



LE REGISTRAIRE DES MARQUES DE COMMERCE
THE REGISTRAR OF TRADEMARKS

Citation: 2021 TMOB 131
Date of Decision: 2021-06-29

IN THE MATTER OF AN OPPOSITION

Anheuser-Busch, LLC

Opponent

and

Molson Canada 2005

Applicant

1,648,874 for GAME DAY PACK

Application

[1] Anheuser-Busch, LLC (the Opponent) opposes registration of the trademark GAME DAY PACK (the Mark) filed by Molson Canada 2005 (the Applicant). Filed on October 22, 2013, the application is based on the Applicant's use of the Mark in Canada since September 15, 2013 in association with brewed alcoholic beverages, namely beer and promotion and sponsorship of sporting events (the Goods and Services).

[2] The Opponent alleges in its statement of opposition that: (i) the application does not conform to the requirements of section 30(b) of the *Trademarks Act*, RSC 1985, c T-13 (the Act); (ii) the Mark is not registrable pursuant to sections 12(1)(d) and 12(1)(e) of the Act; and (iii) the Mark is not distinctive under section 2 of the Act.

[3] For the reasons that follow, I refuse the application as the Applicant has failed to meet its legal onus to show that the Mark has inherent distinctiveness or has acquired distinctiveness.

The Record

[4] The Opponent filed a statement of opposition on January 20, 2015. The Act was amended on June 17, 2019. All references in this decision are to the Act as amended, with the exception of references to the grounds of opposition which refer to the Act before it was amended [section 70 of the Act]. The Applicant filed and served a counter statement.

[5] The Opponent filed the following evidence.

- The affidavit of Matthew Jones – Mr. Jones is a Brand Activation Manager employed by Labatt Breweries of Canada, a company related to the Opponent (paras 2-3). In October-November 2013, the words GAME DAY PACK were displayed on BUDWEISER beer and on point of sale materials (paras 4-7). These BUDWEISER cases included a coupon which could be redeemed for chips or pizza (para 6).
- The affidavit of Nathan Haldane – Mr. Haldane is an articling student with the Opponent's agent. Mr. Haldane includes evidence from reviews, blog posts, and articles on the restaurant GameDay Sports Bar located at 614 College Street, Toronto, Ontario (Exhibit E). He also attaches archived versions of this restaurant's website at *www.gamedayoncollege.com* (Exhibit C).
- The first affidavit of Dane Penney – Mr. Penney is a Trademark Search Specialist with the agents for the Opponent. Mr. Penney's evidence includes printouts of websites including reference to GAMEDAY APPROVED food items sold to promote CFL teams in western Canada, and the TWITTER, YOUTUBE and FACEBOOK accounts of the ESPN show COLLEGE GAME DAY (Exhibits B-C; E-G).

[6] The Applicant filed the following evidence.

- Affidavit of D. Jill Roberts – Ms. Roberts is a law clerk. Ms. Roberts performed a number of internet searches which show that the GameDay Restaurant on College Street is now closed (paras 3-7; Exhibits 2-6).

- Affidavit of Joanne Nardi – Ms. Nardi is the Manager, Trademarks and Intellectual Property for Molson Coors. The Applicant is a partnership that is the operating business of Molson Coors in Canada (para 6). In 2011, Molson Coors entered into a sponsorship agreement with the National Hockey League. In 2014, GAME DAY PACK was featured on cartons of beer along with the NHL trademark and the team crests of NHL teams (paras 11-12; Exhibit D). Ms. Nardi was cross-examined on her affidavit. Between September 2013 – August 2016, the Applicant’s evidence is that 14,000 hectolitres of beer with the Mark was shipped to Brewers’ Distributor Limited(para 16, Question 143).

[7] The Opponent filed a second affidavit of Dane Penney as its reply evidence. This affidavit includes a printout of the Brewers’ Distributor website (Exhibit B) which states that it is a private joint venture between Labatt Breweries of Canada and Molson Breweries.

[8] Both parties submitted written representations and attended a hearing.

Evidential Burden and Legal Onus

[9] The Applicant bears the legal onus of establishing that, on a balance of probabilities, its application complies with the requirements of the Act. There is, however, an initial evidential burden on the Opponent to adduce sufficient admissible evidence from which it could reasonably be concluded that the facts alleged to support each ground of opposition exist [*John Labatt Limited v The Molson Companies Limited* (1990), 30 CPR (3d) 293 (FCTD) at 298].

Grounds of Opposition

Section 2 Ground of Opposition

[10] The ground of opposition pursuant to section 2 has two prongs. The first is that the Mark lacks inherent distinctiveness. The second is that the Mark lacks distinctiveness because of the use of similar trademarks or descriptive uses by a number of different parties. The relevant paragraphs in the statement of opposition are set out below

(c) The [Mark] is not distinctive, under s. 2 of the Act, because it does not actually distinguish, and is not adapted to distinguish, the Applicant's [Goods and Services] from the [goods] and services of others, including the entities identified below that use "Game Day" descriptively or in names or marks associated with beer, sporting event promotion, ... More particularly:

i. The [Mark] inherently lacks distinctiveness in relation to beer because the words "game day pack" clearly and accurately describes a pack of beer that is intended or well-suited for consumption on game day (i.e. the day on which a sports game occurs), and especially as an element in a set of foods and beverages to be consumed while watching a sports game.

ii. The [Mark] has not been so used as to have acquired distinctiveness (i.e. used to such an extent that it now actually distinguishes the Applicant's [Goods and Services] from the [goods] and services of others).

iii. Since at least as early as October 2013, the Opponent has used the words "game day pack" to communicate to consumers that packs of BUDWEISER beer are intended or well-suited for consumption on game day, and especially as an element in a set of foods and beverages to be consumed while watching a sports game.

iv. Since at least as early as October 2012, Gameday Inc. has used GameDay as a name and trademark in association with a sports bar located at 614 College Street in Toronto, Ontario, which features the sale of beer. The GameDay name and mark has been prominently displayed at the sports bar, and in advertising for such bar including an associated website at *gamedayoncollege.com*.

v. The phrase "Game Day" has also been used by the following other entities in Canada with the [goods] and/or services indicated:

GAME DAY – a CBC sports television show;

GAMEDAY Approved / GAME DAY PACKS – a line of products (including foods and beverages commonly consumed while watching a sports game) endorsed and produced by a partnership between the Winnipeg Football Club and CO-OP retail stores in Manitoba;

GAMEDAY WE ALL PLAY! by Winnipeg Football Club ...

College GameDay – an ESPN entertainment show previewing college football games since 1987;

[11] The material date to assess a non-distinctiveness ground of opposition is the filing date of the statement of opposition, in this case, January 20, 2015 [*Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Inc. v Stargate Connections Inc.* (2004), 34 CPR (4th) 317 (FC)].

The Mark is Not Distinctive Because of Use of GAME DAY By Others

[12] I will first consider the second prong of the distinctiveness ground of opposition.

[13] It is well established that in order to meet its initial evidential burden, an opponent must show that one of the relied upon trademarks has a substantial, significant or sufficient reputation in Canada [*Bojangles' International, LLC and Bojangles Restaurants, Inc v Bojangles Café Ltd* (2006), 48 CPR (4th) 427 (FC) at para 34].

[14] In the present case, the Opponent has failed to meet its evidential burden as it has not shown that any of the pleaded GAME DAY trademarks in the statement of opposition had become known in Canada on January 20, 2015 sufficiently to affect the distinctiveness of the Mark. Specifically, I note the following with respect to each of the trademarks relied on by the Opponent.

- (a) GAME DAY – The Opponent has not provided any evidence that a CBC sports television show by this name has ever aired in Canada or has any reputation in Canada.
- (b) GAMEDAY WE ALL PLAY! – The Opponent has not provided any evidence that the Winnipeg Football Club has ever used this trademark in Canada or that this trademark has any reputation in Canada.
- (c) GAMEDAY Approved / GAME DAY PACKS – The Opponent provides evidence of the GAMEDAY APPROVED and GAME DAY PACKS line of products (including foods and beverages which appear to be promoted for consumption while watching a sports game) endorsed and produced by a partnership between various CFL football teams and CO-OP retail stores in Western Canada. The Opponent's evidence, however, is insufficient for me to determine that these trademarks have a significant reputation in Canada. In particular, I note the following:
 - i. There is no viewership evidence provided for the TV spots or digital ads referenced in the Canadian Grocer article dated September 29, 2014

- “Federated Co-Op launches marketing campaign for Game Day Approved line” (Penney affidavit, Exhibit C).
- ii. While the campaign has run each year since 2010, it may only be for three months during football season (Penney affidavit, Exhibit C, “Federated Co-Op launches marketing campaign for Game Day Approved line” article).
 - iii. While the “Federated Co-Op launches marketing campaign for Game Day Approved line” article states that Federated Co-Op has a presence in more than 500 communities with Game Day Approved products in food stores and convenience stores at its gas bars, there is limited evidence on the extent the GAME DAY APPROVED trademarks are known to consumers.
- (d) College GameDay – The Opponent has not provided any evidence that this ESPN entertainment show previewing United States college football games since 1987 has a significant reputation in Canada. While the views on YouTube clips from the College GameDay Youtube channel and number of Twitter likes on posts (Penney affidavit, Exhibits D-F), suggest that this is a popular show, there is no basis on which I can infer it has a significant reputation in Canada.
- (e) Gameday Inc. – The evidence suggests that there was a single location of this restaurant, on College Street in Toronto, Ontario (Haldane affidavit), and the Opponent has failed to show that the trademark has become known to a significant extent in Canada or is well known in a particular area of Canada, in this case Toronto.

The Mark Lacks Inherent Distinctiveness

[15] In *Apotex Inc v Canada (Registrar of Trade-marks)*, 2010 FC 291 (FCTD), Justice Barnes explains that “[w]hether a mark is distinctive is a question of fact which is determined by reference to the message it conveys to ordinary consumers” (para 5). Moreover, in affirming the

lower court's decision, the Federal Court of Appeal states that “[d]istinctiveness is to be determined from the point of view of an everyday user of the wares in question and the trade-mark must be considered in its entirety and as a matter of first impression” [*Apotex Inc v Canada (Registrar of Trade-marks)*, 2010 FCA 313 para 6-7]. Finally, in *Philip Morris Products SA v Imperial Tobacco Canada Limited*, 2014 FC 1237, Justice Bédard states that “the key consideration [...] is whether the term is capable of identifying the source of the wares in light of the overall product and market” (para 81).

[16] The Opponent meets its initial evidential burden with respect to its allegation that the Mark lacks inherent distinctiveness. The Opponent's evidence is sufficient to meet its evidential burden of supporting its allegation that “game day pack” describes a pack of beer that is intended or well-suited for consumption on game day (i.e. the day on which a sports game occurs) and is, therefore, not capable of identifying the source of the goods. I base this on the definitions from the Merriam-Webster dictionary for the words “game” being a “physical or mental competition conducted according to rules with the participants in direct opposition to each other” and “day” being “a specified date or day” as well as the evidence of how these words are used by others, in particular, the following:

- The Opponent's use of the descriptive phrase SHARE IN THE ULTIMATE GAME DAY PACK! in point of sale advertising appearing in the fall of 2013 and the descriptive use of GAME DAY PACK on beer sold during this time (Jones affidavit, paras 5-7). I do not find that there is any reason to discount the Opponent's use during this time as it appears to be in the normal course of trade.
- Article in Canadian Grocer dated September 29, 2014 titled “Federated Co-op launches marketing campaign for Game Day Approved line” (Penney affidavit, Exhibit C) which states

Saskatoon-based Federated Co-operatives Ltd. has launched a three-month marketing campaign promoting its Game Day Approved line of general merchandise and snack food products.

Initially launched in 2010 with the CFL's Saskatchewan Roughriders, the Game Day Approved line of products expanded this year to include the Calgary Stampeders, Winnipeg Blue Bombers and Edmonton Eskimos.

It features snack foods and drinks bearing the name and image of selected players from the four CFL teams. ...

- Article on the Children's Hospital Foundation website dated May 20, 2014 which states:

Moore signed fan autographs Tuesday at the newly opened Red River Co-op food store in Winnipeg's Southdale neighbourhood to launch the Co-op/Blue Bombers Game Day Approved product line. Through the Game Day Approved partnership between Co-op and the Blue Bombers, a portion of sales from 12 co-branded food and general merchandise items products is donated to the Children's Hospital Foundation of Manitoba.

"This is a big win for everyone. Not only are football fans and Co-op shoppers buying quality products and showing their team pride, they're also contributing to a healthier future for our children and families with their Game Day Approved purchases," said Doug Wiebe, Red River Co-op General Manager, on behalf of Co-ops across Manitoba.

This year's Game Day Approved lineup includes specially-packaged sunflower seeds, ice bags, chocolate bars, sliced bread, hamburger buns, peanuts in shell, trail mix, reusable cups, picnic coolers and collector's edition footballs.

[17] Even though Ms. Nardi's affidavit shows sales and promotion of beer in Canada in association with the Mark prior to the material date, the Mark appears in association with the MOLSON CANADIAN and NHL trademarks both which are displayed in a significantly more prominent fashion [*Simmons IP Inc v Park Avenue Furniture Corp* (1996), 74 CPR (3d) 404 (TMOB)]. While it is possible for GAME DAY PACK to acquire distinctiveness even though it has been used with these other trademarks [*Groupe Procycle Inc v Chrysler Group LLC*, 2010 FC 918 (FC)], the Applicant has not provided any evidence to enable me to conclude that the Mark would be recognized by the average consumer on first impression as a source identifier, rather than as a qualifier of some sort, within the context of the Applicant's goods and services. I am unable to conclude that the Mark on its own had become distinctive in Canada. In particular, the use of GAME DAY PACK on packs of beer cannot be said to indicate the source of the associated products to consumers as opposed to packs of beer that are ideal for consumption on game days.

[18] In view of the foregoing, I find that the Applicant has failed to establish, on a balance of probabilities, that the Mark was distinctive within the meaning of section 2 of the Act as of the material date. Accordingly, this ground of opposition is successful.

Section 30(b) Ground of Opposition

[19] The material date for assessing a section 30(b) ground of opposition is the filing date of the application [*Georgia-Pacific Corp v Scott Paper Ltd* (1984), 3 CPR (3d) 469 (TMOB) at 475]. The initial burden on an opponent is light respecting the issue of non-conformance with section 30(b) of the Act because the facts regarding an applicant's first use are particularly within the knowledge of an applicant [*Tune Masters v Mr P's Mastertune Ignition Services Ltd* (1986) 10 CPR (3d) 84 (TMOB) at 89].

[20] The Opponent alleges that the application does not comply with section 30(b) of the Act for several reasons including that the Applicant has not used the [Mark with the Goods and Services] since September 15, 2013; the Applicant has not displayed or associated the words “GAME DAY PACK” with the [Goods and Services] in a manner (e.g. in a consistent typeface; set apart from surrounding visual matter) that would constitute “use” of the [Mark] under section 4 of the Act; and the Applicant did not itself produce the [Goods] or itself provide the [Services] and it did not control the character or quality of the [Goods and Services] sufficiently to obtain the benefits of the deeming provisions of section 50 of the Act.

[21] I find that the Opponent does not meet its evidential burden with respect to the first prong of this ground of opposition. In response to a question taken under advisement, Ms. Nardi provides a spreadsheet showing that beer including the Mark was delivered to Brewers’ Distributor Limited on September 11, 2013. I find that delivery of the beer including the Mark to Brewers’ Distributor Limited satisfies section 4 even though Molson is a partner in its operation (Nardi cross-examination, Q136). The law is clear that the use of a trademark at any point along the chain of distribution in Canada is sufficient to demonstrate use as defined in section 4 of the Act [*Manhattan Industries Inc v Princeton Manufacturing Ltd* (1971), 4 CPR (2d) 6 (FCTD) at para 39; *Osler, Hoskin & Harcourt v Canada (Registrar of Trade Marks)* (1997), 77 CPR (3d) 475 (FCTD) at para 30]. Further while Molson is a partner in Brewers’ Distributor Limited along with Labatt Breweries of Canada, I do not find this problematic as the evidence is that this

is in the Applicant's normal course of trade and Brewers' Distributor Limited locations are like "big warehouses" from which the beer is distributed to stores (Nardi cross-examination, Qs130-137).

[22] With respect to the second prong of this ground of opposition, I do not find that the Opponent has met its initial evidential burden. The Applicant provides packaging showing the phrase GAME DAY PACK in a distinct font set apart from surrounding word matter (Nardi affidavit, Exhibit B). While GAME DAY PACK does appear with the trademark NHL, there is nothing to prevent two trademarks from being used at the same time [*AW Allen Ltd v Canada (Registrar of Trade Marks)* (1985), 6 CPR (3d) 270 (FCTD)].

[23] With respect to the third prong of this ground of opposition, I do not find that the Opponent has met its initial evidential burden. There is no evidence to suggest that the Applicant did not produce the Goods or Services or control the character or quality of the Goods and Services sufficiently to obtain the benefits of the deeming provisions of section 50 of the Act. In her cross-examination, Ms. Nardi explains that the Applicant is a partnership who is the operating entity in Canada, runs the Canadian business and holds the brewing licenses which permits the operation of the brewery (Qs15-20).

[24] In view of my findings above with respect to each of the prongs of the section 30(b) ground of opposition, it is rejected.

Section 12(1)(d) Ground of Opposition

[25] The material date for considering this ground of opposition is the date of my decision [*Park Avenue Furniture Corporation v Wickes/Simmons Bedding Ltd and The Registrar of Trade Marks* (1991), 37 CPR (3d) 413 (FCA)].

[26] Section 12(1)(d) of the Act states that a trademark is registrable if it is not confusing with a registered trademark. The Opponent pleads that the Mark is not registrable under section 12(1)(d) of the Act as it is confusing with trademark registration Nos. TMA823,490 and TMA613,144.

[27] As only registration No. TMA823,490 is in good standing, the Opponent only meets its evidential burden with respect to this trademark [*U.S.V. Pharmaceuticals of Canada Ltd. v*

Sherman and Ulster Ltd., (1974), 15 CPR (2d) 79 (TMOB) which confirms that an opponent can rely upon a third party registration in relation to section 12(1)(d) ground of opposition].

GAMEDAY
(Registration No. TMA823,490)

Salsa, mustard, barbecue sauce, horseradish sauce.

RRF Foods Inc.

Test to determine confusion

[28] The test to determine the issue of confusion is set out in section 6(2) of the Act where it is stipulated that the use of a trademark causes confusion with another trademark if the use of both trademarks in the same area would likely lead to the inference that the goods and services associated with those trademarks are manufactured, sold or leased by the same person, whether or not the goods or services are of the same general class or appear in the same Nice Class. In making such an assessment, I must consider all the relevant surrounding circumstances, including those listed in section 6(5) of the Act. Finally, section 6(2) does not concern the confusion of the trademarks themselves, but confusion of goods or services from one source as being from another source. In the instant case, the question posed by section 6(2) is whether purchasers of the Applicant's Goods and Services, provided under the Mark, would believe that those Goods and Services were being provided by the owner of the GAMEDAY trademark, or that the Applicant was authorized or licensed by the owner of the GAMEDAY trademark.

Inherent distinctiveness of the trademarks

[29] The inherent distinctiveness of the trademarks does not favour either party. Both trademarks lack inherent distinctiveness. Both marks at issue include GAME DAY which means the day that a game is held. The additional word in the Mark is suggestive of the Goods and Services, namely, that they relate to a pack of beverages to be consumed on a game day.

Degree of resemblance

[30] When considering the degree of resemblance, the law is clear that the trademarks must be considered in their totality. The appropriate test is not a side by side comparison but an imperfect recollection in the mind of a consumer of another party's trademark [*Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin v Boutiques Cliquot Ltée*, [2006] 1 SCR 824 at para 20]. There is a high degree of resemblance between the trademarks in appearance and sound and some resemblance in idea suggested (the day that a game is played versus a pack of beverages for consumption on game day).

Extent known and the length of time the trademarks have been in use

[31] These factors favour the Applicant, albeit slightly. The Applicant's evidence only shows use of the Mark from September 2013 – August 2016. The Applicant's evidence is that 14,000 hectolitres of beer was sold with the Mark during this period (Nardi affidavit, para 16, Qs 143; 152-153). The majority of the sales occurred from September 2013 – November 2013 as the answers to undertakings show that over 12,000 hectolitres being shipped from the Applicant to Brewers' Distributor Limited during this period.

Nature of the goods, services, or business, and trade

[32] The goods and services at issue appear to be different as the registered goods are condiments and the applied-for goods and services are beer and promotional services. That being said, there is overlap in the nature of goods and services at issue as all involve targeting a consumer who may wish to consume food and beverages on game day.

Surrounding Circumstance: Jurisprudence Concerning Weak Trademarks

[33] The jurisprudence on weak trademarks favours the Applicant. It is well accepted that comparatively small differences will suffice to distinguish between weak trademarks [*Boston Pizza International Inc v Boston Chicken Inc* (2001), 15 CPR (4th) 345 (FCTD) at para 66]. As explained in *Provigo Distribution Inc v Max Mara Fashion Group SRL* (2005), 46 CPR (4th) 112 (FCTD) at para 31:

The two marks being inherently weak, it is fair to say that even small differences will be sufficient to distinguish among them. Were it otherwise, first user of words in common use would be unfairly allowed to monopolize these words. A further justification given by courts in coming to this conclusion is that the public is expected to be more on its guard when such weak trade names are used ...

[34] A party adopting a weak trademark has been held to accept some risk of confusion [*General Motors v Bellows* (1949), 10 CPR 101 at 115-116 (SCC)]. While it is possible for the degree of distinctiveness attributed to a weak trademark to be enhanced through extensive use [*Sarah Coventry Inc v Abrahamian* (1984), 1 CPR (3d) 238 (FCTD) at para 6], there is no evidence that this is the case here.

Conclusion

[35] The test to be applied is a matter of first impression in the mind of a casual consumer somewhat in a hurry who sees the Mark in association with the Goods and Services at a time when he or she has no more than an imperfect recollection of the GAMEDAY trademark used in association with the registered goods [*Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin v Boutiques Clicquot Ltée, supra*]. Section 6(2) of the Act states that there is a likelihood of confusion if the use of both trademarks in the same area would likely lead to the inference that the goods and services associated with those trademarks are manufactured, sold or leased by the same person. Confusion will also be found if consumers believe that the Applicant's Goods and Services are somehow approved, licensed or sponsored by the owner of the GAMEDAY registration [*Big Apple Ltd v BAB Holdings Inc* (2000), 8 CPR (4th) 252 (TMOB) at para 13].

[36] Considering the factors in section 6(5) of the Act, and taking into account that the registered trademark is a weak trademark and there is no evidence that it is in use, I conclude that the Applicant meets its legal onus. The balance of probabilities on the issue of a reasonable likelihood of confusion between the Mark and the registered trademark fall in favour of the Applicant. Even though the degree of resemblance in appearance and sound is high, given the weakness of the trademarks, the other factors assume a greater importance. Accordingly, the section 12(1)(d) ground of opposition is rejected.

Section 12(1)(e) Ground of Opposition

[37] The material date for assessing whether a trademark is registrable under section 12(1)(e) is the date of my decision [*Canadian Olympic Association v Olympus Optical Co* (1991), 38 CPR (3d) 1 (FCA)].

[38] The Opponent pleads that the Mark is a trademark “so nearly resembling as to be likely to be mistaken for” the official mark GAME DAY (no. 921,574) of Canadian Broadcasting Corporation / Société Radio-Canada.

[39] In assessing whether the Mark is nearly resembling as to be likely to be mistaken for the official mark, the test is not restricted to visual comparison. Regard may be had to the factors set out in section 6(5)(e) of the Act, namely the degree of resemblance between the marks in appearance, sound or in the ideas suggested by them [*Techniquip Ltd v Canadian Olympic Assn* (1998), 80 CPR (3d) 225 (FCTD), *aff’d* (1999), 3 CPR (4th) 298 (FCA)]. The test under section 9(1)(n)(iii) differs from a standard confusion analysis such that in order to be successful there must be a likelihood that consumers will be mistaken as between the marks themselves not a likelihood that consumers will infer an association between the source of the goods or services.

[40] I agree with the Applicant that the Mark is clearly not identical to the official mark. The Mark contains the additional word PACK.

[41] The addition of the word PACK means that the Mark does not so nearly resemble as to be likely to be mistaken for the official mark GAME DAY (no. 921,574) as the official mark suggests the day the game is played and the other suggests a pack of food or beverages for consumption on game day. The Applicant has met its legal onus and the section 12(1)(e) ground of opposition is rejected.

Disposition

[42] Having regard to the foregoing, pursuant to the authority delegated to me under section 63(3) of the Act, I refuse the application pursuant to section 38(12) of the Act.

Natalie de Paulsen
Member
Trademarks Opposition Board
Canadian Intellectual Property Office

**TRADEMARKS OPPOSITION BOARD
CANADIAN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OFFICE
APPEARANCES AND AGENTS OF RECORD**

Hearing Date: 2021-02-23

Appearances

Mark Robbins

For the Opponent

Adele J. Finlayson

For the Applicant

Agents of Record

BERESKIN & PARR LLP/S.E.N.C.R.L.,S.R.L.

For the Opponent

MOFFAT & CO.

For the Applicant