

OPIC



CIPO

LE REGISTRAIRE DES MARQUES DE COMMERCE
THE REGISTRAR OF TRADEMARKS

Citation: 2020 TMOB 54

Date of Decision: 2020-05-29

IN THE MATTER OF AN OPPOSITION

Conec Corporation

Opponent

and

Thomas & Betts International, LLC

Applicant

1,733,022 for QUICK-CONNECT

Application

INTRODUCTION

[1] Conec Corporation (the Opponent) opposes registration of the trademark QUICK-CONNECT (the Mark), which is the subject of application No. 1,733,022 by Thomas & Betts International, LLC (the Applicant).

[2] The application is based on the Applicant's proposed use of the Mark in association with the goods "electrical connectors for cable" (the Goods).

[3] A key issue in this proceeding is whether the applied-for trademark is clearly descriptive of the nature or character of the Goods in association with which it is proposed to be used.

[4] For the reasons set out below, I find that the application ought to be refused.

THE RECORD

[5] The application for the Mark was filed on June 16, 2015, and claims priority from United States application No. 86/526,681, filed on February 6, 2015.

[6] The application was advertised for opposition purposes in the *Trademarks Journal* of September 7, 2016.

[7] On February 6, 2017, the Opponent filed a statement of opposition under section 38 of the *Trademarks Act*, RSC 1985, c T-13 (the Act). As 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 (see section 70 of the Act which provides that section 38(2) of the Act as it read prior to June 17, 2019 applies to applications advertised before this date).

[8] In its statement of opposition, the Opponent alleges that: (i) the application does not conform to the requirements of sections 30(e) and 30(i) of the Act; (ii) the Mark is not registrable pursuant to section 12(1)(b) of the Act; and (iii) the Mark is not distinctive under section 2 of the Act.

[9] The Applicant denied each of the grounds of opposition in a counter statement filed on March 20, 2017.

[10] In support of its opposition, the Opponent filed the affidavits of Dolphy Schwarz, Yawer Khan, and Dylan Churchill. In support of its application, the Applicant filed the affidavit of David Cowley-Salegio. No cross-examinations were conducted.

[11] Both parties filed written arguments, however, only the Opponent attended a hearing.

EVIDENCE

[12] Before assessing the allegations advanced in the statement of opposition, I will provide a brief overview of the parties' evidence.

The Opponent's Evidence

[13] The Opponent's evidence consists of the affidavits of Dolphy Schwarz (sworn July 17, 2017), Yawer Khan (sworn May 18, 2017), and Dylan Churchill (sworn July 14, 2017).

Affidavit of Dolphy Schwarz

[14] Mr. Schwarz is the Managing Director of the Opponent and has been employed by the Opponent since it was founded in 1990 (para 1).

[15] Mr. Schwarz states that the Opponent has continuously manufactured and sold electrical connectors in Canada since 1990. The production and sale of such products is the Opponent's only business (para 2).

[16] Mr. Schwarz defines an electrical connector as a "device for joining (also known as "connecting") electrical circuits together using a mechanical assembly", and explains that some electrical connectors have features that allow them to connect and/or disconnect quickly (paras 6, 7). Mr. Schwarz states that in the electrical connector industry in Canada, it is common to refer to such products as "quick connect", "quick disconnect" or "quick connector" products (para 7).

[17] Mr. Schwarz states that the Opponent manufactures and sells electrical connectors with features that allow them to connect and disconnect quickly, and that the Opponent uses the foregoing terms to describe such connectors, and has continuously sold such electrical connectors in Canada since 2013 (para 8). For example, the Opponent uses such terms on the Opponent's website, in advertisements, newsletters, manuals and other media (para 9; Exhibits B, C, D).

[18] Mr. Schwarz states that it is his understanding that, in the context of the electrical connector industry in Canada, the term "quick-connect" would be readily understood to mean an electrical connector that connects quickly (para 13).

Affidavit of Yawer Khan

[19] Yawer Khan is an articling student employed with the agent of the Opponent. On May 17, 2017, Mr. Khan conducted Google searches for the phrases "quick connect connector",

“quick connect electrical connector”, “quick connect cable”, “quick connect” and “quick disconnect”. Exhibits A through D, respectively, are described as copies of printouts from websites that Mr. Khan located and visited through these searches.

[20] Mr. Khan also conducted a search on the website of Oxford Dictionaries associated with the domain name *https://en.oxforddictionaries.com* for the definitions of the words “quick” and “connect” (Exhibit F).

Affidavit of Dylan Churchill

[21] Mr. Churchill is a summer student employed with the agent of the Opponent. On May 19, 2017, Mr. Churchill visited the following websites where he ran a search for the phrase “quick connect connector” on each sites’ search tool: *www.rona.ca*, *www.canadiantire.ca*, *www.homehardware.ca*, *www.lowes.ca*, *www.renodepot.com*, and *www.amazon.ca*. The results of these searches are attached as Exhibits A through F, respectively.

[22] Mr. Churchill also conducted, on June 15, 2017, searches using the Internet Archive Wayback Machine for websites referenced in Exhibits A to E of the Khan affidavit. Exhibit I of the Churchill affidavit consists of a printout of an archived copy (dating back to April 26, 2015) of a page from the website at *www.wattscanada.ca*. Exhibit K consists of a printout of an archived copy (dating back to May 6, 2015) of a page from the website at *www.eaton.com*.

The Applicant’s Evidence

Affidavit of David Cowley-Salegio

[23] Mr. Cowley-Salegio, an articling student employed with the agent for the Applicant, conducted a search of the Canadian Trademarks Database for the phrase “QUICK CONNECT” using the search field “TM lookup”. A copy of the search results, along with certified copies of the five registered trademarks located therein (and listed below), are attached as Exhibit A to the affidavit:

MODULAR QUICK-CONNECT (TMA790,728) of Zephyr Gas Services, LP
QUICK CONNECT (TMA454,910) of Canadian Tire Corporation, Limited

QUICK CONNECT (TMA689,794) of OMS Investments, Inc.

QUICK CONNECT & Design (TMA594,895) of Fr. Jacob Sohne Gmbh & Co.

QUICK-CONNECT (TMA447,934) of Linatec Corporation

The particulars of these registrations are shown at Schedule A of this decision.

[24] Mr. Cowley-Salegio also conducted searches of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO). Exhibit B contains documents related to a search for the Applicant's application for the trademark "QUICK-CONNECT" (Serial No. 86526681), which is the corresponding United States application to the subject application. Exhibit C contains documents related to a search for United States application No. 86629738 for the trademark QUICK-CONNECT by TPC Wire & Cable Corp.

[25] I note that portions of the Applicant's written argument attempt to introduce evidence relating to Mexican jurisprudence and successful registration of the Applicant's Mark in Mexico (at para 20 of the written argument). The Applicant in its written argument also submits that the Applicant has "used the Mark on its website and in brochures" since the date of filing the application and references a number of website links (at para 34 of the written argument). However, such information should have been submitted by way of evidence. Accordingly, I have not had regard to portions of the written argument which constitute inadmissible evidence.

ONUS AND MATERIAL DATES

[26] The Applicant bears the legal onus of establishing, on a balance of probabilities, that its application complies with the requirements of the Act. However, there is 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 Ltd v Molson Companies Ltd* (1990), 30 CPR (3d) 293 (FCTD) at 298].

[27] The material dates that apply to the grounds of opposition pleaded are:

- Sections 38(2)(a)/30 – the filing date of the application [*Georgia-Pacific Corp v Scott Paper Ltd* (1984) 3 CPR (3d) 469 (TMOB) at 475];
- Sections 38(2)(b)/12(1)(b) – the filing date of the application [*General Housewares Corp v Fiesta Barbeques Ltd* (2003), 2003 FC 1021, 28 CPR (4th) 60 (FC)]; and

- Sections 38(2)(d)/2 – the date of filing of the opposition [*Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Inc v Stargate Connections Inc* (2004), 2004 FC 1185 (CanLII), 34 CPR (4th) 317 (FC)].

ANALYSIS OF THE GROUNDS OF OPPOSITION

Section 12(1)(b) ground of opposition

[28] The Opponent has pleaded that the Mark is not registrable because the Mark is clearly descriptive or deceptively misdescriptive in the English language of the character or quality of the Goods in association with which it is proposed to be used, namely electrical connectors for cable that can be connected quickly.

[29] The registrability of the Mark under section 12(1)(b) must be assessed as of the filing date of the application, in this case, June 16, 2015.

[30] The purpose of the prohibition in section 12(1)(b) is to prevent any single trader from monopolizing a term that is clearly descriptive or common to the trade, thereby placing legitimate traders at a disadvantage [*Canadian Parking Equipment v Canada (Registrar of Trade Marks)* (1990), 34 CPR (3d) 154 (FCTD) at para 14].

[31] The issue as to whether a mark is clearly descriptive or deceptively misdescriptive of the character or quality of the goods and services must be considered from the point of view of the average purchaser of the goods and services. Further, "character" means a feature, trait or characteristic of the goods and services and "clearly" means "easy to understand, self-evident or plain" [*Drackett Co of Canada v American Home Products Corp* (1968), 55 CPR 29 (Can Ex Ct) at 34]. The mark must not be dissected into its component elements and carefully analyzed but must be considered in its entirety as a matter of immediate impression [*Wool Bureau of Canada Ltd v Canada (Registrar of Trade Marks)* (1978), 40 CPR (2d) 25 (FCTD) at 27-8; *Atlantic Promotions Inc v Canada (Registrar of Trade Marks)* (1984), 2 CPR (3d) 183 (FCTD) at 186].

[32] Moreover, it has been established that when assessing whether a trademark is clearly descriptive or deceptively misdescriptive under section 12(1)(b) of the Act, the Registrar must not only consider the evidence at her disposal, but also apply common sense in making the

determination about descriptiveness [*Neptune SA v Canada (Attorney General)* 2003 FCT 715 (CanLII)].

The Opponent meets its evidential burden

[33] In his affidavit, Mr. Schwarz advises that the Opponent has manufactured and sold in Canada electrical connectors with features that connect and disconnect quickly. Mr. Schwarz states that the Opponent uses the terms “quick connector”, “quick connector solution”, “quick connection technology” and “quick release” to describe such connectors, and has done so since 2013 on the Opponent’s websites, newsletters, advertisements, manuals and media. In support, Mr. Schwarz provides as select examples: (i) a copy of a Conec Press Release dated January 7, 2015 entitled “CONEC SnapLock D-SUB hoods & connectors – A Quick Connector Solution” (Exhibit B); (ii) a copy of a page from the Opponent’s website, as it appeared on June 21, 2017, displaying the term “Quick connection technology” (Exhibit C) and; (iii) a copy of a page from the Opponent’s website, as it appeared on June 21, 2017, displaying the term “quick release” (Exhibit D). Mr. Schwarz states that based on his experience, having worked in the electrical connector industry for more than 25 years, it is his understanding, information and belief that, “in the context of the electrical connector industry in Canada, the term “quick-connect” would be readily understood to mean an electrical connector that connects quickly”.

[34] Notwithstanding that Mr. Schwarz’s statements are uncontested by the Applicant, and that his affidavit shows some use (albeit minimal) prior to the filing date by the Opponent of the word “quick” combined with some variation of the word “connect”, I am not prepared to give any significant weight to Mr. Schwarz’s statement that “quick-connect”, in the context of the electrical connector industry in Canada, would be readily understood to mean an electrical connector that connects quickly, as I consider him to be biased by virtue of his employment by the Opponent.

[35] However, it has long been held that an opponent’s burden with respect to this ground of opposition may be met simply by reference to the ordinary dictionary meaning of the words in the trademark [*Flowers Canada/Fleurs Canada Inc v Maple Ridge Florist Ltd* (1998), 86 CPR (3d) 110 (TMOB)]. In the present case, the Opponent has provided evidence of dictionary definitions for the words “quick” and “connect” (Khan affidavit, para 10; Exhibit F). I may also

refer myself to dictionaries [*Insurance Co of Prince Edward Island v Prince Edward Island Mutual Insurance Co* (1999), 2 CPR (4th) 103 (TMOB)], and note the following definitions in the *Canadian Oxford Dictionary* (2nd ed), which are consistent with those provided by the Opponent:

QUICK

adjective

1. capable of doing something in a short time: *a quick runner* / *a quick learner*.
2. with a short interval, rapid: *she wrote four novels in quick succession*.
 - prompt or immediate: *Earl issued a quick reply*.
3. requiring only a short time, brief: *a quick shower*.
4. lively, agile: *quick hands*.
 - acute, alert, perceptive: *she has a quick ear*.
5. [foll. by *to* + infin.] responding immediately or hastily: *she's quick to criticize, even if she doesn't know the whole story*.
 - (of a temper) easily provoked.
6. archaic living, alive: the quick and the dead.

adverb

1. at a rapid rate; quickly.
2. [as interjection] come, go, etc., quickly: *Quick! Get your shoes and let's go!*

noun

1. the soft flesh below the nails, or the skin, or a sore.
2. the source of feeling or emotion: *hurt him to the quick*.

CONNECT

verb

1. [*transitive*] [often foll. by *to*, *with*] join (one thing with another): *connected the hose to the tap*.
 - [*transitive*] join (two things): a bridge connected the two towns.
 - [*intransitive*] be joined or joinable: the two parts do not connect.
2. [*transitive*] [often foll. by *with*] associate mentally or practically: did not connect the two ideas | never connected her with the theatre.
3. [*intransitive*] [foll. by *with*] (of an airplane etc.) be synchronized at its destination with another airplane etc., so that passengers can transfer.
4. [*transitive*] put into communication by telephone.
5. [*intransitive*] meet; establish contact: let's try to connect next week.
6. [*transitive*] join (a house etc.) to a source of electricity, gas, water, etc.: *our hydro hasn't been connected yet*.
 - hook up (a phone, television, etc.) to a telecommunications system: *they won't connect our phone until we pay our outstanding bills*.
7. [*transitive*] [usu. in *passive*; foll. by *with*] unite or associate with others in relationships etc.: *he is connected with the mayor's office*.
 - [*intransitive*] establish a rapport based on common interests, opinions etc.: *Nicole found it easy to connect with Sally*.
8. [*intransitive*] form a logical sequence; be meaningful: *the two ideas do not connect*.

9. [intransitive] informal hit or strike effectively: the batter connected with the ball.

[emphasis added]

[36] In view of the above, I accept that the Opponent has met its initial burden.

[37] As I have found the above ordinary dictionary definitions to be a sufficient basis upon which the Opponent has met its initial burden, it is not necessary to consider the evidence that the Opponent has submitted to try to show that others have used “QUICK-CONNECT” to describe their own goods, or that this phrase is commonly used [*Molson Canada 2005 v Drummond Brewing Company Ltd*, 2011 TMOB 43; *Alberta Government Telephones v Cantel Inc*, 1994 CanLII 10102].

The Applicant fails to meet its legal onus

[38] In its written argument, the Applicant submits that the Cowley-Salegio affidavit provides “significant and substantial evidence showing that the phrase “QUICK CONNECT” or “QUICK-CONNECT” has been registered by the Canadian Trademarks Database on a number of occasions, including for equipment and connection or attachment-type goods”. The Cowley-Salegio affidavit includes certified copies of five Canadian trademark registrations standing in the name of third parties, listed above at paragraph 23 of this decision. Two of these registrations are referred to in the Applicant’s written argument (at paragraph 23), reproduced below:

23. The Mark should not be considered in isolation; rather, it must be perceived in connection with the goods to which it is associated. The Canadian Intellectual Property Office has permitted the registration of the trademark QUICK CONNECT (TMA454,910) and QUICK CONNECT & Design (TMA594,895) with respect to “system for attachments for hoses and hose accessories, namely sprinklers and nozzles”, and, *inter alia*, “connection pipes with controls”, “connection pipes”, and “dead-end pipe connections”, respectively. Thus, it is evident that the term “QUICK-CONNECT” has not been found to be “clearly descriptive” or “deceptively misdescriptive” with respect to connecting or attachment-type goods such that the term is precluded from registration for these types of goods.

[39] The Opponent takes the position that the Canadian registrations put into evidence by the Applicant are of little significance. At the hearing, the Opponent noted that some of the registered trademarks contain design elements (TMA594,895) or other word elements

(TMA790,728). The Opponent also indicated that none of these registrations had been subject to a full opposition proceeding, though this is not in the evidence. The Opponent also argued that despite what may have happened with respect to the registration of these third party trademarks, that the present case must be decided on its own merits and that a “likewise registrable” argument does not suffice (with the Opponent citing in support *BFS Brands, LCC v Michelin recherche et technique SA*, 2010 TMOB 152 (CanLII) at para 25).

[40] I agree with the position advanced by the Opponent that the type of evidence furnished by the Applicant through the Cowley-Salegio affidavit (at para 5; Exhibit A) is not determinative of whether the Mark is clearly descriptive. In this regard, I take guidance from the approach taken by Member Reynolds in *Maple Leaf Foods Inc v Pinnacle Foods Group LLC*, 2015 TMOB 137 (CanLII) (*Maple Leaf Foods*), at paras 24 and 25 (in this case, the applicant had submitted evidence of registrations of third party trademarks sharing a similar construction and associated with similar types of goods):

[24] On more than one occasion, this Board has held that it is not in a position to explain at the opposition stage, why particular trade-marks were permitted to proceed to registration by the examination section of the Trade-marks Office. Such a decision may have resulted because the examiner did not have the benefit of the type of evidence filed in an opposition proceeding or because the onus or legal burden is different at the examination stage [*Thomas J Lipton Inc v Boyd Coffee Co* (1991), 40 CPR (3d) 272 (TMOB) at 277; *UL Canada Inc v High Liner Foods Inc* (2001), 20 CPR (4th) 568 (TMOB); *Simmons IP Inc v Park Avenue Furniture Corp* (1994), 56 CPR (3d) 284 (TMOB); and *Benson & Hedges Inc v Imperial Tobacco Ltd* (1995), 60 CPR (3d) 567 (TMOB)]. I also note that the policies and practices of the Registrar may evolve over time resulting in the appearance of inconsistency [see *Cliche v Canada (Attorney General)*, 2012 FC 564 at para 27].

[25] Furthermore, as pointed out by Justice Kelen in *Worldwide Diamond Trademarks Limited v Canadian Jewellers Association*, while the Court has recognized that the Registrar must consider prior registrations when assessing descriptiveness, it is trite law that if the Registrar has erred in the past, there is no reason to perpetuate that error [*Worldwide Diamond Trademarks Limited v Canadian Jewellers Association*, 2010 FC 309; aff'd at 2010 FCA 326]. In *Worldwide Diamond Trademarks Limited*, Justice Kelen found that the state of the register with respect to similar marks could not render the proposed trade-marks at issue non-descriptive and therefore registrable. I have come to a similar conclusion in the present case.

[41] Further, to the extent that the Applicant may have wished to rely on the USPTO prosecution history and status of its corresponding United States application for the Mark

(Cowley-Salegio affidavit, Exhibit B), or any other QUICK-CONNECT applications or registrations on the US register (Cowley-Salegio affidavit, Exhibit C), I am of the view that these do not bear any weight in my decision as I cannot assume that Canadian and American provisions relating to descriptiveness are the same [*Maple Leaf, supra* at para 18].

[42] Accordingly, considering the Mark as a matter of first impression within the context of the Goods, and employing a common sense approach, I find it reasonable to conclude that the first impression created by QUICK-CONNECT is that it clearly and plainly describes the character of the Goods, that is, that the electrical connectors in association with which the Mark is proposed to be used connect quickly.

[43] In view of the foregoing, I find that the Mark is clearly descriptive within the meaning of section 12(1)(b) of the Act. Accordingly, this ground of opposition is successful.

[44] A trademark that is not registrable by reason of being clearly descriptive under section 12(1)(b) of the Act can become registrable if it has been so used in Canada by the applicant so as to have become distinctive at the date of filing an application for its registration [section 12(2) of the Act; *Backrack Inc v STK, LLC*, 2013 FC 424, 111 CPR (4th) 81]. However, the Applicant has not claimed the benefit of section 12(2) in its application, as the application for the Mark was filed on a proposed use basis.

[45] Finally, I note that as I have found the Applicant's Mark to be clearly descriptive, I need not address the deceptively misdescriptive allegation set out in the pleading.

Section 2 ground of opposition

[46] The Opponent has pleaded that “the Mark is not distinctive, within the meaning of section 2, by reason of the fact that the Mark does not actually distinguish, nor is it adapted to distinguish, the goods and services in association with which it is proposed to be used by the Applicant from the goods or services of others because the Mark consists solely of descriptive and generic terms commonly used by others, including the Opponent in association with electrical connectors, and therefore it is unable and cannot actually distinguish the goods of the Applicant from others”.

[47] As I have found that the Mark is clearly descriptive of the character of the Applicant's Goods and therefore not registrable pursuant to section 12(1)(b), I need not consider the Opponent's evidence with respect to any allegation of common usage of the term "quick connect" or the analogous term "quick disconnect". Indeed, a trademark that is clearly descriptive or deceptively misdescriptive is necessarily not distinctive [*Canadian Council of Professional Engineers v APA - The Engineered Wood*, 2000 CanLII 15543 (FC), 7 CPR (4th) 239 at 253]. I have found the Mark to be clearly descriptive of the character of the Applicant's Goods as of the filing date of the application and I am unable to come to any other conclusion regarding its descriptiveness or distinctiveness as of the date of filing of the statement of opposition, namely, February 6, 2017.

[48] Accordingly, this ground of opposition is also successful.

Section 30(e) ground of opposition

[49] The Opponent has pleaded that the application does not comply with section 30(e) in that as of the filing date of the application: (i) the Applicant, by itself or by its predecessor in title, had commenced use of the Mark as a trademark in Canada in association with the Goods; and (ii) the Applicant did not intend to use the Mark as a trademark in Canada in association with the Goods. However, no evidence was filed in support of these grounds of opposition. As such, the Opponent has failed to meet its evidential burden and this ground of opposition is rejected.

Section 30(i) ground of opposition

[50] The Opponent has pleaded that the application does not comply with section 30(i) in that "the Applicant could not have been satisfied that it was entitled to use the Mark in Canada in association with the Goods since at the date of filing of the application, the Mark was not a "trademark" as defined in section 2. The Mark consists solely of descriptive and generic terms commonly used by others, including the Opponent, in association with the Goods and/or other electrical connectors, and cannot be the subject of exclusive trademark rights".

[51] Section 30(i) of the Act requires an applicant to include a statement in the application that the applicant is satisfied that it is entitled to use the trademark in Canada. Where an applicant has

provided the required statement, the jurisprudence suggests that non-compliance with section 30(i) of the Act can be found only where there are exceptional circumstances that render the applicant's statement untrue, such as evidence of bad faith or non-compliance with a federal statute [*Sapodilla Co Ltd v Bristol-Myers Co* (1974), 15 CPR (2d) 152 (TMOB) at 155; *Canada Post Corporation v Registrar of Trade-marks* (1991), 40 CPR (3d) 221 (FCTD)]. The fact that an applicant is aware or has knowledge that an applied for trademark may possibly be descriptive or generic cannot form the basis of this ground of opposition [see *642897 BC Ltd v 1030983 Ontario Ltd*, 2015 TMOB 45 at para 35], though in any event, this has not been established in the present case.

[52] In the present case, the application contains the requisite statement and there is no evidence that this is an exceptional case involving bad faith or the violation of a federal statute. Accordingly, this ground of opposition is rejected.

DISPOSITION

[53] Accordingly, 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.

Jennifer Galeano
Member
Trademarks Opposition Board
Canadian Intellectual Property Office

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

HEARING DATE 2020-01-23

APPEARANCES

Sarah O'Grady

FOR THE OPPONENT

No one appearing

FOR THE APPLICANT

AGENT(S) OF RECORD

Blake, Cassels & Graydon LLP

FOR THE OPPONENT

Dentons Canada LLP

FOR THE APPLICANT

SCHEDULE A

Trademark	Reg. No.	Owner	Goods/Services
MODULAR QUICK-CONNECT	TMA790,728	Zephyr Gas Services, LP	Oil and natural gas production and processing equipment, namely, amine sweetening plants for treatment of sour gas.
QUICK CONNECT	TMA454,910	Canadian Tire Corporation, Limited	System for attachments for hoses and hose accessories, namely sprinklers and nozzles.
QUICK CONNECT	TMA689,794	OMS Investments, Inc.	Herbicides, insecticides and pesticides for domestic use; manually powered sprayer dispensing system for herbicides, insecticides and pesticides.
QUICK CONNECT & Design	TMA594,895	Fr. Jacob Sohne GmbH & Co.	(1) Pipes, dust extraction and exhaust pipes, connection pipes with controls, forked and T-shaped pieces, clamping rings, transition pipes, connection pipes, cones, air regulating gates, pipe throttle and stop valves, with and without seals, dead-end pipe connections, cylindrical slide valves, ball-and-socket joints, pipe, covering and dosing flap boxes, 2-way distributors, discharge slide valves, rotary manifolds, dust-tight rotary manifolds, rotary manifold guides; all of the wares made entirely or primarily of metal. (2) Clamping rings.
QUICK-CONNECT	TMA447,934	Linvatec Corporation	Medical and surgical apparatus for distention and irrigation and component parts.