

O/0689/26

TRADE MARKS ACT 1994

IN THE MATTER OF REGISTRATION NO. 3939682

IN THE NAME OF

THE CONSTRUCTION PEOPLE LIMITED

IN RESPECT OF THE TRADE MARK:

YurDoca

IN CLASSES 7 & 8

AND

THE APPLICATION FOR INVALIDATION THEREOF

UNDER NO. 507439

BY TAN, HONGTAO

Background and pleadings

1. The Construction People Limited (“the proprietor”) is the registered proprietor of the trade mark shown on the cover of this decision (“the contested mark”). It was filed on 29th July 2023 and proceeded to registration on 27th October 2023 in relation to the goods shown at Annex 1.
2. On 17th June 2024, Tan, Hongtao (“the applicant”) filed an application seeking to invalidate the contested registration in respect of all the goods. The application for invalidity is brought under section 47(2)(b) and section 5(4)(a) of the Trade Marks Act 1994 (“the Act”). This is on the basis of its alleged earlier rights in the sign ‘YurDoca’. It claims that it has been using this sign continuously throughout the UK since February 2021 in respect of the following goods:
Kitchen utensils such as vegetable slicers, vegetable choppers; Microphones; Headphones; Projection apparatus; Protective cases for smartphones; Protective eyeglasses; Reading glasses; Spectacles; Sunglasses.
3. By virtue of relying on section 5(4)(a) of the Act, the applicant claims to have acquired goodwill in its business under the sign, and that use of the contested trade mark would therefore be a misrepresentation to the public and result in damage to the aforementioned goodwill. The proprietor filed counterstatements rejecting (and thus denying) the claims made.
4. Only the cancellation applicant filed evidence in these proceedings and only the registered proprietor filed written submissions in lieu of a hearing. Since no hearing was requested, this decision is taken following careful consideration of all the papers before me. I have not summarised the evidence or submissions in full but will instead refer to these to the extent that is necessary.
5. In these proceedings, the cancellation applicant is represented by “Yayipcom” and the proprietor represents itself via Muhammad Saleem.¹

¹ The proprietor’s counterstatement was completed by Mr Saleem who records himself as the holder of the mark (rather than a representative).

EVIDENCE AND SUBMISSIONS

6. The applicant's evidence is in the form of a witness statement, dated 11th April 2025. It is accompanied by 3 exhibits (Exhibits A-C). It includes the following evidence in support of its claims:

- At Exhibit A, details of a UK trade mark registration held by the applicant for "YurDoca" (a figurative mark comprising stylised text) for goods in class 9. It was filed on 6th February 2021 and registered on 11th June the same year.
- Screenshots of Amazon listings (from Amazon.co.uk) for items sold by the applicant under the "YurDoca" sign at Exhibit B. Items include: two handheld sewing machines, a handheld steam cleaner, a clothes steamer, a vegetable chopper, and a portable blender. The screenshots themselves are dated 13th and 19th March 2025, presumably when the evidence was being collated, but I note that each listing details a "date first available". This varies across the products, but all are between 2020 and 2023 and prior to the relevant date. This is also confirmed by the applicant's narrative evidence.
- Finally, Exhibit C features sales information (previous orders), via the applicant's Amazon account, for four of the products shown in Exhibit B. Once again, these are dated 2025, but I note the results are displayed for orders within a custom date range for each product. I consider this further below.

7. I note that the applicant's witness statement also contains submissions. However, I do not consider it too onerous a task to separate the opinions of Tan, Hongtao from his statements of fact. Therefore, I will adopt a pragmatic approach, treating the submissions as legal arguments and/or opinions rather than factual statements, even though they are conveyed in a witness statement accompanied by a statement of truth.

PRELIMINARY ISSUES

8. As referenced at paragraph 6 above, the applicant includes in its evidence details of a registered UK trade mark it holds for "YurDoca" for goods in class 9. However,

this invalidation action relies on section 5(4)(a) of the Act only – no grounds under 5(1) or 5(2) have been pleaded, therefore the existence of this registered right is not relevant to this assessment.

9. The proprietor's counterstatement references that the proprietor has "good will [sic] in the market...developed over the years". On this I recall that generation of goodwill by the proprietor is not required to defend a passing off claim, rather it is the opponent (in this case, the cancellation applicant) who must show that it had the necessary goodwill and reputation at the relevant date.²
10. I also note that the proprietor within its counterstatement (and written submissions in lieu of a hearing) makes reference to having its brand recognised by Amazon's "brand registry portal". For the avoidance of doubt, this is an independent database administered by Amazon and therefore has no bearing on my decision. Similarly, the proprietor references (albeit late in the proceedings, as it featured only in the final written submissions) that it has registered a company name for the mark and notes the availability of the domain name. Neither are relevant to the case at hand.

DECISION

11. Section 5(4)(a) states:

"(4) A trade mark shall not be registered if, or to the extent that, its use in the United Kingdom is liable to be prevented-

(a) by virtue of any rule of law (in particular, the law of passing off) protecting an unregistered trade mark or other sign used in the course of trade, where the condition in subsection (4A) is met,

(aa) [...]

(b) [...]

² As per CASABLANCA (BL O/349/16), paragraph 35.

A person thus entitled to prevent the use of a trade mark is referred to in this Act as the proprietor of an “earlier right” in relation to the trade mark.”

12. Subsection (4A) of Section 5 states:

“(4A) The condition mentioned in subsection (4)(a) is that the rights to the unregistered trade mark or other sign were acquired prior to the date of application for registration of the trade mark or date of the priority claimed for that application.”

13. The relevant parts of section 47 state:

“47. (1) [...]

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

(a) [...]

(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.

[...]

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

[...]

(6) Where the registration of a trade mark is declared invalid to any extent, the registration shall to that extent be deemed never to have been made: Provided that this shall not affect transactions past and closed.”

The principles

14. In *Discount Outlet v Feel Good UK*, [2017] EWHC 1400 IPEC, Her Honour Judge Melissa Clarke, sitting as a Deputy Judge of the High Court, conveniently summarised the essential requirements of the law of passing off as follows:

“55. The elements necessary to reach a finding of passing off are the ‘classical trinity’ of that tort as described by Lord Oliver in the *Jif Lemon* case (*Reckitt & Colman Product v Borden* [1990] 1 WLR 491 HL, [1990] RPC 341, HL), namely goodwill or reputation; misrepresentation leading to deception or a likelihood of deception; and damage resulting from the misrepresentation. The burden is on the Claimants to satisfy me of all three limbs.

56. In relation to deception, the court must assess whether “a substantial number” of the Claimants’ customers or potential customers are deceived, but it is not necessary to show that all or even most of them are deceived (per *Interflora Inc v Marks and Spencer Plc* [2012] EWCA Civ 1501, [2013] FSR 21).”

15. The concept of goodwill was explained in *Inland Revenue Commissioners v Muller & Co’s Margarine Ltd* [1901] AC 217, at 223:

“What is goodwill? It is a thing very easy to describe, very difficult to define. It is the benefit and advantage of the good name, reputation and connection of a business. It is the attractive force which brings in custom. It is the one thing which distinguishes an old-established business from a new business at its first start.”

The relevant date

16. In *Maier & Anor v ASOS plc & Anor* [2015] EWCA Civ 220, Kitchin LJ (as he then was) said:

165. ... Under the English law of passing off, the relevant date for determining whether a claimant has established the necessary reputation or goodwill is the date of the commencement of the conduct complained of (see, for example, *Cadbury-Schweppes Pty Ltd v The Pub Squash Co Ltd* [1981] RPC 429). The jurisprudence of the General Court and that of OHIM is not entirely clear as to how this should be taken into consideration under Article 8(4) (compare, for example, T-114/07 and T-115/07 *Last Minute Network Ltd* and Case R 784/2010-2 *Sun Capital Partners Inc*). In my judgment the matter should be

addressed in the following way. The party opposing the application or the registration must show that, as at the date of application (or the priority date, if earlier), a normal and fair use of the [contested] trade mark would have amounted to passing off. But if the [contested] trade mark has in fact been used from an earlier date then that is a matter which must be taken into account, for the opponent must show that he had the necessary goodwill and reputation to render that use actionable on the date that it began.”

17. The proprietor appears to suggest in its counterstatement (and more explicitly in its written submissions in lieu of a hearing) that it was using the contested mark prior to its registration. However, this is ambiguous and there is no clear date of first use or evidence to support this. Therefore, the relevant date is the date on which the application was filed, on 29th July 2023. The onus is on the opponent to make out its prima facie case. In particular, the opponent must show that it had sufficient goodwill in its YurDoca sign at the relevant date and that the sign is associated with, or distinctive of, its business.

Goodwill

18. In *South Cone Incorporated v Jack Bessant, Dominic Greensmith, Kenwyn House and Gary Stringer (a partnership)* [2002] RPC 19 (HC), Pumfrey J. stated:

“27. There is one major problem in assessing a passing of claim on paper, as will normally happen in the Registry. This is the cogency of the evidence of reputation and its extent. It seems to me that in any case in which this ground of opposition is raised the registrar is entitled to be presented with evidence which at least raises a prima facie case that the opponent's reputation extends to the goods comprised in the applicant's specification of goods. The requirements of the objection itself are considerably more stringent than the enquiry under s.11 of the 1938 Act (see *Smith Hayden & Co. Ltd's Application (OVAX)* (1946) 63 R.P.C. 97 as qualified by *BALI Trade Mark* [1969] R.P.C. 472). Thus the evidence will include evidence from the trade as to reputation; evidence as to the manner in which the goods are traded or the services supplied; and so on.

28. Evidence of reputation comes primarily from the trade and the public, and will be supported by evidence of the extent of use. To be useful, the evidence must be directed to the relevant date. Once raised, the applicant must rebut the prima facie case. Obviously, he does not need to show that passing off will not occur, but he must produce sufficient cogent evidence to satisfy the hearing officer that it is not shown on the balance of probabilities that passing off will occur.”

19. However, in *Minimax GmbH & Co KG v Chubb Fire Limited* [2008] EWHC 1960 (Pat) Floyd J. (as he then was) stated that:

“[The above] observations are obviously intended as helpful guidelines as to the way in which a person relying on section 5(4)(a) can raise a case to be answered of passing off. I do not understand Pumfrey J to be laying down any absolute requirements as to the nature of evidence which needs to be filed in every case. The essential is that the evidence should show, at least prima facie, that the opponent's reputation extends to the goods comprised in the application in the applicant's specification of goods. It must also do so as of the relevant date, which is, at least in the first instance, the date of application.”

20. I also bear in mind the guidance in *Hart v Relentless Records* [2002] EWHC 1984 (Ch), Jacob J. (as he then was) stated that:

“62. In my view the law of passing off does not protect a goodwill of trivial extent. Before trade mark registration was introduced in 1875 there was a right of property created merely by putting a mark into use for a short while. It was an unregistered trade mark right. But the action for its infringement is now barred by s.2(2) of the Trade Marks Act 1994. The provision goes back to the very first registration Act of 1875, s.1. Prior to then you had a property right on which you could sue, once you had put the mark into use. Even then a little time was needed, see per Upjohn L.J. in BALI Trade Mark [1969] R.P.C. 472. The whole point of that case turned on the difference between what was needed to establish a common law trade mark and passing off claim. If a trivial goodwill is enough for the latter, then the difference between the two is vanishingly small.

That cannot be the case. It is also noteworthy that before the relevant date of registration of the BALI mark (1938) the BALI mark had been used “but had not acquired any significant reputation” (the trial judge's finding). Again that shows one is looking for more than a minimal reputation.”

21. Similarly, in *Smart Planet Technologies, Inc. v Rajinda Sharma* (BL O/304/20), Mr Thomas Mitcheson QC (now KC), as the Appointed Person, reviewed the following authorities about the establishment of goodwill for the purposes of passing-off: *Starbucks (HK) Ltd v British Sky Broadcasting Group Plc* [2015] UKSC 31, paragraph 52, *Reckitt & Colman Product v Borden* [1990] RPC 341, *HL and Erven Warnink B.V. v. J. Townend & Sons (Hull) Ltd* [1980] R.P.C. 31. After reviewing these authorities Mr Mitcheson concluded that:

“... a successful claimant in a passing off claim needs to demonstrate more than nominal goodwill. It needs to demonstrate significant or substantial goodwill and at the very least sufficient goodwill to be able to conclude that there would be substantial damage on the basis of the misrepresentation relied upon.”

22. I remind myself at this stage that the applicant's claims under its section 5(4)(a) ground that its business's goodwill relates to “*Kitchen utensils such as vegetable slicers, vegetable choppers; Microphones; Headphones; Projection apparatus; Protective cases for smartphones; Protective eyeglasses; Reading glasses; Spectacles; Sunglasses*”. On this, I note the comments of Dr. Brian Whitehead, sitting as the Appointed Person in *Bunnyjuice, Inc. v Mercis B.V.*, Case BL O/0064/24 which were as follows:

“In trade mark law, the analysis of proof of use, reputation and enhanced distinctive character needs to be performed on a granular basis, looking at each of the individual goods and services in turn. [...] In passing off law, however, goodwill attaches to a business, rather than to isolated individual goods and services. Of course, when assessing goodwill, it is necessary to ask, “What is the nature of the business?”, but it is not appropriate to break the business down at the same level of granularity as is done for assessing trade mark use etc.”

23. The opponent's evidence is reasonably thin on the ground but revolves around sales via the Amazon.co.uk platform. As noted at paragraph 6, Exhibit B includes screenshots of Amazon listings of six products: two handheld sewing machines, a handheld steam cleaner, a clothes steamer, a vegetable chopper, and a portable blender. Therefore the majority of these listings relate to goods not set out by the applicant in its TM26(I) and are therefore not relevant. Though the last two products, the vegetable chopper and portable blender, are of note. I consider these in more detail below:

- The product page for the vegetable chopper at Exhibit B (page 23) lists the date the product was first available as 7th December 2022. The accompanying sales information is at Exhibit C (pages 37-38). This lists a total of 98 orders for the product, however the "custom date range" for these results is 1st June 2023 to 30th September 2024. Therefore, only a little under two months of this range is prior to the 29th July 2023 relevant date, the rest falling beyond. I only have the first page of the results (out of 7 pages in total) breaking down the details of these sales. Thus, the evidence before me shows only the first 15 sales, all falling within June 2023. The "item subtotal" for each order ranges between £26.99 and £22.99 and the total value of sales stands at: £310.87.³ Regarding the remaining orders (i.e. on pages not included within the evidence but within the total count of 98) I have no way of determining what proportion of these were prior to the relevant date.
- The product page for the portable blender at Exhibit B (page 27) lists the date the product was first available as 13th February 2023. For this, the corresponding sales information once again shows only the first page of sales, all dated early March 2023.⁴ The item value has three different price points across these orders: £17.99, £19.99 and £20.49. Whilst the detailed information for only the first 15 orders is provided within the evidence, the

³ There are three orders valued at £26.99 and ten at £22.99. This totals £310.87. An additional two orders (both dated 12/06/2023) have annotations, one cancelled and the another with a refund applied, therefore these have not been included in the count.

⁴ Exhibit C (pages 40-41).

sales list quotes a total of 223. The custom search date for this value is 1st September 2022 to 30th June 2023, therefore (unlike the vegetable chopper) these orders would all fall prior to the relevant date. However, I do not have any details for the item value for orders beyond the first page. The applicant's best case (based on the limited information I have) gives a total sale value in the region of £3,968.30 to £4,488.30.⁵ These figures are based on multiple assumptions – it uses the upper and lower sales values from the March 2023 orders, but I have no confirmation what the actual sale prices were, and it assumes no cancellations.

- Returning to Exhibit B, the product pages include reviews and ratings for each product. The vegetable chopper has a total of 299 ratings averaging at 4.4 stars. I have no way of determining which proportion of these were acquired prior to the relevant date, but I note that the four written reviews shown (pages 24 and 25) are all prior to the relevant date and positive, allocating a four or five star rating. The customer reaction to the portable blender is less positive. It has 49 ratings (again, with unknown dates) and an average 2.2 star rating. Eight written reviews are shown in the evidence (pages 28-29) but only one is dated prior to the relevant date and gives a one star rating.

24. With respect to the submissions from the applicant, it claims that it has been “enjoying substantial sales in the UK for a very long time and have [sic] become a trustworthy name in the field of household products”.⁶ However this is simply not reflected in the evidence. Of all the products shown in Exhibits B and C, four show a first availability date within the second half of 2022 (less than 12 months before the relevant date). The earliest product availability is 16th December 2020 (for one of the handheld sewing machines) and the latest is 13th February 2023 (for the portable blender). The earliest order evidenced is 1st March 2023 (for the portable blender), this taking place just under five months before the relevant date.

⁵ To arrive at this figure, I calculated the total value of completed (and non-refunded) orders on the first page of sales using the known item subtotals (7 at £17.99, 4 at £19.99, 1 at £20.49, totalling £226.38) and then added this to the totals calculated whereby the remaining 208 orders were sold at a lower selling price of £17.99 or an upper selling price of £20.49.

⁶ Paragraph 5 of written submissions.

Therefore, these figures do little to suggest a well-established business or to substantiate the applicant's claims. The applicant also states its name has "become synonymous with [the applicant] and its quality products/services".⁷ However this assertion is not supported by the evidence.

25. I remind myself that even a small business which has more than a trivial goodwill can protect signs which are distinctive of that business under the law of passing off, even though its goodwill and reputation may be small.⁸ As such, it is not necessary for the trading activities under the present assessment to be at a high level. That being said, I consider that the applicant's evidence falls far short of the threshold to warrant a finding of a protectable level of goodwill in its business. The turnover figures estimated from the evidence provided, being less than £5000 for both of the relevant products combined, are at a very low level. While a low turnover is not fatal in itself, this issue is exacerbated by the fact that, as set out at paragraph 23 above, the total sales figure for the portable blender is merely an estimate. The actual sales figures for the vegetable chopper and portable blender based solely on what is explicitly shown in the evidence (i.e. where the order is listed individually with a sale date and item value) totals only £537.25.⁹

26. Outside of the issues with the sales turnover, there is nothing in the evidence to provide any further support for the applicant's claim. For example, I have nothing pointing to repeat custom (which is a factor in favour of goodwill) or regarding any advertising or marketing efforts to indicate or even suggest a level of awareness across the relevant consumer base.

27. Therefore, having taken all of the evidence of use into account, I find that the applicant's business does not benefit from any protectable level of goodwill in order to sustain a claim for passing off and the ground fails at the first hurdle.

⁷ Ibid. Paragraph 6.

⁸ As per *Lumos Skincare Limited v Sweet Squared Limited and others* [2013] EWCA Civ 590

⁹ This is the combined total for the vegetable choppers at £310.87 (as per calculations at footnote 3) and the portable blender at £226.38 (as per calculations at footnote 5).

CONCLUSION

28. The application for invalidation is unsuccessful, and the contested mark remains registered.

COSTS

29. The proprietor has been successful and is entitled to a contribution towards its costs based upon the scale published in Tribunal Practice Notice 1/2023. I award the proprietor the sum of £900.00, calculated as follows:

Considering the application for invalidation and preparing a counterstatement	£250
Considering the other side's evidence	£300
Preparing written submissions in lieu of a hearing	£350
Total	£900.00

30. I therefore order Tan, Hongtao to pay The Construction People Limited the sum of **£900.00**. This sum should 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 31st day of July 2026

C IRELAND

For the Registrar

Annex 1

Class 7: Sewing machines; Sewing machine motors; Sewing machine installations; Bobbins for sewing machines; Needles for sewing machines; Electric sewing machines; Sewing machinery; Industrial sewing machines; Embroidery machines; Knitting machines; Embroidering machines; Stitching machines; Sewing machines for textiles and leather; Folding machine; Sewing machines for household purposes; Machines for washing fabrics; Electric knitting machines; Textile washing machines; Ironing machines; Machine tools; Machine wheelwork; Needles for knitting machines; Wire stitching machines; Machine mowers; Machine tools for cutting; Tools (Machine -) for cutting; Dyeing machines; Cloth ironing machines; Drycleaning machines; Cloth washing machines; Ironing machines for clothing; Machine belts; Machine guides [parts of machines]; Seaming machines; Weaving machines; Machine tools for drilling; Tools (Machine -) for drilling; Spindles for machine tools; Slides for knitting machines; Ironing machines and laundry presses; Machines for washing laundry; Tools (Machine -) for grinding; Machine tools for grinding; Dry-cleaning machines; Electric ironing machines; Cutters being machine tools; Ultrasonic washing machines; Electrical ironing machines; Electric vacuum cleaners; Electric sweepers; Electric steam mops; Carpet sweepers (Electric -); Electric carpet sweepers ; Electric cordless sweepers; Electric steam cleaning machines; Electric vacuum cleaners for industrial use; Spin dryers; Electric carpet vacuum cleaners; Electric fan units for vacuum cleaners; Electric vacuum cleaners for bedding; Carpet cleaning machines [electric]; Electric blenders; Electric carpet shampooers; Floor polishers, electric; Electric floor polishers; Floor polishers [electric]; Electric brooms; Electric car washers; Spin driers [machines]; Electric juicers; Hoses for electric vacuum cleaners; Electric vacuum cleaners for domestic use; Carpet shampoo applicators (Electric -); Electric domestic vacuum cleaners; Nail extractors, electric; Electric nail extractors; Spin dryers [machines]; Electric kitchen machines; Portable drilling machines [electric]; Spin dryers [not heated]; Cleaning (Machines and apparatus for -), electric; Machines and apparatus for cleaning, electric; Crushers for kitchen use, electric; Electric kitchen mixers; Scissors, electric; Electric scissors; Electric window cleaning machines; Machines for grinding [electric]; Hand held vacuum cleaners (Electric -); Steam cleaners; Multi-purpose steam cleaners; Steam

cleaners [machines]; Steam mops; Steam cleaning machines; Vacuum cleaner hoses; Electric steam cleaners for household purposes; Steam cleaners for household purposes; Separators (Steam oil -); Vacuum cleaner bags; Vacuum cleaners; Suction cleaning machines [vacuum cleaners]; Electric steam mops for household purposes; Wet vacuum cleaners; Industrial floor cleaning machines [vacuum cleaners]; Vacuum cleaners for the cleaning of surfaces; Vacuum cleaners for cars; Hoses for vacuum cleaners; Domestic vacuum cleaners; Household vacuum cleaners; Brushes for vacuum cleaners; Vacuum cleaner bags of paper; Cordless vacuum cleaners; Hand-held vacuum cleaners; Suction nozzles for vacuum cleaners; Wet and dry vacuum cleaners; Vacuum cleaner bags of cardboard; Vacuum cleaner bags of card; Robotic vacuum cleaners; Electrical vacuum cleaners for domestic use; Filters for cleaning cooling air, for engines; Commercial and industrial vacuum cleaners; Electric vacuum cleaners and their components; Steam presses (Rotary -), portable, for fabric; Rotary steam presses, portable, for fabric; Steam presses (Rotary -), portable, for fabrics; Vacuum cleaning machines for use in households; Vacuum cleaner attachments for disseminating perfumes and disinfectants; Vacuum cleaners for household purposes; Electrical carpet cleaning [shampooing] machines; Liquid blenders [machines]; Electric food blenders; Food blenders, electric; Food blenders (Electric -); Utensils (Electric -) for blending liquids; Electric blenders for household purposes; Blenders, electric, for household purposes; Electric food blenders [for household purposes]; Domestic blenders [electric]; Electric food blenders for domestic use; Mixers (Electric -) for mixing food; Electric mixers for mixing food; Electric kitchen appliances for chopping, mixing, pressing; Kitchen grinders, electric; Mixers [kitchen machines]; Food mixers (Electric -); Kitchen tools [electric utensils]; Blending machines for chemical processing; Electric hand-held mixers for household purposes; Electric kitchen tools; Electric meat slicers for kitchen use; Electrical appliances used in kitchen for whisking; Electric juice extractors; Juice extractors, electric; Fruit grinders (Electric -); Salad drainers [electric kitchen machines]; Kitchen knives (Electric -); Meat grinders [electric machines] for household use; Kitchen machines (Electric -) for food preparation [other than cooking]; Electric coffee grinders; Electric fruit juice extractors; Fruit juice extractors, electric; Fruit juice extractors (Electric -); Washing machines for kitchen bowls; Electric food grinders; Food grinders, electric; Electric food grinders for industrial use; Food slicing machines (Electric -); Coffee grinders, other than hand-

operated; Bottle washing machines; Meat choppers [electric machines] for household use; Kitchen machines, electric; Electrical appliances used in kitchen for grinding; Machines for the preparation of foodstuffs [electric, kitchen], other than cooking; Electrical appliances used in kitchen for crushing; Liquidisers [kitchen machines]; Electric food slicers; Machines for slicing food [electric, kitchen]; Vegetable slicers [machines]; Electrical vegetable slicers; Machines for slicing food [industrial]; Vegetable slicers, electric ; Cheese slicers [machines]; Food processors; Cheese slicers, electric; Meat slicing machines; Food shredders (Electric -); Grinders (Electric -) for food preparation; Electric food processors; Food processors, electric; Electric food choppers; Food choppers, electric; Machines used in processing food; Electrical food processors; Slicing machines (Electric -) for large scale food processing; Peeling machines (Electric -) for use in the preparation of food; Food preparation machines (Electric -); Electric food preparation machines; Machines for food preparation [electric]; Food preparation machines, electromechanical; Vegetable spiralizers, electric; Vegetable grating machines; Power-operated meat mincers; Food and beverage processing and preparation machines and apparatus; Juice machines; Electrical juice extractors for fruit; Portable air tools; Rotary steam presses, portable, for fabrics; Vegetable choppers [machines]; Vegetable peelers, electric; Electric vegetable peelers; Steam boilers for steam generating [parts of machines]; Bags (Vacuum cleaner -); Car vacuum cleaners; Air jet cleaners (Electric -); Dust filters for vacuum cleaners.

Class 8: Vegetable choppers; Non-electric garlic choppers; Meat choppers [cleavers]; Vegetable choppers (Hand-operated -); Hand-operated choppers; Potato peelers [knives]; Mincing knives / Fleshing knives / Meat choppers being meat knives; Hand-operated banana slicers; Meat choppers [hand tools]; Vegetable slicers; Vegetable shredders; Vegetable knives; Vegetable peelers, hand-operated; Vegetable spiralizers, hand-operated; Vegetable slicers (Hand-operated -); Vegetable slicers, hand-operated; Hand-operated vegetable shredders; Vegetable shredders, hand-operated; Non-electric vegetable peelers; Vegetable peelers [hand tools]; Hand-operated fruit slicers; Non-electric fruit peelers.