

**BENELUX-OFFICE FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY**  
**OPPOSITION DECISION**  
**N° 2015708**  
**of 12 March 2021**

**Opponent:** **The a2 Milk Company Limited**  
Shortland Street (Level 10) 51  
1010 Auckland  
New Zealand

**Representative:** **NautaDutilh, SPRL**  
Chaussée de la Hulpe 120  
1000 Brussels  
Belgium

**Invoked trademark 1:** **EU trademark 10097939**



**Invoked trademark 2:** **EU trademark 14406326**



**Invoked trademark 3:** **EU trademark 3974623**



*Against*

**Defendant:** **MJN U.S. Holdings LLC IN**  
West Lloyd Expressway 2400  
47721-0 Evansville  
United States of America


**Representative:** **Bird & Bird (Netherlands) LLP**  
Zuid-Hollandplein 22  
2596 AW Den Haag  
Netherlands

**Contested trademark: Benelux application 1404683**





## I. FACTS AND PROCEEDINGS


### A. Facts

1. On 25 October 2019, the defendant filed a Benelux trademark application for the combined word/figurative trademark  for goods in classes 5 and 29. This application was processed under number 1404683 and was published on 28 October 2019.

2. On 13 December 2019 the opponent filed an opposition against this application. The opposition is based on the following earlier trademarks:

- European Union trademark 10097939 for the combined word/figurative trademark , filed on 5 July 2011 and registered on 11 August 2012 for goods in classes 5 and 29;

- European Union trademark 14406326 for the combined word/figurative trademark , filed on 22 July 2015 and registered on 12 September 2016 for goods in classes 5 and 29;

- European Union trademark 3974623 for the combined word/figurative trademark , filed on 13 August 2004 and registered on 28 November 2005 for goods in class 29.

3. According to the register the opponent is the actual holder of the trademarks invoked.

4. The opposition is directed against all the goods of the contested application and is based on all the goods of the trademarks invoked.

5. The grounds for opposition are those laid down in Article 2.14, 2 (a) Benelux Convention on Intellectual Property (hereinafter referred to as: "BCIP").

6. The language of the proceedings is English.

### B. Proceedings

7. The opposition is admissible and the Benelux Office for Intellectual Property (hereinafter referred to as: "the Office") notified the parties on 17 December 2019. During the administrative phase of the proceedings both parties filed arguments. All the documents submitted meet the requirements as stated in the BCIP and the Implementing Regulations (hereinafter referred to as: "IR"). The administrative phase of the procedure was completed on 8 July 2020.

## II. ARGUMENTS OF THE PARTIES

8. The opponent filed an opposition at the Office under article 2.14, 2 (a) BCIP, in accordance with the provisions of article 2.2ter, 1 (b) BCIP: the likelihood of confusion based on the identity or similarity of the relevant marks and of the goods or services concerned.

**A. Opponent's arguments**

9. The opponent states that it bases the opposition "among others" on the second right invoked mentioned above, and submits arguments only in relation to that trade mark.

10. The opponent observes that, from a visual point of view, the trademarks invoked are dominated by the "a2" element, as the "milk" word is descriptive.

11. This "a2" element is identically present in the contested Benelux application, be it that the Arabic numeral (2) has been changed in the roman numeral (II) and the lower case letter a was changed to the uppercase letter A. These minor differences are insufficient to rule out any visual similarity between the marks which are almost identical, according to the opponent.

12. The opponent points out that roman numerals are a widely recognised numeral system, which has a variety of contemporary uses, including, but not limited to: generational suffixes, hour marks on time pieces, sequels to films and video games, different acts in plays, page numbering of prefaces and introductions of books, chemistry nomenclature, regnal and papal names, grand sporting events such as the summer and winter Olympics. Consequently, roman numerals have a clear and established meaning and will be easily understood by the relevant public as an alternative to Arabic numerals.

13. Therefore, the opponent is of the opinion that the roman numeral "II" will be read and pronounced as "deux" (in French) or "twee" (in Dutch) by the relevant public, as it will be perceived as an alternate way of presenting the number two. The Roman numeral II in the contested Benelux application is written in superscript. The use of superscript is commonly used for numerals and will thus be associated with its Arabic alternative 2. Any other interpretation or reading of the II in the contested Benelux application can thus be ruled out. There is no difference between the pronunciation of roman numerals and Arabic numerals. Therefore, the opponent concludes that the earlier marks and the later mark are phonetically identical.

14. The opponent finds that the trademarks at hand have no meaning for the public. Accordingly, the conceptual comparison can have no influence on the assessment of the similarity of the trademarks at issue and therefore, only the visual and aural comparison should be taken into consideration.

15. According to the opponent, all goods covered by the contested Benelux application are identical or at least highly similar to those for which opponent's trademarks are registered because they either share the same nature or method of use, are interchangeable and, therefore, target the same consumers, which can find them in the same shops or aisles thereof.

16. Considering the above, the opponent concludes that there exists a likelihood of confusion. He therefore asks the Office to reject the contested trademark application and to let the defendant bear the costs of the procedure.

**B. Defendant's arguments**

17. The defendant notes that the opponent has only substantively based its opposition arguments on the second trademark invoked. For this reason alone, the opposition should already be rejected insofar it is based on the other trademarks invoked. Moreover, because of the fact that the opposition is only substantively based on the second trademark invoked, the defendant will only substantively refute the opponent's arguments based on that trademark, notwithstanding he is of the opinion that the other two trademarks cannot lead to the opposition being upheld either.

18. According to the defendant, it becomes immediately clear that visually the trademarks are not similar. Firstly, in the contested trademark application, the combination of thin and bold lines, straight lines and curves, elements extending out of the characters, and II depicted as superscript, is striking, whereas the opponent's trademark is characterized by its purple curved lettering. These design elements are what last an impression with the relevant consumer.

19. Secondly, the contested trademark application contains the uppercase letter A, whereas the trademark invoked contains the lowercase letter a. This difference in writing is significant, as well as the writing of 2 versus II. Moreover, the contested trademark application contains three characters, whereas the trademark invoked contains six. The defendant thus concludes that the trademarks are visually dissimilar.

20. In contrast to the opponent's statements, the trademarks are phonetically dissimilar. The contested trademark will be pronounced [A-I-I] whereas the trademarks invoked will be pronounced [a-toe].

21. The defendant explains that A2 is a type of milk that is free, or predominantly free, of A1 beta-casein protein. Such milk is commonly known as A2 milk. Most milk contains two forms of protein beta-casein, known as A1 and A2. A2 milk comes from specially bred cows that produce milk that only or primarily contain the A2 protein. According to the defendant, the term A2 in relation to milk and milk-related supplementary and complimentary products in classes 5 and 29 is, therefore, descriptive. In that respect, the defendant refers to two earlier decisions of the Office.

22. Consequently, the a2 part of the trademarks invoked being descriptive, that part will not be regarded as distinctive and dominant in the overall impression. As a result, the scope of protection of these trademarks is limited to the design elements. This is however not the case for AII, as it creates a recognisably different overall impression due to the unusual use of roman numerals. Hence, the defendant concludes that the trademarks are conceptually dissimilar.

23. According to the defendant, various goods covered by its trademark application do not satisfy the factors for similarity, nor has the opponent substantively stated that they would. Several of the products covered by the contested trademark application usually have different commercial origins and distribution channels, a different nature and method of use, and are not in competition or interchangeable. In the defendant's view, it is up to the opponent to state and if necessary, prove that those goods and services are similar, and they have not done so.

24. Based on the above, the defendant concludes that the relevant public, which has a high degree of attention, will not be confused and will not think that its products originate from the same company as the opponent's products and will not think they are dealing with the same or a similar trademark. Consequently, the opposition must be rejected and the opponent should be ordered to bear all costs and fees incurred by the defendant.

### **III. DECISION**

#### **A. Likelihood of confusion**

25. In accordance with article 2.14 BCIP, the holder of a prior trademark may submit a written opposition to the Office, within a period of two months to be calculated from the publication date of the application, against a trademark which in the order of priority, ranks after its own in accordance with Article 2.2ter BCIP.

26. Article 2.2ter, para. 1 BCIP stipulates that "A trademark shall, in case an opposition is filed, not be registered (...) where because of its identity with, or similarity to, the earlier trademark and the identity or similarity of the goods or services covered by the trademarks, there exists a likelihood of confusion on the part of the public; the likelihood of confusion includes the likelihood of association with the earlier trademark."

27. According to case law of the Court of Justice of the European Union (hereinafter: the "CJEU") concerning the interpretation of Directive (EU) 2015/2436 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 December 2015 to approximate the laws of the Member States relating to trademarks (hereinafter: "Directive"), the likelihood of confusion of the public, which is defined as the risk that the public might believe that the goods or services in question come from the same undertaking or, as the case may be, from economically-linked undertakings, must be appreciated globally taking into account all factors relevant to the circumstances of the case (CJEU, Canon, C-39/97, 29 September 1998, ECLI:EU:C:1998:442; Lloyd Schuhfabrik Meyer, C-342/97, 22 June 1999, ECLI:EU:C:1999:323; CJBen, Brouwerij Haacht/Grandes Sources belges, A 98/3, 2 October 2000; Marca Mode/Adidas, A 98/5, 7 June 2002; Supreme Court of the Netherlands, Flügel-bottle, C02/133HR, 14 November 2003, ECLI:NL:HR:2003:AK4818; Court of Appeal Brussels, N-20060227-1, 27 February 2006).



### **Comparison of the trademarks and the goods**



28. The wording of Article 5, 1 (b) of the Directive (compare article 2.2ter, 1 (b) BCIP) according to which "there exists a likelihood of confusion on the part of the public including the likelihood of association with the earlier trademark" shows that the perception of marks in the mind of the average consumer of the type of goods or services in question plays a decisive role in the global assessment of the likelihood of confusion. The average consumer normally perceives a mark as a whole and does not proceed to analyse its various details (CJEU, Sabel, C-251/95, 11 November 1997, ECLI:EU:C:1997:528).

29. Global assessment of the visual, aural or conceptual similarity of the marks in question must be based on the overall impression given by the marks, bearing in mind, in particular, their distinctive and dominant components (CJEU, Sabel and Lloyd, already cited).

30. The overall impression created in the memory of the relevant public by a complex mark might, in certain circumstances, be dominated by one or more components of that mark (CJEU, Limonchello, C334/05 P, 12 June 2007, ECLI:EU:C:2007:333). With regard to the assessment of the dominant characteristics of one or more components of a complex trademark, account must be taken, in particular, of the intrinsic qualities of each of these components by comparing them with those of other components. In addition, account may be taken of the relative position of the various components within the arrangement of the complex mark (EGC, Matratzen, T-6/01, 23 October 2002, ECLI:EU:T:2002:261 and El Charcutero Artesano, T-242/06, 13 December 2007, ECLI:EU:T:2007:391).

31. The trademarks and goods to be compared are the following:

Opposition based on:	Opposition directed against:
	
Class 5 Infant foods; milk and milk powder for infants. Class 29 Milk and milk products in this Class; other goods in this Class which include milk or milk products as ingredients.	Class 5 Pharmaceutical, veterinary and sanitary preparations; dietetic substances adapted for medical use, food for babies; infant formula; nutritional supplements; vitamin and mineral supplements; food adapted for medical

	<p>purposes; electrolyte replenishment preparations; plasters, materials for dressings; material for stopping teeth, dental wax; disinfectants; preparations for destroying vermin; fungicides, herbicides.</p> <p>Class 29 Meat, fish, poultry and game; meat extracts; preserved, dried and cooked fruits and vegetables; jellies, jams; eggs, milk and milk products; powdered preparations for making milk beverages; milk powder; milk based drinks; milk substitutes; edible oils and fats.</p>
	
<p>Class 5 Food for infants; powdered milk for babies; dietetic beverages adapted for medical use.</p> <p>Class 29 Milk powder; milk; butter; cheese; yoghurt; milk beverages, milk predominating.</p>	
	
<p>Class 29 Milk and milk products, full cream, milk powder, full cream milk powder, skim milk powder, whey and whey products, butter, cheese, milk beverages, other goods in this class which include milk or milk products as ingredients.</p>	

32. The trademarks invoked are combined word/figurative trademarks. The first trademark invoked consists of the characters "a2", which are depicted in a white curved font and surrounded by an asymmetrical circle which gradually becomes more vague towards the outside against its black backdrop. Within the "a", a white stripe in the shape of a droplet is visible. The second trademark invoked consists of the characters "a2" written in lowercase purple, curved letters, with directly below the word "Milk", written in the same purple, curved font. The third trademark invoked consists of the characters "a2", with the "a" depicted in a bold font, and the "2" depicted in a slim font, within a design element of a white liquid splashing on these characters (or a black liquid against a white background), and the whole trademark is framed by a black outline.

33. The contested trademark is a combined verbal/figurative trademark, consisting of a stylized letter A followed by the Roman numerals II in superscript. Of course, the Roman numerals II could also be perceived as the Arabic number 2. In that case, the trademarks have the combination "a2" in common, albeit that the letter A in the contested trademark is a capital letter and the II is a roman numeral instead of an Arabic one.

34. Furthermore, as the defendant has explained (see points 21 and 22), in relation to the relevant goods, the indication A2 has a mere descriptive meaning. A2 milk is provided by cows with two copies of the A2 gene from beta-casein. This differs from regular milk, which is referred to as A1. The idea is supposedly that the A2 gene is a more original (less inbred) variant. The milk of these cows is also referred to as "primal-milk". Therefore, mainly the older and more authentic cow breeds, such as the Jerseys and Guernseys, produce A2 milk. Positive characteristics are attributed to A2 milk. For example, people supposedly have less intolerance symptoms (particularly in digestion, bloating, etc.) when consuming A2 milk, in contrast to A1 milk. These alleged beneficial properties of A2 milk form an important sales

argument.<sup>1</sup> The Office finds that in the particular branch of milk and milk products both consumers and producers are generally well aware of the fact that A2 refers to a specific characteristic of the product. Therefore the Office must conclude that the indication "a2" or "A2" is a descriptive indication for a type of milk and for (dairy) products derived from it. The element therefore has no distinctive character as such.

35. The descriptive element "a2" is the only element in common, at least in so far as the contested trademark will be perceived as a variant thereof in roman numerals. The second right invoked contains in addition the also descriptive indication "milk". Finally, the invoked trademarks have some figurative elements, beside the descriptive verbal element "a2".

36. In the trademarks invoked, the verbal element will be interpreted by the public as non-distinctive, whereas it describes a characteristic of the relevant goods which concern goods relating to milk and milk products (EGC, Budmen, T-129/01, 3 July 2003, ECLI:EU:T:2003:184). Because the respective word elements "a2" and "a2 milk" are not to be considered distinctive and (therefore) dominant in the global impression of the trademarks, more weight should be given to the figurative elements.

### *Conclusion*

37. The similarity between the trademarks is exclusively to be found in a descriptive element. Due to the differences in the graphic components and the unusual use of roman numerals in the contested trademark, the Office considers that the overall impression of the trademarks is not similar or in any case insufficient to be able to justify the finding of likelihood of confusion.

### **B. Other factors**

38. The opponent states that it bases the opposition "among others" on the second right invoked, and submits arguments only in relation to that trade mark (see paragraph 9). The defendant refutes only the opponent's arguments based on that trademark and is of the opinion that the opposition should already be rejected insofar it is based on the other two trademarks invoked (see paragraph 17). It could indeed be inferred from the opponent's arguments that he is limiting the grounds for opposition, but in this case this can be left open, as it will not affect the outcome of this decision.

39. With reference to the request that the other party should bear all costs of the proceedings (see paragraphs 16 and 24), the Office considers that opposition proceedings with the Office provide for an allocation of the costs of the proceedings to the losing party. Article 2.16, 5 BCIP, as well as rule 1.28, 3 IR, only stipulates in this respect that an amount equalling the basic opposition fee shall be borne by the losing party.

### **C. Conclusion**

40. Since it has been established that the trademarks invoked are not similar to the contested trademark, the Office will not proceed to the comparison of the goods for reasons of procedural economy. Indeed, there can be no likelihood of confusion if the trademarks are not sufficiently similar, even if the

---

<sup>1</sup> See (amongst others): <http://www.local2local.nl/blog/a2-melk-eeen-wonder/> and <https://oermelk.nl/> and <http://www.semex.nl/i?lang=nl&viewnews=1457017994> and <http://www.milkstory.nl/artikel/is-a2-melk-de-oplossing-voormelkallergie-en-intolerantie> and <http://edepot.wur.nl/248064> and <https://www.ah.nl/producten/product/wi407086/hollandjersey-volle-melk> and <https://www.nrc.nl/nieuws/2016/10/18/hoeoer-is-oermelk-4868117-a1527151> and <http://journalagricom.ca/le-lait-a2-une-nouvelle-tendance/> and <https://fr.sputniknews.com/societe/201603021023066228-compagnie-producteur-lait-amende-proteine-fournisseur/>.



goods were identical (see in this sense: EGC, easyHotel, T-316/07, 22 January 2009, ECLI:EU:T:2009:14 and YOKANA, T-103/06, 13 April 2010, ECLI:EU:T:2010:137).

#### **IV. CONSEQUENCE**

41. The opposition with number 2015708 is not justified.
42. The Benelux application with number 1404683 will be registered for all the goods applied for.
43. The opponent shall pay the defendant 1,045 euros in accordance with article 2.16, 5 BCIP in conjunction with rule 1.28, 3 IR, as the opposition is not justified. This decision constitutes an enforceable order pursuant to article 2.16, 5 BCIP.

The Hague, 12 March 2021

Willy Neys  
*rapporteur*

Pieter Veeze

Tomas Westenbroek



Administrative officer:

Rémy Kohlsaet