

**IN THE HEARINGS AND MEDIATION DEPARTMENT OF THE
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OFFICE OF SINGAPORE**

[2022] SGIPOS 17

Trade Mark Nos. 40201907176S and 40201926155W

**IN THE MATTER OF A TRADE MARK APPLICATIONS BY
SOCIÉTÉ DES PRODUITS NESTLÉ S.A.**

... Applicant

**AND OPPOSITION THERETO BY
THE A2 MILK COMPANY LIMITED**

... Opponent

GROUNDS OF DECISION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
PROCEDURAL HISTORY	4
GROUND OF OPPOSITION	5
OPPONENT’S EVIDENCE	5
THE ATWO ILLUMA MARK	5
THE ATWO ILLUMCARE MARK.....	6
APPLICANT’S EVIDENCE	6
THE ATWO ILLUMA MARK	6
THE ATWO ILLUMCARE MARK.....	6
APPLICABLE LAW AND BURDEN OF PROOF	6
GROUND OF OPPOSITION UNDER SECTION 8(2)(B)	7
SIMILARITY OF MARKS	8
MARKS-SIMILARITY ASSESSMENT	10
<i>Visual similarity</i>	10
<i>Aural similarity</i>	12
<i>Conceptual similarity</i>	13
CONCLUSION ON OPPOSITION UNDER SECTION 8(2)(B)	15
GROUND OF OPPOSITION UNDER SECTION 8(7)(A)	15
CONCLUSION ON OPPOSITION UNDER SECTION 8(7)(A)	16
OVERALL CONCLUSION	17
ANNEX 1: OPPONENT’S TRADE MARKS.....	18

The a2 Milk Company Limited

v

Société des Produits Nestlé S.A.

[2022] SGIPOS 17

Trade Mark Nos. 40201907176S and 40201926155W

Principal Assistant Registrar Tan Mei Lin

30 August 2022

30 November 2022

Principal Assistant Registrar Tan Mei Lin:

Introduction

1 This is a consolidated opposition against the following two trade mark applications (collectively the “**Subject Applications**”) filed by Société des Produits Nestlé S.A. (the “**Applicant**”):

Trade Mark No.	Mark	Specification
40201907176S	 (the “ Atwo Illumina Mark ”)	<u>Class 5</u> Dietetic food, beverages and substances adapted for medical and clinical use; food and food substances for babies; infant formula; lacteal flour for babies; powdered milk for babies; food and food substances for medical use for children and invalids. <u>Class 29</u> Milk and milk products; powdered milk; preparations and beverages based on milk; milk substitutes; milk beverages, milk predominating.

40201926155W	 (the “ Atwo Illumcare Mark ”)	<u>Class 5</u> Dietetic food, beverages and substances adapted for medical and clinical use; food and food substances for babies; infant formula; lacteal flour for babies; powdered milk for babies; food and food substances for medical use for children and invalids; food and food substances for nursing mothers for medical use; nutritional supplements for medical purposes for pregnant women and nursing mothers; nutritional supplements; dietary supplements for medical use; nutritional and dietary supplements for medical use; vitamin preparations, mineral-based preparations; dietary fiber; vitamins; vitamin preparations and substances; dietary and nutritional supplements. <u>Class 29</u> Milk and milk products; powdered milk; preparations and beverages based on milk; milk substitutes; milk beverages, milk predominating; milk based beverages containing cereals and / or chocolate; yogurt; soya milk (milk substitutes).
--------------	---	---

2 I will refer to the Atwo Illuma Mark and the Atwo Illumcare Mark collectively as the “**Application Marks**”.

3 The Subject Applications are opposed by The a2 Milk Company (the “**Opponent**”). The Opponent is the registered proprietor in Singapore of numerous trade marks for “A2” and containing “A2” and “a2”. While the Opponent relies on the trade mark registrations set out in Annex 1 (collectively referred to as the “**Opponent’s Trade Marks**”) as earlier trade marks in these

proceedings, the primary mark which the Opponent focussed on is the following:

TM No.	Trade Mark	Goods	Application Date
T1320092Z	A2	<u>Class 05</u> Dried milk preparations being food for babies; milk powder for foodstuffs for babies; milk powder for nutritional purposes for babies; powdered milk foods for infants. <u>Class 29</u> Milk and milk products, cream (dairy products), milk powder, full cream milk powder, skim milk powder, whey and whey products, butter, cheese, milk beverages, other dairy products in this class.	12/12/2013

(the “**A2 Word Mark**”). I will do the same in this decision as I agree that the A2 Word Mark represents the Opponent’s best case in that if the Application Marks are not similar to it, they would be even more dissimilar to the rest of the Opponent’s Trade Marks.

4 This is the second trade mark opposition action commenced by the Opponent against the Applicant that has come up for hearing before this tribunal. The earlier opposition, *The a2 Milk Company Limited v Société des*

Produits Nestlé S.A. [2022] SGIPOS 12 (the “**Prior Opposition**”), concerned



the mark (the “**Opposed Mark**”). In that opposition, I found, among other things, the Opposed Mark to be more dissimilar than similar to the A2 Word Mark and allowed the Opposed Mark to proceed to registration.

Procedural History

5 The Subject Applications were filed by the Applicant on 2 April 2019 (in the case of the Atwo Illuma Mark) and 2 December 2019 (in the case of the Atwo Illumcare Mark). The Atwo Illuma Mark was accepted and published for opposition purposes on 8 August 2019 while the Atwo Illumcare Mark was accepted and published for opposition purposes on 7 February 2020.

6 The Opponent filed its Notice of Opposition in respect of the Atwo Illuma Mark on 9 December 2019, and in respect of the Atwo Illumcare Mark on 5 June 2020. The Applicant filed its Counter-Statement in respect of the Atwo Illuma Mark on 5 February 2020, and in respect of the Atwo Illumcare Mark on 28 July 2020.

7 Evidence was filed by the parties as follows:

(a) In respect of the Atwo Illuma Mark – the Opponent filed its evidence in support of the opposition on 11 November 2020. The Applicant filed its evidence in support of the application on 22 March 2021. The Opponent filed its evidence in reply on 11 February 2022.

(b) In respect of the Atwo Illumcare Mark – the Opponent filed its evidence in support of the opposition on 24 December 2020. The

Applicant filed its evidence in support of the application on 22 March 2021. The Opponent filed its evidence in reply on 11 February 2022.

8 Following the close of evidence, a pre-hearing review for the Subject Applications was held on 7 March 2022. The parties made their oral submissions before me on 30 August 2022.

Grounds of opposition

9 The Opponent relies on Sections 8(2)(b) and 8(7)(a) of the Trade Marks Act 1998 (“**the Act**”) in this opposition.

Opponent’s evidence

The Atwo Illuma Mark

10 The Opponent’s evidence in relation to the Atwo Illuma Mark comprises:

- (a) a Statutory Declaration made by Susan Massasso, Chief Growth and Brand Officer of the Opponent, on 10 November 2020;
- (b) a Statutory Declaration made by Dr. Andrew John Clarke, Chief Scientific Officer of the Opponent, on 9 November 2020;
- (c) a Statutory Declaration in reply made by Jaron James McVicar, Chief Legal and Sustainability Officer and Company Secretary of the Opponent, on 25 January 2022.
- (d) a Statutory Declaration in reply made by the same Dr. Andrew Clarke on 26 January 2022.

The Atwo Illumcare Mark

11 The Opponent's evidence in relation to the Atwo Illumcare Mark comprises:

- (a) a Statutory Declaration made by the same Susan Massasso on 8 December 2020;
- (b) a Statutory Declaration made by the same Dr. Andrew John Clarke on 21 December 2020;
- (c) a Statutory Declaration in reply made by the same Jaron James McVicar on 25 January 2022.
- (d) a Statutory Declaration in reply made by the same Dr. Andrew Clarke on 26 January 2022.

Applicant's evidence

The Atwo Illuma Mark

12 The Applicant's evidence in relation to the Atwo Illuma Mark comprises a Statutory Declaration made by Isabelle De Blic-Hamon, Senior Legal Counsel IP of the Applicant, on 8 March 2021.

The Atwo Illumcare Mark

13 The Applicant's evidence in relation to the Atwo Illumcare Mark comprises a Statutory Declaration made by the same Isabelle De Blic-Hamon on 8 March 2021.

Applicable law and burden of proof

14 There is no overall onus on the Applicant before the Registrar during

examination or in opposition proceedings. The undisputed burden of proof in the present case falls on the Opponent.

Ground of Opposition under Section 8(2)(b)

15 Section 8(2)(b) of the Act reads:

8.—(2) A trade mark shall not be registered if because —

...

(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.

16 To succeed in an opposition under this ground, an opponent must establish that:

(a) the competing marks are similar;

(b) the goods and services of the competing marks are identical or similar; and

(c) there exists a likelihood of confusion arising from the similarities in (a) and (b) above.

17 These conditions are assessed “step-by-step.” As stated by the Court of Appeal in the landmark decision of *Staywell Hospitality Group Pty Ltd v Starwood Hotels & Resorts Worldwide, Inc and another and another appeal* [2014] 1 SLR 911 (“*Staywell*”) at [15]:

... Under the step-by-step approach, the three requirements of similarity of marks, similarity of goods or services, and likelihood of confusion arising from the two similarities, are assessed systematically. The first two elements are assessed individually before the final element which is assessed in the round.

18 Each step, or element, in the sequence must be cleared before moving on to the next. If the marks are found to be dissimilar, the inquiry ends, and the opposition under Section 8(2)(b) of the Act will fail. The same applies for the second step: if the respective goods/services are found to be dissimilar, the opposition under this section will likewise fail. It is only if these first two steps are crossed that it falls to be considered, under the third step, whether there exists a likelihood of confusion on the part of the public.

Similarity of Marks

19 The key principles relating to the evaluation for marks-similarity have been set out in a number of decisions of the Court of Appeal, including *Staywell* and *Hai Tong Co (Pte) Ltd v Ventree Singapore Pte Ltd* [2013] 2 SLR 941 (“***Hai Tong***”). These can be summarised as follows:

(a) There are three aspects of this evaluation, namely, visual, aural and conceptual similarities. These aid the court’s evaluation by signposting its inquiry. There is no requirement that all three similarities (visual, aural, and conceptual) need to be made out before the marks or signs being compared may be found to be similar. The relative importance of each aspect of similarity will depend on the circumstances, including the nature of the goods and the types of marks involved and a trade-off can be made between the three aspects of similarity. (*Hai Tong* at [40].)

(b) Integrated into the analysis of visual, aural and conceptual similarity is a consideration of whether the earlier mark is distinctive (in both its technical and non-technical sense (*Staywell* at [30])).

(c) When assessing two contesting marks or signs, the court does so with the “*imperfect recollection*” of the average consumer. The two marks or signs should not be compared side by side or examined in detail because “*the person who is confused often makes comparison from memory removed in time and space from the marks*”. (*Hai Tong* at [40].)

(d) Further, the assessment of marks-similarity is “mark-for-mark without consideration of any external matter” (*Staywell* at [20].)

20 In *V V Technology Pte Ltd v Twitter, Inc* [2022] SGHC 293 (“**Twitter**”), a judgement issued by Goh Yi-han JC (“Goh JC”) after I heard parties, JC Goh gave his views as to the correct approach to understanding and applying the concept of “distinctiveness” in the marks-similarity inquiry. The views were summarised at [119] as follows:

(a) First, I would suggest the consistent use of the following expressions when discussing the concept of distinctiveness at the marks-similarity inquiry: (a) inherent technical distinctiveness; (b) acquired technical distinctiveness; and (c) non-technical distinctiveness. The consistent use of these expressions would aid in the formulation of coherent arguments before decision-makers, as well as enhance the comprehensibility of our intellectual property law jurisprudence.

(b) Second, I would suggest a faithful return to *Staywell* and not consider “distinctiveness” as a “threshold” enquiry (even for reasons of convenience or ease of analysis), as this is in reality a separate step to the analysis that is not permitted by *Staywell*. Treating distinctiveness as integrated within the step-by-step approach would ensure that it is properly applied in the right context.

(c) Third, I hold that acquired technical distinctiveness should not be considered at the marks-similarity inquiry based on reasons of precedent, principle, and policy. The issue of acquired technical distinctiveness should be considered at the likelihood of confusion stage of the inquiry to preserve conceptual clarity.

21 I respectfully agree and will adopt the analytical framework as well as the terminology put forward by Goh JC here.

Marks-similarity assessment

22 The marks under comparison are reproduced below for ease of reference.

Application Marks	A2 Word Mark
	A2
	

Visual similarity

23 The parties do not dispute that a mark which has greater technical distinctiveness enjoys a high threshold before a competing sign will be considered dissimilar to it. (*Staywell* at [25]). However, they disagree on the level of technical distinctiveness the A2 Word Mark should enjoy. I considered this issue in the Prior Opposition and found that the A2 Word Mark has a low

level of distinctiveness¹ overall (both inherent technical distinctiveness² and non-technical distinctiveness³). As the parties' evidence and submissions on this issue remain very much the same as in the Prior Opposition, my finding in the Prior Opposition must necessarily apply here as well.

24 Accordingly, the A2 Word Mark does not enjoy a high threshold before a competing sign will be considered dissimilar to it.

25 I now consider whether the marks are similar. The Opponent submits⁴:

The Application Marks both comprise of the word “Atwo” with a tear-drop shaped device in the background followed by the words “illumina” / “illumcare”. The tear-drop shaped device is non-descript and would not be viewed by the consumer as being distinctive (both in the technical and non-technical sense) and dominant. Consumers' attention would be drawn to the words in the Application Marks. The first word in the Application Marks is “Atwo”, which is simply A2 but represented visually with the numeral “2” spelt out in word form, i.e. “two”. Visually, consumers would pay immediate attention to “Atwo” since it is the first word in both Application Marks. As pleaded in the Notices of Opposition, “Atwo” differs from the Opponent's “a2” and the Opponent's Trade Mark Registration No. T1320092Z “A2” only in that the numeral 2 is spelt out in word form, i.e. “two”. Visually, the first

¹ At [24] of the Prior Opposition.

² Refers to the ability of a mark to distinguish the goods or services of one particular trader from those of another (*Twitter* at [43]).

³ Refers to the dominant/outstanding and memorable component of a mark which stands out in the average consumer's imperfect recollection (*Twitter* at [43]).

⁴ Opponent's Written Submissions at [12].

word in the Application Mark “Atwo” which would attract immediate visual attention from consumers, is similar to the Opponent’s “a2”, the Opponent’s Trade Mark Registration No. T1320092Z “A2” and the distinctive and dominant element “A2” / “a2” in all of the Opponent’s Trade Marks.

26 I disagree. The exercise here is to determine the overall impression given by the mark on the consumer who does not spend too much time analysing the marks. The real task is to determine what impression the use of that mark would make upon people in the ordinary course of trade in goods of the kind specified in the application for registration. Approaching the matter in that way, I am satisfied that the Application Marks are visually dissimilar to the A2 Word Mark. The technical distinctiveness of the A2 Word Mark comes from the fact that a single letter “A” is combined with a single numeral “2”. The Application Marks do not capture this aspect of the A2 Word Mark. In my view, the element “Atwo” in the Application Marks is more likely to be perceived as a meaningless invented word than as “A2” or even “A-Two”. In addition, the Application Marks have other components which I would not expect people to overlook or ignore – the word “illumina”/“illumcare” and the “tear-drop shaped device”.

Aural similarity

27 I turn next to aural similarity. *Staywell* makes it clear that there are two possible approaches: the first is to consider the dominant components of both marks (“**Dominant Component Approach**”), and the second is to undertake a quantitative assessment as to whether the competing marks have more similar syllables than not (“**Quantitative Approach**”).

28 On the Dominant Component Approach, the Opponent submits⁵:

...“Atwo” will stand out and is the dominant component of the Application Mark[s] from the aural perspective because “Atwo” is the first word in the Application Marks and will be pronounced first by consumers. “Atwo” being spelt as a word, would appear like a word and would likely be pronounced as “A-Two” which is aurally identical to the [A2 Word Mark]...

29 I disagree. Firstly, I am not certain that “Atwo” would be pronounced as “A-Two”. Given that it is presented as a single word, it seems to me that “Er Two” is a more probable pronunciation. This is how other English words beginning with the letter “a” is pronounced, such as “afar” and “ado”. Secondly, and more importantly, it seems more probable that the second word of the Application Marks is dominant, given that it is the longer word, and would take a longer time to pronounce, and therefore would form the greater aural impression. Accordingly, the Dominant Component Approach does not assist the Opponent’s case.

30 As for the Quantitative Approach, it is obvious that this approach would weigh against a finding of similarity.

31 All things considered; the marks are aurally more dissimilar than similar.

Conceptual similarity

32 The conceptual analysis “*seeks to uncover the ideas that lie behind and inform the understanding of the mark as a whole*”. (Staywell at [35].)

⁵ Opponent’s Written Submissions at [19].

33 The Opponent submits two alternative arguments here. Its first submission is that the marks are similar as the concept of “A2” runs through both the Application Marks and the A2 Word Mark. Its second argument is that the marks are conceptually neutral since both are not ordinary English words.

34 I take the view that the marks should be looked at as wholes in order to understand the concept behind “*the mark as a whole*”. I therefore do not agree that the Opponent’s first approach, focussing on the first word in the Application Marks and ignoring the second, is correct.

35 In my view, when the marks are compared as wholes, the marks are conceptually neutral. Some consumers may know that “A2” could describe a beta-casein protein in milk and for these consumers, the A2 Word Mark would convey this meaning. However, for consumers who are not aware of this information, they would find the A2 Word Mark to be meaningless. As for the Application Marks, which are composite marks, I bear in mind that consumers do not dissect marks and conceptualise them based on their separate components. The Court of Appeal in *Staywell* at [35] cautioned that greater care is needed in considering what the conceptually dominant component of a composite mark is, because the idea connoted by each component might be very different from the sum of its parts. As wholes, the Application Marks do not convey any particular idea as they are made up of invented words and a device which carries no particular concept in relation to the goods.

Conclusion on marks-similarity assessment

36 I have found that the Application Marks and A2 Word Mark are (a) visually dissimilar; (b) aurally more dissimilar than similar; and (c)

conceptually neutral. Overall, I find that the marks are more dissimilar than similar.

37 My conclusion that the Application Marks are overall more dissimilar than similar to the A2 Word Mark applies, with the appropriate modifications, to the rest of the Opponent's Trade Marks as well, each of which is even more dissimilar to the Application Marks.

Conclusion on opposition under Section 8(2)(b)

38 Since the similarity of competing marks is a threshold requirement that must be satisfied before the confusion inquiry is undertaken (*Staywell* at [15]), my finding at [36] and [37] disposes of the opposition under Section 8(2)(b). This ground of opposition therefore fails.

Ground of Opposition under Section 8(7)(a)

39 Section 8(7)(a) of the Act reads:

(7) A trade mark shall not be registered if, or to the extent that, its use in Singapore 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...

40 To succeed on the ground of opposition under section 8(7)(a), an opponent must establish the classical trinity of goodwill, misrepresentation and damage (*Novelty Pte Ltd v Amanresorts Ltd and another* [2009] 3 SLR(R) 216 at [37] and affirmed in *Singsung Pte Ltd v LG 26 Electronics Pte Ltd (trading as L S Electrical Trading)* [2016] 4 SLR 86 at [28]).

41 I will start with the element of misrepresentation for reasons that will

become clear. Under this element, the Opponent must show that the use of the Application Marks, in a normal and fair manner in respect of the goods for which registration is sought, amounts to a misrepresentation. The misrepresentation (whether intentional or not) must be such that it would lead or be likely to lead the public into believing that the goods (in respect of which registration is sought) are the goods of the Opponent or from a commercially related trade source.

42 The Court of Appeal in *The Singapore Professional Golfers' Association v Chen Eng Waye and others* [2013] SGCA 18 further elaborated at [20]:

... It will then be necessary to consider, amongst other factors, whether there is such a similarity between the corresponding element that is being used by the defendant on the one hand and by the claimant on the other such that in all the circumstances, it is sufficiently likely to result in the relevant segment of the public being deceived or confused into thinking that the defendant's goods or services are, or emanate from a source that is linked to, the claimant's...

43 Given my finding at [36] that the Application Marks are more dissimilar than similar to the A2 Word Mark and at [37] that they are even more dissimilar to the rest of Opponent's Trade Marks, I do not consider there is any realistic possibility of deception being caused by any misrepresentation inherent in the use by the Applicant of the Application Marks in relation to any goods falling within the specification of the Application Marks.

Conclusion on opposition under Section 8(7)(a)

44 The ground of opposition under Section 8(7)(a) therefore fails.

Overall Conclusion

45 Having considered all the pleadings and evidence filed and the submissions made in writing and orally, I find that the opposition against the Subject Applications fails on both grounds pleaded. The Subject Applications will proceed to registration.

46 As regards costs, the Applicant shall be entitled to costs, to be taxed, if not agreed.

Tan Mei Lin
Principal Assistant Registrar

Mr David Lim and Ms Gloria Goh (Allen & Gledhill LLP) for
the Opponent;
Mr Stanley Lee and Ms Elica Wong (ZICO IP Pte. Ltd.) for the
Applicant.

ANNEX 1

Opponent's Trade Marks

No.	Trade Mark	Trade Mark No.	Goods	Application Date (Priority Date)
1	A2	T1320092Z	<u>Class 05</u> Dried milk preparations being food for babies; milk powder for foodstuffs for babies; milk powder for nutritional purposes for babies; powdered milk foods for infants. <u>Class 29</u> Milk and milk products, cream (dairy products), milk powder, full cream milk powder, skim milk powder, whey and whey products, butter, cheese, milk beverages, other dairy products in this class.	12/12/2013
2	THE a2 MILK COMPANY	T1404738F	<u>Class 05</u> Infant foods; milk and milk powder for infants; dietetic foods and beverages.	28/03/2014 (24/02/2014)

No.	Trade Mark	Trade Mark No.	Goods	Application Date (Priority Date)
			<u>Class 29</u> Milk and milk products in this class; food made principally from milk; food preparations consisting wholly or substantially wholly of milk; foods made from milk products; products made wholly or principally of milk.	
3	TRUE A2	T1413693A	<u>Class 29</u> Milk and milk products, cream (dairy products), milk powder, full cream milk powder, skim milk powder, whey and whey products, butter, cheese, milk beverages.	26/08/2014
4		40201503914P	<u>Class 05</u> Infant foods; milk and milk powder for infants; dietetic foods and beverages. <u>Class 29</u> Milk and milk products in this	03/09/2014

No.	Trade Mark	Trade Mark No.	Goods	Application Date (Priority Date)
			class; other goods in this class which consists predominantly of milk or milk products as ingredients.	
5	a2 MILK	40201610396P	<u>Class 05</u> Food for infants; milk and milk powder for infants; dietetic foods and beverages. <u>Class 29</u> Milk powder; Milk; Cream; Butter; Cheese; Yoghurt; Milk beverages, milk predominating.	28/06/2016
6	a2tonishing	40201615752X	<u>Class 05</u> Food for infants; milk and powdered milk for infants; dietetic foods and beverages. <u>Class 29</u> Milk powder; milk; butter; cheese; cream; yoghurt; milk beverages, milk predominating.	15/07/2016 (12/04/2016)

No.	Trade Mark	Trade Mark No.	Goods	Application Date (Priority Date)
7		40201616122Y	<u>Class 05</u> Food for infants; milk and milk powder for infants; dietetic foods and beverages. <u>Class 29</u> Milk powder; milk; cream; butter; cheese; yoghurt; milk beverages, milk predominating.	30/09/2016
8		40201700208Q	<u>Class 05</u> Food for infants; powdered milk for babies; dietetic beverages adapted for medical use; animal semen; diagnostic preparations for veterinary purposes for detecting genetic predispositions; diagnostic test reagents for veterinary use. <u>Class 29</u> Milk powder; milk; cream; butter; cheese; yoghurt; milk beverages, milk predominating	06/07/2016 (16/06/2016)

No.	Trade Mark	Trade Mark No.	Goods	Application Date (Priority Date)
			<u>Class 30</u> Ice cream, frozen yoghurt; ices; frozen desserts. <u>Class 44</u> Veterinary services; animal breeding; providing information relating to animal breeding; genetic testing of animals for breeding purposes; breeding and stud services for animals.	
9		40201704565Q	<u>Class 05</u> Food for infants; powdered milk for babies; dietetic beverages adapted for medical use; animal semen; diagnostic preparations for veterinary purposes for detecting genetic predispositions; diagnostic test reagents for veterinary use. <u>Class 29</u> Milk powder; milk; butter; cheese;	22/07/2016 (01/07/2016)

No.	Trade Mark	Trade Mark No.	Goods	Application Date (Priority Date)
			yoghurt; milk beverages, milk predominating. <u>Class 30</u> Ice cream, frozen yoghurt; ices; frozen desserts. <u>Class 44</u> Veterinary services; animal breeding; providing information relating to animal breeding; genetic testing of animals for breeding purposes; breeding and stud services for animals.	
10		40201716521W	<u>Class 05</u> Food for infants; milk and powdered milk for infants; dietetic foods adapted for medical purposes; dietetic beverages adapted for medical purposes; nutritional supplements; protein dietary supplements. <u>Class 29</u>	01/06/2017 (10/05/2017)

No.	Trade Mark	Trade Mark No.	Goods	Application Date (Priority Date)
			Milk powder; milk; butter; cheese; cream; yoghurt; milk beverages, milk predominating <u>Class 30</u> Ice cream, frozen yoghurt; ices; frozen ice desserts	
11		40201716587V	<u>Class 05</u> Food for infants; milk and powdered milk for infants; dietetic foods adapted for medical purposes; dietetic beverages adapted for medical purposes; nutritional supplements; protein dietary supplements <u>Class 29</u> Milk powder; milk; butter; cheese; cream; yoghurt; milk beverages, milk predominating <u>Class 30</u> Ice cream, frozen yoghurt; ices; frozen desserts.	01/06/2017 (10/05/2017)

No.	Trade Mark	Trade Mark No.	Goods	Application Date (Priority Date)
12		40201716588T	<u>Class 05</u> Food for infants; milk and powdered milk for infants; dietetic foods adapted for medical purposes; dietetic beverages adapted for medical purposes; nutritional supplements; protein dietary supplements. <u>Class 29</u> Milk powder; milk; butter; cheese; cream; yoghurt; milk beverages, milk predominating <u>Class 30</u> Ice cream, frozen yoghurt; ices; frozen desserts.	01/06/2017 (10/05/2017)
13		40201716589R	<u>Class 05</u> Food for infants; milk and powdered milk for infants; dietetic foods adapted for medical purposes; dietetic beverages adapted for medical purposes; nutritional	01/06/2017 (10/05/2017)

No.	Trade Mark	Trade Mark No.	Goods	Application Date (Priority Date)
			supplements; protein dietary supplements <u>Class 29</u> Milk powder; milk; butter; cheese; cream; yoghurt; milk beverages, milk predominating <u>Class 30</u> Ice cream, frozen yoghurt; ices; frozen desserts	
14	a2 Store	40201720873X	<u>Class 05</u> Food for infants; powdered milk for babies; dietetic foods adapted for medical purposes; dietetic beverages adapted for medical purposes; dietary and nutritional supplements; protein dietary supplements. <u>Class 09</u> Computer software; downloadable computer software applications; downloadable electronic publications	24/10/2017 (26/09/2017)

No.	Trade Mark	Trade Mark No.	Goods	Application Date (Priority Date)
			<u>Class 29</u> Milk powder; milk; butter; cheese; cream; yoghurt; milk beverages, milk predominating <u>Class 30</u> Ice cream; edible ices; frozen yoghurt; desserts, namely, bakery desserts, dessert puddings, and frozen ice desserts; pastries; confectionery <u>Class 35</u> Retail services; online retail store services; wholesale services; advertising; promotional services; organisation and management of customer loyalty programs.	
15	a2 PLATINUM	40201721812Y	<u>Class 05</u> Food for infants; milk and powdered milk for infants; dietetic foods adapted for medical purposes; dietetic	03/11/2017 (24/10/2017)

No.	Trade Mark	Trade Mark No.	Goods	Application Date (Priority Date)
			beverages adapted for medical purposes; nutritional supplements; protein dietary supplements; powdered nutritional supplement drink mixes; dietary supplemental drinks; protein powder. <u>Class 29</u> Milk powder; milk; cream; butter; cheese; yoghurt; milk beverages, milk predominating; whey; dry whey.	
16	a2 Only	40201722474T	<u>Class 05</u> Food for infants; milk and powdered milk for infants; dietetic foods adapted for medical purposes; dietetic beverages adapted for medical purposes; nutritional supplements; protein dietary supplements;	14/11/2017 (20/10/2017)

No.	Trade Mark	Trade Mark No.	Goods	Application Date (Priority Date)
			powdered nutritional supplement drink mixes; dietary supplemental drinks; protein powder; milk-based protein drinks. <u>Class 29</u> Milk powder; milk; butter; cheese; cream; yoghurt; milk beverages, milk predominating; whey; dry whey; protein powder (meat substitute) for use as a food additive. <u>Class 30</u> Ice cream; frozen yoghurt; edible ices; desserts, namely, bakery desserts, dessert puddings, and frozen ice desserts; pastries; confectionery.	
17	a2 True	40201803409X	<u>Class 05</u> Food for infants; milk and powdered milk for infants; dietetic foods	23/02/2018 (18/01/2018)

No.	Trade Mark	Trade Mark No.	Goods	Application Date (Priority Date)
			adapted for medical purposes; dietetic beverages adapted for medical purposes; nutritional supplements; powdered nutritional supplement drink mixes; dietary supplemental drinks; protein dietary supplements; protein powder. <u>Class 29</u> Milk powder; milk; butter; cheese; cream; yoghurt; milk beverages, milk predominating; milk-based protein drinks; whey; dry whey; protein powder for use as meat substitute.	
18	True a2	40201805656V	<u>Class 05</u> Food for infants; milk and powdered milk for infants; dietetic foods adapted for medical purposes; dietetic beverages adapted	26/03/2018

No.	Trade Mark	Trade Mark No.	Goods	Application Date (Priority Date)
			for medical purposes; nutritional supplements; powdered nutritional supplement drink mixes; dietary supplemental drinks; protein dietary supplements; protein powder (dietary supplements).	