

O-201-07

TRADE MARKS ACT 1994

IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION NO 2418442

TO REGISTER A TRADE MARK

BY THE TIMKEN COMPANY

IN CLASS 37

TRADE MARKS ACT 1994

IN THE MATTER OF AN APPLICATION NO 2418442 TO REGISTER A TRADE MARK BY THE TIMKEN COMPANY IN CLASS 37

DECISION AND GROUNDS OF DECISION

Background

1. On 3 April 2006 The Timken Company of 1835 Deuber Avenue, S.W., Canton, Ohio 44706, United States of America applied under the Trade Marks Act 1994 to register a trade mark. Subsequent to the examination report being issued the trade mark applied for was amended to:

FRICION MANAGEMENT SOLUTIONS

2. Registration is sought for the following services:

Class 37

Design, selection and provision of services and products to lengthen the life of industrial equipment, namely machines and vehicles which use bearings and accessories therefore, and lubricants, and repair of the same.

3. Objection was taken against the application under Section 3(1)(b) and (c) of the Act because the mark consists exclusively of the words **FRICION MANAGEMENT SOLUTIONS**, being a sign which may serve in trade to designate the intended purpose of the services e.g. to provide solutions to manage (or control) friction in industrial equipment.

4. Objection was also taken under Rule 8 of the Trade Mark Rules 2000 because some of the services in the class 37 specification of services were either unclear or proper to another class.

5. Following a hearing which was held on 19 January 2007 at which the applicant was represented by Mr Reddington of Jones Day, their trade mark attorneys the objection was maintained and Notice of Final Refusal was subsequently issued.

6. I am now asked under Section 76 of the Act and Rule 62(2) of the Trade Mark Rules 2000 to state in writing the grounds of my decision and the materials used in arriving at it.

7. No evidence has been put before me. I have, therefore, only the prima facie case to consider.

The Law

8. Section 3(1)(b) and (c) of the Act reads as follows:

“3.-(1) The following shall not be registered-

(b) trade marks which are devoid of any distinctive character,

(c) trade marks which consist exclusively of signs or indications which may serve, in trade, to designate the kind, quality, quantity, intended purpose, value, geographical origin, the time of production of goods or of rendering of services, or other characteristics of goods or services,”

The case for registration

9. In correspondence prior to the hearing Mr Reddington made several submissions in support of this application. Mr Reddington contested that the mark FRICTION MANAGEMENT SOLUTIONS is neither devoid of any distinctive character nor directly descriptive of the services applied for. Although it may be suggestive rather than descriptive the mark, when viewed as a whole, does not directly convey the characteristics or features of the applicant’s services. Mr Reddington went on to make the following statement:

“The correct approach when assessing the distinctiveness of a mark, in relation to the specified goods or services, is to consider the mark globally, without dissecting it into its component elements. In the present case, whilst the words “friction management” may perhaps be considered purely descriptive and therefore non-distinctive in relation to the specified services, the overall combination FRICTION MANAGEMENT SOLUTIONS may not.”

10. Mr Reddington then submits that this mark does not convey a message with a meaning which is immediately apparent. Rather, he suggests that a multi-stage reasoning process is required “before the mental leap between the word and the product is made”.

11. Mr Reddington refers to seven earlier registered trade marks, all of which contain the word SOLUTIONS. Details of these registrations are at Annex A.

12. Finally, Mr Reddington makes reference to the decision of the Court of First Instance in relation to the trade mark EASYBANK and to the comments made by Advocate General Ruiz-Jarabo Colomer in relation to the trade mark COMPANYLINE.

13. At the hearing no additional submissions were made. Essentially Mr Reddington relied on the submissions already made in correspondence and on the seven earlier registered trade marks which are identified above.

Decision

14. In a judgement issued by the European Court of Justice on 23 October 2003, *Wm. Wrigley Jr. Company v. Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (OHIM)*, Case - 191/01 P, (the DOUBLEMINT case), the Court gives guidance on the scope and purpose of Article 7(1)(c) of the Community Trade Mark Regulation (equivalent to Section 3(1)(c) of the Trade Marks Act). Paragraphs 28 - 32 of the judgement are reproduced below:

- “28. Under Article 4 of Regulation No 40/94, a Community trade mark may consist of any signs capable of being represented graphically, provided that they are capable of distinguishing the goods or services of one undertaking from those of other undertakings.
29. Article 7(1)(c) of Regulation No 40/94 provides that trade marks which consist exclusively of signs or indications which may serve, in trade, to designate the kind, quality, quantity, intended purpose, value, geographic origin, time of production of the goods or rendering of the service, or other characteristics of the goods or service are not to be registered.
30. Accordingly, signs and indications which may serve in trade to designate the characteristics of the goods or service in respect of which registration is sought are, by virtue of Regulation No 40/94, deemed incapable, by their very nature, of fulfilling the indication-of-origin function of the trade mark, without prejudice to the possibility of their acquiring distinctive character through use under article 7(3) of Regulation No 40/94.
31. By prohibiting the registration as Community trade marks of such signs and indications, Article 7(1)(c) of Regulation No 40/94 pursues an aim which is in the public interest, namely that descriptive signs or indications relating to the characteristics of goods or services in respect of which registration is sought may be freely used by all. That provision accordingly prevents such signs and indications from being reserved to one undertaking alone because they have been registered as trade marks (see, inter alia, in relation to the identical provisions of Article 3(1)(c) of First Council Directive 89/104/EEC of 21 December 1988 to approximate the laws of Member States relating to trade marks (OJ 1989 L 40, p. 1), *Windsurfing Chiemsee*, paragraph 25, and Joined Cases C-53/01 to C-55/01 *Linde and Others* [2003] ECR I-3161, paragraph 73).
32. In order for OHIM to refuse to register a trade mark under Article 7(1)(c) of Regulation No 40/94, it is not necessary that the signs and indications composing the mark that are referred to in that article actually be in use at the time of the application for registration in a way that is descriptive of goods or services such as those in relation to which the application is filed, or of characteristics of those goods or services. It is sufficient, as the wording of that provision itself

indicates, that such signs and indications could be used for such purposes. A sign must therefore be refused registration under that provision if at least one of its possible meanings designates a characteristic of the goods or services concerned.”

15. I also take account of the decision of the European Court of Justice in *Postkantoor* (Case C-363/99) which again considered the registrability of combinations of descriptive words. Paragraphs 96 – 100 of the judgement are reproduced below:

- “96. If a mark, such as that at issue in the main proceedings, which consists of a word produced by a combination of elements, is to be regarded as descriptive for the purpose of Article 3(1)(c) of the Directive, it is not sufficient that each of its components may be found to be descriptive. The word itself must be found to be so.
97. It is not necessary that the signs and indications composing the mark that are referred to in Article 3(1)(c) of the Directive actually be in use at the time of the application for registration in a way that is descriptive of goods or services such as those in relation to which the application is filed, or of characteristics of those goods or services. It is sufficient, as the wording of that provision itself indicates, that those signs and indications could be used for such purposes. A word must therefore be refused registration under that provision if at least one of its possible meanings designates a characteristic of the goods or services concerned (see to that effect, in relation to the identical provisions of Article 7(1)(c) of Council Regulation (EC) No 40/94 of 20 December 1993 on the Community trade mark (OJ 1994 L 11, p. 1), Case C-191/01 P *OHIM v Wrigley* [2003] ECR I-0000, paragraph 32).
98. As a general rule, a mere combination of elements, each of which is descriptive of characteristics of the goods or services in respect of which registration is sought, itself remains descriptive of those characteristics for the purposes of Article 3(1)(c) of the Directive. Merely bringing those elements together without introducing any unusual variations, in particular as to syntax or meaning, cannot result in anything other than a mark consisting exclusively of signs or indications which may serve, in trade, to designate characteristics of the goods or services concerned.
99. However, such a combination may not be descriptive within the meaning of Article 3(1)(c) of the Directive, provided that it creates an impression which is sufficiently far removed from that produced by the simple combination of those elements. In the case of a word mark, which is intended to be heard as much as to be read, that condition must be satisfied as regards both the aural and the visual impression produced by the mark.
100. Thus, a mark consisting of a word composed of elements, each of which is descriptive of characteristics of the goods or services in respect of which registration is sought, is itself descriptive of those

characteristics for the purposes of Article 3(1)(c) of the Directive, unless there is a perceptible difference between the word and the mere sum of its parts: that assumes either that, because of the unusual nature of the combination in relation to the goods or services, the word creates an impression which is sufficiently far removed from that produced by the mere combination of meanings lent by the elements of which it is composed, with the result that the word is more than the sum of its parts, or that the word has become part of everyday language and has acquired its own meaning, with the result that it is now independent of its components. In the second case, it is necessary to ascertain whether a word which has acquired its own meaning is not itself descriptive for the purpose of the same provision.”

16. Section 3(1)(c) of the Act has common roots to Art. 7(1)(c) of the CTMR, and is substantially identical to that provision. Accordingly, the ECJ’s guidance with regard to that provision may be taken to apply equally to Section 3(1)(c) of the Act. The provision excludes signs which may serve, in trade, to designate the kind of services or other characteristics of services. It follows that in order to decide this issue it must first be determined whether the mark designates a characteristic of the services in question.

17. This is an application to register the trade mark FRICTION MANAGEMENT SOLUTIONS. Each of these words are well known dictionary words and there is no need for me to refer specifically to their individual dictionary meanings. I must, in any case, consider the mark in its entirety, bearing in mind the meaning of these individual elements in relation to the services applied for. In relation to such services I have concluded that the mark will be perceived in one way – a commercial activity that addresses friction related problems. In his letter of 8 August 2006 Mr Reddington conceded that “...the words “friction management” may perhaps be considered purely descriptive and therefore non-distinctive in relation to the specified services...”. I would go further and say that it is not a case that they “may perhaps” be so evaluated, they are directly descriptive.

18. Under cover of a letter dated 19 April 2006 Jones Day filed a certified copy of the corresponding United States application in support of the priority claim. This bundle includes a brochure which provides details of the services provided by the applicant. I note the following statements made within that brochure which I have flagged for ease of reference:

“Friction isn’t good for moving parts. And it’s not good for business processes either. With Timken friction management solutions, you’ll find less of both”.

“Complementing our core products is an ever-growing line of friction management solutions including lubricants, single-point lubricants, maintenance tools and safety equipment, condition monitoring systems and surface finishes that keep systems running smoothly”.

“By bringing together two world leaders in friction management technology, Timken is able to provide you with an expanding line of bearings or related products...”.

“From breadth of product to product quality, our friction management solutions satisfy a wide range of needs, giving you the ability to add lasting value for your customers”.

“Here’s a quick view of our friction management solutions.”

19. Although this is use of this combination of words by the applicant it does demonstrate how this combination may be, and in fact is, used as a direct description of the services in question.

20. Turning to the services applied for, I have already noted that some of the terms are either not proper to Class 37 or are considered too vague for classification purposes; nevertheless the core services for which registration is sought are quite clear. The applicant appears to provide solutions for friction management which are individually tailored to meet individual needs. In a letter dated 8 August 2006 the applicant sought to address these specification queries by adding classes 40, 41 and 42 and by transferring specific services from Class 37 to these classes. However, this proposal was dependant on the objections under Section 3(1)(b) and (c) of the Act being waived. Accordingly no action has been taken in respect of these proposals.

21. It is also clear that such services will be directed engineers and manufacturers of machines and vehicles which use bearings and lubricants. Furthermore I accept that such consumers are likely to be knowledgeable and perhaps even experts in this particular field and that such services would be considered carefully before any commercial decisions were made or contracts signed. The fact that the consumers are deemed to be knowledgeable or even perhaps expert in this particular field does not by itself render the objection under Section 3(1)(c) of the Act invalid. The applicant provides tailored solution to friction management problems. The applicant itself describes these services as friction management solutions and it appears to me that this a perfectly apt term for other traders to use to describe the same services.

22. The specification of services is quite wide ranging but in my view the objection is equally valid in respect of all services applied for as the trade mark applied for is equally descriptive for each of them.

23. Mr Reddington has referred me to seven registered marks which incorporate the word SOLUTIONS and has suggested that these should influence the outcome of this application. I do not accept this.

24. I am unaware of the circumstances surrounding the acceptance of these marks and they are of little if any assistance in determining the outcome of this application. I draw support for this from the judgement of Jacob J in *British Sugar* [1996] R.P.C. 281 at 305 where he stated:

“Both sides invited me to have regard to the state of the register. Some traders have registered marks consisting of or incorporating the word “Treat”. I do not think this assists the factual enquiry one way or the other, save perhaps to confirm that this is the sort of word in which traders would like a monopoly. In particular the state of the register does not tell you what is actually

happening out in the market and in any event one has no idea what the circumstances were which led the registrar to put the marks concerned on the register. It has long been held under the old Act that comparison with other marks on the register is in principle irrelevant when considering a particular mark tendered for registration, see *e.g. MADAME Trade Mark* and the same must be true under the 1994 Act. I disregard the state of the register evidence.”

25. I am aware that the trade mark applied for is a combination of the three dictionary words FRICTION, MANAGEMENT and SOLUTIONS. In the context of the services applied for the meaning of each word will be clearly understood by the relevant consumer and their combination FRICTION MANAGEMENT SOLUTIONS will be perceived as a combination of words indicating that the services relate to the provision of solutions for friction management problems.

26. Consequently, I have concluded that the mark applied for consists exclusively of signs which may serve, in trade, to designate the kind of services and is, therefore, excluded from registration by Section 3(1)(c) of the Act.

27. Having found that this marks is to be excluded from registration by Section 3(1)(c) of the Act, that effectively ends the matter, but in case I am found to be wrong in this decision, I will go on to determine the matter under section 3(1)(b) of the Act.

28. The approach to be adopted when considering the issue of distinctiveness under Section 3(1)(b) of the Act has recently been summarised by the European Court of Justice in paragraphs 37, 39 to 41 and 47 of its Judgment in *Joined Cases C-53/01 to C-55/01 Linde AG, Windward Industries Inc and Rado Uhren AG* (8th April 2003) in the following terms:

“37. It is to be noted at the outset that Article 2 of the Directive provides that any sign may constitute a trade mark provided that it is, first, capable of being represented graphically and, second, capable of distinguishing the goods and services of one undertaking from those of other undertakings.

.....

39. Next, pursuant to the rule 1 Article 3(1)(b) of the Directive, trade marks which are devoid of distinctive character are not to be registered or if registered are liable to be declared invalid.

40. For a mark to possess distinctive character within the meaning of that provision it must serve to identify the product in respect of which registration is applied for as originating from a particular undertaking, and thus to distinguish that product from products of other undertakings (see *Philips*, paragraph 35).

41. In addition, a trade mark’s distinctiveness must be assessed by reference to, first, the goods or services in respect of which registration is sought and, second, the perception of the relevant persons, namely the consumers of the goods or services. According to the Court’s case-law, that means the presumed expectations of an average consumer of

the category of goods or services in question, who is reasonably well informed and reasonably observant and circumspect (see Case C-210/96 *Gut Springenheide and Tusky* [1998] ECR I-4657, paragraph 31, and *Philips*, paragraph 63).

.....

47. As paragraph 40 of this judgment makes clear, distinctive character means, for all trade marks, that the mark must be capable of identifying the product as originating from a particular undertaking, and thus distinguishing it from those of other undertakings.”

29. I must determine whether the trade mark applied for is capable of enabling the relevant consumer of the services in question to identify the origin of the services and thereby to distinguish them from other undertakings. In *OHIM v SAT.1* (Case C-329/02) the European Court of Justice provided the following guidance at paragraph 41:

“41 Registration of a sign as a trade mark is not subject to a finding of a specific level of linguistic or artistic creativity or imaginativeness on the part of the proprietor of the trade mark. It suffices that the trade mark should enable the relevant public to identify the origin of the goods or services protected thereby and to distinguish them from those of other undertakings.”

30. For the same reasons that I found this trade mark is to be excluded by the provisions of Section 3(1)(c) of the Act I have concluded that the relevant consumer of the services in question would not consider this mark to denote trade origin. The average consumer of these services will, upon encountering the words *FRICITION MANAGEMENT SOLUTIONS*, perceive them as no more than an indication that they relate to the provision of solutions to friction management problems. That is why it will not be seen as a badge of origin. I am not persuaded that the trade mark applied for is sufficient, in terms of bestowing distinctive character on the sign as a whole, to conclude that it would serve, in trade, to distinguish the services of the applicant from those of other traders.

31. I have concluded that the mark applied for will not be identified as a trade mark without first educating the public that it is a trade mark. I therefore conclude that the mark applied for is devoid of any distinctive character and is thus excluded from *prima facie* acceptance under Section 3(1)(b) of the Act.

Conclusion

32. In this decision I have considered all the documents filed by the applicant and all the arguments submitted to me in relation to this application and, for the reasons given, it is refused under the terms of Section 37(4) of the Act because it fails to qualify under Sections 3(1)(b) and 3(1)(c) of the Act.

Dated this day of July 2007

**A J PIKE
For the Registrar
The Comptroller-General**

ANNEX A

Section 1

Class 37	CTM 2,715,530	24 May 2002	Registered	English/French
<p>SIGN & GRAPHIC SOLUTIONS MADE SIMPLE</p> <p>Application Date: 24 May 2002 Registration Date: 7 Jan 2004</p> <p>Class 37: [English] Sign construction maintenance and repair services; all included in class 37. Class 16: [English] Signs all being flexible and engraved, screen printed or of computer set lettering and all being for exterior or interior use; all included in class 16. Class 20: [English] Signs all being rigid and engraved, screen printed or of computer set lettering, and all being for exterior or interior use; all included in class 20. Class 35: [English] Advertising; business assistance; business management; information and advisory services; retail services in relation to signs. Class 40: [English] Custom manufacture of signs; printing reproductions; printing all related to signs. Class 42: [English] Sign and banner lettering services; computer-aided design services; artwork design; drawing; consultancy services relating to retail sign making services.</p> <p>Official languages: English/French</p> <p>Owner: Fastsigns International, Inc 2550 Midway Rd, Ste 150 Carrollton, 75006 TX United States</p> <p>Service: Baker & McKenzie LLP 100 New Bridge Street London EC4V 6JA United Kingdom Email: TradeMarks.Enquires@bakernet.com</p> <p>Received by OHIM: 24 May 2002 Journal: Bulletin 009/2004-B p1338. Bulletin 047/2003-A p345.</p> <p>Week Ending Recent History 03 Jun 2002 Added 04 Jun 2002 New-Class Old:None New-App-Date Old:None New-Wordmark New-Proprietor 13 Jan 2003 New-Class:40 New-Goods 23 May 2003 Status:Advertised 07 Jan 2004 Status:Registered 09 Feb 2004 Other-Update 08 Jun 2005 Other-Update</p>				

Class 37

UK M754,589

16 Feb 2001

Registered

INDUSTRIAL IT SOLUTIONS

Application Date: 16 Feb 2001

Originating Office: CH

Actual application number: 754589

Priority date: 16.08.2000

Class 11: Lighting fixtures, as well as heating, cooling and ventilating apparatus and fans, sanitary installations.
Class 17: Insulating materials.

Class 35: Advertising; public relations; dissemination of advertising matter; market research; television advertisements; publication of advertising texts; marketing; dissemination of advertising material; business information; sales promotion.

Class 37: Construction; repair work; pipeline construction and maintenance; underwater construction.

Class 40: Energy production; processing of waste; processing of oil; air conditioning; air purification; air deodorising; processing of metals; recycling of waste and refuse; processing of paper; refining services; processing of water; rental of generators; processing of fabrics and textiles.

Owner: ABB Automation Group AG

Binzmühlestrasse 93,

Zürich

CH

CH-8050

Agent: ABB Business Services Ltd

Haselstrasse 16,

Baden

CH

CH-5400

Protected

Additional Agents (NB unindexed): Intellectual Property/Abt. SLE-I

Week Ending Recent History

18 May 2001 Added

29 Jun 2001 Status:Advert1

19 Oct 2001 Status:Registered

Reserved Words to 20 Sep 2005
 United Kingdom Trade Marks to 21 Jul 2006
 European Community Trade Marks to 21 Jul 2006
 International Trade Marks to 21 Jul 2006

Section 1

Class 37	UK 2,108,252	22 Aug 1996	Registered	Jnl 6151,14015
<p>DISPLAY SOLUTIONS</p> <p>Application Date: 22 Aug 1996 Registration Date: 28 Feb 1997</p> <p>Class 9: Electric and luminous signs, message centers, and scoreboards; electric and luminous portable and stationary traffic warning signs; and parts therefor, namely, monochrome and color lenses, fiber optic cables, temperature cables, metal reflectors and louvres and instructions manuals, sold as a unit. Class 37: Installation of electric and luminous signs, message centers, scoreboards and portable and stationary traffic warning signs, Class 40: Custom design and manufacture of electric and luminous signs, message centers, scoreboards and portable and stationary traffic warning signs.</p> <p>Owner: Display Solutions, Inc 6301 Best Friend Road Norcross Georgia 30071 United States of America</p> <p>Agent: Boulton Wade Tennant Verulam Gardens 70 Gray's Inn Road London WC1X 8BT</p> <p>Journal: 6151,14015</p> <p>Week Ending Recent History 30 Aug 1996 Added 15 Nov 1996 Status:Advert1 Journal-Set 22 Nov 1996 New-Goods 28 Feb 1997 Registration 07 Mar 1997 Status:Registered 13 Feb 2002 Other-Update</p>				

Section 1

Class 37	UK 2,162,592	31 Mar 1998	Registered	Jnl 6233,7618
SOLUTIONS FOR FITNESS				
Application Date: 31 Mar 1998 Registration Date: 23 Oct 1998				
Class 35: Marketing services. Class 37: Repair, installation and maintenance of fitness equipment and facilities. Class 42: Design of fitness facilities.				
Owner: Powersport International Ltd Queens Road Bridgend Industrial Estate Bridgend Mid Glamorgan CF31 3UT				
Journal: 6233,7618				
Week Ending Recent History 03 Apr 1998 Added 10 Jul 1998 Status:Advert1 Journal-Set 23 Oct 1998 Registration 30 Oct 1998 Status:Registered 13 Feb 2002 Other-Update 02 Aug 2002 Proprietor-Details				

Section 1

Class 37	UK 2,235,175	7 Jun 2000	Registered	Jnl 6352,19245
REAL PEOPLE, REAL SOLUTIONS				
Application Date: 7 Jun 2000 Registration Date: 28 Dec 2001				
Class 35: Telemarketing, fulfillment services for others, namely, order processing and coupon redemption. Class 37: Computer hardware maintenance services. Class 41: Development of instructional materials for others in the field of courseware development and computer-based training design. Class 42: Technical support services for the computer industry, namely, technical support services to users of computer software and hardware; computer services, namely, computer programming, software design and development, software application development, data processing consulting, systems operation, and software maintenance for others; computer functional testing consulting services for computer software producers and users; customer support service, namely, providing information regarding computers through a customer services telephone call centre; database conversion services; custom writing and text editing and language translating services for product information for others, namely, user and reference documentation, maintenance documentation and development of product information to be published by means of a global computer network.				
Owner: Sykes Enterprises, Inc 100 North Tampa Street, Suite 3900 Tampa Florida 33602 United States of America				
Agent: Boulton Wade Tennant Verulam Gardens 70 Gray's Inn Road London WC1X 8BT				
Journal: 6352,19245				
Week Ending Recent History 16 Jun 2000 Added 06 Oct 2000 Journal-Set 03 Nov 2000 Status:Advert1 28 Dec 2001 Status:Registered 28 Dec 2001 Registration 13 Feb 2002 Other-Update				

Section 1

Class 37	UK M747,984	9 Oct 2000	Registered
<p>UNITED ICT SOLUTIONS Application Date: 9 Oct 2000</p> <p>Originating Office: BX Actual application number: 747984 Priority date: 18.05.2000</p> <p>Class 16: Blank data carriers in the form of tapes, cards, discs and other similar products made of paper or cardboard, for automation purposes; printed matter, particularly books, manuals and brochures relating to automation and the integrated services provided by organisations and networks. Class 35: Recruitment and selection of personnel; provision of personnel; personnel consulting; secondment of personnel; information relating to personnel; administration, particularly salary and staff administration; advice on business organisation and management. Class 37: Maintenance, repair and installation of network apparatus and data processing apparatus, as well as of parts and accessories thereof. Class 41: Education; training and courses; training and instruction of personnel; publication of printed matter, including by electronic means. Class 42: Adjustment, improvement and updating of software; technical advice relating to the purchase and implementation of hardware, software, networks and data processing apparatus; automation and electronic office services.</p> <p>Owner: United Intellectual Property B.V. P.J. Oudweg 61, Almere NL NL-1314 CK</p> <p>Agent: Shield Mark B.V. Overschiestraat, 61, Amsterdam NL NL-1062 XD</p> <p>Protected</p> <p>Week Ending Recent History 02 Feb 2001 Added 05 Apr 2002 New-Proprietor Old:Unique International N.V. 12 Apr 2002 Other-Update 10 May 2002 Status:Advertised 06 Sep 2002 Status:Registered</p>			

Class 37	CTM 1,024,116 22 Dec 1998 Registered English/French
<h2 style="text-align: center;">WATER SOLUTIONS</h2>	
Application Date: 22 Dec 1998 Registration Date: 29 May 2000	
<p>Class 37: [English] Maintenance of infrastructure for supply, transportation and storage of water; maintenance of infrastructure for collection, transportation, storage and disposal of waste and sewage.</p> <p>Class 39: [English] Supply, transportation and storage of water; collection, transportation, storage and disposal of waste and sewage; supply of infrastructure for supply, transportation and storage of water; supply of infrastructure for collection, transportation, storage and disposal of waste and sewage.</p> <p>Class 40: [English] Treatment of water; purification of water; treatment of waste and sewage; disposal of waste and sewage.</p> <p>Class 42: [English] Laboratory services; research and development; scientific analysis.</p>	
Official languages: English/French	
Owner: E J Stiell Group Ltd Bothwell Road Hamilton ML3 0DL United Kingdom	
Service: Murgitroyd & Company Scotland House 165-169 Scotland Street Glasgow G5 8PL United Kingdom Email: mail@murgitroyd.com	
Received by OHIM: 22 Dec 1998	
Journal: Bulletin 054/2000-B p585. Bulletin 086/1999-A p400.	
Week Ending Recent History 02 Nov 1999 Status: Advertised 29 May 2000 Status: Registered 10 Dec 2003 Other-Update	

Section 1

Databases:	RW UK CTM IR
Classes:	37
Match Woru:	solution-
Status:	Registered Pending Lapsed Abandoned

Number of Hits:	372
-----------------	-----