

RICH PRODUCT CORPORATION,
Opposer,

—versus—

RICHLAND FOOD INDUSTRIES INC.,
Respondent-Applicant

IPC No. 14-2008-00119
Case Filed: 03 August 2007
Opposition to:
Serial No. 4—2004—002658
Date Filed: 19 March 2004
Trademark: RICH-O! With An
Exclamation Point

Decision No. 2011 - 22

DECISION

RICH PRODUCT CORPORATION (“Opposer”), a corporation organized and existing under the laws of Delaware, U.S.A., with principal address at One Robert Rich Way, Buffalo, New York 14213, U.S.A., filed on 13 August 2007 an opposition to Trademark Application Serial No. 1-2004-002658. The application, filed by Richland Food Industries (“Respondent-Applicant”), a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the Philippines, with address at No. 7 Arturo Drive, Unit 2 First Avenue, Bagumbayan, Taguig City, on 19 March 2004, covers the mark “RICH-O! With An Exclamation Point” for use on “chocolate drinks” under Class 30.’

The Opposer alleges the following:

“3. In the Philippines, Opposer is the owner-registrant, by prior adoption and use, of the following internationally famous trademark, which is valid and subsisting as of the present date:

(a) Trademark: RICH’S WHIP TOPPING
Registration No.: 54099
Date Issued: 1 February 1993
Class: 30

(b) Trademark: RICH’S
Registration No.: 1—2005-006758
Date Issued: 5 May 2007
Class: 29

3. 1 Although this Honorable Bureau may take judicial notice of the aforesaid registrations, Opposer has attached a copy of Certificate of Registration No. 54099 and the Trademark Detail for the recently registered Registration No. 4—2005-006758 as Exhibits ‘A’ and ‘A-1’, respectively.

“4. Opposer is also the applicant for trademark registration of the following internationally famous trademarks, among others:

(a) Trademark: RICK’S GOLD LABEL
Application No.: 1—2005-006759
Date Filed: 19 July 2005
Classes: 29, 30

(b) Trademark: RICH’S
Application No.: 4—2005-008257
Date Filed: 21 August 2005
Class: 29

4.1 Copies of the foregoing trademark applications are attached hereto as Exhibits ‘B and ‘B-1’.

"5. Opposer's 'RICH'S' trademark was first used in commerce in the United States of America on 1 March 1945, and in the Philippines on March 1999 on the following products: RICH'S ON TOP NON-DAIRY DESSERT TOPPING', 'RICH'S CHOCOLATE WHIP TOPPING'. 'RICH'S WHIP TOPPING BASE', 'RICH'S AIR CATERING WHIP TOPPING'. 'NUTRIFIL', 'SUNDIWHIP' and 'RICH'S SUPER 50'.

- a. Copies of the sales data from 1997 to 2006 as well as the sales invoices for the year 2000 covering the sale of the foregoing products in the Philippines are attached hereto as Exhibits 'C—series'.
- b. Samples of the packaging of the foregoing products bearing the 'RICH'S' trademark are attached hereto as Exhibits 'fl-series'.

"6. Opposer's products are widely and aggressively protected, promoted, advertised, marketed and sold worldwide The 'RICH'S' trademark has thus become internationally-famous, associated and distinctly identified with the products and business of Opposer'.

6.1 Samples of the promotional materials and product brochures used by the Opposer to promote, advertise, market and sell its products hearing the 'RICH'S' trademark worldwide are attached hereto as Exhibits 'E-series'.

"7. The trademark 'RICH'S' is also registered in several foreign jurisdictions, for Classes 29 and so goods in the name of the Opposer. Among said foreign jurisdictions are: the United States of America, New Zealand, Indonesia, Hong Kong, Macau, Sri Lanka, Australia and China.

7.1 A representative sampling of the foreign Certificates of Registration for the trademark 'RICH'S' are attached hereto and marked as Exhibits 'F-series'.

"8. Prescinding from mere registration, Opposer's worldwide organization aggressively and consistently uses and advertises the 'RICH'S' mark. On top of that, trademark protection programs are also in place and actively pursued in all the countries of registration and in countries where Opposer's products are marketed and sold.

"9. As shown, among others, by the documents attached hereto, Opposer is the owner by prior adoption and widespread international use of the trademark 'RICH'S' which has consistently and continuously been used on goods covered under Classes 29 and 30. Thus, Respondent-Applicant's 'RICH-O! WITH AN EXCLAMATION POINT' mark which is being applied for registration for goods under Class 30 covering chocolate drinks should be denied registration.

"10. Republic Act No. 8293, otherwise known as the intellectual Property Code of the Philippines (IP Code'), provides: x x x

"11. Opposer's 'RICH'S' mark has long been in use and was first appropriated (I by it, both internationally and in the Philippines. As stated above, Opposer first used the RICH'S' mark in commerce in the United States of America on 1 March 1945, and locally, on March 1999.

"12. The trademark of the Respondent-Applicant, which is 'RICH-O! WITH AN EXCLAMATION POINT', employs as a dominant feature thereof the mark 'RICH', which in turn, is the dominant feature of Opposer's 'RICH'S WHIP TOPPING' mark, which has been registered in the Philippines since 1 February 1993 (Exhibit 'A'). More significantly, 'RTCH-O! WITH AN EXCLAMATION POINT' is almost identical to Opposer's 'RICH'S' trademark which was registered in the Philippines on 5 May 2007 (Exhibit 'A-I'). Since Respondent-Applicant's trademark nearly resembles Opposer's priorly registered

Philippine trademarks, and considering that Respondent-Applicant's mark is being applied, chocolate drinks, whereas Opposer's trademarks are applied, among others, on milk, milk products and beverages, as to likely cause confusion the registration of the Respondent-applicant's mark is proscribed under Section 123.1(d) of the IP Code.

"13. Moreover, Opposer's ownership of the 'RICH'S' trademarks have been confirmed by the issuance of the Certificates of Registration in its favor by the responsible government agencies of numerous Countries worldwide, such as the United States of America, New Zealand, Indonesia, Hong Kong, Macau, Sri Lanka, Australia and China. All the worldwide registrations for the 'RICH'S' trademarks undeniably point to Opposer's ownership of the internationally-famous 'RICH'S' trademarks In this connection this Honorable Bureau is a 'competent authority' to make a determination of the international famousness of Opposer's 'RICH'S' mark.

"14.. Thus, Opposer's "RICH'S" trademarks are also internationally famous and well-known, based on the criteria set forth under Rule 102 of the Rules and Regulations on Trademarks, which provide that a combination of any of the following should be taken into account in the determination of whether a mark is indeed well known or internationally famous, namely:

- (a) the duration, extent and geographical area of any use of the mark, in particular, the duration, extent and geographical area of any promotion of the mark, including advertising of publicity and the presentation at fairs or exhibitions, of the goods and/or services to which the mark applies;
- (b) the markets share, in the Philippines and in other countries of the goods and/or services to which the mark applies;
- (c) the degree of the inherent or acquired distinction of the mark;
- (d) the quality image or reputation acquired by the mark;
- (e) the extent to which the mark has been registered in the world;
- (f) the exclusivity of registration attained by the mark in the world;
- (g) the extent to which the mark has been used in the world;
- (h) the exclusivity of use attained by the mark in the world;
- (i) the commercial value attributed to the mark in the world;
- (j) the record of successful protection of the rights in the mark;
- (k) the outcome of litigation dealing with the issue of whether the mark is a well-known mark; and
- (l) the presence or absence of identical or similar marks validly registered for or used on identical or similar goods or services and owned by persons other than the person claiming that his mark is a well-known mark.

"15. Using the foregoing criteria, Opposer's 'RICH'S' trademarks are well-known internationally, including being well-known in the Philippines.

15.1. Opposer's trademarks are among the most valuable assets of the company. Because of the high value of its trademarks, Opposer spends substantial amounts of resources to promote its products bearing its trademarks and to protect the said trademarks, Opposer employs all possible legal remedies to do so worldwide.

15.2. The sales data and invoices attached hereto as Exhibits 'C-series' establish the market share in the Philippines of the goods covered by the 'RICH'S' trademarks.

15.3. The advertisements promotional and marketing materials of the goods to which the 'RICH'S' trademarks are applied, attached hereto as Exhibits 'E—series', establish the duration, extent and geographical area of the use and

promotion of Opposer's 'RICH'S' trademark, as well as the reputation and commercial value thereof.

From the foregoing, it is beyond dispute that the 'RICH'S' trademark of Opposer is a well-known mark, both internationally and locally, and that registration of Respondent's 'RICH0 ! WITH AN EXCLAMATION POINT' mark, which prominently utilizes the 'RICH' mark, is proscribed under Section 123.1 (e) of the IP Code.

"16. Verily, the registration of the mark 'RICH-O' WITH AN EXCLAMATION POINT for use on Class 30 goods, particularly, chocolate drinks, of Respondent-applicant will likely confuse and...7 mislead the public as to the manufacturer and/or distributor of these goods. The public has come to associate the RICH'S' mark with Opposer and its milk and beverage products. If Respondent- Applicant is allowed to use the RICH' word as part of its marks in its goods, namely, chocolate drinks, there is a strong possibility that the public, upon seeing the word RICH', would be misled into believing that Respondent-Applicant's goods are being manufactured, distributed or otherwise sponsored by Opposer, when in truth and in fact, they are not.

"17. The registration of Respondent-Applicant's RICH-O' WITH EXCLAMATION POINT mark is also barred by Section 168 of the IP Code. Section 168 recognizes, and affords protection to the property right of a person, who has identified in the mind of the public the goods he manufactures, to the goodwill generated by the use of a mark in the goods so identified. Here, the registration of the RICH-O' WITH AN EXCLAMATION POINT mark in the name of the Respondent-Applicant, which will be used on goods under Class 30, similar to the 'RICH'S' trademarks of the Opposer which is being applied on goods under Classes 29 and 30. would not only add to the confusion of the buying public as to the manufacturer of the goods; worse, it may aid in the passing-off Respondent-Applicant's use of the word 'RICH' in its 'RICH-C) WITH AN EXCLAMATION POINT mark would thus also constitute unfair competition.

The Opposer's evidence consists of the following:

1. Exh "A" - Copy of Cert. o Reg. No. 54099;
2. Exh. "A-1" - Trademark detail for Reg. No. 4-2005-006758;
3. Exh. "B" and "B-1" - Copies of Trademark Applications Nos. 4-2005-6759 and 4-2005-0087.
4. Exh. "C-series" - Sales Data from 1997 to 2006 and Sales Invoices for the year 2007 covering the sale of Opposer's products;
5. Exh. "D-series" - Samples of the Packaging of the Opposer's products bearing its "RICH'S" mark;
6. Exh. "E-series" - Samples of promotional materials and product brochures; and
7. Exh. "F-series" - Representative sampling of the foreign Certificates of Registration of Opposer's "RICH'S" mark.

On 10 December 2008. The Respondent-Applicant filed its Verified Answer alleging the following:

"3.1 The Opposer has no legal cause of action against the Respondent-Applicant as will be discussed below.

"3.2 The Respondent-Applicant has used the trademark Rich-O! with an Exclamation Point in the Philippines since January 2005 making commercially available and distributing its chocolate drink products to various retail outlets, groceries or supermarket chains like Puregold, Robinsons, Landmark, Waltermart, Ministop and Isetann, among others.

"3.3 The Respondent-Applicant has continuously and openly used the trademark

Rich-O! with an Exclamation Point in the Philippines and aggressively continues to promote its chocolate drink products bearing the said trademark through mass media advertisements like promotions popular noontime television show like Wowowee accessible to all sectors of Philippine society that own a television and trade marketing activities like Mascot Festival, Search for Rich-O! Boy 2008 Caravans and the like.

“3.4 The Opposer mark is not confusingly similar to the Respondent-Applicant’s mark. The mark present glaring dissimilarities in terms of their overall appearance, impression, product and target marked involved.

“3.5 The Respondent-Applicant’s Rich-O! with an Exclamation Point mark has a different font compared to the Opposer’s mark and is slanted towards the right with a big letter ‘O’ with an exclamation point.

“3.6 As represented by the Opposer in its Opposition, the Opposer’s products are available in containers , which needs refrigeration as shown by the bold letters “Keep Refrigerated’. (See: Opposition. Exhibits ‘D’ and ‘E’-series). In fact, in the Storage & Handling Instructions’, the Opposers products must be stored in the freezer (Opposition, Exhibit E-series). On the other hand, the Respondent-Applicant’s chocolate drink product is in powder form, packed in a foil package with different packing weights like 100 grams, 200 grams, single-serve sachets, etc. and is displayed in open shelves or the retail outlets, groceries or supermarkets alongside similar products such as ‘Ovaltine’ and ‘Milo’. Moreover, there is no refrigeration required for the Respondent-Applicant’s products bearing the mark ‘Rich-O! with an Exclamation Point.’ Obviously, the consumer will not see the Opposer’s and the Respondent-Applicant’s products displayed alongside or beside each other. Thus, the possibility of confusion will not occur.

“3.7. The Respondent-Applicant’s chocolate milk products are commercially available in powdered form and are required to be mixed with water to be consumed. On the other hand, the Opposer’s product is used as a topping on another food product without the need for mixing it with water. Clearly, the consumer will not he misled by the products of the Opposer and those of the Respondent-Applicant.

“3.8. The target market of the Respondent-Applicant’s chocolate drink products is directed to households with children ages 5 to 12 years old and with moderate income level from C, D and E market, which explains its moderate price. On the other hand, the target markets of the Opposer’s products are institutional consumers like bakeries, restaurants and hotels and the same are priced higher.

“3.9. The Opposer has offered no competent evidence as to the alleged sales of their products in the Philippines from 1997 to 2006. The Opposer’s Exhibit ‘C’ is an unsigned and unidentified document which cannot he admitted as evidence. What was stated by the Supreme Court in *IBM v. NLRC*, 305 SCRA 592, 601-602 [1999] applies mutatis mutandis in this case, thus:

xxx

“3.10. Even the alleged sales Invoices for the year 2000 covering supposed sales of the Opposer’s products in the Philippines cannot be admitted since they are also unsigned and unidentified, and are also mere photocopies. There is no explanation where the originals are and whether the photocopies are faithful reproduction of the originals. In *Ong v. People*, 342 SCRA 372, 384-385 (2000), the Supreme Court reiterated the rule that:

xxx

Again, in *People v. Casingal*, 337 SCRA 100, 113-114i (2000), the Supreme Court said:

Moreover, the firms listed in their exhibits, i.e., Estrima International Corporation and Leysan Commercial, are obviously fabricated. In the 2008—2009 Metro Manila Telephone Directory of the Philippine Long Distance Telephone Company — Government and Business White Pages, no such firms are even listed. Copies of the pertinent pages of the said Directory are hereto attached as EXHIBITS”1” and “2”. Assuming arguendo that sales to the said listed firms can be admitted, the Opposer has not shown any further sales in the Philippines aside from the invoice dates indicated therein, i.e., January 13, 2000 for Exhibit “C- 1”, February 08, 2000 for Exhibit “C-2” and April 18, 2000 for Exhibit “0-3”. There are no recorded sales prior to January 13, 2000. There is likewise no sales after April 18, 2000. This shows that the alleged sales are mere isolated transactions.

“3.11. The supposed foreign Certificates of Registration of Opposer’s marks attached as Exhibits “F-series” cannot be admitted in evidence. The reason is simple and obvious — the documents are not authenticated (Rules of Court, Rule 132, Section 24)

“3.12. The Opposer’s claim that its mark is a world famous mark is bereft of factual and legal basis. As shown earlier, the Opposer’s evidences showing sales data and invoices attached as Exhibits “C-series” are mere scraps of paper with no evidentiary value as they are unsigned, unidentified and mere photocopies. The Opposer’s allegation that it “spends substantial amounts of resources to promote its products...” is a mere conclusion and a gratuitous statement without proof of army newspaper or magazine advertisements.

“3.13. This Honorable Office has affirmed the registrability of the Respondent-Applicant’s mark “Rich-O!” with an exclamation point” when the subject application was allowed after it had undergone merit examination.

Is the Opposer’s mark a well-known mark?

Rule 102 of the Trademark Regulations sets forth the criteria for determining whether a mark is well-known, to wit:

Rule 102. Criteria for determining whether a Mark is Well-known. In determining whether a mark is well-known, the following criteria or any combination thereof may be taken into account:

- a. the duration, extent and geographical area of any use of the mark, in particular, the duration, extent and geographical area of any promotion of the mark, including advertising or publicity and the presentation, at fairs or exhibitions, of the goods and/or services to which the mark applies;
- b. the market share, in the Philippines and in other countries, of the goods and/or services to which the mark applies;
- c. the degree of the inherent or acquired distinction of the mark;
- d. the quality-image or reputation acquired by the mark;
- e. the extent to which the mark has been registered in the world;
- f. the exclusivity of registration attained by the mark in the world;
- g. the extent to which the mark has been used in the world;
- h. the exclusivity of use attained by the mark in the world;
- i. the commercial value attributed to the mark in the world;
- j. the record of successful protection of the rights in the mark;
- k. the outcome of litigations dealing with the issue of whether the mark is a well-known mark; and

I. the presence or absence if identical or similar marks validly registered for or used on identical or similar goods or services and owned by persons other than the person claiming that his mark is a well-known mark.

This Bureau finds that the evidence submitted by the Opposer is insufficient to declare its mark well-known under the afore-cited rule. The Opposer only submitted machine copies of its trademark registrations abroad, including sales data and sales invoices, promotional materials and brochures. Aside from being merely machine copies, these were not corroborated by other evidence that would firmly establish the concurrence of at least a combination of the criteria under Rule 102 of the Trademark Regulations.

Scrutinizing the evidence submitted by the Opposer, this Bureau noticed that the certificates of registration of the mark "RICH'S" in foreign jurisdictions are not authenticated as required by Rule 132, Sec. 24., of the Revised Rules of Court and Rule 2, Sec. 7.1 of the Regulations on the Inter Partes Proceedings, as amended. Some of the alleged certificates of registration are merely correspondence/letters from the Opposer's agent- counsels. Moreover, the alleged statement of its gross sales from 1996 to 2006 and sales invoices in the months of January, February and April 2006 are not only unsigned, but are also unidentified. Said statement of gross sales and sales invoices are not supported by an Affidavit of any of the Opposer's witnesses.

The foregoing notwithstanding, the opposition should still be sustained.

It is emphasized that the essence of trademark registration is to give protection to the owners of trademarks. The function of a trademark is to point out distinctly the origin Or ownership of the goods to which it is affixed; to secure to him, who has been instrumental in bringing into the market a superior article of merchandise, the fruit of his industry and skill; to assure that they are procuring the genuine article; to prevent fraud and imposition; and to protect the manufacturer against substitution and sale of an inferior and different article or his product. Thus, marks is based on ownership. The Supreme Court held: The right to register trademarks, trade names and service mark is based on ownership. Only the owner of the mark may apply for its registration.

"By itself, registration is not a mode of acquiring ownership. When the applicant is not the owner of the trademark being applied for, he has no right to apply for registration of the same. x x x


"Registration, without more, does not confer upon the registrant an absolute right to the registered mark. The certificate of registration is merely a prima facie proof that the registrant is the owner of the registered mark or trade name. Evidence of prior and continuous use of the mark or trade name by another can overcome the presumptive ownership of the registrant and may very well entitle the former to be declared the owner in an appropriate case."³

Corollarily, Sec. 123.1 of Rep. Act No. 8293, also known as the Intellectual Property Code of the Philippines ("IP Code"), provides that a mark cannot be registered if it: is identical with a registered mark belonging to a different proprietor or mark with an earlier filing or priority date, in respect of the same goods or services or closely related goods or services, or if it nearly resembles such a mark as to be likely to deceive or cause confusion.

Once an Opposition proceeding is filed, it is basically turned into a review of the trademark application in question, succinctly, to determine whether the requirements of the law are met. In this regard, this Bureau may and should take cognizance by way of judicial notice the contents of or entries in the Trademark Registry and other records of the Intellectual Property office of the Philippines.

Accordingly, records show that at the time the Respondent-Applicant filed its trademark

application on 19 March 2004, the Opposer has an existing trademark registration for RICH'S WHIP TOPPING (Reg. No. 54099) which was issued as early as 01 February 1993. The registration covers goods under Class 30: "non-dairy edible oleaginous emulsion of being whipped or aerated to form stable foam for use on desserts, salads and the like. The Opposer also has the following Trademark registrations/applications. Nos. 4—2005-006758⁴, 4-2005-006759⁵, 4-2005-008236⁶, 4-2005-008237⁷, 4-2007-005852⁸, 4-2009-003783⁹, 4-2009-003784¹⁰, 4-2009-004347¹¹. The question is: Are the competing marks are depicted below resemble each other that deception or confusion is likely to occur?

Opposer's Marks (Denominated in Registration/Application Number)	Respondent-Applicant's Mark
<p>RICH'S WHIP TOPPING No. 054099</p> <p>RICH'S GOLD LABEL No. 4-2005-006759</p> <p>RICH'S No. 4-2007-005852</p> <p>RICH'S WHIP TOPPING No. 4-2009-003784</p>	
<p>RICH'S No. 4-2009-003783</p> <p>RICH'S No. 4-2005-008237</p> <p>RICH'S No. 42009004347</p> <p>RICH'S GOLD LABEL No. 42005008236</p> <p>RICH'S No. 42005006758</p>	

While there may be differences between the Respondent-Applicant's mark and the opposer's with respect to font, color and some embellishments, the Respondent-Applicant's mark is still appears a colorable imitation of the Opposer's. The feature in the Respondent-Applicant's mark that draws the eyes and rings to the ears in the word "RICH". That component of the Respondent-Applicant's mark is the one that will likely be remembered by the consumers, not the letter "O" nor the exclamation. The word "RICH", however, is identical to the opposer's marks or to the prominent feature thereof.

But, is the Respondent-Applicant's mark used on goods or products that are similar or closely related to the Opposers? In *Societe Des Produits nestle, S.A. v. Court of Appeals, et al*¹², the Supreme Court, held:

"However, in *Esso standard eastern, Inc. vs. Court of Appeals, et al. L-29971, Aug31, 1982*, the Supreme Court took the occasion of discussing what is implied in the definition of 'infringement' when it stated: 'Implicit in this definition s the concept that the goods must so related that the public may be, or is actually, deceived and misled that they came from the same maker or manufacturer. For non-competing goods may also be those which, being entirely unrelated, could not reasonably be assumed to have a

common source. In the former case of related goods, confusion of business could arise out of the use of similar marks; in the latter case of non-related goods, it could not.

Furthermore, in said case the Supreme Court as well discussed on when goods may become so related for purposes of infringement when it stated: 'Goods are related when they belong to the same class or have same descriptive properties; when they possess the same physical attributes or essential characteristics with reference to their form, composition, texture or quality. They may also be related because they serve the same purpose or are sold in grocery stores. x x x

There are no doubt that the Respondent-Applicant 's goods or products are similar and/or closely related to those covered by the Opposer's trademark registration nos. 4-2005-006758, 4-2005-006759, 4-2005-008236, 4-2005-008237, 4-2007-005852, 4-2009-003783, 4-2009-003784, and 4-2009-004347, the fact that these registrations came after the filing by the Respondent-Applicant 's of its trademark application is of no moment. This Bureau finds the goods covered by Reg. No. 05499, which was issued prior the filing of the respondent-applicant's trademark application, closely related to the goods covered by the respondent-applicant's mark. The goods belong to Class 30 (food products) and although maybe different in form, basically have the same properties and composition. In fact, the goods covered by the respondent-applicant's mark are naturally and logically within the sphere of the opposer's business as evidenced by the opposer's trademark applications and registrations subsequent to Reg. No. 05499. Thus, even assuming in arguendo that the goods covered by the opposer's Reg. No. 05499 and those under the respondent-applicant's trademark application are non competing, the resemblance of the response mark to the opposers is such that confusion or deception is likely, if not for the goods, then as to the business or origin. In *American Wire & Cable Co. vs. Director of Patents et. al*¹³, the Supreme Court held:

"The determine factor in a contest involving registration of trademark is not whether the challenged mark would actually cause confusion or deception of the purchasers but whether the use of such mark would likely cause confusion or mistake on the part of the buying public. In short, to constitute an infringement of an existing trademark, patent and warrant a denial of application for registration, the law does not require that the competing trademarks must be so identical as to produce actual error or mistake; it would be sufficient for purposes of the law, that the similarity between the two labels is such that there is a possibility or likelihood of the purchaser of the older brand mistaking the newer brand for it."

WHEREFORE, premises considered, the instant opposition is hereby SUSTAINED. Let the filewrapper of trademark application Serial No. 4-2004-002658 be returned, together with a copy of this decision to the Bureau of Trademarks for information and appropriate action.

SO ORDERED.

Makati City, 28 February 2011.

NATHANIEL S. AREVALO
Director, Bureau of Legal Affairs
Intellectual Property Office