

O/0177/25

TRADE MARKS ACT 1994

CONSOLIDATED PROCEEDINGS

IN THE MATTER OF APPLICATION NOS UK00003851301 AND UK00003851290

BY COACH CUBE LIMITED

TO REGISTER THE TRADE MARKS:

COACHCUBE

AND



IN CLASSES 9, 35, 36 AND 38

AND

IN THE MATTER OF OPPOSITION THERETO UNDER NOS 440771 AND 440779

BY CUBE INFRASTRUCTURE MANAGERS

BACKGROUND AND PLEADINGS

1. On 20 November 2022, Coach Cube Limited (“the applicant”) applied to register the marks UK00003851290 (“ ‘1290 mark”) and UK00003851301 (“ ‘1301”) shown on the cover page of this decision in the UK. The applications were published for opposition purposes on 10 February 2023 and the applicant seeks registration for the goods and services listed in **Annex 1** of this decision.

2. The applications for UK00003851301 and UK00003851290 were partially opposed by Cube Infrastructure Managers (“the opponent”) on 10 May 2023 for the following services:

Class 36: Online business banking services; Online banking services; Online banking; Providing online information about insurance from a computer database or the Internet; Providing online information about reinsurance from a computer database or the Internet.

3. The opposition is based on section 5(2)(b) of the Trade Marks Act 1994, and the opponent relies on the following mark:

CUBE

UK00003617018¹

Filing date 26 March 2021; date of entry in register 21 September 2021.

Priority date 21 March 2019 from the EU from trade mark 018039294.

Relying on all its goods and services, namely:

Class 36: Investment funds; fund investment services; financial services.

(“opponent’s mark”)

¹ This mark was filed subject to Article 59 of the Withdrawal Agreement between the United Kingdom and the European Union.

4. The opponent claims that there is a likelihood of confusion because the applications and the earlier mark contain the word 'CUBE'. It is submitted that as a result of the identical 'CUBE' element there is a high degree of aural, visual and conceptual similarity between the marks. In addition, the opponent argues that the services covered by the marks are identical. On that basis, the opponent argues that there is a likelihood of confusion on the part of the public, which includes a likelihood of association.

5. The applicant filed defences and counterstatements denying the claims made. In particular, the services are denied to be similar on the basis that the nature, purposes, uses and trade channels of the respective services are very different. The applicant argues that the services are aimed at different groups of consumers and they are not in competition with one another. In relation to the similarity of the marks, it is denied that the trade mark is highly similar to the opponent's earlier marks.

6. The opponent is represented by Boulton Wade Tennant LLP; the applicant is represented by Dynham. Neither party filed evidence and neither party filed submissions. No hearing was requested, and neither party filed submissions in lieu of a hearing. This decision is taken following a considered review of the papers. I do not propose to summarise the submissions made by the parties in full at this stage but will refer to them below, where necessary.

DECISION

Section 5(2)(b): legislation and case law

7. Section 5(2)(b) of the Act is as follows:

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

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

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

8. Section 5A of the Act states as follows:

“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.”

9. The opponent’s earlier mark qualifies as an earlier mark within the meaning of Section 6(1) of the Trade Marks Act because it has an earlier filing date than the contested applications. The applicant put the opponent to proof of use. However, as the opponent’s earlier mark completed its registration processes less than five years before the application date of the applicant’s mark, they are not subject to the proof of use provisions of section 6A of the Act. The opponent can, therefore, rely upon all of the services for which its marks are registered.

10. 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.

(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 impression 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 greater 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 to mind the earlier mark, 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 THE SERVICES

11. Both parties services to be compared can be seen below:

The applicant's services	The opponent's services
<p>'1290 mark Class 36: Online business banking services; Online banking services; Online banking; Providing online information about insurance from a computer database or the Internet; Providing online information about reinsurance from a computer database or the Internet.</p> <p>'1301 mark Class 36: Online business banking services; Online banking services; Online banking; Providing online information about insurance from a computer database or the Internet; Providing online information about reinsurance from a computer database or the Internet.</p>	<p>Class 36: Investment funds; fund investment services; financial services.</p>

12. When making the comparison, all relevant factors relating to the services in the specifications should be taken into account. In the judgment of the Court of Justice of the European Union ("CJEU") in *Canon*, Case C-39/97, the court stated at paragraph 23 of its judgment that:

“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”.

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

- (a) The respective uses of the respective goods or services;
- (b) The respective users of the respective goods or services;
- (c) The physical nature of the goods or acts of service;
- (d) The respective trade channels through which the goods or services reach the market;
- (e) 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;
- (f) 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.”

14. In *Gérard Meric v Office for Harmonisation in the Internal Market (Trade Marks and Designs)* (OHIM) case T-133/05, the General Court (“GC”) stated:

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

15. In *SEPARODE Trade Mark*, BL O-399-10, Mr Geoffrey Hobbs QC, sitting as the Appointed Person, said:

“The determination must be made with reference to each of the different species of goods listed in the opposed application for registration; if and to the extent that the list includes goods which are sufficiently comparable to be assessable for registration in essentially the same way for essentially the same reasons, the decision taker may address them collectively in his or her decision.”

16. The ‘1301 mark and the ‘1290 marks have identical specifications. Therefore, my below findings will apply to both applications.

17. The opponent submits that its services are identical or highly similar to the services applied for. In contrast, the applicant disagrees that there is any similarity between the services.

18. In relation to “*online business banking services*”, “*online banking services*” and “*online banking*” in the applicant’s specification, I consider that these services are encompassed by the term “*financial services*” that appear in the opponent’s specification. Therefore, I consider these services to be identical on the principle outlined in *Meric*.

19. Moving onto “*providing online information about insurance from a computer database or the internet*” and “*providing online information about reinsurance from a computer database or the internet*” that appear in the applications. These services

provide information on insurance/reinsurance, therefore they are still providing information on insurance. Therefore, these services describe a type of financial service and will therefore, fall within the wider category of “*financial services*” in the opponent’s specification. As a result, I consider that the services are identical under the principle outlined in *Meric*. However, even if I am mistaken, the services will overlap in trade channels, users, method of use, nature and purpose. Further, I consider that there may be competition between the services. Therefore, I consider that the services will be highly similar.

THE AVERAGE CONSUMER AND THE PURCHASING ACT

20. As the case law above indicates, it is necessary for me to determine who the average consumer is for the respective parties’ services. I must then determine the manner in which the services are likely to be selected by the average consumer. In *Hearst Holdings Inc, Fleischer Studios Inc v A.V.E.L.A. Inc, Poeticgem Limited, The 18 Partnership (Trading) Limited, U Wear Limited, J Fox Limited*, [2014] EWHC 439 (Ch), Birss J described the average consumer in these terms:

“60. The trade mark questions have to be approached from the point of view of the presumed expectations of the average consumer who is reasonably well informed and reasonably circumspect. The parties were agreed that the relevant person is a legal construct and that the test is to be applied objectively by the court from the point of view of that constructed person. The words “average” denotes that the person is typical. The term “average” does not denote some form of numerical mean, mode or median.”

21. The average consumer of the services will include both members of the general public and businesses. The terms covered by the parties’ specifications are broad and would include a range of financial services from insurance information to online banking. While banking is likely to attract a low cost or be free of charge, various factors will still be taken into account such as consumer service standards, interest rates and security. I consider that the risks such as financial fraud and serious financial consequences of mistakes being made even for the low cost/free of charge services, will result in a high degree of attention being paid.

22. All the services are likely to be selected from specialist retailers, websites, advertisements, and signs on a physical outlet. Visual considerations are, therefore, likely to dominate the selection process. However, I do not discount that there may also be an aural component to the purchase through advice sought from a sales assistant or through word-of-mouth recommendations.

COMPARISON OF THE TRADE MARKS

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

24. 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 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.

25. The respective trade marks are shown below:

The applicant's marks	The opponent's mark
COACHCUBE (‘1301 mark)	CUBE



('1290 mark)

Overall impression

26. The opponent's mark consists of the word 'CUBE' presented in upper case. I consider that the overall impression of this mark lies in the word alone.

27. The applicant's '1301 mark consists of the word 'COACHCUBE' presented in upper case. I consider that the overall impression of this mark lies in the word.

28. The applicant's '1290 mark consists of the word 'coachcube' presented in lower case. The word element of the mark has a two tone effect, with the word 'coach' presented in dark blue and the word 'cube' in light blue. To the left of the word is a device that appears to be a cube, it is presented in blue and has what appears to be a white stylised 'C' contained in the device. As the eye is naturally drawn to the element of the mark that can be read, I consider that the greater role in the overall impression of the mark lies in the word 'coachcube' with the colour, stylisation and device playing lesser roles.

'1301 mark

29. Visually, the parties' marks share the word 'CUBE' which is the totality of the opponent's marks and accounts for the last four letters of the applicant's mark. The marks differ in the presence of the word 'COACH' at the beginning of the applicant's mark. I note that it is the beginning of the marks that make more of an impact than the ends. Taking the above into account, I consider the marks to be visually similar to a medium degree.

30. Aurally, the parties' marks will share the pronunciation of the word 'CUBE'. The marks will differ in the pronunciation of the word 'COACH' which precedes 'CUBE' in

the applicant's mark. Bearing the above in mind, I consider that the marks are aurally similar to a medium degree.

31. Conceptually, the applicant's mark consists of the word 'COACHCUBE'. I note that the parties have not provided dictionary definitions of the words. In my view, this is not a dictionary defined term, however, individually the words 'COACH' and 'CUBE' can be found in any recognised English dictionary as a descriptor, each having several meanings. To my mind, the word 'COACH' in the applicant's mark alludes to a person whose job is to teach people to improve a skill. When positioned next to the word 'CUBE', this may be potentially in relation to mathematics, as 'CUBE' will, in my view, convey the concept of the three-dimensional shape or the product of a number that is multiplied by its square. The opponent's mark consists of the word 'CUBE'. I consider that it will convey the same concept as discussed above in the opponent's mark. On the basis that the marks share the concept conveyed by the word 'CUBE', I consider that the marks are conceptually similar to a low to medium degree.

'1290 mark

32. Visually, the similarities/differences outlined above at paragraph 29 also apply in relation to the '1290 mark and the opponent's mark. In addition, the device, colour and stylisation are a point of difference between the marks. Accordingly, I consider the marks to be visually similar to a low to medium degree.

33. Aurally, the discussion made above at paragraph 30, also applies here. In addition, the cube device will not be articulated. Therefore, I consider the marks to be aurally similar to medium degree.

34. Conceptually, I do not consider that the stylisation, device and colour of the mark will add anything conceptually. If anything, the device of a cube will be supporting the reference made to 'CUBE' in the applicant's mark. Therefore, I consider that the findings that I made above in paragraph 31 will also apply here. Consequently, I consider the marks to be conceptually similar to a low to medium degree.

DISTINCTIVE CHARACTER OF THE EARLIER MARK

35. In *Lloyd Schuhfabrik Meyer & Co. GmbH v Klijsen Handel BV*, Case C-342/97 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 C108/97 and C-109/97 Windsurfing Chiemsee v Huber and Attenberger* [1999] ECR I-2779, 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 promotion of 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).”

36. Registered trade marks possess varying degrees of inherent distinctive character, ranging from the very low, because they are suggestive or allusive of a characteristic of the goods, to those with high inherent distinctive character, such as invented words which have no allusive qualities. The distinctiveness of a mark can be enhanced by virtue of the use that has been made of it. No evidence has been provided to support a claim of enhanced distinctive character. Therefore, I have only the inherent distinctive character to consider.

37. The opponent's mark consists of the word 'CUBE'. This is an ordinary dictionary word. It is neither allusive nor descriptive of the services at issue. Despite this, it is not, from a trade mark perspective, particularly remarkable. Therefore, I find that the opponent's mark enjoys a medium degree of inherent distinctive character.

LIKELIHOOD OF CONFUSION

38. Confusion can be direct or indirect. Direct confusion involves the average consumer mistaking one mark for the other, while indirect confusion is where the average consumer realises the marks are not the same but puts the similarity that exists between the marks and the goods and services down to the responsible undertakings being the same or related. There is no scientific formula to apply in determining whether there is a likelihood of confusion; rather, it is a global assessment where a number of factors need to be borne in mind. The first is the interdependency principle i.e. a lesser degree of similarity between the respective trade marks may be offset by a greater degree of similarity between the respective goods and services and vice versa. As I mentioned above, it is necessary for me to keep in mind the distinctive character of the earlier marks, the average consumer for the goods and services and the nature of the purchasing process. In doing so, I must be alive to the fact 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 that he has retained in his mind.

39. I have found the '1301 to be visually similar to a medium degree and '1290 to be visually similar to a low to medium degree. I have found all of the marks to be aurally similar to a medium degree. In addition, I have found the marks to be conceptually similar to a low to medium degree. I have found the earlier mark to be inherently distinctive to a medium degree. I have identified the average consumer to be the general public and businesses, who will select the services primarily by visual means, although I do not discount an aural component. I have concluded that a high degree of attention will be paid during the purchasing process. I have found the

services to be identical, or in the event that I am mistaken, highly similar in relation to insurance information.

'1301 mark

40. Taking all the above and the principle of imperfect recollection into account, I do not consider that the parties' marks will be mistakenly recalled or misremembered for one another. I recognise that the marks share the same common element, being 'CUBE' which is in favour of the opponent. Despite this, I consider that the visual, aural and conceptual differences between the marks, particularly in the absence of the word 'Coach' at the beginning of the applicant's mark will be sufficient to enable the average consumer to differentiate between them. I do not consider that a consumer paying a high degree of attention during the purchasing process will overlook the "Coach" element at the beginning of the applicant's mark, a position which tends to make more of an impact than the ends. This will allow the average consumers to sufficiently recall the marks. Consequently, I consider there to be no likelihood of direct confusion between the marks.

'1290 mark

41. The analysis made above in relation to the '1301 mark applies here. With the added points of difference of device, stylisation and two-tone colouring (which whilst I found to play lesser roles are still points of distinction) pointing further away than the above mark from direct confusion. Therefore, I consider that there is no likelihood of direct confusion between the marks.

42. Indirect confusion involves recognition by the average consumer of the difference between the marks. Mr Purvis Q.C. in the *L.A Sugar Limited* case sets out

three main categories of indirect confusion and that indirect confusion ‘tends’ to fall into one of them.² The three categories are as follows:

“(a) where the common element is so strikingly distinctive (either inherently or through use) that the average consumer would assume that no-one else but the brand owner would be using it in a trade mark at all. This may apply even where the other elements of the later mark are quite distinctive in their own right (“26 RED TESCO” would no doubt be such a case).

(b) where the later mark simply adds a non-distinctive element to the earlier mark, of the kind which one would expect to find in a sub-brand or brand extension (terms such as “LITE”, “EXPRESS”, “WORLDWIDE”, “MINI”, etc.). BL O/375/10 Page 15 of 16

(c) where the earlier mark comprises a number of elements, and a change of one element appears entirely logical and consistent with a brand extension (“FAT FACE” to “BRAT FACE” for example).”³

43. Whilst I note that the examples set out by Mr Purvis are not exhaustive, I note the recent case of *Liverpool Gin Distillery Ltd & Ors v Sazerac Brands, LLC & Ors*,⁴ wherein Arnold LJ referred to the comments of James Mellor QC sitting as the Appointed Person in *Cheeky Italian Ltd v Sutaria* (O/219/16), where he stated that a finding of a likelihood of indirect confusion is not a consolidation prize and that there needs to be a reasonably special set of circumstances in order to get indirect confusion where there is no likelihood of direct confusion. Arnold LJ agreed, pointing out that there must be a “proper basis” for concluding that there is a likelihood of indirect confusion where there is no likelihood of direct confusion.

² Paragraphs 16 & 17 of *L.A Sugar Limited v By Black Beat Inc*, Case BL-O/375/10

³ *Ibid*, Paragraph 17

⁴ [2021] EWCA Civ 1207

44. In the present case, I am of the view that when confronted with the parties' marks, consumers would identify them as originating from different and economically unconnected undertakings. I say this because the opponent's mark will be viewed as conveying the concept of a three-dimensional shape or the product of a number that is multiplied by its square. Whereas the applications with convey the concept of a person whose job is to teach people to improve a skill. The word 'Coach' positioned next to the word 'CUBE', will convey the concept of a coach potentially in relation to mathematics. In light of this, I see no reason why a consumer would believe that the differences between the marks are logical indicators of sub-brands or brand extensions of one another. For example, I do not consider that a consumer would consider it logical for an undertaking, particularly 'CUBE' would alter their brand to the point that it would be branded as 'COACHCUBE', or vice versa. I appreciate that when the consumer views the applicant's mark, the shared use of the word 'CUBE' may call the opponent's mark to mind. However, this is mere association, not indirect confusion.⁵ In addition, I do not consider that the shared use of the word 'CUBE' would be seen as something only one undertaking would use. I consider that the consumer would believe that its shared use would be coincidental, even when considering the fact that the marks could be viewed for services that are identical or (in the event that I am mistaken) highly similar. Taking all of this into account together with the comments of Arnold LJ and Mr Mellor Q.C. in the preceding paragraph, I find that there exists no likelihood of indirect confusion between the marks at issue. For the same reasons above and in consideration of the further differences between the marks, I consider that this finding will apply in relation to mark '1290 and '1301 marks.

CONCLUSION

45. The opposition fails in its entirety and, subject to any successful appeal of my decision, the applicant's marks may proceed to registration for all of their goods and services, as can be seen in **annex 1** of this decision.

COSTS

⁵ See *Duebros Limited v Heirler Cenovis GmbH*, BL O/547/17

46. The applicant has been successful and is entitled to a contribution towards its costs, as the oppositions were filed after 1 February 2023 it will be based upon the scale published in Tribunal Practice Notice 1/2023. In the circumstances, I award the applicant the sum of £500 as a contribution towards the costs of the proceedings. The sum is calculated as follows:

Preparing a statement and considering the other side's statement x2	£500
---	------

TOTAL	£500
--------------	-------------

47. I therefore order Cube Infrastructure Managers to pay Coach Cube Limited the sum of £500. This sum is to be paid within 21 days of the expiry of the appeal period or, if there is an appeal, within 21 days of the conclusion of the appeal proceedings.

Dated this 26th day of February 2025

A KLASS

For the Registrar

Annex 1

Mark UK00003851290

Class 9

Software for online messaging;Software for evaluating customer behaviour in online shops;Software for designing online advertising on websites;Software for operating an online shop;Computer game software for use with on-line interactive games;Software for embedding online advertising on websites;Software for arranging online transactions;Computer software for the administration of on-line games and gaming;Computer programs for accessing, browsing and searching online databases.

Class 35

Advertising the goods and services of online vendors via a searchable online guide;Providing searchable online advertising guides;Providing a searchable online advertising guide featuring the goods and services of online vendors;Conducting online business management research surveys;Providing a searchable online advertising guide featuring the goods and services of other on-line vendors on the internet;Online marketing;Online business networking services;Online retail services for downloadable digital music;Online community management services;Business information services provided online from a computer database or the internet;Online advertising services;Compilation of online business directories;Promotion, advertising and marketing of on-line websites;Providing academic course administration services relating to online course registration;Online advertising;On-line advertising and marketing services;Business information services provided online from a global computer network or the internet;Providing on-line auction services;Providing online commercial directory information services;Conducting virtual trade show exhibitions online;Computerized on-line ordering services;Business information services provided on-line from a computer database or the internet;Arranging subscriptions of the online

publications of others;Online retail services for downloadable and pre-recorded music and movies;Online ordering services;Online retail services relating to handbags.

Class 36

Online business banking services;Online banking services;Online banking;Providing online information about insurance from a computer database or the Internet;Providing online information about reinsurance from a computer database or the Internet.

Class 38

Providing online forums for communication in the field of electronic games;Providing online forums;Providing on-line chat rooms for social networking;Online messaging services;Communication by online blogs;Providing access to multimedia content online;Providing an online interactive bulletin board;Providing online facilities for real-time interaction with other computer users.

Class 41

Providing online training seminars;Providing online games;Provision of online training;Conducting training sessions on physical fitness online;Career counselling and coaching;Providing online courses of instruction;Personal coaching [training];Conducting training courses relating to nutrition online;Sports tuition, coaching and instruction;Conducting training courses relating to diet online;Life coaching (training);Providing online video games;Sports coaching services;Distance learning services provided online;Training or education services in the field of life coaching;Providing an online computer game;Sports coaching;Online sports betting services;Personal coaching services in the field of ballet;Provision of information on fitness training via an online portal;Online computer game services;Providing online information on computer and video game strategies;Providing online entertainment in the nature of game tournaments;Esports coaching;Providing on-line video games;Coaching [training];On-line game services;Online digital publishing services;Providing online publications, not downloadable;Providing online virtual

guided tours;Provision of information relating to physical training via an online web site;Providing on-line interactive computer games;Providing online music, not downloadable;Provision of online tutorials;Provision of online computer games;Online gaming services;Provision of online information relating to game players;Providing on-line computer games;Online education services;Providing online electronic publications;Providing online videos, not downloadable;Coaching services;Online academic library services;Online gambling services;Providing on-line information and news in the field of employment training;Educational services in the nature of coaching;Providing online electronic publications, not downloadable, in the field of music;Providing online electronic publications in the field of music, not downloadable;Online casino services;Providing an on-line computer game;Provision of information relating to physical education via an online web site;Publication of online reviews in the field of entertainment;Providing online comic books, not downloadable;Provision of an online magazine featuring information in the field of computer games;Political speech training and coaching;Game services provided online from a computer network;Providing online electronic publications, not downloadable;Providing information about online education;Provision of online information in the field of computer games entertainment;Providing training courses on business management;Political debate training and coaching;Online game services through mobile devices;Online research library services;Providing on-line non-downloadable video content;Provision of education on-line from a computer database or via the internet or extranets;Provision of information relating to physical exercises via an online web site;Providing on-line publications;Providing online newsletters in the fields of sports entertainment;Providing on-line music, not downloadable;Computerised training in career counselling;Arranging professional workshop and training courses;Providing on-line publications (not downloadable);Providing on-line publications (non-downloadable);Conducting of educational courses in business management;Providing online entertainment in the nature of game shows.

Class 42

Hosting online web facilities for others for sharing online content;Hosting of digital content online;Hosting online facilities for conducting interactive discussions;Providing online non-downloadable software for use in communication;Hosting online web facilities for others for conducting interactive discussions;Providing online, non-downloadable software;Programming of software for online advertising;Hosting on-line web facilities for others for managing and sharing on-line content;Programming of software for evaluating customer behaviour in online shops;Providing temporary use of online non-downloadable investment software;Hosting an online website for creating and hosting micro websites for businesses;Hosting on-line facilities for conducting interactive discussions;Providing temporary use of online non-downloadable software;Providing on-line non-downloadable software for database management;Creating electronically stored web pages for online services and the internet;Providing temporary use of on-line non-downloadable software for web site development;Providing on-line support services for computer program users;Providing temporary use of on-line non-downloadable software for database management;Providing online non-downloadable software for use in supply chain management;Providing temporary use of on-line non-downloadable software for inventory management;Providing temporary use of on-line non-downloadable software development tools;Providing temporary use of on-line non-downloadable software for the management of information.

Mark UK00003851301

Class 9

Software for online messaging;Software for evaluating customer behaviour in online shops;Software for designing online advertising on websites;Software for operating an online shop;Computer game software for use with on-line interactive games;Software for embedding online advertising on websites;Software for arranging online transactions;Computer software for the administration of on-line games and gaming;Computer programs for accessing, browsing and searching online databases.

Class 35

Advertising the goods and services of online vendors via a searchable online guide; Providing searchable online advertising guides; Providing a searchable online advertising guide featuring the goods and services of online vendors; Conducting online business management research surveys; Providing a searchable online advertising guide featuring the goods and services of other on-line vendors on the internet; Online marketing; Online business networking services; Online retail services for downloadable digital music; Online community management services; Business information services provided online from a computer database or the internet; Online advertising services; Compilation of online business directories; Promotion, advertising and marketing of on-line websites; Providing academic course administration services relating to online course registration; Online advertising; On-line advertising and marketing services; Business information services provided online from a global computer network or the internet; Providing on-line auction services; Providing online commercial directory information services; Conducting virtual trade show exhibitions online; Computerized on-line ordering services; Business information services provided on-line from a computer database or the internet; Arranging subscriptions of the online publications of others; Online retail services for downloadable and pre-recorded music and movies; Online ordering services; Online retail services relating to handbags.

Class 36

Online business banking services; Online banking services; Online banking; Providing online information about insurance from a computer database or the Internet; Providing online information about reinsurance from a computer database or the Internet.

Class 38

Providing online forums for communication in the field of electronic games;Providing online forums;Providing on-line chat rooms for social networking;Online messaging services;Communication by online blogs;Providing access to multimedia content online;Providing an online interactive bulletin board;Providing online facilities for real-time interaction with other computer users.

Class 41

Providing online training seminars;Providing online games;Provision of online training;Conducting training sessions on physical fitness online;Career counselling and coaching;Providing online courses of instruction;Personal coaching [training];Conducting training courses relating to nutrition online;Sports tuition, coaching and instruction;Conducting training courses relating to diet online;Life coaching (training);Providing online video games;Sports coaching services;Distance learning services provided online;Training or education services in the field of life coaching;Providing an online computer game;Sports coaching;Online sports betting services;Personal coaching services in the field of ballet;Provision of information on fitness training via an online portal;Online computer game services;Providing online information on computer and video game strategies;Providing online entertainment in the nature of game tournaments;Esports coaching;Providing on-line video games;Coaching [training];On-line game services;Online digital publishing services;Providing online publications, not downloadable;Providing online virtual guided tours;Provision of information relating to physical training via an online web site;Providing on-line interactive computer games;Providing online music, not downloadable;Provision of online tutorials;Provision of online computer games;Online gaming services;Provision of online information relating to game players;Providing on-line computer games;Online education services;Providing online electronic publications;Providing online videos, not downloadable;Coaching services;Online academic library services;Online gambling services;Providing on-line information and news in the field of employment training;Educational services in the nature of coaching;Providing online electronic publications, not downloadable, in the field of music;Providing online electronic publications in the field of music, not

downloadable;Online casino services;Providing an on-line computer game;Provision of information relating to physical education via an online web site;Publication of online reviews in the field of entertainment;Providing online comic books, not downloadable;Provision of an online magazine featuring information in the field of computer games;Political speech training and coaching;Game services provided online from a computer network;Providing online electronic publications, not downloadable;Providing information about online education;Provision of online information in the field of computer games entertainment;Providing training courses on business management;Political debate training and coaching;Online game services through mobile devices;Online research library services;Providing on-line non-downloadable video content;Provision of education on-line from a computer database or via the internet or extranets;Provision of information relating to physical exercises via an online web site;Providing on-line publications;Providing online newsletters in the fields of sports entertainment;Providing on-line music, not downloadable;Computerised training in career counselling;Arranging professional workshop and training courses;Providing on-line publications (not downloadable);Providing on-line publications (non-downloadable);Conducting of educational courses in business management;Providing online entertainment in the nature of game shows.

Class 42

Hosting online web facilities for others for sharing online content;Hosting of digital content online;Hosting online facilities for conducting interactive discussions;Providing online non-downloadable software for use in communication;Hosting online web facilities for others for conducting interactive discussions;Providing online, non-downloadable software;Programming of software for online advertising;Hosting on-line web facilities for others for managing and sharing on-line content;Programming of software for evaluating customer behaviour in online shops;Providing temporary use of online non-downloadable investment software;Hosting an online website for creating and hosting micro websites for businesses;Hosting on-line facilities for conducting interactive discussions;Providing temporary use of online non-

downloadable software;Providing on-line non-downloadable software for database management;Creating electronically stored web pages for online services and the internet;Providing temporary use of on-line non-downloadable software for web site development;Providing on-line support services for computer program users;Providing temporary use of on-line non-downloadable software for database management;Providing online non-downloadable software for use in supply chain management;Providing temporary use of on-line non-downloadable software for inventory management;Providing temporary use of on-line non-downloadable software development tools;Providing temporary use of on-line non-downloadable software for the management of information.