

O-642-17

TRADE MARKS ACT 1994

CONSOLIDATED PROCEEDINGS

TRADE MARK APPLICATION NO. 3187093
BY WESTERN DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES, INC.
TO REGISTER THE TRADE MARK

WD PURPLE

IN CLASSES 9 and 42

AND

THE OPPOSITION THERETO UNDER NO. 408309
BY PURPLE TECHNOLOGIES (EUROPE) LIMITED

AND

TRADE MARK REGISTRATION NO. 3155298
OWNED BY PURPLE TECHNOLOGIES (EUROPE) LIMITED

Purple.com

IN CLASSES 9, 38 AND 41

AND THE APPLICATION FOR A DECLARATION OF INVALIDITY THERETO
BY WESTERN DIGITAL TECHNOLOGIES, INC., NO 501554

Background and pleadings

1. Western Digital Technologies, Inc. (“Western”) applied for the trade mark WD PURPLE on 22 September 2016 for goods and services in classes 9 and 42. The application was published on 21 October 2016 and was subsequently opposed by Purple Technologies (Europe) Limited (“Purple”) on the basis of section 5(2)(b) of the Trade Marks Act 1994 (“the Act”). Purple claims that there is a likelihood of confusion with its earlier mark number 3155298, for the mark Purple.com, registered for goods and services in classes 9, 38 and 41.

2. Western responded to the opposition by filing a counterstatement, denying the ground of opposition. It also filed an application to have Purple’s mark declared invalid on the basis that there is a likelihood of confusion, under section 47(2)(a)/5(2)(b) of the Act, with an earlier EU trade mark owned by Western, number 012407474 for the mark WD PURPLE, registered in classes 9, 37 and 42. Purple denies the grounds of Western’s application for invalidation.

3. Western’s counterstatement includes the following:

“20. Further, the Applicant [Western] notes that the Opponent [Purple] is linked to Michael Gleissner. Due to a recent vast trade mark filing programme by businesses linked to this individual, suspicions have been raised that many of the rights sought and/or obtained (including that on which the Opponent relies) were filed in bad faith. An article from World Trademark Review that discusses this filing programme is enclosed under the *Annex* to this Counterstatement. In the Cancellation, we will be inviting the Registrar to look very closely at whether the Opponent had any intention to use the mark relied on in the Opposition. If our concerns on that point are proved correct, and if the Opponent persists in forcing the Applicant to spend money on the Opposition, we submit that whenever and however the Opposition is resolved, these facts should be taken into consideration when awarding costs in due course.”

4. Western is represented by Carpmaels & Ransford LLP. Purple represents itself. Neither party filed evidence. Western filed submissions during the evidence rounds. Neither party requested a hearing and neither filed submissions in lieu of a hearing. I make this decision having carefully read all the papers filed in the consolidated proceedings.

Decision

5. I will begin with Western's application for a declaration of invalidity because if this succeeds in full, then Purple's opposition will automatically fail for want of a valid earlier right upon which to base its claim under section 5(2)(b) of the Act.

6. Section 47(2) states:

“(2) 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) But 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 the application for the declaration,

(b) the registration procedure for the earlier trade mark was not completed before that date, or

(c) the use conditions are met.

(2F) Subsection (2A) does not apply where the earlier trade mark is a trade mark within section 6(1)(c).”

7. Western’s EUTM 12407474 was filed on 9 December 2013 and was registered on 18 July 2014. Purple’s mark, 3155298, was filed on 17 March 2016 and was registered on 19 August 2016. Western’s mark is therefore an earlier right. Further, as it had been registered for less than five years on the date on which the application for invalidation was filed, it is not subject to the proof of use provisions and may be considered for all the goods and services for which it is registered.

8. 5(2)(b) of the Act states:

“(2) A trade mark shall not be registered if because –

(a) ...

(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.”

9. The following principles are gleaned from the decisions of the EU courts in *Sabel BV v Puma AG*, Case C-251/95, *Canon Kabushiki Kaisha v Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Inc*, Case C-39/97, *Lloyd Schuhfabrik Meyer & Co GmbH v Klijsen Handel B.V.* Case C-342/97, *Marca Mode CV v Adidas AG & Adidas Benelux BV*, Case C-425/98, *Matratzen Concord GmbH v OHIM*, Case C-3/03, *Medion AG v. Thomson*

Multimedia Sales Germany & Austria GmbH, Case C-120/04, Shaker di L. Laudato & C. Sas v OHIM, Case C-334/05P and Bimbo SA v OHIM, Case C-591/12P.

The principles

(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

10. In comparing the respective specifications, all relevant factors should be considered, as per *Canon Kabushiki Kaisha v Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Inc.* where the 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.”

11. ‘Complementary’ was defined by the GC in *Boston Scientific Ltd v Office for Harmonization in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs) (OHIM) Case T-325/06*:

“82 It is true that goods are complementary if there is a close connection between them, in the sense that one is indispensable or important for the use of the other in such a way that customers may think that the responsibility for those goods lies with the same undertaking...”.

12. Additionally, the criteria identified in *British Sugar Plc v James Robertson & Sons Limited* (“*Treat*”) [1996] R.P.C. 281 for assessing similarity between goods and services also include an assessment of the channels of trade of the respective goods or services.

13. In *Avnet Incorporated v Isoact Limited*, [1998] F.S.R. 16, Jacob J. (as he then was) stated that:

“In my view, specifications for services should be scrutinised carefully and they should not be given a wide construction covering a vast range of activities. They should be confined to the substance, as it were, the core of the possible meanings attributable to the rather general phrase.”

14. In *YouView TV Ltd v Total Ltd* [2012] EWHC 3158 (Ch) at [12] Floyd J said:

“... Trade mark registrations should not be allowed such a liberal interpretation that their limits become fuzzy and imprecise: see the observations of the CJEU in Case C-307/10 *The Chartered Institute of Patent Attorneys (Trademarks) (IP TRANSLATOR)* [2012] ETMR 42 at [47]-[49]. Nevertheless the principle should not be taken too far. *Treat* was decided the way it was because the ordinary and natural, or core, meaning of 'dessert sauce' did not include jam, or because the ordinary and natural description of jam was not 'a dessert sauce'. Each involved a straining of the relevant language, which is incorrect. Where words or phrases in their ordinary and natural meaning are apt to cover the category of goods in question, there is equally no justification for straining the language unnaturally so as to produce a narrow meaning which does not cover the goods in question.”

15. The law requires that goods and services be considered identical where one party's description of its goods or services encompasses the specific goods or services covered by the other party's descriptions (and vice versa): see *Gérard Meric v OHIM*, Case T-33/05, GC. The goods and services to be compared are set out in the table below. I have highlighted goods in class 9 which are identical either in the words used or because the description encompasses goods of the other party.

Western's goods and services	Purple's goods and services
<p>Class 9: Data storage devices, namely, hard disk drives, digital disk drives, media players, solid state drives, blank digital storage media, hybrid drives and computer peripherals; computer storage devices, namely, computer memory hardware and hard drives for computers; digital electronic devices for organizing, receiving, playing, transmitting, managing, storing, securing, encrypting, centralizing, backing-up, transferring, customizing, navigating, playing, viewing, accessing, sharing, streaming, synchronizing, modifying, reviewing, uploading, and downloading text, data, image, audio and video files, information, or media stored on, streamed through, hosted on or run on data storage devices, hard drives, disk drives, solid state drives, media players, Internet servers and cloud storage services; removable hard drive based computer backup system; computer hardware for upload, storage, retrieval, download, transmission and delivery of digital content; computer software for use in the synchronization, back-up, playing and</p>	<p>Class 9: Computer hardware; Computer software; Computer peripherals; Electronic data processing equipment; Computer networking and data communications equipment; Computer components and parts; Electronic memory devices; Electronic control apparatus.</p> <p>Class 38: Telecommunications and broadcast communication services; transmission and streaming of data content via computer and global information networks; operating of electronic communications networks; providing access to databases; providing access to online databases via portals; electronic data interchange; telecommunications services for providing access to computer databases; providing data access to databases for downloading information via electronic media.</p> <p>Class 41: Teaching, education, training and entertainment services; Production and distribution of television programs, shows and movies; provision of non-downloadable</p>

encryption and decryption of digital files, including audio, video, text, binary, still images, graphics and multimedia files; computer network storage devices, namely, storage and backup of electronic data either locally or via a telecommunications network; networking software, namely, software for setting up and configuring managed storage and online backup services over wide area networks; computer software and hardware for synchronizing and connecting local network storage and global computer networks, for upload, storage, retrieval, download, transmission and delivery of digital content, for storing and managing data on local and Internet based file servers, for processing storage of data; computer firmware for data storage, data retrieval, data access, data backup, data replication, data availability, data recovery, data translation and data conversion; computer hardware for use in video surveillance applications and systems, digital or personal video recorders, Internet protocol televisions, set-top boxes, audio systems, digital signage, karaoke players, computer gaming devices and DVD recorders.

Class 37: Updating and maintenance of data storage devices, hard drives, disk drives, solid state drives, media players and computer peripherals.

films and television programs via video-on-demand services; Arranging and conducting of workshops (education), congresses, lessons; Organization of exhibitions for cultural or educational purposes; Publication of electronic books and journals on-line.

Class 42: Providing temporary use of online, non-downloadable computer software for use in storing and managing the computer data of others; back-up services for computer hard drive data and for computer data storage devices; computer services, namely, data recovery services and data synchronization services; providing temporary use of online, non-downloadable computer software for use in storing and managing the computer data of others; providing temporary use of online non-downloadable cloud computing software for use in database management, and use in electronic storage of data; providing non-downloadable computer software, including firmware and mobile applications to transfer, stream, view and play text, data, audio and video files, digital images and multimedia content from data storage devices, hard drives, disk drives, solid state drives, media players and computer peripherals to televisions, video monitors, projectors, and computer and mobile devices, namely computer tablets and laptops; computer services, namely, cloud hosting provider services; providing software as a service (SAAS) services for remote data management, providing web-based access to applications and/or services through a web operating system or portal Interface over a network, including but not limited to the Internet; computer and electronic data storage; design, development, updating and maintenance of computer software, firmware, mobile applications; design and development

of data storage devices, hard drives, disk drives, solid state drives, media players and computer peripherals.	
--	--

16. Purple's *electronic control apparatus* is a vague term. If not identical to WD's goods, it is highly similar to WD's computer peripherals, computer hardware and electronic devices, all of which could be for electronic control, sharing users, methods of use, channels of trade and complementarity.

17. In relation to Purple's class 38 services, there is a good degree of similarity with WD's goods in Class 9, in particular *digital electronic devices for organizing, receiving, playing, transmitting, managing, storing, securing, encrypting, centralizing, backing-up, transferring, customizing, navigating, playing, viewing, accessing, sharing, streaming, synchronizing, modifying, reviewing, uploading, and downloading text, data, image, audio and video files, information, or media stored on, streamed through, hosted on or run on data storage devices, hard drives, disk drives, solid state drives, media players, Internet servers and cloud storage services and computer hardware for use in video surveillance applications and systems, digital or personal video recorders, Internet protocol televisions, set-top boxes, audio systems, digital signage, karaoke players, computer gaming devices and DVD recorders*. Converging technologies mean that telecommunications providers also provide users with equipment, such as modems, set-top boxes and dongles and streaming equipment and software. The purpose is the same: to enable transmission and reception/telecommunication to take place. There is a two-way complementary relationship, shared users and shared channels of trade.

18. Western's earlier mark covers, in Class 42, *providing non-downloadable computer software, including firmware and mobile applications to transfer, stream, view and play text, data, audio and video files, digital images and multimedia content from data storage devices, hard drives, disk drives, solid state drives, media players and computer peripherals to televisions, video monitors, projectors, and computer and mobile devices, namely computer tablets and laptops*. There is a complementary relationship with Purple's *provision of non-downloadable films and*

television programs via video-on-demand services. One well-known example of the converging technology which provides an alternative to watching traditional television broadcasts is Netflix, which provides a software application and the films themselves for streaming to the user's device. I find these services to be similar to a reasonable degree, sharing purpose (enabling films to be watched on demand), users, channels of trade and complementarity. Western has not provided any arguments as to why the remainder of Purple's class 41 services are similar to its own goods and services. It is not apparent to me that there is any similarity between them; therefore, I find no similarity in respect of Purple's *teaching, education, training and entertainment services; production and distribution of television programs, shows and movies; arranging and conducting of workshops (education), congresses, lessons; organization of exhibitions for cultural or educational purposes; publication of electronic books and journals on-line.*

The average consumer and the purchasing process

19. The average consumer is deemed to be reasonably well informed and reasonably observant and circumspect. For the purpose 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 or services in question: *Lloyd Schuhfabrik Meyer, Case C-342/97.*

20. The goods and services of both parties are technical, for the most part potentially expensive, potentially with long-term important applications and will be purchased only after exercising an above average degree of care and attention to detail to ensure e.g. compatibility, price, functionality etc. In some cases, considerable care will be taken. The perception of the marks during the selection process will be primarily visual, on the basis of e.g. advertisements, company literature and websites, but I do not ignore the possibility of oral use of the marks during the purchasing process.

Comparison of marks

21. It is clear from *Sabel BV v. Puma AG* (particularly paragraph 23) that the average consumer normally perceives a 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 marks must be assessed by reference to the overall impressions created by the marks, bearing in mind their distinctive and dominant components. The Court of Justice of the European Union 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 impression and all factors relevant to the circumstances of the case, to assess the likelihood of confusion.”

22. It is necessary to take into account the distinctive and dominant components of the marks and to give due weight to any other features which are not negligible and therefore contribute to the overall impressions created by the marks. The marks to be compared are:

Western's mark	Purple's mark
WD PURPLE	Purple.com

23. The dominant and distinctive element of both marks is the word purple. In the case of the later mark, it is the first element and ‘.com’ will merely be seen as a domain name suffix. In the earlier mark, it is the longer and more memorable element.

24. Although both marks have elements which are not common to the other mark (WD and .com), they both contain the word purple. This is the longer element in each mark. The marks have a medium degree of visual similarity.

25. Aurally, Western's mark contains four syllables (WD will be pronounced as two separate letters). Purple's mark also has four syllables (.com will be pronounced as dot com). Two of the syllables in each mark comprise the word Purple. Allowing for the fact that Purple is the second element in Western's mark, there is a medium level of aural similarity between the marks.

26. Conceptually, both marks bring to mind the colour purple. Purple's mark has the additional concept of a domain name owing to the '.com' component. The WD element in Western's mark does not appear to have a meaning. Balancing these factors, there is a medium degree of conceptual similarity between the marks.

27. Overall, there is a medium degree of similarity between the marks.

Distinctive character of the earlier marks

28. In *Lloyd Schuhfabrik Meyer & Co. GmbH v Klijsen Handel BV*¹ the CJEU stated that:

“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).

¹ Case C-342/97

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).”

29. One of the principles which must be taken into account in deciding whether there is a likelihood of confusion is that 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. Western has not filed any evidence of use of its mark; therefore, I have only the level of inherent distinctiveness to consider.

30. WD PURPLE does not describe or allude to the goods and services. Purple is a dictionary word and so of average distinctive character; this is the relevant consideration as the only part of the earlier mark which is similar to the later mark is the word PURPLE.

Likelihood of confusion

31. Deciding whether there is a likelihood of confusion is not scientific; it is a matter of considering all the factors, weighing them and looking at their combined effect, in accordance with the authorities set out earlier in this decision. One of those principles states that a lesser degree of similarity between goods and services may be offset by a greater degree of similarity between the trade marks, and vice versa (*Canon Kabushiki Kaisha v Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Inc.*). I have found that all the class 9 goods of the parties are identical or highly similar; that the class 38 services of the later mark are similar to the goods of the earlier mark to a good degree; and that some of the services in class 41 of the later mark are reasonably similar to

services in class 42 of the earlier mark. However, where there is no similarity between the goods and the services, there is no likelihood of confusion. Consequently, the application for invalidation fails in respect of *teaching, education, training and entertainment services; production and distribution of television programs, shows and movies; arranging and conducting of workshops (education), congresses, lessons; organization of exhibitions for cultural or educational purposes; publication of electronic books and journals on-line*, in Class 41.

32. The dominant and distinctive element of both marks is PURPLE. The other elements are unremarkable. Two letters do not have a great deal of distinctiveness and are not easily remembered. The conceptual hook for both marks is the word PURPLE. Even allowing for an above average degree of attention during the purchasing process, the other elements in each mark are not sufficiently distinctive/memorable to counter the effects of imperfect recollection when the goods and services are identical and similar to the degrees I have found. There is a likelihood of confusion.

Invalidation outcome

33. Western's application for invalidation succeeds under sections 47(2)(a)/5(2)(b) of the Act, except in relation to *teaching, education, training and entertainment services; production and distribution of television programs, shows and movies; arranging and conducting of workshops (education), congresses, lessons; organization of exhibitions for cultural or educational purposes; publication of electronic books and journals on-line*. Except for these services, Purple's application for registration is deemed never to have been made, under section 47(6) of the Act.

Purple's opposition to Western's application

34. Western's application is identically worded in class 09 and almost so in class 42. Its mark is identical to its earlier EUTM, WD PURPLE.

35. Purple's earlier mark survives for *teaching, education, training and entertainment services; production and distribution of television programs, shows and movies; arranging and conducting of workshops (education), congresses, lessons; organization of exhibitions for cultural or educational purposes; publication of electronic books and journals on-line*. I have already carried out a comparison of goods and services and did not find these services to be similar to Western's goods and services. All other aspects of the global comparison already undertaken in the invalidation proceedings carry forward to this opposition. There is no likelihood of confusion. Consequently, the opposition fails.

Opposition outcome

36. Purple's opposition fails. Western's application may proceed to registration.

Overall outcome of the consolidated proceedings

37. Western's application for invalidation partially succeeds under sections 47(2)(a)/5(2)(b) of the Act. Purple's registration may remain registered for *teaching, education, training and entertainment services; production and distribution of television programs, shows and movies; arranging and conducting of workshops (education), congresses, lessons; organization of exhibitions for cultural or educational purposes; publication of electronic books and journals on-line*. Except for these services, Purple's application for registration is deemed never to have been made, under section 47(6) of the Act.

38. Purple's opposition fails. Western's application may proceed to registration.

Costs

39. Western has had the greatest level of success and is entitled to a contribution towards its costs. Awards of costs in proceedings commenced after 1 July 2016 are governed by Annex A of Tribunal Practice Notice ("TPN") 2 of 2016. As Purple is unrepresented, at the conclusion of the evidence rounds the tribunal invited it to

indicate whether it intended to make a request for an award of costs and, if so, to complete a pro-forma indicating a breakdown of its actual costs, including providing accurate estimates of the number of hours spent on a range of given activities relating to the prosecution of the proceedings. It was made clear to Purple that if the pro-forma was not completed “no costs, other than official fees arising from the action and paid by the successful party...will be awarded”. Purple did not respond to that invitation within the timescale allowed (nor has any response been received from it prior to the date of the issuing of this decision). It was unsuccessful in the opposition, so is not entitled to the opposition fee. It was partially successful in defending its registration against complete invalidation, but did not incur any official fees in that action.

40. I referred at the start of this decision to the counterstatement, in which Western stated:

“Further, the Applicant [Western] notes that the Opponent [Purple] is linked to Michael Gleissner. Due to a recent vast trade mark filing programme by businesses linked to this individual, suspicions have been raised that many of the rights sought and/or obtained (including that on which the Opponent relies) were filed in bad faith. An article from World Trademark Review that discusses this filing programme is enclosed under the *Annex* to this Counterstatement. In the Cancellation, we will be inviting the Registrar to look very closely at whether the Opponent had any intention to use the mark relied on in the Opposition. If our concerns on that point are proved correct, and if the Opponent persists in forcing the Applicant to spend money on the Opposition, we submit that whenever and however the Opposition is resolved, these facts should be taken into consideration when awarding costs in due course.”

41. There was no bad faith ground in Western’s invalidation action, and consequently no evidence about Purple’s intentions to use its mark. I cannot, therefore, see how I could have looked ‘very closely’ at Purple’s intention to use its mark, or how Western concerns could be proved in these proceedings.

42. I award the following costs to Western, taking into account the economies achieved by consolidation of the proceedings.

Considering Purple's opposition and preparing a counterstatement	£450
Fee for TM26(I)	£200
Preparing the invalidation and considering the counterstatement	£450
Written submissions	£500
Total	£1600

43. I order Purple Technologies (Europe) Limited to pay Western Digital Technologies, Inc. the sum of £1600 which, in the absence of an appeal, should be paid within fourteen days of the expiry of the appeal period.

Dated this 13th day of December 2017

Judi Pike
For the Registrar,
the Comptroller-General