The compared goods and/or services need not be identical or even competitive to find a likelihood of confusion. See *On-line Careline Inc. v. Am. Online Inc.*, 229 F.3d 1080, 1086, 56 USPQ2d 1471, 1475 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Recot, Inc. v. Becton*, 214 F.3d 1322, 1329, 54 USPQ2d 1894, 1898 (Fed. Cir. 2000); TMEP §1207.01(a)(i). They need only be “related in some manner and/or if the circumstances surrounding their marketing are such that they could give rise to the mistaken belief that [the goods and/or services] emanate from the same source.” *Coach Servs., Inc. v. Triumph Learning LLC*, 668 F.3d 1356, 1369, 101 USPQ2d 1713, 1722 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (quoting *7-Eleven Inc. v. Wechsler*, 83 USPQ2d 1715, 1724 (TTAB 2007)); TMEP §1207.01(a)(i); see *Made in Nature, LLC v. Pharmavite LLC*, 2022 USPQ2d 557, at *44 (TTAB 2022) (quoting *In re Jump Designs LLC*, 80 USPQ2d 1370, 1374 (TTAB 2006)).

Determining likelihood of confusion is based on the description of the goods and/or services stated in the application and registration at issue, not on extrinsic evidence of actual use. See *In re Detroit Athletic Co.*, 903 F.3d 1297, 1307 (Fed. Cir. 2018) (citing *In re i.am.symbolic, llc*, 866 F.3d 1315, 1325 (Fed. Cir. 2017)).

The marks use broad wording in-part to identify “software for generative text AI tasks and natural language processing AI tasks and to produce written content based on a theme, text summaries, document question-answering and natural conversation simulation” and “software that enables users to create customizable surveys.” Applicant’s identified “content” have not been limited to any type of specific content and can therefore be used for enabling users to create customizable surveys. Similarly, registrant’s “software” can encompass any type of software features, including software powered by AI. See attached Internet evidence from

SurveyMonkey.com, *Jotform.com*, *Blocksurvey.io*, *Survalyzer.com*, and *Sogolytics.com*, showing software powered by AI frequently offers the creation of customizable surveys. Therefore, applicant's and registrant's services are legally identical. See, e.g., *In re i.am.symbolic, llc*, 127 USPQ2d 1627, 1629 (TTAB 2018) (citing *Tuxedo Monopoly, Inc. v. Gen. Mills Fun Grp., Inc.*, 648 F.2d 1335, 1336, 209 USPQ 986, 988 (C.C.P.A. 1981); *Inter IKEA Sys. B.V. v. Akea, LLC*, 110 USPQ2d 1734, 1745 (TTAB 2014); *Baseball Am. Inc. v. Powerplay Sports Ltd.*, 71 USPQ2d 1844, 1847 n.9 (TTAB 2004)).

Additionally, the goods and/or services of the parties have no restrictions as to nature, type, channels of trade, or classes of purchasers and are "presumed to travel in the same channels of trade to the same class of purchasers." *In re Viterra Inc.*, 671 F.3d 1358, 1362 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (quoting *Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Packard Press, Inc.*, 281 F.3d 1261, 1268 (Fed. Cir. 2002)); see *Cai v. Diamond Hong, Inc.*, 901 F.3d 1367, 1372 (Fed. Cir. 2018). Thus, applicant's and registrant's goods and/or services are related.

Conclusion

Because the marks are similar and the goods and services are related, there is a likelihood of confusion as to the source of applicant's goods and services, and registration is refused pursuant to Section 2(d) of the Trademark Act.

PRIOR PENDING APPLICATIONS MAY BAR REGISTRATION

The effective filing dates of pending U.S. Application Serial Nos. 99141555 and 99599765 precede applicant's filing date. See attached referenced applications. If one or more of the marks in the referenced applications register, applicant's mark may be refused registration under Trademark Act Section 2(d) because of a likelihood of confusion with the registered mark(s). See 15 U.S.C. §1052(d); 37 C.F.R. §2.83; TMEP §§1208 *et seq.* Therefore, upon receipt of applicant's response to this Office action, action on this application may be suspended pending final disposition of the earlier-filed referenced applications.

In response to this Office action, applicant may present arguments in support of registration by addressing the issue of the potential conflict between applicant's mark and the marks in the referenced applications. Applicant's election not to submit arguments at this time in no way limits applicant's right to address this issue later if a refusal under Section 2(d) issues.

RESPONSE OPTIONS TO REFUSALS

Although applicant's mark has been refused registration, applicant may respond to the refusal(s) by submitting evidence and arguments in support of registration.

If applicant responds to the refusal(s), applicant must also respond to the requirement(s) set forth below.

FOREIGN REGISTRATION REQUIREMENT

The application specifies both an intent to use basis under Trademark Act Section 1(b) and a claim of priority under Section 44(d) based on a foreign application. See 15 U.S.C. §§1051(b),

1126(d); 37 C.F.R. §2.34(a)(2), (a)(4). However, no copy of a foreign registration has been provided even though the application indicates applicant's intent to rely on Section 44(e) as an additional basis for registration. See 15 U.S.C. §1126(e).

An application with a Section 44(e) basis must include a true copy, photocopy, certification, or certified copy of a foreign registration from an applicant's country of origin. 15 U.S.C. §1126(e); 37 C.F.R. §2.34(a)(3)(ii); TMEP §§1004, 1004.01, 1016. In addition, an applicant's country of origin must be a party to a convention or treaty relating to trademarks to which the United States is also a party, or must extend reciprocal registration rights to nationals of the United States by law. 15 U.S.C. §1126(b); TMEP §§1002.01, 1004.

Therefore, applicant must provide a copy of the foreign registration from applicant's country of origin when it becomes available. TMEP §1003.04(a). A copy of a foreign registration must consist of a document issued to an applicant by, or certified by, the intellectual property office in applicant's country of origin. TMEP §1004.01. If applicant's country of origin does not issue registrations or Madrid Protocol certificates of extension of protection, applicant may submit a copy of the Madrid Protocol international registration that shows that protection of the international registration has been extended to applicant's country of origin. TMEP §1016. In addition, applicant must also provide an English translation if the foreign registration is not written in English. 37 C.F.R. §2.34(a)(3)(ii); TMEP §1004.01(a)-(b). The translation should be signed by the translator. TMEP §1004.01(b).

If the foreign registration has not yet issued, or applicant requires additional time to procure a copy of the foreign registration (and English translation, as appropriate), applicant should so inform the trademark examining attorney and request that the U.S. application be suspended until a copy of the foreign registration is available. TMEP §§716.02(b), 1003.04(b).

If applicant cannot satisfy the requirements of a Section 44(e) basis, applicant may request that the mark be approved for publication based solely on the Section 1(b) basis. See 15 U.S.C. §§1051(b), 1126(e); 37 C.F.R. §2.35(b)(1); TMEP §§806.02(f), 806.04(b), 1003.04(b). Although the mark may be approved for publication on the Section 1(b) basis, it will not register until an acceptable allegation of use has been filed. See 15 U.S.C. §1051(c)-(d); 37 C.F.R. §§2.76, 2.88; TMEP §1103. Please note that, if the U.S. application satisfied the requirements of Section 44(d) as of the U.S. application filing date, applicant may retain the priority filing date under Section 44(d) without perfecting the Section 44(e) basis, provided there is a continuing valid basis for registration. See 37 C.F.R. §2.35(b)(3)-(4); TMEP §§806.02(f), 806.04(b).

Alternatively, applicant has the option to amend the application to rely solely on the Section 44(e) basis and request deletion of the Section 1(b) basis. See 37 C.F.R. §2.35(b)(1); TMEP §806.04. The foreign registration alone may serve as the basis for obtaining a U.S. registration. See 37 C.F.R. §2.34(a)(3); TMEP §806.01(d).

RESPONSE GUIDELINES

Response guidelines. For this application to proceed, applicant must explicitly address each refusal and/or requirement in this Office action. See TMEP §718.03. For a refusal, applicant may provide written arguments and evidence against the refusal, and may have other response

options if specified above. For a requirement, applicant should set forth the changes or statements. See the [Responding to Office Actions](#) webpage for more information and tips on responding.

Please call or email the assigned trademark examining attorney with questions about this Office action. Although an examining attorney cannot provide legal advice, the examining attorney can provide additional explanation about the refusal(s) and/or requirement(s) in this Office action. See TMEP §§705.02, 709.06.

The USPTO does not accept emails as responses to Office actions; however, emails can be used for informal communications and are included in the application record. See 37 C.F.R. §§2.62(c), 2.191; TMEP §§304.01-.02, 709.04-.05.

How to respond. File a [response form to this nonfinal Office action](#) or file a [request form for an extension of time to file a response](#).

/Leanna Samson/
Leanna Samson
Examining Attorney
Law Office 138
(571) 272-2901
Leanna.Samson@uspto.gov

RESPONSE GUIDANCE

- **Missing the deadline for responding to this letter will cause the application to [abandon](#).** A response or extension request must be received by the USPTO before 11:59 p.m. **Eastern Time** of the last day of the response deadline. Trademark Electronic Application System (TEAS) [system availability](#) could affect an applicant's ability to timely respond. For help resolving technical issues with TEAS, email TEAS@uspto.gov.
- **[Responses signed by an unauthorized party](#) are not accepted and can cause the application to [abandon](#).** If applicant does not have an attorney, the response must be signed by the individual applicant, all joint applicants, or someone with [legal authority to bind a juristic applicant](#). If applicant has an attorney, the response must be signed by the attorney.
- If needed, **find [contact information for the supervisor](#)** of the office or unit listed in the signature block.

6140016

MYTHOS

Word Mark	MYTHOS
Goods/Services	IC 042 US 101 100 Software as a Service (SAAS) services featuring software for creating customizable, searchable databases of information and software for collecting, storing, managing, manipulating, editing, tagging, and sharing user-generated content; Software as a Service (SAAS) services featuring software that enables users to create customizable surveys to facilitate and enhance marketing of content to target audiences FIRST USE: 2015-10-31. FIRST USE IN COMMERCE: 2015-10-31.
Register	PRINCIPAL
Serial Number	88678952
Filing Date	2019-11-04T00:00:00
Original Filing Basis	1a
Current Filing Basis	1a
Publication Date	2020-06-16
Registration Number	6140016
Date Registered	2020-09-01
Owner	(REGISTRANT) Global Printing Inc. (CORPORATION; VIRGINIA, USA); 3670 Wheeler Ave., Alexandria, VIRGINIA 22304, UNITED STATES
Type of Mark	SERVICE MARK
Mark Drawing Code	(4) STANDARD CHARACTER MARK
Live Dead Indicator	LIVE
Status	SECTION 8 & 15-ACCEPTED AND ACKNOWLEDGED

Attorney of Record

Lynn M. Jordan

Print: October 19, 2026 10:54 AM

99141555

Myth-OS

Word Mark	MYTH-OS
Goods/Services	IC 009 US 026 038 023 036 021 Software for the emotional and symbolic education of users, namely, downloadable software for use in semiotic analysis, symbolic pattern recognition, and providing users with educational tools, activities, and resources for personal development using artificial intelligence (AI)
	IC 041 US 101 100 107 Educational services, namely, providing courses and workshops for emotional and symbolic education in the fields of symbolic intelligence, archetypal psychology, self-awareness, and personal myth-making; Educational services, namely, providing multimedia content in the nature of online non-downloadable videos and articles for emotional and symbolic education in the fields of symbolic intelligence, archetypal psychology, self-awareness, and personal myth-making
	IC 042 US 101 100 Software for the emotional and symbolic education of users, namely, software as a service (SAAS) services featuring an artificial intelligence (AI) software platform for use in mapping symbolic intelligence, generating mythic insights, and facilitating recursive self-inquiry
Register	PRINCIPAL
Serial Number	99141555
Filing Date	2025-04-17T00:00:00
Original Filing Basis	1b
Current Filing Basis	1b
Publication Date	2025-10-28
Owner	(LAST LISTED OWNER) Mythos Holdings, Incorporated (CORPORATION; Delaware, USA); 137 Maple Ave, Hartland, Wisconsin 53029-2110, UNITED STATES

Type of Mark	• TRADEMARK • SERVICE MARK
Mark Drawing Code	(4) STANDARD CHARACTER MARK
Live Dead Indicator	LIVE
Status	FIRST EXTENSION - GRANTED

Print: October 19, 2026 10:20 AM

99599765

MYTHOS

Word Mark	MYTHOS
Goods/Services	IC 042 US 101 100 Providing on-line non-downloadable software for note-taking, journaling, collaborative creation, organization, management, publication, and sharing of documents, content, and information; Software as a service (SAAS) services featuring software for note-taking, journaling, collaborative creation, organization, management, publication, and sharing of documents, content, and information; Providing a website featuring non-downloadable software for note-taking, journaling, collaborative creation, organization, management, publication, and sharing of documents, content, and information FIRST USE: 2018-02-08. FIRST USE IN COMMERCE: 2018-07-31.
Register	PRINCIPAL
Serial Number	99599765
Filing Date	2026-01-16T00:00:00
Original Filing Basis	1a
Current Filing Basis	1a
Owner	(APPLICANT) Cooperating Citizens of One, Inc. (CORPORATION; Delaware, USA); 16192 Coastal Highway, Lewes, Delaware 19958, UNITED STATES
Type of Mark	SERVICE MARK
Mark Drawing Code	(4) STANDARD CHARACTER MARK
Live Dead Indicator	LIVE
Status	SUSPENSION LETTER - MAILED
Attorney of Record	Marc E. Hankin

