

TRADE MARKS ACT 1994

IN THE MATTER OF TRADE MARK APPLICATION **m** 2119770
BY VERT BAUDET (UK) LIMITED
TO REGISTER THE TRADE MARK

ORIGINE WORLD

AND

IN THE MATTER OF OPPOSITION BY
BY ORIGINS NATURAL RESOURCES INCORPORATED
THERE TO UNDER OPPOSITION **m** 47030

DECISION

Vert Baudet (UK) Limited, 18 Canal Road, Bradford, West Yorkshire, BD99 4XB, applied on 31 December 1996 to register the above mark. The specified goods are:

5 Class 24: 'Textile and textile goods, not included in other classes; bed and table covers; textile piece goods; household textile articles; towels; face cloths and bath linen; handkerchiefs; furnishing fabrics and materials.'

Class 25: 'Clothing; footwear; headgear.'

The application is opposed by Origins Natural Resources Incorporated based on the following sections of the Trade Marks Act 1994, in that the mark ORIGINE WORLD, under:

10 ! ss 5(2) and (3) registration would be contrary to the provisions of the Act;

! s 5(4)(a) is liable to be prevented by virtue of the law of passing off as being calculated to deceive or cause confusion or otherwise to interfere with the Opponents' rights.

15 The Opponents also ask for the registration to be refused in the exercise of the Registrar's discretion. However, under the 1994 Act the Registrar does not have discretion to refuse an application. It can only be refused if it fails to comply with the requirements of the Act and Rules in one or more respects.

The Opponents are the proprietor of the registrations of the ORIGINS mark listed in the Annex.

20 A counter statement is provided by the Applicants denying the grounds of opposition, and both parties ask for their costs. No hearing was requested and the following decision is based on the pleadings and evidence submitted.

The Evidence

25 Two Statutory Declarations are enclosed from Maleka Dattu, the Sales and Marketing Manager of the Origins Division of Estee Lauder Cosmetics Limited, one dated 17 March 1998, the other 2 November 1998. The Applicants submit one declaration, from Ellen McLaughlin, the Assistant Company Secretary and Solicitor of Empire Stores Group plc.

30 Ms Dattu explains that her Company is a United Kingdom company who, together with the Opponents, are part of the Estee Lauder group of companies which manufacture and distribute cosmetics throughout the world. She says that the Opponents are the registered proprietor and her company is the licensee of various ORIGIN registered trade marks in the table in the Annex, and those which appear in the list following the table.

Ms Dattu says that the trade mark ORIGINS was first used in the UK in the mid 1980's by the Opponents predecessor in title, Natural Assets Limited. This was in respect of cosmetics and, what Ms Dattu calls, a wide variety of lifestyle products all within several classes. Examples are given as diffuser, jacknobby, retractable lip brush, a mesh bush bag and stress balls.

5 Ms Dattu says that other divisions of the Estee Lauder group have sold non-cosmetic merchandise under their principle trade marks with the intention to promote the fragrance and cosmetics business. She adds that in the case of the Opponents, the non-cosmetic products including clothing are not always promotional but are often intended to be sold or distributed individually on their own merits. She says 'The purpose of selling these non-cosmetic
10 products is to increase the general visibility of the mark and to add interest to the cosmetic products in the range' and adds that the Opponents have been selling a wide range of clothing in the USA for several years, including belts, hats, coats, jackets, baseball caps, slippers, t-shirts, ties and bathrobes. Apparently less clothing has been sold under the mark in the UK, but an example of a T-shirt is enclosed in evidence (Exhibit MD2) which was distributed in a
15 two product set along with a denim back pack in the London store Harrods, from December 1997.

Apart from clothing products which have been sold in the UK in Harrods only, ORIGINS goods in general have been sold to customers located throughout the UK through retail outlets listed in Exhibit MD3. These include John Lewis in London, Kendalls in Manchester, Frasers
20 in Glasgow and House of Fraser in Nottingham. Ms Dattu says that the presence of ORIGINS products is emphasised by banners, posters and displays bearing the ORIGINS mark, in windows and throughout the stores. Because of this, she says, the brand maintains a very high visual profile and a significant section of the public notice the products even if they do not buy them.

25 Other promotions of the ORIGINS brand is also described by Ms Dattu. As well as widespread advertising she says that products are promoted at peak times through radio stations throughout the United Kingdom and includes, in evidence, samples of three radio advertising scripts. She also says that promotion takes place on escalator panels on the London Underground, on banners, outdoor posters and billboards. A bundle of documents
30 included under Exhibit MD5 show examples of ORIGINS promotional documents such as product guides, brochures, postcards, leaflets, highlighters and A4 visuals. Further, advertising has taken place in Elle, Marie Claire, Health & Beauty, Zest, She, Good Housekeeping, Country Living, Cosmopolitan and O.K. magazines. Evidence includes examples of recent national magazine advertisements for ORIGINS products. I note that none
35 of the material enclosed in these exhibits contain references to clothing. Ms Dattu also refers to national press advertising, radio advertising and advertising in local press and the local radio, which is paid for by local retail stores, also mentioned in the advertising.

Ms Dattu gives the current functional turnover for the whole ORIGINS range as £1,588,000 per annum. She says that the gross sales turnover at wholesale prices to stores non-cosmetic
40 products bearing the ORIGINS mark in the United Kingdom since 1995 to December 1997 is as follows:

Fiscal Year	Non-Cosmetic Products Gross Wholesale Sales £	Units Sold
1995-1996	30,000	6,843
1996-1997	85,000	18,134

5 Ms Dattu then compares the Applicants' mark ORIGINE WORLD with the Opponents' marks registered under Nos. 1426965 and 1490584 (see Annex). Mr Dattu believes that confusion will take place for a number of reasons. First, the positioning of the respective parties products and their likely customers will be very similar. Next, because the British public is becoming used to a wide variety of the lifestyle products, including clothing, being sold under the ORIGINS mark and there seems a probability that they would regard the

10 Applicants' mark as an allusion to the Opponents'. She says that she does not believe the inclusion of the word WORLD in ORIGINE WORLD would in any way retract from the primary focus of the Applicants' mark which is undoubtedly the word ORIGIN. In her view it is this first word that would form a lasting impression in the public's mind because it is the first and most distinctive part of the mark. Further this will be reinforced because WORLD is an

15 exceptionally common word used in the names of numerous retailers to such an extent that it has become generic for the word shop, store etc. An example is given as PC World. She notes there is only one letter difference between the Applicants' ORIGIN and the Opponents' and adds that conceptually the two words are very close. She says: 'The natural assumption would be that ORIGINE WORLD referred to a larger umbrella of companies of which the

20 ORIGINS organisation was a part or sister company' and adds that the public would not have the opportunity of comparing the two products and marks side by side as in these proceedings. In her view, taken together, these factors will lead to a confusing similarity between the marks and says that even if the Applicants did not intend this it seems very likely that their registration would be highly detrimental to the value of the her Company's mark which has

25 been, hitherto, wholly distinctive within the world of fashion and beauty.

Ms McLaughlin, in her declaration, states that there is no mention of the Opponents' mark ORIGINS having been used in relation to clothing. She says it is unclear whether the reference to use in respect of clothing relates to this or other of their marks or the Estee Lauder group. Referring to the table reproduced above, she notes that the sales of

30 non-cosmetic products in 1995 and 1996 were given as £30,000, and says it is not clear that any of these products were clothes.

Ms McLaughlin believes the confusion between the marks at issue will not take place for a number of reasons. First, the Opponents have not filed any evidence of actual confusion despite the fact the marks have co-existed in the market place for at least two years. She says:

35 'The applicant has been trading in goods bearing the marks ORIGINE WORLD in the United Kingdom since as early as 1997. The goods sold by the applicant under the trade mark are children's clothes. The applicant does not sell cosmetic products under the trade mark. The sales of products under the trade mark total approximately £1,000,000 pounds and this figure continues to grow. Therefore, the applicants use of the trade mark in the

40 UK is extensive'.

Despite this, confusion does not appear to have occurred. Ms McLaughlin also notes that the Applicants are the proprietors of registration number 2114963 ORIGINE WORLD & device. She says that this registration co-exists with the Opponents' trade marks both on the register and in the market place and the Opponents have raised no objections before.

5 She also says goods traded in by the Opponents appear to be aimed at exclusive purchasers and not at children, while the primary media for the Applicants' products is children's wear and these are sold through mail order. Enclosed in evidence in Exhibit EM2 are sample copies of catalogues used by the Applicants. Ms McLaughlin says 'The trade channels are completely different and the fact that the Opponents goods have been sold in a store such as
10 Harrods would seem to support the contention that the trade channels are very different and therefore there is no risk of confusion.' She also says the products under both trade marks have been sold in France and there has been no evidence of confusion in that country.

In her second statutory declaration Ms Dattu includes a number of criticisms of Ms
15 McLaughlin's declaration and also adds further evidence of the supply of clothing under the ORIGINS mark in the UK. An example of the denim back pack mentioned above is enclosed at Exhibit MD7 and in Exhibit MD8 is an ORIGINS marked belt. Ms Dattu says that approximately 150 such belts were retailed at Harrods of Knightsbridge at £25 each.

In commenting on Ms McLaughlin's declaration, Ms Dattu criticises the distinction Ms
20 McLaughlin has drawn between exclusive purchases and products produced for children. She says:

'It is wrong to imply the advertising by the applicant in the mail order catalogues is aimed at children. Children do not purchase their own clothes and in most cases, especially in the case of very young children, children play little if any role in the decision making involved in purchasing their clothes.'

25 She adds that the same members of the public will be exposed to both the Opponents' and the Applicants' advertising since it is aimed at those potential customers with disposable income and says that the likelihood of confusion will not be as remote as implied by Ms McLaughlin. A customer having purchased an ORIGINS marked product may, in Ms Dattu's view, wonder whether a catalogue using a similar mark was in fact related to the Opponents'.

30 Ms Dattu again lists the stores throughout the UK that currently sell ORIGINS marked products and says that all these stores operate mail order services in which ORIGINS marked products have appeared from time to time. She says that the Opponents are currently in the process of arranging to mail 100,000 mail order catalogues to Harrods account and mail order customers and adds that it is wrong to suggest, as Ms McLaughlin does, that the trade
35 channels of the Applicants and Opponents are completely different. Finally, Ms Dattu that the Opponents intends to open its first free standing stall in the Churchill Square Centre of Brighton around the end of November 1988. Though she says large scale clothing related sales are not anticipated, there is every possibility these may occur in the future, and refers to a pair of gloves exhibited at MD10, which the store will be selling.

The Decision

The grounds pleaded are under s 5(2):

‘5. (2) A trade mark shall not be registered if because-

5 (a) it is identical with an earlier trade mark and is to be registered for goods or services similar to those for which the earlier trade mark is protected, or

(b) it is similar to an earlier trade mark and is to be registered for goods or services identical with or similar to those for which the earlier trade mark is protected,

there exists a likelihood of confusion on the part of the public, which includes the likelihood of association with the earlier trade mark.

10 The two marks at issue are:

ORIGINS and ORIGINE WORLD.

15 ORIGINS, the Opponents’ mark, is registered for ‘Articles of clothing; footwear; headgear’ under **m** 1490584 (see ANNEX). This, I believe, includes the detailed list of clothing goods specified under **m** 1426965, and I will not consider these items further. Thus the Opponents mark is registered for goods identical to those in the current application under class 25. However, those under class 24:

20 ‘Textile and textile goods, not included in other classes; bed and table covers; textile piece goods; household textile articles; towels; face cloths and bath linen; handkerchiefs; furnishing fabrics and materials’

25 which specifically excludes textile goods in other classes. Based on current Registry practice, textile materials for manufacture of clothing are regarded as similar goods to clothing. It is not clear whether such products are included in the above specification. To the extent that they are not, those items specified under here under Class 24 are not in my view similar goods for the purposes of the s 5(2). Thus my considerations under this section are restricted to goods in class 25 and textile material for the making up into clothing under Class 24. The opposition has therefore failed under this ground for other goods listed in Class 24.

In the recent BALMORAL¹ Decision Mr Geoffrey Hobbes, acting as the Appointed Person, constructed the following test for use in applying s 5(2), here recast as:

30 ‘Are there similarities between ORIGINS and ORIGINE WORLD (including visual, aural and conceptual), which would combine to create a likelihood of confusion in the mind of the average consumer if they were used simultaneously on the market?’

¹Trade Marks Act 1994: In the matter of Application no. 2003949 to register a trade mark in class 33 in the name of REISSUEMENT ESTATES PTY LIMITED; Decision of the Appointed Person, 18 August 1998 (unpublished).

The SABEL v PUMA² Case, also referred to by the Appointed Person in the same Decision, states:

5 ‘That global appreciation of the visual, aural or conceptual similarity of the marks in question must be based on the overall impression given by the marks, bearing in mind, in particular, their distinctive and dominant components. ... The average consumer normally perceives a mark as a whole and does not proceed to analyse its various details.’

10 The only similarity in the marks is the presence of ORIGIN in both. Ms Dattu was of the view that this will tend to dominate. However, I remain to be convinced of this. There are obvious visual differences between the marks in that one consists of two words and the other of one, with the latter mark ending ORIGIN in an S, the former in an E. These differences are more than trivial. For example, orally, the marks, in my view, will be distinguished by the -INE in ORIGINE in which will tend to be pronounced to rhyme with WINE. The other obvious oral difference is the word WORLD.

15 Ms Dattu says in her declaration: ‘WORLD is an exceptionally common word used in the names of numerous retailers to such an extent that it has become generic for the words “shop”, “store”, etc. Examples of this generic use would include store names such as “PC World”.’. This may be the case for some obvious consumer product - such as computers or cars - but is less likely to be perceived in this manner when used in the Applicants’ mark. Taken as a whole, its presence tends to move any significance the mark has towards the fanciful.

20 I also believe that the likelihood of confusion is reduced even further because ORIGINS is not a particularly distinctive mark. Further, the goods at issue are not cheap items and are normally purchased with care. Against this background, considering normal and fair use of the marks, I think it unlikely there will be confusion on the part of consumers, and this ground of opposition fails.

25 Turning to s 5(3), this states:

(3) A trade mark which -

(a) is identical or similar to an earlier trade mark, and

30 (b) is to be registered for goods or services which are not similar, to those for which the earlier trade mark is protected,

shall not be registered if, or to the extent that, the earlier trade mark has a reputation in the United Kingdom .. and the use of the later mark without due cause would take unfair advantage of, or be detrimental to, the distinctive character or the repute of the earlier trade mark.

²European Court of Justice in Case C-251/95 *SABER BV v. PUMA AG* [1998] RPC 199.

This section applies to identical or similar marks and goods which are not similar to those for which the earlier mark is registered. This will not include the goods considered above under s 5(2)(b), but will include those remaining under Class 24.

The purpose of s 5(3) is explained in the 'Notes on the Trade Marks Act 1994'³, which states:

- 5 'The justification for this provision is that a mark may become so well known in its own field that the use of an identical or similar mark in quite a different field could cause consumers wrongly to infer a trade connection - for example, to think that the owner of the well-known mark has diversified his activities, or has authorised someone else to use the mark... At the very least the attractive power of the mark could be diluted'.
- 10 Such protection depends on the reputation of the ORIGINS mark in general - not just that related to clothing - and the evidence suggests to me that Opponents do have some reputation for cosmetics and related products. In her declaration, Ms Dattu says that the current wholesales turnover for the whole ORIGINS range is currently about £1.6M. Obviously, that represents a much greater amount sold on to consumers. Also mentioned, and provided in
- 15 evidence, is material relating to promotion of the Opponents' product, via radio advertising and in magazines. However, this reputation is confined to retail outlets described by Ms Dattu as only '..of the very best quality' and only nine are mentioned in evidence. In my view, this must limit the extent of the Opponents' reputation though, that which exists, may reside in high value merchandise.
- 20 In view of this, I must conclude that the Opponents have not shown that their reputation in their marks is wide enough that registration of the mark in suit will ride on its back in some way, or take advantage of it, such that some damage will be the result. My belief is supported by the conclusions above about the limited similarity between the marks in this case. This ground also fails.
- 25 The final ground concerns 'passing off' under s 5(4):
- (4)(a) A trade mark shall not be registered if, or to the extent that, its use in the United Kingdom is liable to be prevented -
- (a) by virtue of any rule of law (in particular, the law of passing off) protecting an unregistered trade mark or other sign used in the course of trade...'
- 30 Geoffrey Hobbs QC, acting as the 'Appointed Person', summed up the current law under Section 5(4)(a) of the Act in the WILD CHILD⁴. He stated that:

³A publication called '*Notes on the Trade Marks Act 1994*' which was prepared for the use by Parliament during passage of the Bill.

⁴*Wild child* [1998] 14 RPC, 455.

‘A helpful summary of the elements of an action for passing off can be found in Halsbury’s Laws of England 4th Edition Vol 48 (1995 reissue) at paragraph 165. The guidance given with reference to the speeches in the House of Lords in Reckitt & Colman Products Ltd -v- Borden Inc [1990] RPC 341 and Erven Warnink BV -v- J Townend & Sons (Hull) Ltd [1979] ACT 731 is (with footnotes omitted) as follows:

“The necessary elements of the action for passing off have been restated by the House of Lords as being three in number:

- (1) that the plaintiff’s goods or services have acquired a goodwill or reputation in the market and are known by some distinguishing feature;
- (2) that there is a misrepresentation by the defendant (whether or not intentional) leading or likely to lead the public to believe that goods or services offered by the defendant are goods or services of the plaintiff; and
- (3) that the plaintiff has suffered or is likely to suffer damage as a result of the erroneous belief engendered by the defendant’s misrepresentation.

The restatement of the elements of passing off in the form of this classical trinity has been preferred as providing greater assistance in analysis and decision than the formulation of the elements of the action previously expressed by the House. This latest statement, like the House’s previous statement, should not, however, be treated as akin to a statutory definition or as if the words used by the House constitute an exhaustive, literal definition of ‘passing off’, and in particular should not be used to exclude from the ambit of the tort recognised forms of the action for passing off which were not under consideration on the facts before the House”

Further guidance is given in paragraphs 184 to 188 of the same volume with regard to establishing the likelihood of deception or confusion. In paragraph 184 it is noted (with footnotes omitted) that;

“To establish a likelihood of deception or confusion in an action for passing off where there has been no direct misrepresentation generally requires the presence of two factual elements:

- (1) that a name, mark or other distinctive feature used by the plaintiff has acquired a reputation among a relevant class of persons; and
- (2) that members of that class will mistakenly infer from the defendant’s use of a name, mark or other feature which is the same or sufficiently similar that the defendant’s goods or business are from the same source or are connected.

While it is helpful to think of these two factual elements as successive hurdles which the plaintiff must surmount, consideration of these two aspects cannot be

completely separated from each other, as whether deception or confusion is likely is ultimately a single question of fact.

In arriving at the conclusion of fact as to whether deception or confusion is likely, the court will have regard to:

- 5 (a) the nature and extent of the reputation relied upon;
- (b) the closeness or otherwise of the respective fields of activity in which the plaintiff and the defendant carry on business;
- 10 (c) the similarity of the mark, name etc. used by the defendant to that of the plaintiff;
- (d) the manner in which the defendant makes use of the name, mark etc. complained of and collateral factors; and
- 15 (e) the manner in which the particular trade is carried on, the class of persons who it is alleged is likely to be deceived and all other surrounding circumstances.

In assessing whether confusion or deception is likely, the court attaches importance to the question whether the defendant can be shown to have acted with a fraudulent intent, although a fraudulent intent is not a necessary part of the cause of action.” ’

20 In summary, to succeed in a passing off action, it is necessary for the Opponents to establish that at the relevant date (31 December 1996): (i) they had acquired goodwill under their mark, (ii) that use of the other mark would amount to a misrepresentation likely to lead to confusion as to the origin of their goods; and (iii) that such confusion is likely to cause real damage to their goodwill.

25 As stated above, I do consider that the Opponents have a reputation in the purveyance of cosmetic products, and goodwill for these products under the ORIGINS mark. This appears to extend to what Ms Dattu calls ‘lifestyle products’ as listed in paragraph 6 of her first Declaration. However, this goodwill does not, in my view, include the products listed in the Applicants’ specification. Evidence of clothing sales is rather small. Ms Dattu does refer to T-Shirts (see Exhibit MD2), sold in Harrods as part of a two product set with a denim
30 backpack (also included in evidence at MD7). The former is marked with an ORIGINS trade mark in the neck label, while the latter carries no mark. There is no evidence showing the advertising or promotion of these products. Ms Dattu also says that the sales of non-cosmetic products in 1995 and 1996 amounted to £30,000 and in 1996/1997 to £85,000, and though she confirms in her second declaration that this includes clothes, she does not say how much.
35 The only other evidence of clothing sales before the relevant date is 150 belts sold at Harrods in 1995.

In view of this I must conclude that the Opponents have very small goodwill in clothing sales in this country, and I am unable to conclude that this is such that confusion will occur with the Applicants’ mark that results in damage to this goodwill. This ground also fails.

The Applicants having been successful in these proceedings, are entitled to a contribution towards their costs. I therefore order the Opponents to pay them the sum of £435.00

Dated this 22th day of July 1999

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

ANNEX

Date	Number	Class	Goods
20.03.1986	1263081	3	Perfumes, essential oils, cosmetics, non-medicated preparations for the care of the body; dentifrices; deodorants for personal use.
07.03.1989	1375726	3	Soaps; shampoos; non-medicated toilet preparations for the care of the hair and/or the scalp; hair lotions.
5 31.10.1994	1490251	3	Perfumes, cosmetics, non medicated toilet preparations; essential oils; preparations for the care of the skin and body; anti-perspirants; preparations for the care of the hair.
01.06.1990	1426965	25	Jackets; shirts; skirts; gloves; vests; mittens; scarves; boots; shoes; caps; hats; belts; boot straps; sweat pants; sweatshirts; T-shirts; sleeping garments; ladies' halter tops; bandanas; rain suits; children's wear; sock suspenders; neckties; jeans; underwear; coats; sweaters; leather leggings.
12.02.1992	1490584	25	Articles of clothing; footwear; headgear.

	NUMBER	MARK	CLASS	FILING DATE
	B 1,263,081	ORIGINS	3	20.03.1986
10	B 1,341,296	ORIGINS	5	13.04.1988
	B 1,375,726	ORIGINS	3	07.03.1989
	1,385,347	ORIGINS	30	25.05.1989
	B 1,426,965	ORIGINS	25	01.12.1989
15	B 1,429,385	ORIGINS HANDLE WITH CARE	3	20.06.1990
	B 1,429,398	ORIGINS CLEAR IMPROVEMENT	3	20.06.1990
	B 1,429,426	ORIGINS MINT WASH	3	20.06.1990

	NUMBER	MARK	CLASS	FILING DATE
	B 1,429,447	ORIGINS STRESS BUFFER	3	20.06.1990
5	B 1,429,450	ORIGINS COMFORTING SOLUTION	3	20.06.1990
	B 1,429,456	ORIGINS MANAGING SOLUTION	3	20.06.1990
	B 1,429,461	ORIGINS TUNING SOLUTION	3	20.06.1990
10	B 1,429,462	ORIGINS MENDING SOLUTION	3	20.06.1990
	B 1,429,466	ORIGINS DRENCHING SOLUTION	3	20.06.1990
15	1,430,664	NATURAL ORIGINS & Tree Device	3	31.10.1994
	1,460,802	ORIGINS	42	06.04.1991
	1,461,034	ORIGINS	16	12.04.1991
	B 1,470,669	ORIGINS ZERO OIL	3	16.07.1991
	B 1,470,670	ORIGINS WELL OFF	3	16.07.1991
20	1,470,673	ORIGINS MUSCLE EASING	3	16.07.1991
	B 1,470,676	ORIGINS UNDERWEAR FOR LASHES	3	16.07.1991
25	B 1,470,678	ORIGINS STARTING OVER	3	16.07.1991
	B 1,487,996	ORIGINS & Trees Device	3	15.01.1992
	1,490,251	ORIGINS in special form	3	31.10.1994
	B 1,490,578	ORIGINS	4	12.02.1992

	NUMBER	MARK	CLASS	FILING DATE
	B 1,490,579	ORIGINS	8	12.02.1992
	B 1,490,580	ORIGINS	9	12.02.1992
	B 1,490,581	ORIGINS	14	12.02.1992
5	B 1,490,582	ORIGINS	18	12.02.1992
	B 1,490,583	ORIGINS	21	12.02.1992
	B 1,490,584	ORIGINS	25	12.02.1992
	1,507,215	ORIGINS FRINGE BENEFITS	3	22.07.1992
10	1,541,899	ORIGINS BEAUTY BEINGS WITH YOUR WELL-BEING	3	31.10.1994
	1,541,900	ORIGINS BEAUTY BEINGS WITH YOUR WELL-BEING	42	31.10.1994
15				
	1,544,651	ORIGINS EMPTIES	40	12.08.1993
	1,544,653	ORIGINS INHALATIONS	3	31.10.1994
	1,544,658	ORIGINS PLANT SPIRITS	3	31.10.1994
	1,559,937	ORIGINS SPOT REMOVER	3	31.10.1994
20				
	B 1,574,611	ORIGINS KNOT FREE	3	31.10.1994
	1,574,904	ORIGINS NO DEPOSIT	3	31.10.1994
	1,574,980	ORIGINS NATURAL RESOURCES	3	31.10.1994
25	1,584,398	ORIGINS SMELL THE FLOWERS	3	31.10.1994
	2,000,072	ORIGINS	35, 41 & 42	31.10.1994

NUMBER	MARK	CLASS	FILING DATE
2,002,565	ORIGINS EMERGENCY BALM	3	22.11.1994
5 2,108,606	ORIGINS OUT OF TROUBLE	3	28.08.1996
2,132,656	ORIGINS SHIMMER STICK	3	14.05.1997