

1. *Timing.* The exemption in § 1026.41(e)(5)(iv)(B) applies with respect to a single periodic statement or coupon book following an event listed in

§ 1026.41(e)(5)(iv)(A). For example, assume that a mortgage loan has a monthly billing cycle, each payment due date is on the first day of the month following its respective billing cycle, and each payment due date has a 15-day courtesy period. In this scenario:

i. If an event listed in § 1026.41(e)(5)(iv)(A) occurs on October 6, before the end of the 15-day courtesy period provided for the October 1 payment due date, and the servicer has not yet provided a periodic statement or coupon book for the billing cycle with a November 1 payment due date, the servicer is exempt from providing a periodic statement or coupon book for that billing cycle. The servicer is required thereafter to resume providing periodic statements or coupon books that comply with the requirements of § 1026.41 by providing a modified or unmodified periodic statement or coupon book for the billing cycle with a December 1 payment due date within a reasonably prompt time after November 1 or the end of the 15-day courtesy period provided for the November 1 payment due date. *See* § 1026.41(b).

ii. If an event listed in § 1026.41(e)(5)(iv)(A) occurs on October 20, after the end of the 15-day courtesy period provided for the October 1 payment due date, and the servicer timely provided a periodic statement or coupon book for the billing cycle with the November 1 payment due date, the servicer is not required to correct the periodic statement or coupon book already provided and is exempt from providing the next periodic statement or coupon book, which is the one that would otherwise be required for the billing cycle with a December 1 payment due date. The servicer is required thereafter to resume providing periodic statements or coupon books that comply with the requirements of § 1026.41 by providing a modified or unmodified periodic statement or coupon book for the billing cycle with a January 1 payment due date within a reasonably prompt time after December 1 or the end of the 15-day courtesy period provided for the December 1 payment due date. *See* § 1026.41(b).

2. *Duplicate coupon books not required.* If a servicer provides a coupon book instead of a periodic statement under § 1026.41(e)(3), § 1026.41 requires the servicer to provide a new coupon book after one of the events listed in § 1026.41(e)(5)(iv)(A) occurs only to the extent the servicer has not previously provided the consumer with a coupon book that covers the upcoming billing cycle.

3. *Subsequent triggering events.* The single-statement exemption in § 1026.41(e)(5)(iv)(B) might apply more than once over the life of a loan. For example, assume the exemption applies beginning on April 14 because the consumer files for bankruptcy on that date and the bankruptcy plan provides that the consumer will surrender the dwelling, such that the mortgage loan becomes subject to the requirements of § 1026.41(f). *See* § 1026.41(e)(5)(iv)(A)(1). If the consumer later exits bankruptcy on November 2 and has not

discharged personal liability for the mortgage loan pursuant to 11 U.S.C. 727, 1141, 1228, or 1328, such that the mortgage loan ceases to be subject to the requirements of § 1026.41(f), the single-statement exemption would apply again beginning on November 2. *See* § 1026.41(e)(5)(iv)(A)(2).

\* \* \* \* \*

Dated: October 2, 2017.

**Richard Cordray,**

*Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection.*

[FR Doc. 2017-21907 Filed 10-17-17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4810-AM-P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### United States Patent and Trademark Office

#### 37 CFR Part 2

[Docket No. PTO-T-2017-0032]

RIN 0651-AD23

#### Removal of Rules Governing Trademark Interferences

**AGENCY:** United States Patent and Trademark Office, Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of proposed rulemaking.

**SUMMARY:** Consistent with Executive Order 13777, “Enforcing the Regulatory Reform Agenda,” and Executive Order 13771, “Reducing Regulation and Controlling Regulatory Costs,” the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO or Office) proposes to amend the Rules of Practice in Trademark Cases to remove the rules governing trademark interferences. This proposed rule implements the USPTO’s work to identify and propose regulations for removal, modification, and streamlining because they are outdated, unnecessary, ineffective, costly, or unduly burdensome on the agency or the private sector. The revisions proposed herein would put into effect the work the USPTO has done, in part through its participation in the Regulatory Reform Task Force (Task Force) established by the Department of Commerce (Department or Commerce) pursuant to Executive Order 13777, to review and identify regulations that are candidates for removal.

**DATES:** Written comments must be received on or before November 17, 2017.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments on the changes set forth in this proposed rulemaking should be sent by electronic mail message to [TMFRNotices@uspto.gov](mailto:TMFRNotices@uspto.gov). Written comments also may be submitted by mail to the Commissioner

for Trademarks, P.O. Box 1451, Alexandria, VA 22313-1451, attention Catherine Cain; by hand delivery to the Trademark Assistance Center, Concourse Level, James Madison Building-East Wing, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314, attention Catherine Cain. Comments concerning ideas to improve, revise, and streamline other USPTO regulations, not discussed in this proposed rulemaking, should be submitted to [RegulatoryReformGroup@uspto.gov](mailto:RegulatoryReformGroup@uspto.gov).

Comments may also be submitted via the Federal eRulemaking Portal at <http://www.regulations.gov>. See the Federal eRulemaking Portal Web site for additional instructions on providing comments via the Federal eRulemaking Portal.

Although comments may be submitted by postal mail, the Office prefers to receive comments by electronic mail message over the Internet because the Office may easily share such comments with the public. Electronic comments are preferred to be submitted in plain text, but also may be submitted in ADOBE® portable document format or MICROSOFT WORD® format. Comments not submitted electronically should be submitted on paper in a format that facilitates convenient digital scanning into ADOBE® portable document format.

The comments will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Commissioner for Trademarks, Madison East, Tenth Floor, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314. Comments also will be available for viewing via the Office’s Internet Web site (<http://www.uspto.gov>) and at <http://www.regulations.gov>. Because comments will be made available for public inspection, information that the submitter does not desire to make public, such as an address or phone number, should not be included in the comments.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Catherine Cain, Office of the Deputy Commissioner for Trademark Examination Policy, by email at [TMFRNotices@uspto.gov](mailto:TMFRNotices@uspto.gov), or by telephone at (571) 272-8946.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### I. Background

In accordance with Executive Order 13777, “Enforcing the Regulatory Reform Agenda,” the Department established a Task Force, comprising, among others, agency officials from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Bureau of Industry and Security, and the USPTO, and

charged with evaluating existing regulations and identifying those that should be repealed, replaced, or modified because they are outdated, unnecessary, ineffective, costly, or unduly burdensome to both government and private-sector operations.

To support its regulatory reform efforts on the Task Force, the USPTO assembled a Working Group on Regulatory Reform (Working Group), consisting of subject-matter experts from each of the business units that implement the USPTO's regulations, to consider, review, and recommend ways that the regulations could be improved, revised, and streamlined. In considering the revisions, the USPTO, through its Working Group, incorporated into its analyses all presidential directives relating to regulatory reform, but primarily focused on Executive Order 13771, "Presidential Executive Order on Reducing Regulation and Controlling Regulatory Costs." The Working Group reviewed existing regulations, both discretionary and required by statute or judicial order. The USPTO also solicited comments from stakeholders through a Web page established to provide information on the USPTO's regulatory reform efforts and through the Department's **Federal Register** Notice titled "Impact of Federal Regulations on Domestic Manufacturing" (82 FR 12786, Mar. 7, 2017), which addressed the impact of regulatory burdens on domestic manufacturing. These efforts led to the development of candidate regulations for removal based on the USPTO's assessment that these regulations were not needed and/or that elimination could improve the USPTO's body of regulations. This rule proposes to remove trademark-related regulations. Other proposals to remove regulations on other subject areas may be published separately.

## II. Regulations Proposed for Removal

This proposed rule revises the regulations concerning trademark interferences codified at 37 CFR 2.91–2.93, 2.96, and 2.98. A trademark interference is a proceeding in which the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board (Board) determines which, if any, of the owners of conflicting applications (or of one or more applications and one or more conflicting registrations) is entitled to registration. 15 U.S.C. 1066. A trademark interference can be declared only upon petition to the Director of the USPTO (Director). However, the Director will grant such a petition only if the petitioner can show extraordinary circumstances that would result in a party being unduly prejudiced in the absence of an

interference. 37 CFR 2.91(a). The availability of an opposition or cancellation proceeding to determine rights to registration ordinarily precludes the possibility of such undue prejudice to a party. *Id.* Thus, a petitioner must show that there is some extraordinary circumstance that would make the remedy of opposition or cancellation inadequate or prejudicial to the party's rights.

Trademark interferences have generally been limited to situations where a party would otherwise be required to engage in successive or a series of opposition or cancellation proceedings involving substantially the same issues. Trademark Manual of Examining Procedure § 1507. Where searchable, USPTO reviewed its paper and electronic records of petitions and found that since 1983, the USPTO has received an average of approximately 1 such petition a year, and almost all of them have been denied except for three petitions that were granted in 1985 (32 years ago). The USPTO has been unable to identify a situation since that time in which the Director has granted a petition to declare a trademark interference. Given the extremely low rate of filing over this long period of time, and because parties would still retain an avenue for seeking a declaration of interference if the trademark interference regulations are removed, the USPTO considers them unnecessary.

The trademark interference regulations proposed in this rule for removal achieve the objective of making the USPTO regulations more effective and more streamlined, while enabling the USPTO to fulfill its mission goals. The USPTO's analysis shows that while the removal of these regulations is not expected to substantially reduce the burden on the impacted community, they are nonetheless being eliminated because they are "outdated, unnecessary, or ineffective" regulations that are encompassed by the directives in Executive Order 13777.

Section 16 of the Trademark Act, 15 U.S.C. 1066, states that the Director may declare an interference "[u]pon petition showing extraordinary circumstances." Although eliminating §§ 2.91–2.93, 2.96, and 2.98 removes the regulations regarding the requirements for declaring a trademark interference, the statutory authority will remain. On the rare occasion that the Office receives a request that the Director declare a trademark interference, it is currently submitted as a petition under 37 CFR 2.146, a more general regulation on petitions. In the unlikely event that a need for an interference arose, it would

still be possible for a party to seek institution of a trademark interference by petitioning the Director under 37 CFR 2.146(a)(4), whereby a petitioner may seek relief in any case not specifically defined and provided for by Part 2 of Title 37. Thus, if the trademark interference regulations are removed, parties would still retain an avenue for seeking a declaration of interference.

## III. Discussion of Proposed Rules Changes

The USPTO proposes to remove and reserve §§ 2.91–2.93, 2.96, and 2.98.

### Rulemaking Considerations

*A. Administrative Procedure Act:* The changes in this proposed rulemaking involve rules of agency practice and procedure, and/or interpretive rules. *See Perez v. Mortg. Bankers Ass'n*, 135 S. Ct. 1199, 1204 (2015) (Interpretive rules "advise the public of the agency's construction of the statutes and rules which it administers." (citation and internal quotation marks omitted)); *Nat'l Org. of Veterans' Advocates v. Sec'y of Veterans Affairs*, 260 F.3d 1365, 1375 (Fed. Cir. 2001) (Rule that clarifies interpretation of a statute is interpretive.); *Bachow Commc'ns Inc. v. FCC*, 237 F.3d 683, 690 (D.C. Cir. 2001) (Rules governing an application process are procedural under the Administrative Procedure Act.); *Inova Alexandria Hosp. v. Shalala*, 244 F.3d 342, 350 (4th Cir. 2001) (Rules for handling appeals were procedural where they did not change the substantive standard for reviewing claims.).

Accordingly, prior notice and opportunity for public comment for the changes in this proposed rulemaking are not required pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(b) or (c), or any other law. *See Perez*, 135 S. Ct. at 1206 (Notice-and-comment procedures are required neither when an agency "issue[s] an initial interpretive rule" nor "when it amends or repeals that interpretive rule."); *Cooper Techs. Co. v. Dudas*, 536 F.3d 1330, 1336–37 (Fed. Cir. 2008) (stating that 5 U.S.C. 553, and thus 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2)(B), does not require notice and comment rulemaking for "interpretative rules, general statements of policy, or rules of agency organization, procedure, or practice" (quoting 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(A))). The Office, however, is publishing these proposed changes for comment as it seeks the benefit of the public's views on the Office's proposed implementation of the proposed rule changes.

*B. Regulatory Flexibility Act:* For the reasons set forth herein, the Senior Counsel for Regulatory and Legislative Affairs, Office of General Law, of the

USPTO has certified to the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration that changes proposed in this notice will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. See 5 U.S.C. 605(b).

This proposed rule would remove the regulations addressing trademark interferences codified at 37 CFR 2.91–2.93, 2.96, and 2.98. In trademark interferences, the Board determines which, if any, of the owners of conflicting applications (or of one or more applications and one or more conflicting registrations) is entitled to registration. 15 U.S.C. 1066. Where searchable, USPTO reviewed its paper and electronic records of petitions and found that since 1983, USPTO has received an average of approximately 1 such petition a year, and almost all of them have been denied except for three petitions that were granted in 1985 (32 years ago). Because these regulations have rarely been invoked in the last 32 years, the USPTO considers these regulations unnecessary and has determined to remove them. Removing the trademark interference regulations proposed in this rule achieves the objective of making the USPTO regulations more effective and more streamlined, while enabling the USPTO to fulfill its mission goals. The removal of these regulations is not expected to substantively impact parties as, in the unlikely event that a need for a trademark interference arose, a party would be able to institute an interference by petitioning the Director under 37 CFR 2.146(a)(4). For these reasons, this rulemaking will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities.

*C. Executive Order 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review):* This rulemaking has been determined to be not significant for purposes of Executive Order 12866.

*D. Executive Order 13563 (Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review):* The Office has complied with Executive Order 13563. Specifically, the Office has, to the extent feasible and applicable: (1) Made a reasoned determination that the benefits justify the costs of the rule; (2) tailored the rule to impose the least burden on society consistent with obtaining the regulatory objectives; (3) selected a regulatory approach that maximizes net benefits; (4) specified performance objectives; (5) identified and assessed available alternatives; (6) involved the public in an open exchange of information and perspectives among experts in relevant disciplines, affected stakeholders in the private sector and the public as a whole,

and provided on-line access to the rulemaking docket; (7) attempted to promote coordination, simplification, and harmonization across government agencies and identified goals designed to promote innovation; (8) considered approaches that reduce burdens and maintain flexibility and freedom of choice for the public; and (9) ensured the objectivity of scientific and technological information and processes.

*E. Executive Order 13771 (Reducing Regulation and Controlling Regulatory Costs):* This proposed rule is expected to be an Executive Order 13771 deregulatory action.

*F. Executive Order 13132 (Federalism):* This rulemaking does not contain policies with federalism implications sufficient to warrant preparation of a Federalism Assessment under Executive Order 13132 (Aug. 4, 1999).

*G. Executive Order 13175 (Tribal Consultation):* This rulemaking will not: (1) Have substantial direct effects on one or more Indian tribes; (2) impose substantial direct compliance costs on Indian tribal governments; or (3) preempt tribal law. Therefore, a tribal summary impact statement is not required under Executive Order 13175 (Nov. 6, 2000).

*H. Executive Order 13211 (Energy Effects):* This rulemaking is not a significant energy action under Executive Order 13211 because this rulemaking is not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy. Therefore, a Statement of Energy Effects is not required under Executive Order 13211 (May 18, 2001).

*I. Executive Order 12988 (Civil Justice Reform):* This rulemaking meets applicable standards to minimize litigation, eliminate ambiguity, and reduce burden as set forth in sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988 (Feb. 5, 1996).

*J. Executive Order 13045 (Protection of Children):* This rulemaking does not concern an environmental risk to health or safety that may disproportionately affect children under Executive Order 13045 (Apr. 21, 1997).

*K. Executive Order 12630 (Taking of Private Property):* This rulemaking will not affect a taking of private property or otherwise have taking implications under Executive Order 12630 (Mar. 15, 1988).

*L. Congressional Review Act:* Under the Congressional Review Act provisions of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*), prior to issuing any final rule, the USPTO will

submit a report containing the final rule and other required information to the United States Senate, the United States House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the Government Accountability Office. The changes in this notice are not expected to result in an annual effect on the economy of 100 million dollars or more, a major increase in costs or prices, or significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets. Therefore, this notice is not expected to result in a “major rule” as defined in 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

*M. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995:* The changes set forth in this notice do not involve a Federal intergovernmental mandate that will result in the expenditure by State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, of 100 million dollars (as adjusted) or more in any one year, or a Federal private sector mandate that will result in the expenditure by the private sector of 100 million dollars (as adjusted) or more in any one year, and will not significantly or uniquely affect small governments. Therefore, no actions are necessary under the provisions of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995. See 2 U.S.C. 1501 *et seq.*

*N. National Environmental Policy Act:* This rulemaking will not have any effect on the quality of the environment and is thus categorically excluded from review under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. See 42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*

*O. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act:* The requirements of section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) are not applicable because this rulemaking does not contain provisions that involve the use of technical standards.

*P. Paperwork Reduction Act:* This rulemaking involves information collection requirements which are subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*). The collection of information involved in this rule has been reviewed and previously approved by OMB under control number 0651–0054.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person is required to respond to nor shall a person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act unless that collection of

information displays a currently valid OMB control number.

#### List of Subjects for 37 CFR Part 2

Administrative practice and procedure, Trademarks.

For the reasons stated in the preamble and under the authority contained in 15 U.S.C. 1123 and 35 U.S.C. 2, as amended, the Office proposes to amend part 2 of title 37 as follows:

#### PART 2—RULES OF PRACTICE IN TRADEMARK CASES

■ 1. The authority citation for part 2 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 15 U.S.C. 1123 and 35 U.S.C. 2 unless otherwise noted.

■ 2. Remove and reserve § 2.91.

#### § 2.91 [Reserved]

■ 3. Remove and reserve § 2.92.

#### § 2.92 [Reserved]

■ 4. Remove and reserve § 2.93.

#### § 2.93 [Reserved]

■ 5. Remove and reserve § 2.96.

#### § 2.96 [Reserved]

■ 6. Remove and reserve § 2.98.

#### § 2.98 [Reserved]

Dated: October 10, 2017.

**Joseph D. Matal,**

*Associate Solicitor, Performing the Functions and Duties of the Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.*

[FR Doc. 2017-22394 Filed 10-17-17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510-16-P**

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

##### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R03-OAR-2014-0701; FRL-9969-50-Region 3]

#### Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia; Interstate Transport Requirements for the 2010 1-Hour Sulfur Dioxide Standard

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) proposes to approve the state implementation plan revision submitted by the District of Columbia. This revision pertains to the infrastructure requirement for interstate transport pollution with respect to the

2010 1-hour sulfur dioxide national ambient air quality standards. In the Final Rules section of this **Federal Register**, EPA is approving the District's SIP submittal as a direct final rule without prior proposal because the Agency views this as a noncontroversial submittal and anticipates no adverse comments. A more detailed description of the state submittal and EPA's evaluation is included in a technical support document (TSD) prepared in support of this rulemaking action. A copy of the TSD is available, upon request, from the individual listed in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section of this document or is also available electronically within the Docket for this rulemaking action. If no adverse comments are received in response to this action, no further activity is contemplated. If EPA receives adverse comments, the direct final rule will be withdrawn and all public comments received will be addressed in a subsequent final rule based on this proposed rule. EPA will not institute a second comment period. Any parties interested in commenting on this action should do so at this time.

**DATES:** Comments must be received in writing by November 17, 2017.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R03-OAR-2014-0701 at <https://www.regulations.gov>, or via email to [stahl.cynthia@epa.gov](mailto:stahl.cynthia@epa.gov). For comments submitted at [Regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov), follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from [Regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov). For either manner of submission, the EPA may publish any comment received to its public docket. Do not submit electronically any information you consider to be confidential business information (CBI) or other information whose disclosure is restricted by statute. Multimedia submissions (audio, video, etc.) must be accompanied by a written comment. The written comment is considered the official comment and should include discussion of all points you wish to make. EPA will generally not consider comments or comment contents located outside of the primary submission (*i.e.*, on the Web, cloud, or other file sharing system). For additional submission methods, please contact the person identified in the **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT** section. For the full EPA public comment policy, information about CBI or multimedia submissions, and general guidance on making effective comments, please visit <http://www2.epa.gov/dockets/commenting-epa-dockets>.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Joseph Schulingkamp, (215) 814-2021, or by email at [schulingkamp.joseph@epa.gov](mailto:schulingkamp.joseph@epa.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** For further information, please see the information provided in the direct final action, with the same title, regarding the District's interstate transport requirements for sulfur dioxide, that is located in the "Rules and Regulations" section of this **Federal Register** publication as well as the TSD that accompanies this rulemaking action at [www.regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov).

Dated: September 29, 2017.

**Cecil Rodrigues,**

*Acting Regional Administrator, Region III.*

[FR Doc. 2017-22252 Filed 10-17-17; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 6560-50-P**

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

##### 40 CFR Part 52

[EPA-R05-OAR-2015-0034; FRL-9969-58-Region 5]

#### Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Minnesota; Regional Haze Progress Report

**AGENCY:** Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

**ACTION:** Proposed rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is proposing to approve a regional haze progress report as a revision to the Minnesota State Implementation Plan. The progress report examines Minnesota's progress in implementing its regional haze plan during the first half of the first implementation period. Minnesota has met the requirements for submitting a periodic report describing its progress toward reasonable progress goals established for regional haze. It also provided a determination of the adequacy of its plan in addressing regional haze with its negative declaration submitted with the progress report.

**DATES:** Comments must be received on or before November 17, 2017.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit your comments, identified by Docket ID No. EPA-R05-OAR-2015-0034 at <https://www.regulations.gov> or via email to [blakley.pamela@epa.gov](mailto:blakley.pamela@epa.gov). For comments submitted at [Regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov), follow the online instructions for submitting comments. Once submitted, comments cannot be edited or removed from [Regulations.gov](http://www.regulations.gov). For either manner of