

O/0161/26

TRADE MARKS ACT 1994

IN THE MATTER OF

UK REGISTRATION NO. 4020063

IN THE NAME OF AREEN DESIGN LIMITED

IN RESPECT OF THE FOLLOWING TRADE MARKS



SONET



SONET

IN CLASSES 20, 24, 37, AND 42

AND

AN APPLICATION FOR A DECLARATION OF THE INVALIDITY

THEREOF UNDER NO 508355

BY

SINOT DESIGN ELITE B.V.

Background and pleading

1. Trade mark No. 4020063 shown on the cover page of this decision stands registered in the name of Areen Design Limited (“***the Proprietor***”). It was applied for on 29 February 2024 before the UK IPO and was registered on 24 May 2024 for the following goods and services (“***the Contested Mark***”):

Class 20 Furniture; Furniture and furnishings; Upholstered furniture; Outdoor furniture; Household furniture; Tables [furniture]; Seating furniture; Office furniture; Furniture (Office -); Indoor furniture; Furniture for offices; Furniture for washrooms; Mirrors [furniture]; Domestic furniture.

Class 24 Interior decoration fabrics; Fabrics for interior decorating; Coverings for furniture; Furniture coverings of textile; Coverings (Furniture -) of textile.

Class 37 Construction of interior accommodation; Interior refurbishment of buildings.

Class 42 Interior design; Design of interior decoration; Design of interior decor; Interior decor design; Decor (Design of interior -); Interior decorating design; Architectural design for interior decoration; Interior and exterior design services; Commercial interior design; Interior design services; Design of building interiors; Interior design services for boutiques; Design of furnishings; Design services relating to interior decoration; Architectural design; Space planning [design] of interiors; Interior decorating; Design of furniture; Furniture design; Design services for building interiors; Construction design; Interior decoration consultation; Interior architectural services; Consultancy relating to selection of furnishing fabrics [interior design]; Design services relating to interior decorating for homes; Design services relating to interior decorating for offices; Consultancy relating to selection of curtaining [interior design]; Design of artwork; Furnishing design services for the interiors of aircraft; Furnishing design services for the interiors of buildings; Interior design services for the retail industry; Consultancy relating to selection of loose covers for furniture [interior design]; Consultancy services relating to interior design; Design of carpets; Design of buildings; Professional consultancy relating to the design of interior accommodation;

Architectural design services; Design of bathrooms; Consultation services relating to interior design; Design services for architecture; Architecture design services; Advisory services relating to interior design; Design of curtains; Design of layouts for office furniture; Office layout design services; Product design; Design consultancy; Design services for furniture; Office furniture design; Architectural services for the design of buildings; Design of layouts for offices; Design planning; Technical design; House design services; Building design services; Design services for art-work; Design of office space; Planning [design] of bathrooms; Designing of furniture.

2. On 23 January 2025, Sinot Design Elite B.V. ("**the Applicant**") filed an application to have this trade mark declared invalid under the provisions of section 5(2)(b) of the Trade Marks Act 1994 ("**the Act**"). This ground may be relied upon in invalidation proceedings by virtue of section 47 of the Act. The application is directed against all of the goods and services for which the Contested Mark stands registered.
3. The Applicant relies on the following trade marks ("**the Earlier Marks**"):
 1. IR number: WO0000001624462 ("**the first earlier mark**")

Mark's representation: **SINOT**

International registration date: 30 April 2021

UK designation date: 30 April 2021

Date of protection of the IR in UK: 11 February 2022

Goods and services relied upon: see Annex A to this decision

2. IR number: WO0000001799413 ("**the second earlier mark**")

Mark's representation: **SINOT**

International registration date: 02 April 2024

UK designation date: 02 April 2024

Date of protection of the IR in UK: 05 December 2024

Goods and services relied upon: see Annex B to this decision

4. The Earlier Marks, by virtue of their earlier filing dates, both constitute earlier marks in accordance with section 6 of the Act. The Earlier Marks were registered less than five years before the filing date of the Contested Mark and are therefore not subject to proof of use in accordance with section 6A of the Act. The Applicant can, therefore, rely upon all of the goods and services it has identified without having to demonstrate use of the marks.
5. The Applicant in the Notice of Cancellation contends that due to the high similarity between the marks and the identity or high similarity of the goods and services, there is a likelihood of confusion, including a likelihood of association, and, thus, the Contested Mark should be declared invalid under Section 5(2)(b) of the Act.
6. The Proprietor filed a counterstatement, denying the grounds of invalidation. The Proprietor argues the respective goods and services are not identical and that although the respective marks share the same beginning in "S" and ending in "T", and contain the letter "N", the marks are aurally and visually different as well as conceptually different.

Relevance of EU law

7. The provisions of the Act relied upon in these proceedings are assimilated law, as they are derived from EU law. Although the UK has left the EU, section 6(3)(a) of the European Union (Withdrawal) Act 2018 (as amended by Schedule 2 of the Retained EU Law (Revocation and Reform) Act 2023) requires tribunals applying assimilated law to follow assimilated EU case law. That is why this decision refers to decisions of the EU courts which predate the UK's withdrawal from the EU.

Evidence and submissions

8. Neither party filed written submissions apart from their respective statement of grounds and counterstatement. Neither party requested a hearing, but the Applicant filed submissions in lieu of a hearing. I will not summarise the submissions here, but I will refer to them as and where appropriate during this decision. This decision is taken following a careful perusal of the papers.

Representation

9. In these proceedings, the Applicant is represented by Murgitroyd & Company. The Proprietor is not legally represented.

Preliminary matter

Party argues that they operate in a different commercial sector

10. The Proprietor, in its counterstatement, states that “*a person familiar with (and/or a relative consumer in) the \$500m+ ultra-luxury yacht market will almost certainly identify renowned designer Sander J. Sinot’s SINOT Yacht Architecture brand and disregard the modest building interiors of SONET. [...] SONET is clearly not a competitor of SINOT*”.
11. The Proprietor seems to bring forward the argument that the competing goods and services are dissimilar as the parties operate in different market sectors (and address different categories of consumers). Accordingly, the Proprietor submits that the Applicant offers design services in the field of ultra-luxury yachts, whereas the Proprietor offers design services for building interiors.
12. To this regard, I am reminded of the findings of Dr. Brian Whitehead in *City Storage Systems LLC v Kenmark Kitchen Limited*,¹ where, sitting as the Appointed Person, he stated (my emphasis):

“18. The authors of Kerly state at 11-055: “It is the goods or services covered by the specifications of the marks at issue that must be considered when making this assessment, and not the goods or services actually marketed under those marks”, referring to *Present-Service Ullrich GmbH & Co KG v OHIM* (T-66/11) [2013] E.T.M.R. 29. In that case, the General Court said at 45:

“Secondly, the applicant’s claim that it operates in a completely different commercial sector from the intervener is also irrelevant. In order to assess the similarity of the goods or services at issue for the purposes of art.8(1)(b) of Regulation 207/2009, the group of goods or services protected by the marks at issue must be taken into account, and not the goods or services actually marketed under those marks”.

¹ Decision BL O/0065/24.

13. It follows that in my assessment I must look at the similarity of the goods and services solely on the basis of those registered and applied for and it is impermissible for me to take into account the goods and services actually provided by the parties.

Decision

Section 47

14. The relevant parts of section 47 of the Act are as follows:

“(2) Subject to subsections (2A) and (2G), the registration of a trade mark may be declared invalid on the ground—

- (a) that there is an earlier trade mark in relation to which the conditions set out in section 5(1), (2) or (3) obtain, or
- (b) that there is an earlier right in relation to which the condition set out in section 5(4) is satisfied, unless the proprietor of that earlier trade mark or other earlier right has consented to the registration.

[...]

(2A) The registration of a trade mark may not be declared invalid on the ground that there is an earlier trade mark unless—

- (a) the registration procedure for the earlier trade mark was completed within the period of five years ending with the date of application for the declaration,
- (b) [...]
- (c) [...]

(5) Where the grounds of invalidity exist in respect of only some of the goods or services for which the trade mark is registered, the trade mark shall be declared invalid as regards those goods or services only.

(5A) An application for a declaration of invalidity may be filed on the basis of one or more earlier trade marks or other earlier rights provided they all belong to the same proprietor.

(6) Where the registration of a trade mark is declared invalid to any extent, the registration shall to that extent be deemed never to have been made:

Provided that this shall not affect transactions past and closed.”

Section 5(2)(b)

15. Section 5(2) of the Act states that:

“(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, [...]

(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.”

“5A Where grounds for refusal of an application for registration of a trade mark exist in respect of only some of the goods or services in respect of which the trade mark is applied for, the application is to be refused in relation to those goods and services only.”

The Principles

16. The following standard summary of the principles applicable to the assessment of the likelihood of confusion was approved by the Supreme Court in *Iconix Luxembourg Holdings SARL v Dream Paris Europe Inc & Anor*, [2025] UKSC 25:

(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 or 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, and whose attention varies according to the category of goods or services in question;

(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 normally be assessed by reference to the overall impressions created by the marks bearing in mind their distinctive and dominant components, but it is only when all other components of a complex mark are negligible that it is permissible to make the comparison solely on the basis of the dominant elements;

(e) nevertheless, the overall impression conveyed to the public by a composite trade mark may be dominated by one or more of its components;

(f) however, it is also possible that in a particular case an element corresponding to an earlier trade mark may retain an independent distinctive role in a composite mark, without necessarily constituting a dominant element of that mark;

(g) a lesser degree of similarity between the goods or services may be offset by a great degree of similarity between the marks, and vice versa;

(h) there is a greater likelihood of confusion where the earlier mark has a highly distinctive character, either per se or because of the use that has been made of it;

(i) mere association, in the strict sense that the later mark brings the earlier mark to mind, is not sufficient;

(j) the reputation of a mark does not give grounds for presuming a likelihood of confusion simply because of a likelihood of association in the strict sense;

(k) if the association between the marks creates a risk that the public might believe that the respective goods or services come from the same or economically-linked undertakings, there is a likelihood of confusion.

Comparison of goods and services

17. When making the comparison, all relevant factors relating to the goods and services in the specification should be taken into account. In *Canon*, the Court of Justice of the European Union (“CJEU”) stated at paragraph 23 of its judgment:

“In assessing the similarity of the goods or services concerned, as the French and United Kingdom Governments and the Commission have pointed out, all the relevant factors relating to those goods or services themselves should be taken into account. Those factors include, inter alia, their nature, their intended purpose and their method of use and whether they are in competition with each other or are complementary”.

18. Guidance on this issue has also come from Jacob J. (as he then was) in the *Treat* case, [1996] R.P.C. 281, where he identified the factors for assessing similarity as:

- a) The respective users of the respective goods or services;
- b) The physical nature of the goods or acts of services;
- c) The respective trade channels through which the goods or services reach the market;
- d) In the case of self serve consumer items, where in practice they are respectively found or likely to be found in supermarkets and in particular whether they are, or are likely to be, found on the same or different shelves;
- e) The extent to which the respective goods or services are competitive. This inquiry may take into account how those in trade classify goods, for instance whether market research companies, who of course act for industry, put the goods or services in the same or different sectors.

19. The General Court (“GC”) confirmed in *Gérard Meric v Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market*, Case T-133/05, that, even if goods are not worded identically, they can still be considered identical if one term falls within the scope of another (or vice versa):

“29. In addition, the goods can be considered as identical when the goods designated by the earlier mark are included in a more general category, designated by trade mark application (Case T-388/00 *Institut für Lernsysteme v OHIM- Educational Services (ELS)* [2002] ECR II-4301, paragraph 53) or

where the goods designated by the trade mark application are included in a more general category designated by the earlier mark”.

20. For the purposes of considering the issue of similarity of goods and services, it is permissible to consider groups of terms collectively where they are sufficiently comparable to be assessed in essentially the same way and for the same reasons (see *Separode Trade Mark* (BL O/399/10) and *BVBA Management, Training en Consultancy v. Benelux-Merkenbureau* [2007] ETMR 35 at paragraphs 30 to 38).
21. Annex C to this decision shows a table detailing the goods and services for comparison. Having carefully considered the respective specifications, I find that some of the terms are identical (or very highly similar). I have provided below an example of such identical (or very highly similar) terms.
22. Both the specifications of the second earlier mark and of the Contested Mark identically contain the term “*Furniture*” in class 20. I also note that all the remaining terms in the Proprietor’s specification consist of types of furniture: “*Furniture and furnishings; Upholstered furniture; Outdoor furniture; Household furniture; Tables [furniture]; Seating furniture; Office furniture; Furniture (Office -); Indoor furniture; Furniture for offices; Furniture for washrooms; Mirrors [furniture]; Domestic furniture*”. It follows that these terms fall within the Applicant’s wider category of “*Furniture*” and are identical in line with the principle outlined in *Meric*.
23. The Proprietor’s specification features the terms “*Coverings for furniture; Furniture coverings of textile; Coverings (Furniture -) of textile*” in class 24. These terms are considered to encompass (and vice versa) the Applicant’s “*throws (furniture coverings)*” contained in the specification of the second earlier mark. Thus, these goods are identical in line with *Meric*.
24. The Proprietor’s specification in class 42 lists a series of interior design services (i.e., “*Interior design; Design of interior decoration; Design of interior decor; Interior decor design; Decor (Design of interior -); Interior decorating design*”). The Applicant in the first earlier mark’s specification features the term “*services of a design agency, including the development and design of [...] interiors, [...] not for advertising purposes*”. The respective services are identical or, in case I am mistaken, I find them to be at least very highly similar to each other.

25. In light of these findings, and for reasons which will later become apparent, I will first assess the likelihood of confusion with regard to these terms.
26. For the sake of completeness, I note the Proprietor, in its counterstatement, seems to provide a “backup specification” indicating that *“the Proprietor is willing to simplify its registration of various goods and services in Classes 20, 24, 37 & 42 retaining broadly ‘interior design’ related services”*. Whilst I appreciate the Proprietor’s proposed fall-back specification, I find that it is not acceptable. This is because the mere indication of *“interior design related services”* does not amount to a clear and precise limitation of the applied-for specification (especially services in class 37 and 42). Thus, I am unable to determine the proposed limited specification the Proprietor intends to fall back on. In any case, even if I were to accept the fall-back specification, this would fall within the Applicant’s wider term *“services of a design agency, including the development and design of [...] interiors, [...] not for advertising purposes”* and, thus, be identical or, in case I am mistaken, at least very highly similar.

The average consumer and the nature of the purchasing act

27. The average consumer of the category of products (and services) concerned is deemed to be the reasonably well-informed and reasonably observant and circumspect (see, to that effect, Case C-210/96, *Gut Springenheide and Tusky* [1998] ECR I-4657, paragraph 31).
28. For the purposes of assessing the likelihood of confusion, it must be borne in mind that the average consumer’s level of attention is likely to vary according to the category of goods and services in question.²
29. In *Iconix Luxembourg Holdings SARL v Dream Paris Europe Inc & Anor*, [2025] UKSC 25, the Supreme Court approved the comments of Arnold LJ in *Lidl Great Britain Ltd & Anor v Tesco Stores Ltd & Anor (Rev1)* [2024] EWCA Civ 262, where he pointed out that:
- (a) Consumers who are ill-informed or careless, or consumers with specialised knowledge or who are excessively careful are excluded from consideration;

² *Lloyd Schuhfabrik Meyer & Co. GmbH v. Klijsen Handel BV*, (Case C-342/97, para 26).

(b) The average consumer provides a standard which enables the courts to strike a balance between the competing interests involved, such as trade mark owners, their competitors and consumers;

(c) The average consumer is neither a single hypothetical person nor a mathematical average; assessment from the perspective of the average consumer does not involve a statistical test. There is no single meaning rule and if, having regard to the perceptions and expectations of the average consumer, the court considers that a significant proportion of the relevant public is likely to be confused, a finding of infringement may properly be made;

(d) Assessment from the perspective of the average consumer is intended to facilitate adjudication of trade mark disputes by providing an objective criterion, by promoting consistency of assessment and by enabling courts and tribunals to determine such issues so far as possible without the need for evidence;

(e) The average consumer's level of attention varies according to the category of goods or services in question; and

(f) the average consumer rarely has the opportunity to make direct comparisons between trade marks (or between trade marks and signs) and must instead rely upon the imperfect picture of the trade mark they have kept in their mind.

30. With regard to the goods for which I found identity in classes 20 (furniture) and 24 (furniture coverings), given that the goods at issue can be used in both domestic and more professional environments such as, furniture for offices or textile covers used to decorate, for example, office reception areas, I consider that the average consumer will consist of both members of the general public at large who look to furnish and décor their homes as well as business users (e.g., interior designers or decorators) who may be looking to furnish and/or decorate professional environments.

31. The goods at issue will be available via general homeware or specialist furnishing/décor retailers and their online equivalents. In stores, the goods will typically be displayed on shelves, hanging displays or larger floor displays for bigger pieces of furniture and self-selected by the consumer. For online retailers,

the goods will be displayed on webpages and selected after the consumer has viewed images of the products.

32. The price of the goods at issue is likely to vary from relatively inexpensive goods (e.g., small pieces of furniture or furniture coverings) to more expensive goods such as larger items of furniture. The goods are likely to be purchased relatively infrequently. However, I appreciate that for some business consumers, the selection may be more frequent in that they may need to restock, for example, office furniture on a more regular basis. Regardless of who the average consumer is, I am of the view the same factors are likely to be considered during the purchasing process and this may include factors such as comfort, materials used (including durability and ease of cleaning, and in commercial contexts, characteristics such as fire-retardancy), adjustability, perceived fit and suitability as well as more practical considerations such as dimensions/compatibility.
33. With this in mind, I consider that the average consumer will generally pay a medium degree of attention during the purchasing process whereas the professionals will pay a higher degree of attention. In any case, the likelihood of confusion must be assessed from the perspective of the former (the general public) since they are the group who will pay the lower degree of attention.³
34. The visual aspect will dominate the selection process, however, I do not discount the aural component playing a role by way of word-of-mouth recommendations or after discussions with salespersons.
35. With regard to interior design services in class 42, given that such services may be sought for both domestic living spaces and more specialised commercial environments, I consider that the average consumer will consist of members of the general public looking to improve or renovate their homes, as well as professional business users seeking to create functional and aesthetically coherent workplaces. These services may be obtained through independent designers, design studios, or larger architectural firms, with initial contact made either in person, via recommendations, or through online platforms showcasing portfolios and/or projects. Both categories of consumers (the general public and professionals) will purchase the services fairly infrequently (e.g., to build or renovate their home or

³ Case T-356/14, [25] – [26].

build/refurbish professional spaces) and the price of the services ranges from average to fairly expensive according to the nature of the design project (e.g., the size of the spaces to design/decorate). Before purchasing the services, consumers will typically review examples of the provider's previous projects, mood boards, and digital visualisations to assess style, suitability, and expertise.

36. I consider that the average consumer will, generally, pay an above-medium degree of attention during the purchasing process whereas the professionals will pay a high degree of attention especially considering that the services can concern bigger spaces (e.g., large office environments) requiring higher investments. In any case, the likelihood of confusion must be assessed from the perspective of the former (the general public) since they are the group who will pay the lower degree of attention.⁴

37. In my view, the visual aspect will dominate the selection process, however, I do not discount the aural/verbal component playing a role, whether through consultations, discussions of requirements, or word-of-mouth referrals.

Comparison of trade marks

38. It is clear from *Sabel BV v Puma AG* (particularly paragraph 23) that the average consumer normally perceives a trade mark as a whole and does not proceed to analyse its various details. The same case also explains that the visual, aural and conceptual similarities of the trade marks must be assessed by reference to the overall impressions created by the trade marks, bearing in mind their distinctive and dominant components.

39. The CJEU stated at paragraph 34 of its judgment in Case C-591/12P, *Bimbo SA v OHIM*, that:

“[...] it is necessary to ascertain, in each individual case, the overall impression made on the target public by the sign for which registration is sought, by means of, inter alia, an analysis of the components of a sign and of their relative weight in the perception of the target public, and then, in the light of that overall

⁴ Case T-356/14, [25] – [26].

impression and all factors relevant to the circumstances of the case, to assess the likelihood of confusion”.

40. It would be wrong, therefore, to artificially dissect the trade marks, although it is necessary to take into account the distinctive and dominant components of the trade marks and to give due weight to any other features which are not negligible and therefore contribute to the overall impressions created by the trade marks.

41. The trade marks to be compared are as follows:

Earlier Marks	Contested Marks (series of two marks)
<p data-bbox="204 943 560 1037">SINOT</p> <p data-bbox="204 1088 710 1126"><i>(“the first and second earlier mark”)</i></p>	<div data-bbox="906 846 1251 1025" style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px; text-align: center;"> <p data-bbox="956 943 1246 1014">SONET</p> </div> <div data-bbox="916 1249 1283 1505" style="background-color: black; color: white; padding: 10px; text-align: center; margin-top: 20px;"> <p data-bbox="956 1346 1243 1417">SONET</p> </div>

Overall impression

42. The Earlier Marks both consist of the all-capitalised word “SINOT”. The marks’ overall impression resides in the word “SINOT” of which they are composed. As the marks are identical, for ease of reference, I will refer to them in the singular as “the earlier mark”.

43. The Contested Marks consist of a series of two marks. The first mark in the series features the all-capitalised word “SONET” in black on a white background. The

second mark in the series identically features the word “SONET” but in inverted colours: white wording on a black background. In both marks “SONET” is presented in fairly standardised typeface/font. Given that consumers tend to be drawn to elements of marks that can be read,⁵ I find that in the case of both marks in the series, their overall impression lies in the word “SONET” and the marks’ stylisation plays only a small role in their overall impression.

Visual similarity

44. The Proprietor denies the respective marks’ similarity arguing that although the respective marks start with the letter “S”, end in the letter “T” and share the letter “N”, the marks differ in their “*middle letters and vowel sounds leading to different [...] visual patterns*”.⁶ The Applicant contends that the respective marks have at least some visual similarity in so far as they coincide in the letters “S”, “N”, “O” and “T” with the coinciding letters “S”, “N” and “T” placed in the same order. The Applicant also argues that the Contested Marks’ stylisation does not detract from the marks’ visual similarity.⁷

45. I acknowledge the parties’ submissions. Both the earlier mark and the Contested Marks are comprised of five letters. Whilst I appreciate that consumers read from left to right and that, generally, beginnings of words tend to have more visual and aural impact than the ends,⁸ the principle laid down in *El Corté Ingles* and other case law is not a hard and fast rule of law. Rather, it is a practical rule of thumb, based on experience and observation. It amounts to no more than “All else being equal, the average consumer will tend to pay more attention to the beginnings of marks than other parts of marks, because consumers read from left to right”.⁹ In the case at hand, the marks differ in their respective vowel sequence (in bold): S-**I-N-O**-T and S-**O-N-E**-T which constitutes the central part of the respective marks (“INO” vs “ONE”). I agree with the Proprietor that the change in the marks’ vowels creates a visual difference between the marks, especially taking into account that the respective marks are relatively short words and thus any difference is more noticeable than it may have been had both marks been longer. With regard to the

⁵ *Migros-Genossenschafts-Bund v EUIPO*, T-189/16, [52].

⁶ Proprietor’s counterstatement, paragraph 1.

⁷ Applicant’s submissions in lieu dated 5 September 2025, at [27].

⁸ *El Corte Inglés, SA v OHIM*, Cases T-183/02 and T-184/02.

⁹ See decision from the Appointed Person O/0648/24 at [21].

Contested Marks' stylisation, although minimum, it still creates some visual difference. Overall, I find the marks have a below-medium visual similarity.

Aural similarity

46. The Proprietor argues that as the marks differ in their vowel sounds, they will have different pronunciations.¹⁰ The Applicant contends that the respective marks are both composed of two syllables and that the location of the vowel "O" in the marks is inverted from the second syllable in the earlier mark (SI-NOT) to the first syllable in the Contested Marks (SO-NET). The Applicant also directs me to two previous decisions from the General Court where it was found aural similarity notwithstanding the fact that the syllables in the marks were pronounced in an inverted order.¹¹ I appreciate the Applicant's submissions, however, I find that they do not apply to the case at hand. In the cases referred to me the two-syllable marks consisted of a combination of two words ("InvestHedge / HEDGE INVEST" and "VITS4KIDS/Kids Vits") whereas in this case the marks are single two-syllable words where the change of one vowel from one syllable to another has a greater impact in terms of the marks' pronunciation. Furthermore, the marks' differences do not end here; along with the change in the vowel "O" from one syllable to another, the respective marks also differ in the vowel in the other respective syllable, being "I" in the earlier mark (contained in the first syllable) and "E" in the Contested Marks (contained in the second syllable). This creates a further difference in the mark's pronunciation. The marks share the initial "S" sound along with the "N" nasal sound and the dental "T" sound at the end whilst differ in the pronunciation of the vowel "O" placed in a different order (or syllable) and also differ in the pronunciation of the letters "I" and "E" that are not reproduced, respectively, in the other party's marks. Also bearing in mind that variation in pronunciation in the middle of the signs is readily perceptible when spoken,¹² overall, I find the marks share a medium degree of aural similarity.

Conceptual similarity

¹⁰ Proprietor's counterstatement, paragraph 1.

¹¹ Applicant's submissions in lieu at [28] and [29].

¹² Case T-546/17, *Leshare / Lexware*, [53].

47. The Proprietor contends that the marks are conceptually different in that “SONET” is a play on the word “SONNET” which identifies a “*fixed poetic form*” whereas “SINOT” is a family name and it does not have a commonly recognised meaning.¹³
48. The Applicant submits that neither of the competing marks have a meaning and, thus, a conceptual comparison cannot be carried out. With regard to the Proprietor’s submissions above, the Applicant argues that the relevant consumer will not understand “SONET” as meaning “sonnet” because the two words are pronounced differently. Furthermore, the Applicant states that although “sonnet” is an English dictionary word, the relevant consumers of the goods and services at hand are unlikely to be familiar with such word and, thus, they will not understand “SONET” as the word “sonnet”. The Applicant also submits that the Proprietor did not provide any evidence to show that the relevant consumer will understand the Contested Marks as “sonnet”.¹⁴
49. Whilst conceptual comparisons are usually done without reference to the goods/services at issue,¹⁵ the consumer does look to the goods to inform the meaning of the mark, particularly where there is a link between the conceptual meaning of the mark and the goods to which it is affixed.¹⁶ With this in mind, it is my view that the relevant consumers will not understand “SINOT” as a family name and they will not attach any meaning to this word. Similarly, I agree with the Applicant’s position that a significant proportion of the relevant consumers will not understand “SONET” as referring to the English dictionary word “sonnet”. Therefore, I find the marks to be conceptually neutral. Nonetheless, I do not completely disregard the possibility that a separate significant proportion of the relevant consumers will see “SONET” as the abbreviation of “sonnet” and, thus, I find that, in this case, the respective marks are conceptually dissimilar.

Distinctive character of the Earlier Mark

50. In *Lloyd Schuhfabrik Meyer & Co. GmbH v Klijsen Handel BV*, Case C-342/97 the CJEU stated that:

¹³ Proprietor’s counterstatement, second paragraph.

¹⁴ Applicant’s submissions in lieu at [31] and [32].

¹⁵ EMILIANA, Case BL O/052/22.

¹⁶ 4 LIGHT VITAMIN, Case BL O/1174/25.

“22. In determining the distinctive character of a mark and, accordingly, in assessing whether it is highly distinctive, the national court must make an overall assessment of the greater or lesser capacity of the mark to identify the goods or services for which it has been registered as coming from a particular undertaking, and thus to distinguish those goods or services from those of other undertakings (see, to that effect, judgment of 4 May 1999 in Joined Cases C-108/97 and C-109/97 *Windsurfing Chiemsee v Huber and Attenberger* [1999] ECR I-0000, paragraph 49).

23. In making that assessment, account should be taken, in particular, of the inherent characteristics of the mark, including the fact that it does or does not contain an element descriptive of the goods or services for which it has been registered; the market share held by the mark; how intensive, geographically widespread and long-standing use of the mark has been; the amount invested by the undertaking in promoting the mark; the proportion of the relevant section of the public which, because of the mark, identifies the goods or services as originating from a particular undertaking; and statements from chambers of commerce and industry or other trade and professional associations (see *Windsurfing Chiemsee*, paragraph 51).”

51. Registered trade marks possess varying degrees of inherent distinctive character. These range from the very low, such as those which are suggestive or allusive of the services, to those with high inherent distinctive character, such as invented words. The degree of distinctiveness is an important factor as it directly relates to whether there is a likelihood of confusion; the more distinctive the Earlier Mark, the greater the likelihood of confusion.

52. Before I move to consider the earlier mark’s inherent distinctiveness, I note that the Applicant directs me to the Proprietor’s counterstatement where it submits that “[...] *whereas a person familiar with (and/or a relative consumer in) the \$500m+ ultra-luxury yacht market will almost certainly identify renowned designer Sander J. Sinot’s SINOT Yacht Architecture brand and disregard the modest building interiors of SONET*”. The Applicant contends that, as per admission by the Proprietor, the earlier mark “*has a high degree of consumer recognition*” and “[*it*] *is endowed with*

an above average degree of distinctive character".¹⁷ Therefore, the Applicant seems to claim that the earlier mark has at least some degree of enhanced distinctiveness. As I already clarified at paragraphs [10] - [13] and following from my findings at paragraphs [30] - [33], the relevant consumer for the goods and services at hand is the general public; therefore, it would be wrong for me to find any degree of enhanced distinctiveness for the earlier mark exclusively with regard to consumers for the "\$500m+ ultra-luxury yacht market". The Applicant has not filed any evidence of use to substantiate its claim that the earlier mark's distinctiveness has been enhanced through use. Accordingly, I have only the inherent position to consider.

53. The Applicant contends that the earlier mark's inherent distinctiveness is high in that "SINOT" is neither descriptive nor alludes to the characteristics of the goods and services in issue.¹⁸ The Proprietor did not provide any submissions on this point.

54. The Earlier Mark is a word-only mark comprising of the single word "SINOT" with a small level of stylisation as indicated above. As stated above, the earlier mark is an invented word devoid of any semantic correlation with the goods and services at hand. Therefore, the earlier mark is high in distinctive character.

Likelihood of confusion

55. There is no simple formula for determining whether there is a likelihood of confusion. The factors considered above have a degree of interdependency (*Canon* at [17]). I must make a global assessment of the competing factors (*Sabel* at [22]), considering the various factors from the perspective of the average consumer and deciding whether the average consumer is likely to be confused. In making my assessment, I must keep in mind that the average consumer rarely has the opportunity to make direct comparisons between trade marks and must instead rely upon the imperfect picture of them he has retained in his mind (*Lloyd Schuhfabrik* at [26]).

¹⁷ Applicant's submissions in lieu at [25] and [26].

¹⁸ *Idem* at [25].

56. Confusion can be direct or indirect. Direct confusion involves the average consumer mistaking one mark for the other. The concept of indirect confusion was explained by Iain Purvis Q.C., sitting as the Appointed Person, in *L.A. Sugar Limited v By Back Beat Inc*, BL O/375/10 as follows:

“16. Although direct confusion and indirect confusion both involve mistakes on the part of the consumer, it is important to remember that these mistakes are very different in nature. Direct confusion involves no process of reasoning – it is a simple matter of mistaking one mark for another. Indirect confusion, on the other hand, only arises where the consumer has actually recognized that the later mark is different from the earlier mark. It therefore requires a mental process of some kind on the part of the consumer when he or she sees the later mark, which may be conscious or subconscious but, analysed in formal terms, is something along the following lines: “The later mark is different from the earlier mark, but also has something in common with it. Taking account of the common element in the context of the later mark as a whole, I conclude that it is another brand of the owner of the earlier mark”.

57. I have already elected to proceed by considering the likelihood of confusion in relation to identical (or very highly similar) goods and services. The relevant consumer is likely to pay a medium level of attention in their selection of the goods and an above-medium degree of attention for the services for which I found identity (or very high similarity). I found that part of the relevant public for the goods and services at issue could be professionals who would pay a higher level of attention, but I will assess the likelihood of confusion from the perspective of the general public since they are the group who will pay the lower degree of attention.

58. The inherent distinctiveness of the earlier mark is high. The marks have a below-medium degree of visual similarity, a medium degree of aural similarity and they are either conceptually neutral or dissimilar according to the public’s understanding of the word “SONET”. The purchase of the contested goods and services is considered to be mainly visual but the potential for aural use is borne in mind.

59. The Applicant contends that there is a likelihood of direct confusion in that the marks have identical (or at least similar) goods and services and that the marks

have an above-average degree of similarity.¹⁹ The Proprietor, does not provide specific submissions on the marks' likelihood of confusion, but it denies any similarity between the marks and the respective goods and services.²⁰

60. Although both signs are word elements of a similar length that share the letters "S", "N" and "T" in this order, the marks' central parts differ in one vowel ("I" and "E") as well as in the placement of the "O" in respect of the central "N" ("-INO-" versus "-ONE-"). I find these differences to be notable, especially considering that the marks are short words, and such that the relevant consumer will not overlook them.²¹ Therefore, weighing all of the factors above, notwithstanding that the goods and services are identical and that the earlier mark has a high inherent distinctiveness, and even applying the principles of imperfect recollection and interdependency, I find that the differences between the marks are sufficient to avoid direct confusion. As a result, I find that there is no likelihood of direct confusion.

61. Turning to indirect confusion, taking into consideration the marks' dissimilarity outlined above, even considering the earlier mark's highly inherent distinctive character, I do not see how the consumers, upon noticing the differences between the marks, would perceive the Contested Marks as originating from the Applicant's "SINOT".

62. Having reached the conclusions above in respect of identical (or very highly similar) goods and services, the Applicant would be in an inferior position were I to assess the likelihood of confusion based on goods and services with a lower degree of similarity. Therefore, it follows that there is no likelihood of confusion (both direct and indirect) for the remaining goods and services at hand.

Conclusion

63. The application for invalidation under section 5(2)(b) of the Act has failed. Subject to any successful appeal against my decision, the Proprietor's mark will remain registered in the UK.

Costs

¹⁹ Applicant's submissions in lieu at [37].

²⁰ Proprietor's counterstatement.

²¹ Case T-273/02, *Calpico / Calypso*, at [39].

64. As the application for invalidation has been unsuccessful, the Proprietor is entitled to a contribution towards its costs. As the Proprietor is unrepresented, at the conclusion of the evidence rounds, the official letter, dated 8 August 2025, advised the Proprietor that, if it intended to make a request for an award for costs it should complete and return the relevant costs proforma by 5 September 2025. The same letter stated, inter alia, that:

“If the pro-forma is not completed and returned, costs, other than official fees arising from the action (excluding extensions of time), may not be awarded.”

65. No costs proforma has been filed by the Proprietor in response to the abovementioned letter. As such, the Proprietor is not entitled to any costs award.

Dated this 26th day of February 2026

Andrea Rossi

For the Registrar

Annex A – goods and services relied on for WO0000001624462

Class 20 Hinges and locks, furniture fittings, name plates and symbol plates, namely name plates or identification plates, prohibition signs and pictogram signs; all the aforesaid goods not being of metal; furniture, mirrors, picture frames; umbrella stands, coat stands, coat hangers; products made of wood, cork, reed, cane, wicker, horn, bone, ivory, whalebone, tortoiseshell, amber, mother-of-pearl, meerschaum and substitutes for all these materials, not included in other classes; furniture fittings of porcelain, glass and earthenware.

Class 35 Advertising and marketing services; advertising agency services; setting up, supervising and implementing innovative advertising concepts related to consumers, products and services; services of market research and marketing agencies; business organizational consultancy and information provision in the fields of marketing, brand design (not for commercial purposes), marketing communications and advertising design; advice regarding promotional activities and projects; creating, developing and executing advertising campaigns and other promotional activities and projects; business support for advertising campaigns; directing and producing of commercials, including corporate films; public relations; marketing advice in the field of brands, products and services; consultancy with regard to commercial matters relating to brands, as well as marketing for products and services; providing of commercial information relating to products and services; developing innovative marketing and advertising concepts for the provision of services and for the commercialization of products; providing company and product presentations and company events and other events for commercial and / or advertising purposes; information, consultancy and advice regarding the aforesaid services, whether or not provided via the internet; advertising and marketing advice relating to brands, as well as for the promotion of products and services; development of strategies and concepts for the marketing and promotion of the shipbuilding industry; organization of business meetings for concept development in the field of the shipbuilding industry; organization of business and promotional

events; business management of restaurants; franchise services in the nature of business support related to restaurants as well as franchise services in the nature of marketing support related to restaurants; the aforementioned services exclusively provided in the context of nautical events and / or in ports.

Class 42 Graphic designing, technical drawing and graphic arts design; industrial design; industrial research; services of a design agency, including the development and design of new products, packaging, interiors, house styles and logos, not for advertising purposes; technical or scientific research; graphic design services, industrial design services, design services relating to packaging, design services relating to sanitary facilities and sanitary products; designing and maintaining websites; designing and developing products and advising in this area; digital design (graphic design); information, consultancy and advice regarding the aforesaid services, whether or not provided via the internet; consultancy with regard to designing trademarks and designs, not for commercial purposes and designing trademarks and designs, not for commercial purposes; graphic design of corporate branding, names and logos for advertising purposes; consultancy in the design of trademarks and designs for commercial purposes and the design of trademarks and designs for commercial purposes.

Annex B – goods and services relied on for WO0000001799413

- Class 20 Furniture; garden and terrace furniture; tables; chairs, stools; cabinets; pegs, not of metal; cabinets and tables with working surface; kitchen and bathroom furniture; handles for cabinets; non-metal hinges, locks, furniture fittings and nameplates; symbol plates, namely nameplates, identification plates, prohibition plates and pictogram plates, not of metal; all the aforesaid goods not being of metal; mirrors; pillows; mattresses; living room furniture, kitchen furniture, bathroom furniture and bedroom furniture, office furniture; furniture, including chairs, seats, armchairs, couches, divan beds, settees, divans, tables, coffee tables, side tables, beds, bed bases, cabinets, drawers, bookcases, wardrobes, credenzas; picture frames of wood, cork, cane, beech, stone, horn, bone, ivory, whalebone, tortoiseshell, yellow amber, mother-of-pearl, meerschaum, substitutes of all these materials, or of plastics, as far as not included in other classes; wine racks; book stands; umbrella stands; coatstands; indoor window blinds [furniture]; slatted indoor blinds for windows; curtain tracks, hooks, rings, rods, tie-backs, rollers, runners, fittings, poles; bamboo curtains; non-metallic fasteners for window coverings; locks, not of metal, for windows; knobs for curtain poles; statues, plaquettes and works of art made of plastic; decorative objects and works of art of plastic.
- Class 21 Household or kitchen utensils and containers; glassware, porcelain and earthenware; candle holders, candle jars; candelabras; butler's trays; statues, plaquettes and works of art made of materials, namely, porcelain, terracotta or glass; tableware of glass or porcelain; bowls, jugs, serving plates, wine coolers; decanters; vases; food domes; boxes of glass or ceramics; decorative objects and works of art of glass, porcelain or earthenware; wall-mounted soap dishes, toilet paper holders and towel holders; perfume diffusers and home fragrance diffusers.
- Class 24 Textiles and textile goods, not included in other classes; fabrics for textile use and functional fabrics for textile use; bed, bath, kitchen and table

linen; blankets and tablecloths; textile napkins; curtain fabrics; curtains; pillowcases, bed sheets, duvet covers and bed coverings; covers for decorative pillows; textile for furniture and wall coverings; wall hangings; tapestries of textile; throws (furniture coverings); towels of textile; duvet covers; handkerchiefs of textile; bath linen; bath mitts and gloves; banners of textile; travelling blankets; window furnishing fabrics; curtain holders of textile; coverings for windows.

Class 27 Carpet, rugs and mats; bath and door mats; decorative wall hangings not of textile.

Class 35 Advertising, marketing and promotional services; business assistance relating to the establishment of franchises; assistance in business management within the framework of a franchise contract; presentation of goods and/or services on communications media of all kinds, for sales purposes; online business services relating to bringing together internet users and trading partners for the sale of goods and/or services; online retail sale services of clothing, footwear, headgear, leatherware, bags, suitcases, interior furniture, outdoor furniture, textiles and textile goods, kitchen utensils and containers, bedding; online retail sale services of picture frames, mirrors, christmas decorations, playthings, books, magazines, foodstuffs, alcoholic or non-alcoholic beverages, cosmetics and dietary supplements, paints, lacquers, building materials and building components made of metal, hand tools, lamps, furniture for bathrooms, carpets, mats and matting, wall hangings, ornaments, clocks; organising fairs, exhibitions, events and other activities for commercial purposes.

Annex C – goods and services comparison table

Applicant's goods and services	Proprietor's goods and services
Class 20	Class 20
<p>WO0000001624462 <i>("the first earlier mark")</i></p> <p>Class 20</p> <p>Hinges and locks, furniture fittings, name plates and symbol plates, namely name plates or identification plates, prohibition signs and pictogram signs; all the aforesaid goods not being of metal; furniture, mirrors, picture frames; umbrella stands, coat stands, coat hangers; products made of wood, cork, reed, cane, wicker, horn, bone, ivory, whalebone, tortoiseshell, amber, mother-of-pearl, meerschaum and substitutes for all these materials, not included in other classes; furniture fittings of porcelain, glass and earthenware.</p> <p>WO0000001799413 <i>("the second earlier mark")</i></p> <p>Class 20</p> <p>Furniture; garden and terrace furniture; tables; chairs, stools; cabinets; pegs, not of metal; cabinets and tables with</p>	<p>Class 20</p> <p>Furniture; Furniture and furnishings; Upholstered furniture; Outdoor furniture; Household furniture; Tables [furniture]; Seating furniture; Office furniture; Furniture (Office -); Indoor furniture; Furniture for offices; Furniture for washrooms; Mirrors [furniture]; Domestic furniture</p>

working surface; kitchen and bathroom furniture; handles for cabinets; non-metal hinges, locks, furniture fittings and nameplates; symbol plates, namely nameplates, identification plates, prohibition plates and pictogram plates, not of metal; all the aforesaid goods not being of metal; mirrors; pillows; mattresses; living room furniture, kitchen furniture, bathroom furniture and bedroom furniture, office furniture; furniture, including chairs, seats, armchairs, couches, divan beds, settees, divans, tables, coffee tables, side tables, beds, bed bases, cabinets, drawers, bookcases, wardrobes, credenzas; picture frames of wood, cork, cane, beech, stone, horn, bone, ivory, whalebone, tortoiseshell, yellow amber, mother-of-pearl, meerschaum, substitutes of all these materials, or of plastics, as far as not included in other classes; wine racks; book stands; umbrella stands; coatstands; indoor window blinds [furniture]; slatted indoor blinds for windows; curtain tracks, hooks, rings, rods, tie-backs, rollers, runners, fittings, poles; bamboo curtains; non-metallic fasteners for window coverings; locks, not of metal, for windows; knobs for curtain poles; statues, plaquettes and works of art made of plastic; decorative objects and works of art of plastic.

<p>Class 21</p>	
<p>WO0000001799413 <i>("the second earlier mark")</i></p> <p>Class 21</p> <p>Household or kitchen utensils and containers; glassware, porcelain and earthenware; candle holders, candle jars; candelabras; butler's trays; statues, plaquettes and works of art made of materials, namely, porcelain, terracotta or glass; tableware of glass or porcelain; bowls, jugs, serving plates, wine coolers; decanters; vases; food domes; boxes of glass or ceramics; decorative objects and works of art of glass, porcelain or earthenware; wall-mounted soap dishes, toilet paper holders and towel holders; perfume diffusers and home fragrance diffusers.</p>	
<p>Class 24</p>	<p>Class 24</p>
<p>WO0000001799413 <i>("the second earlier mark")</i></p> <p>Class 24</p> <p>Textiles and textile goods, not included in other classes; fabrics for textile use and functional fabrics for textile use; bed, bath, kitchen and table linen; blankets and tablecloths; textile napkins; curtain</p>	<p>Class 24</p> <p>Interior decoration fabrics; Fabrics for interior decorating; Coverings for furniture; Furniture coverings of textile; Coverings (Furniture -) of textile.</p>

<p>fabrics; curtains; pillowcases, bed sheets, duvet covers and bed coverings; covers for decorative pillows; textile for furniture and wall coverings; wall hangings; tapestries of textile; throws (furniture coverings); towels of textile; duvet covers; handkerchiefs of textile; bath linen; bath mitts and gloves; banners of textile; travelling blankets; window furnishing fabrics; curtain holders of textile; coverings for windows.</p>	
<p>Class 27</p>	
<p>WO0000001799413 <i>("the second earlier mark")</i></p> <p>Class 27</p> <p>Carpet, rugs and mats; bath and door mats; decorative wall hangings not of textile.</p>	
<p>Class 35</p>	
<p>WO0000001624462 <i>("the first earlier mark")</i></p> <p>Class 35</p> <p>Advertising and marketing services; advertising agency services; setting up, supervising and implementing innovative advertising concepts related to consumers, products and services; services of market research and</p>	

marketing agencies; business organizational consultancy and information provision in the fields of marketing, brand design (not for commercial purposes), marketing communications and advertising design; advice regarding promotional activities and projects; creating, developing and executing advertising campaigns and other promotional activities and projects; business support for advertising campaigns; directing and producing of commercials, including corporate films; public relations; marketing advice in the field of brands, products and services; consultancy with regard to commercial matters relating to brands, as well as marketing for products and services; providing of commercial information relating to products and services; developing innovative marketing and advertising concepts for the provision of services and for the commercialization of products; providing company and product presentations and company events and other events for commercial and / or advertising purposes; information, consultancy and advice regarding the aforesaid services, whether or not provided via the internet; advertising and marketing advice relating to brands, as well as for the promotion of products and services;

development of strategies and concepts for the marketing and promotion of the shipbuilding industry; organization of business meetings for concept development in the field of the shipbuilding industry; organization of business and promotional events; business management of restaurants; franchise services in the nature of business support related to restaurants as well as franchise services in the nature of marketing support related to restaurants; the aforementioned services exclusively provided in the context of nautical events and / or in ports.

WO0000001799413

("the second earlier mark")

Class 35

Advertising, marketing and promotional services; business assistance relating to the establishment of franchises; assistance in business management within the framework of a franchise contract; presentation of goods and/or services on communications media of all kinds, for sales purposes; online business services relating to bringing together internet users and trading partners for the sale of goods and/or

<p>services; online retail sale services of clothing, footwear, headgear, leatherware, bags, suitcases, interior furniture, outdoor furniture, textiles and textile goods, kitchen utensils and containers, bedding; online retail sale services of picture frames, mirrors, christmas decorations, playthings, books, magazines, foodstuffs, alcoholic or non-alcoholic beverages, cosmetics and dietary supplements, paints, lacquers, building materials and building components made of metal, hand tools, lamps, furniture for bathrooms, carpets, mats and matting, wall hangings, ornaments, clocks; organising fairs, exhibitions, events and other activities for commercial purposes.</p>	
	Class 37
	<p>Class 37</p> <p>Construction of interior accommodation; Interior refurbishment of buildings.</p>
Class 42	Class 42
<p>WO0000001624462 <i>("the first earlier mark")</i></p> <p>Class 42</p> <p>Graphic designing, technical drawing and graphic arts design; industrial</p>	<p>Class 42</p> <p>Interior design; Design of interior decoration; Design of interior decor; Interior decor design; Decor (Design of</p>

<p>design; industrial research; services of a design agency, including the development and design of new products, packaging, interiors, house styles and logos, not for advertising purposes; technical or scientific research; graphic design services, industrial design services, design services relating to packaging, design services relating to sanitary facilities and sanitary products; designing and maintaining websites; designing and developing products and advising in this area; digital design (graphic design); information, consultancy and advice regarding the aforesaid services, whether or not provided via the internet; consultancy with regard to designing trademarks and designs, not for commercial purposes and designing trademarks and designs, not for commercial purposes; graphic design of corporate branding, names and logos for advertising purposes; consultancy in the design of trademarks and designs for commercial purposes and the design of trademarks and designs for commercial purposes.</p>	<p>interior -); Interior decorating design; Architectural design for interior decoration; Interior and exterior design services; Commercial interior design; Interior design services; Design of building interiors; Interior design services for boutiques; Design of furnishings; Design services relating to interior decoration; Architectural design; Space planning [design] of interiors; Interior decorating; Design of furniture; Furniture design; Design services for building interiors; Construction design; Interior decoration consultation; Interior architectural services; Consultancy relating to selection of furnishing fabrics [interior design]; Design services relating to interior decorating for homes; Design services relating to interior decorating for offices; Consultancy relating to selection of curtaining [interior design]; Design of artwork; Furnishing design services for the interiors of aircraft; Furnishing design services for the interiors of buildings; Interior design services for the retail industry; Consultancy relating to selection of loose covers for furniture [interior design]; Consultancy services relating to interior design; Design of carpets; Design of buildings; Professional consultancy relating to the design of interior accommodation; Architectural design services; Design of</p>
---	---

	<p>bathrooms; Consultation services relating to interior design; Design services for architecture; Architecture design services; Advisory services relating to interior design; Design of curtains; Design of layouts for office furniture; Office layout design services; Product design; Design consultancy; Design services for furniture; Office furniture design; Architectural services for the design of buildings; Design of layouts for offices; Design planning; Technical design; House design services; Building design services; Design services for art-work; Design of office space; Planning [design] of bathrooms; Designing of furniture.</p>
--	---