

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

In the Matter of:

Timothy A. Ramos

Respondent

)
)
)
)
)
)
)

Proceeding No. D2014-09

FINAL ORDER PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 11.24

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.24, the suspension of Timothy A. Ramos (“Respondent”) is hereby ordered for violation of 37 C.F.R. § 11.804(h).

Background

On November 12, 2013, the Supreme Judicial Court for Suffolk County in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts issued an order in *In re: Timothy Andrew Ramos*, No. BD-2013-084, suspending Respondent from the practice of law for six (6) months in that jurisdiction based on ethical grounds.

On April 7, 2014, a “Notice and Order Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.24” (“Notice and Order”) mailed by certified mail (receipt no. 70131710000223654110) notified Respondent that the Director of the Office of Enrollment and Discipline (“OED Director”) had filed a “Complaint for Reciprocal Discipline Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.24” (“Complaint”) requesting that the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO or Office”) impose reciprocal discipline upon Respondent identical to the discipline imposed by the Supreme Judicial Court for Suffolk County in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts in *In re: Timothy Andrew Ramos*, No. BD-2013-084. The Notice and Order was resent to Respondent by express mail (receipt no. EH212372852US) on June 2, 2014. The Notice

and Order was delivered to Respondent on June 4, 2014.

The Notice and Order provided Respondent an opportunity to file, within forty (40) days, a response opposing the imposition of reciprocal discipline identical to that imposed by the Supreme Judicial Court for Suffolk County in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, No. BD-2013-084, based on one or more of the reasons provided in 37 C.F.R. § 11.24(d)(1). Respondent has not filed a response to the Notice and Order.

Analysis

In light of Respondent's failure to file a response, it is hereby determined that there is no genuine issue of material fact under 37 C.F.R. § 11.24(d) and suspension of Respondent from the practice of patent, trademark, and non-patent law before the USPTO for six (6) months is appropriate.

ACCORDINGLY, it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

1. Respondent be suspended from the practice of patent, trademark, and non-patent law before the USPTO for six (6) months, effective the date of this Final Order;
2. The OED Director publish the following Notice in the *Official Gazette*:

NOTICE OF SUSPENSION

This Notice concerns Timothy A. Ramos of Quincy, Massachusetts, who is a registered patent attorney (Registration Number 52,148). In a reciprocal disciplinary proceeding, the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") has ordered that Mr. Ramos be suspended for six (6) months from practice before the USPTO in patent, trademark, and other non-patent matters for violating 37 C.F.R. § 11.804(h), predicated upon being suspended from the practice of law by a duly constituted authority of a State.

On November 12, 2013, the Supreme Judicial Court for Suffolk County in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts suspended Mr. Ramos from the practice of law for six (6) months. The suspension is based on Mr. Ramos' unauthorized practice of law in Ohio in violation of Mass. R. Prof. C. 5.5(a); using a firm name and letterhead with an address in Ohio in violation of Mass. R. Prof. C. 7.

1 and 7.5(a); conviction of four misdemeanors involving reckless operation of vehicles and possession of marijuana in violation of Mass. R. Prof. C. 8.4(b) and (h); and failure to report the convictions to bar counsel in violation of Mass. R. Prof. C. 8.4(d) and S.J.C. Rule 4:01, § 12(8).

This action is taken pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 32 and 37 C.F.R. § 11.24. Disciplinary decisions involving practitioners are posted for public reading at the Office of Enrollment and Discipline's Reading Room available at: <http://e-foia.uspto.gov/Foia/OEDReadingRoom.jsp>.

3. The OED Director give notice pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.59 of the public discipline and the reasons for the discipline to disciplinary enforcement agencies in the state(s) where Respondent is admitted to practice, to courts where Respondent is known to be admitted, and to the public;

4. Respondent shall comply with the duties enumerated in 37 C.F.R. § 11.58;

5. The USPTO dissociate Respondent's name from any Customer Numbers and the public key infrastructure ("PKI") certificate associated with those Customer Numbers;

6. Respondent shall not apply for a USPTO Customer Number, shall not obtain a USPTO Customer Number, nor shall he have his name added to a USPTO Customer Number, unless and until he is reinstated to practice before the USPTO; and

7. Such other and further relief as the nature of this cause shall require.

(signature page follows)

JUL 28 2014

Date

For



James O. Payne
Deputy General Counsel for General Law
United States Patent and Trademark Office

on behalf of

Michelle Lee
Deputy Under Secretary of Commerce for
Intellectual Property and Deputy Director of the
United States Patent and Trademark Office