TRADE MARKS ACT 1994

IN THE MATTER OF TRADE MARK Application No. 2129922 to register trade a mark in the name of Texecom Limited

AND IN THE MATTER OF Opposition No. 48605 thereto by the Oracle Corporation.

Decision

Texecom Limited, Texecom House, 559 Wilbraham Road, Chorlton-cum-Hardy, Manchester, M21 OAE applied on 4th March 1997 to register the mark ORACLE for:

> 'Surveillance apparatus and instruments; closed circuit television cameras; parts and fittings for all the aforesaid goods; all included in Class 9; but not including goods for providing traffic information, goods for vehicle interiors for providing information or goods for monitoring traffic.'

The application is opposed by the Oracle Corporation, who cite their grounds for opposition as under s 3(6) and ss 5(1), (2), (3) and (4). They are the owners of the marks listed in the Annex.

The applicants deny the grounds and both parties ask for their costs. No hearing was requested. Only the opponents submitted evidence, which I have summarised as follows.

The Evidence

The opponents' evidence is largely intended to demonstrate the extent of their reputation in the ORACLE mark; as a consequence, it is fairly extensive. I do not think I need to refer to it all in detail - rather I think it sufficient to indicate the most significant parts thereof.

They are two declarations: the first is from Alan Wallace Laing, the Vice President of operations in Europe, Middle East and Asia of Oracle Corporation UK Limited; the next from Brenda G. Woodson Vice President and Associate General Counsel of the Oracle Corporation.

Mr Laing says that Oracle UK was incorporated in January 1984 and now has over 3500 UK employees. He says that annual world-wide gross revenues now exceed 7 billion US dollars; for the UK he gives the following figures

Fiscal Year	Turnover (US$)
1988	24,727,813
1989	47,978,667
1990	84,405,206
1991	102,856,026
1992	120,081,000
1993	160,170,000
1994	184,480,000

	UK annual revenue (£)
1995	208,236,000
1996	243,020,000
1997	334,641,000

Mr Laing says of the opponents:

> 'Oracle Corporation is the world's second largest software company. It has two major businesses: one aimed at providing the lowest cost information technology infrastructure, and the other to provide business and competitive advantage through high value applications. Oracle Corporation ....including Oracle UK design, develop, market and support computer software products with a wide variety of uses, including database management and network products, applications development productivity tools, and end user applications. Oracle offers consulting, education, support and systems integration services to back up its customers' use of ORACLE software products in the UK and elsewhere throughout the world.'

Much of the rest of Mr Laing's evidence focuses on the opponents advertising of its wares under the ORACLE mark (see Exhibits AWL 3, AWL 4 and AWL 7). Promotions are also mentioned (trade fairs and the like), but I do not think I need to dwell on this; it is clear that the opponents are ready marketers of their products (some 3% of annual turnover is apparently spent on this activity) and their reputation - as evidenced by various articles in the trade and business press (Exhibit AWL4) - is very significant.

There is also material on the product range as well. For example, Exhibit AWL 2 contains a 1998 catalogue. Though this is a year or so after the relevant date, I think it is a reasonable representation of the kind of product in which the opponents' established reputation resides. Nearly all the products cited here are software products - mainly concerned with business applications - though consultancy and education services are also mentioned, they all appear to be related to these latter products.

Other references to the opponents' products - i.e. free coverage in the press (see Exhibit AWL4) - again refer to software products. Mr Laing completes his evidence by stating that the opponents have a '..substantial reputation and goodwill in the name' Oracle. I agree. But it seems to reside, on the basis of his evidence, solely in software.

This is also emphasised in Ms Woodson's Declaration. She states:

> 'Oracle Corporation is the world's second largest software company. Oracle Corporation, its subsidiaries, including Oracle UK, and affiliates ("Oracle") design, develop, market and support computer software products with a wide variety of uses, including database management and network products, applications, development productivity tools, and end user applications. Oracle offers consulting, education, support and systems integration services to back up its customers' use of ORACLE software products in the UK and elsewhere throughout the world. Oracle presently operates in over 140 countries and is one of the few companies capable of implementing end-to-end enterprise IT infrastructure and applications solutions on a global scale.'

Much of the rest of her Declaration confirms my conclusion on the opponents' reputation above. World wide data on revenue, turnover and promotion are included, which adds little to that already submitted. Where Ms Woodson's Declaration become interesting is when she addresses the issue - on which I believe this case largely turns - of the similarity between the applicants' specified goods and that of her own Company's. She suggests that there is enough of a link - against the background of the opponents' reputation in the name - for confusion to occur. She also states:

> 'There is now produced and shown to me marked "Exhibit BGW4" an Oracle Technical White Paper dating from June 1997, introducing the Oracle8 TM Image Data cartridges. There is considerable value in integrating digital images with other application data. For example, in the commercial sector the use of photographic IDs for security purposes is increasing, and their integration into customer checking and credit card record systems along with their availability at retail outlet terminals provides a mechanism for cutting down on fraud. The Oracle8 Image Data cartridges provide foundational support for static two-dimensional images in Oracle databases and provides the means for adding images to existing records, querying and retrieving images, and to convert them between various formats. Oracle also offer visual information retrieval, which would allow a search of a security database to find people whose face match a certain image. The images retrieved by such a search can then be re-queried to find more images like it, thus enabling the user to close in on a mental image.
>
> Oracle provides an end-to-end software architecture for delivering interactive services over any network - broadband, ISDN, Internet or local area network - to any client device, television set or PC. There is now produced and shown to me marked "Exhibit BGW5" two press releases of 23 December 1996 and 17 December 1997 reporting on the Oracle Video Server. The Oracle Video Server delivers broadband full-motion and full-screen video concurrently to multiple clients. The Oracle Video Server has already been purchased by a leading Canadian telecommunications company for video-on-demand services in three areas. In 1997, Singapore Telecom successfully deployed the Oracle Video Server to deliver the first video-on-demand entertainment and news service through a nationwide broad band multimedia program. The SingaporeONE network, through which the service is offered, can deliver a potentially unlimited range of broadband multimedia services to homes, workplaces and schools.'

I take this as an attempt to demonstrate trade activity - and a reputation - in products that are closer to the applicants' specified 'Surveillance apparatus and instruments; closed circuit television cameras..' etc. If it is, I do not believe that Ms Woodson has succeeded. Again, the emphasis is on production of the software that makes the cited devices function; but more importantly, there is no evidence of trade in such items in the UK, and therefore no significant goodwill under the name ORACLE in this jurisdiction. Further, I note that the press releases in Exhibit BGW5 specifically refer to '.. education, training, entertainment, home banking, shopping and community services to home PCs and network computer client devices..' and to '..Shows, News, Magix ShopStop, Speednet, Interactive Learning, Games, Music and Magix City to its subscribers..'; this multi-media servicing, not surveillance equipment.

The Decision

Of the opponents' grounds, I think I can dismiss that under s 3(6) immediately. I have seen no evidence that shows bad faith on behalf of the applicants; such a pleading requires more than an assertion by an opponent - it requires proof - and I have seen none.

The remaining grounds are under s 5 of the Act. These state:

> '5.-(1) A trade mark shall not be registered if it is identical with an earlier trade mark and the goods or services for which the trade mark is applied for are identical with the goods or services for which the earlier trade mark is protected.
>
> (2) A trade mark shall not be registered if because -
>
> (a) it is identical with an earlier trade mark and is to be registered for goods or services similar to those for which the earlier trade mark is protected, or
>
> (b) it is similar to an earlier trade mark and is to be registered for goods or services identical with or similar to those for which the earlier trade mark is protected,
>
> there exists a likelihood of confusion on the part of the public, which includes the likelihood of association with the earlier trade mark.
>
> (3) A trade mark which -
>
> (a) is identical with or similar to an earlier trade mark, and
>
> (b) is to be registered for goods or services which are not similar to those for which the earlier trade mark is protected,
>
> shall not be registered if, or to the extent that, the earlier trade mark has a reputation in the United Kingdom (or, in the case of a Community trade mark, in the European Community) and the use of the later mark without due cause would take unfair advantage of, or be detrimental to, the distinctive character or the repute of the earlier trade mark.
>
> (4) A trade mark shall not be registered if, or to the extent that, its use in the United Kingdom is liable to be prevented -
>
> (a) by virtue of any rule of law (in particular, the law of passing off) protecting an unregistered trade mark or other sign used in the course of trade...
>
> (b) .. ,
>
> A person thus entitled to prevent the use of a trade mark is referred to in this Act as the proprietor of an "earlier right" in relation to the trade mark..'

In terms of ss 5(1) to (3) the opponents are the owners of 'earlier' trade marks as defined by s 6(1) (see the ANNEX to this Decision). They would also argue that they are the proprietors an earlier right under s 5(4) in that use of the applicants' mark is likely to amount to 'passing off'.

Ss 5(1) and (2) are designed to deal with the situations where the marks at issue are identical and so are the goods; where the marks are identical and the goods are similar and, finally, where the marks are similar and the goods are similar. The second and third of these are relevant in this case (the goods at issue are certainly not identical).

In doing so, I have taken into account the guidance provided by the European Court of Justice (ECJ) in *Sabel BV v Puma AG* [1998] RPC 199 at 224, *Canon v MGM* [1999] ETMR 1 and *Lloyd Schufabrik Meyer & Co GmbH v Klijsen Handel BV* [1999] ETMR 690 at 698. (Though these cases were primarily concerned with s 5(2)(b), it is clear that the following will also apply to s 5(2)(a) as well):

> (a) the likelihood of confusion must be appreciated globally, taking account of all relevant factors;
>
> (b) the matter must be judged through the eyes of the average consumer, of the goods/services in question, who is deemed to be reasonably well informed and reasonably circumspect and observant - but who rarely has the chance to make direct comparisons between marks and must instead rely upon the imperfect picture of them he has kept in his mind;
>
> (c) the average consumer normally perceives a mark as a whole and does not proceed to analyse its various details;
>
> (d) the visual, aural and conceptual similarities of the marks must therefore be assessed by reference to the overall impressions created by the marks bearing in mind their distinctive and dominant components;
>
> (e) a lesser degree of similarity between the marks may be offset by a greater degree of similarity between the goods, and vice versa;
>
> (f) there is a greater likelihood of confusion where the earlier trade mark has a highly distinctive character, either *per se* or because of the use that has been made of it.

I want to deal with s 5(2)(a) first, i.e. identical marks, but similar goods. The marks at issue here are shown on the first page of the ANNEX.

The case law summarised above counsels against a 'piecemeal' approach to appraising the likelihood of confusion. Rather, it must be 'appreciated globally, taking account of all relevant factors', which includes a 'trade off' between the similarity of the services, the closeness of the marks at issue and also the distinctiveness of the mark with the earlier right. However, as part of this process, I do need to consider the extent to which the goods at stake are similar, and I will do so now.

Similarity of goods has previously been determined by the criteria established by Jacob J in *British Sugar plc v James Robertson & Sons Ltd* [1996] 9 RPC 281. The latter have been confirmed in *Canon*:

> 'In assessing the similarity of the goods or services concerned... all the relevant factors relating to those goods or services themselves should be taken into account...includ[ing],

inter alia, their nature, their end users and their method of use and whether they are in competition with each other or are complementary..'

To this list, Jacob J included the respective trade channels through which the goods enter the market.

The opponents specifications under the mark ORACLE list a wide range of goods and services. I have no hesitation in stating that the latter are dissimilar to the applicants' goods (see the ANNEX; registration Nos. 1564104, 1564105, 1564107, 1282825 and 2115435). Further, I do not consider that: 'Books, manuals, user guides, magazines, newsletters, technical publications and printed matter, all relating to computers, computer software and their use and applications; all included in Class 16.' (registration No. 1564103) are similar either. The opponents are left with the ORACLE registration No. 1313522 'Computer programmes; tapes, discs and wires, all being magnetic and cassettes for use therewith, all for computers; parts and fittings for all the aforesaid goods; all included in Class 9; but not including any such goods relating to prophecies.' This includes computer software and hardware.

As I stated in the evidence summary, the opponents have a significant reputation in the former products. In her Declaration Ms Woodson thought a link would be established between the name ORACLE and the applicants' proposed use of this mark on its products because of this:

'The trade mark ORACLE has been used extensively in relation to computer software in the United Kingdom. ....I submit that the trade mark ORACLE has acquired a wide reputation and goodwill vesting in Oracle Corporation in the United Kingdom. .... Additionally, given the extensive use of the ORACLE trade mark it is submitted that members of the public may assume that goods bearing the Applicant's ORACLE trade mark are in some way connected with Oracle Corporation's business in the United Kingdom and may accordingly be confused as to the origin or nature of the products. This is especially likely in that Oracle Corporation provides support to major businesses such as Energis, BE Telecomms, Telewest Communications, Cellnet and the CPS.'

Thus the opponents contend that their mark - identical to the applicants' - is very distinctive on the market place. It might also be added that the mark itself is distinctive in relation to use on software (even though one might decipher in the name ORACLE an allusion to its meaning as a source of wisdom, and thus discern a laudatory reference). Obviously these observations are relevant to point (f) above.

Nevertheless, I do not believe that there is enough here to overwhelm the differences between the goods at issue, as required by point (e), such that the result would be a likelihood of confusion.

Turning to the case under s 5(2)(b), I find less comfort for the opponents here. Many of the products cited are again, software (Nos. 1369833 and 1561374) and, given my conclusions above, I do not believe there would be the necessary likelihood of confusion, particularly as these earlier marks of the opponents now contain excess material. The software items in registration No. 2152161 are include '..business, scientific, technical, commercial, educational and personal computing uses..', but are limited to '.. the fields of database management, local and global computer networks, and text, videos and graphics on demand'. In my view these are, as before, not similar enough for a plea under s 5(2)(b) to succeed.

The same applies to the products specified with mark No. 1561795, which are similar to those specified with registration No. 1564103; there I found insufficient similarity, and I do so here as well. Registrations Nos. 2057267 and 2101538 refer to hardware computer products. The specified 'communication devices' are for '..communication devices for business, scientific, technical, commercial, educational and personal ***computing uses***..'; thus limited I cannot, even with a significant effort, regard them as sufficiently similar to the applicants' 'Surveillance apparatus and instruments; closed circuit television cameras..' etc to find a likelihood of confusion. This ground also fails.

Before moving on, however, I think the recent case of *Marca Mode CV v Adidas AG and Adidas Benelux BV* dated 22 June 2000 (unpublished) is worth mentioning here. The ECJ said of Article 4(1)(b) (transposed into UK law in s 5(2)(b) - but the following would also apply to s 5(2)(a) as well):

> 'The reputation of a mark, where it is demonstrated, is thus an element which, amongst others, may have a certain importance. To this end, it may be observed that marks with a highly distinctive character, in particular because of their reputation, enjoy broader protection than marks with a less distinctive character ..... Nevertheless, the reputation of a mark does not give grounds for presuming the existence of a likelihood of confusion simply because of the existence of a likelihood of association in the strict sense.'

The Court felt that the concept of association of marks in the global assessment of the likelihood of confusion was over emphasised. It is not sufficient for the average consumer to merely associate marks in the sense that if prompted a consumer will call to mind another mark. Thus a mere possibility of confusion, even in situations where a mark clearly has a strong reputation, is not a valid ground for opposition to a trade mark.

This point is developed in a recent UK case *Peintures Du Lauragaise SA Trade Mark Application*, dated 5th November 1999 (Unpublished). Here it was said by the Appointed Person:

> 'It is of importance that in both the relevant provisions in the European Directive and in Section 5(2) of the 1994 Act what has to be identified is the likelihood of confusion, not simply the possibility of confusion. At the very highest, in the present case, in my view, it might be said that there was a possibility of confusion in the mind of certain members of the public but I consider that it was unreal to think in terms of there being a likelihood of confusion.'

It is conceivable that, against the background of the use the opponents have made of their mark, that some consumers might recall the opponents when they come across the mark ORACLE. But this is not enough for the case law. Even for those that did, I do not accept that they would be many or would do it for long, because the specialised nature of the products and the high degree of knowledge amongst the opponents' customers would, in my view, tend to minimise such occurrences. The employees of the businesses cited by Ms Woodson (see page 6, lines 8 and 9) would be experienced and intelligent professionals.

I think these conclusions also decide the s 5(4) ground as well. Following from *Wild Child* [1998] RPC 455, at page 460ff, to succeed in a passing off action, it is necessary for the applicants to establish, at the relevant date (4th March 1997) that: (i) they had acquired

goodwill under their mark; (ii) that use of the mark would amount to a misrepresentation likely to lead to confusion as to the origin of their goods; and (iii) that such confusion is likely to cause real damage to their goodwill. I have already found that the opponents have extensive goodwill in the production of software products under the name ORACLE, but concluded that this was not enough to result in a likelihood of confusion under s 5(2). It seems to me that the necessary misrepresentation required by the tort of passing off would not occur here, either. I might have come to a different conclusion if I had found evidence, before the relevant date, of software marketed by the opponents, associated with 'Surveillance apparatus and instruments; closed circuit television cameras..' etc. I have not, and this ground fails as well.

Finally, the opponents also plead s 5(3). It is clear that the similarity of goods is not a requirement under this section. However, for the section to bar registration of a mark certain conditions must apply. In *RBS Advanta v Barclays Bank plc* [1996] RPC, 307 Laddie J considered the meaning of the proviso to Section 10(6) of the Act, which deals with comparative advertising, but contains wording identical with the wording in Section 5(3) of the Act. Laddie J expressed the following view on the meaning of the above words in that context:

> 'At the most these words emphasise that the use of the mark must take advantage of it or be detrimental to it. In other words the use must either give some advantage to the defendant or inflict some harm on the character or repute of the registered mark which is above the level of *de minimis.*'

In *CORG1 Trade Mark* [1999] RPC 15, 549 at 558, Geoffrey Hobbs, acting as the Appointed Person, said:

> 'It seems to me ... that section 5(3) provides "extensive protection to those trade marks which have a reputation" (see the ninth recital to Council Directive 89/104/EEC) by specifying particular circumstances in which the protection enjoyed by an "earlier trade mark" may be taken to extend to cases involving the use of the same or similar mark in relation to goods or services which are not similar; those circumstances exist when: (i) the "earlier trade mark" can be shown to possess a distinctive character enhanced by a reputation acquired through use in relation to goods or services of the kind for which it is registered; and (ii) it can be shown that use of the later mark in relation to goods or services of the kind for which it is registered (or sought to be registered) would without due cause capture the distinctive character or repute of the "earlier trade mark" and exploit it positively (by taking unfair advantage of it) or negatively (by subjecting it to the effects of detrimental use).'

Taking the first point cited by Mr Hobbs: are the applicants exploiting this reputation 'by taking unfair advantage of it'?

Ms Woodson's contention was, because of the opponents' reputation, '..members of the public may assume that goods bearing the Applicant's ORACLE trade mark are in some way connected with Oracle Corporation's business in the UK..'.

I think it unlikely, however, that the opponents' reputation in software supply would be extended to 'surveillance apparatus'. Their expertise is in high quality programming for business applications and the closest they come to surveillance products is the research recorded in Exhibit BGW4 - which I discussed on pages 2 and 3 above - and concluded that it was insufficient to expand the nature of their reputation that it might encapsulate the applicants' very specific hardware. It is hard to see how the latter could gain an unfair advantage from using the name ORACLE on surveillance equipment when the character of the opponents' reputation is such as it is. Both might describe their products as 'high tec'; it is possible that surveillance equipment might require some software to be written (during development or otherwise) to enable its function - as is common with most electronic items today - but these are very tenuous links to form between the opponents' existing reputation and the applicants' goods. I think I could concede that, in using the mark on their products, some of the applicants' potential customers may recall the opponents, but this does not amount to taking an unfair advantage. The following passage from *Oasis Stores Ltd's Trade Mark Application* [1998] RPC 631 is relevant:

> 'I do not consider that simply being reminded of a similar trade mark with a reputation for dis-similar goods necessarily amounts to taking unfair advantage of the repute of that mark. The opponents chances of success may have been better if they were able to point to some specific aspect of their reputation ... which was likely, through (non-origin) association, to benefit the applicants' mark to some significant extent. However, in my judgement, the opponents have not established any such conceptual connection between their reputation for batteries etc, and the goods in respect of which the applicants' mark is to be used.'

The reputation the Opponents' have is of a specific type, resting, in my view, in the production of software in particular and in Information Technology in general. I do not believe that this reputation extends beyond this - their involvement in consultancy services, for example, is related to their expertise in software. It is difficult to see how registration of the applicants' mark will in some way parasitise on the goodwill the opponents enjoy.

But will registration of the applicants' mark negatively affect the opponents reputation?

Ms Woodson said that use of the applicants' mark would '..be detrimental to the Opponents..' rights and dilute its existing reputation in the mark ORACLE. A simple statement such as this is not, in my view, enough. The onus is on the opponents to establish their case under this section, that is, to show how the effects identified by Mr Justice Laddie above would be caused if the applicants' mark is registered. In the *General Motors Corporation v Ypion SA Opinion* of Advocate General Jacobs delivered on 26 November, when referring to Article 5(2) in the Directive, implemented in the Act as s 5(3), he said:

> 'It is to be noted in particular that Article 5(2), in contrast to Article 5(1)(b), does not refer to a mere risk or likelihood of its conditions being fulfilled. The wording is more positive: "takes unfair advantage of, or is detrimental to" (emphasis added). Moreover, the taking of unfair advantage or the suffering of detriment must be properly substantiated, that is to say, properly established to the satisfaction of the national court: the national court must be satisfied by evidence of actual detriment, or of unfair advantage. The precise method of adducing such proof should in my view be a matter for national rules of evidence and procedure, as in the case of establishing likelihood of confusion...'

As the *Oasis* decision states, dilution is a matter of the extent to which it occurs, as any use of the same or a similar mark for dis-similar goods or services is liable, to some extent, to dilute the distinctiveness of the earlier mark. Is there any evidence, however, that fair use of ORACLE on the applicants' goods would lead to somehow people finding ORACLE less distinctive for the opponents' products? Instinctively one would say that is not likely. I would go further and say it is rather improbable. And there is no evidence to suggest otherwise. This ground also fails, and the opposition thus fails.

The applicants are successful. They are entitled to an award of costs, and I order the opponents to pay to them £335.00. This sum is to be paid within seven days the expiry of the appeal period or within seven days of the final determination of this case if any appeal against this decision is unsuccessful.

Dated this 10th day of October 2000

Dr W J Trott
Principal Hearing Officer
For the Registrar
the Comptroller-General

ANNEX

Mark	Number	Date	Goods
ORACLE	1313522	18.06.1987	Computer programmes; tapes, discs and wires, all being magnetic and cassettes for use therewith, all for computers; parts and fittings for all the aforesaid goods; all included in Class 9; but not including any such goods relating to prophecies.
	1564103	02.03.1994	Books, manuals, user guides, magazines, newsletters, technical publications and printed matter, all relating to computers, computer software and their use and applications; all included in Class 16.
	1564104	02.03.1994	Data processing services; technical assistance to businesses in the field of computers, computer software, database development and design, information processing and management, communications and business operations; management consulting and business management assistance services relating to computers, computer software and computer systems; arranging and conducting trade shows; all included in Class 35.
	1564105	02.03.1994	Financing, insurance and brokerage services with respect to computers, computer software, computer systems and computer peripheral devices; all included in Class 36.
	2115435	12.11.1996	Telecommunications, communications, telephone, facsimile, telex, message collection and transmission, radio-paging and electronic mail services; transmission and reception of data and of information; on-line information services; data interchange services; transfer of data by telecommunications; telecommunications of information (including web pages); provision of telecommunication access and links to computer databases and to the Internet; satellite communication services; leasing or rental of apparatus, instruments, installations or components for use in the provision of all the aforementioned services; advisory, information and consultancy services relating to all the aforementioned services.
	1564107	02.03.1994	Education, instructional and training services; planning of and participation in conferences and seminars; all relating to computers, computer software and databases; all included in Class 41.
	1282825	01.10.1986	Computer design services; feasability study services relating to computers and to computer software; computer software consultancy services; information services relating to computers; all included in Class 42.

Mark	Number	Date	Goods
ORACLE SQL*PLUS	1369833	12.01.1989	Computer programs included in Class 9.
ORACLE MEDIA SERVER	1561374	04.02.1994	Computer programs for business, scientific, technical, commercial, educational, and personal computing uses; all included in Class 9.
	1561795	09.02.1994	Books, manuals, user guides, magazines, newsletters, technical publications and printed matter, all relating to computers, computer software and their use and applications; all included in Class 16.
ORACLE NETWORK COMPUTER	2057267	17.02.1996	Computers, computer peripheral devices and communication devices for business, scientific, technical, commercial, educational and personal computing uses, computer programs therefor.
ORACLE NC	2101538	01.06.1996	Computers, computer peripherals and communication devices for business, scientific, technical, commercial, educational and personal computing uses, computer programs therefor.
	2152161	27.11.1997	Computer programs for business, scientific, technical, commercial, educational and personal computing uses, in the fields of database management, local and global computer networks, and text, videos and graphics on demand.