

O-384-03

**TRADE MARKS ACT 1994**

**IN THE MATTER OF APPLICATION NO. 2291237  
IN THE NAME OF EEZEEPAY LIMITED  
TO REGISTER A TRADE MARK IN  
CLASSES 16 AND 36**

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER OF OPPOSITION THERETO  
UNDER NO. 90956 BY  
EASYGROUP IP LICENSING LIMITED**

**IN THE MATTER OF Application No.  
2291237 by Eezeepay Ltd to register  
a Trade Mark in Classes 16 and 36**

**and**

**IN THE MATTER OF OPPOSITION  
thereto under No. 90956 by  
EasyGroup IP Licensing Limited**

**Background**

1. On 28 January 2002 Eezeepay Ltd applied to register the mark:



2. The applicant claims the colours red (Pantone®32) and yellow (Pantone®123) as an element of the mark.

3. The application was made in respect of the following goods and services.

**Class 16**

Printers' type, printing blocks, printed matter, printed publications, security cards, swipe cards, credit cards, bank cards, loyalty cards, plastic cards, cards for use in automated cash machines, plastic wallets.

**Class 36**

Financial affairs, monetary affairs, payment collection of bills via a network of connection points, advisory services relating thereto, financial transaction services, issue of tokens of value, credit and credit card services, charge and charge card

services; loyalty schemes, financial services relating to customer loyalty cards services, customer loyalty schemes, electronic fund transfer.

4. The application is numbered 2291237.

5. On 15 August 2002 easyGroup IP Licensing Limited filed notice of opposition. The opponent says it is the proprietor by assignment of a large number of marks, brief details of which are set out in Annex 1 to this decision.

6. The opponent's grounds of opposition are as follows:

- Under Section 5(2)(b). It is said “the trade mark Eezee PAY YOUR EASY WAY TO PAY applied for under no. 2291237 and advertised in Journal 6430 8989 so closely resembles the Opponent's trade marks referred to above, which contain the prefix EASY, that it is likely to deceive or cause confusion. The classes 16 and 36 goods and services in respect of which the trade mark is applied for are identical or similar to all the class 9,16,18, 29, 30, 32, 33, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41 and 42 goods and services covered by the Opponent's trade marks EASYJET, EASYTRAIN, EASYBUS, EASYTRAK, EASYWEB, EASYEXTRAS, EASYCAFE, EASY EVERYTHING, EASYCARD, EASYPAY, EASYMONEY, easyJet .the web's favourite airline, easyTech, EASYKIOSK, EASYJET, easyEverything, easyrentacar, easyLife, easy.com, easyRentacar & logo, easyJet tours, easyJet Services, easydotcom logo, easyJet.com & logo, EASYEVERYTHING, EASYCLICKIT, easyJet ramp, EASY, EASYMONEY, EASYCLICKIT, easydotcom logo, easyLife, easyServices, easyRamp, EASYVALUE, EASYHOTEL, easy.com, EASYODDS, easyEverything the world's largest Internet cafes & logo, easy (stylised), EASYJET GIFTS, easyJet.com & plane livery, GO EASYJET, easyValue.com & logo, EASYJET.COM THE WEB'S FAVOURITE AIRLINE, easyJet, easyElectrical, easyKiosk, easyMoney (stylised), easyCar, easyCar (stylised), easyPoints (stylised), easyFunds (stylised), easyCredit (stylised), easyBank (stylised), easyGiro (stylised), EASYAIR and easyMoney.com & logo. As a result, the registration of the trade mark offends the provision of Section 5(2)(b) of the Trade Marks Act 1994 on the basis that because there are earlier similar trade marks in respect of identical or similar goods and services, there exists a likelihood of confusion on the part of the public”.
- Under Section 5(4)(a) on the basis, it is said, “that use could be prevented by virtue of a rule of law, namely, the rule of passing off, protecting trade marks used in the course of trade. By virtue of the extensive use of the trade marks EasyMoney, EasyEverything, easyJet, easyRentacar, easyValue and the many other trade marks of the Opponent which have the prefix easy in relation to travel services, paper goods, Internet café services, Internet services, financial services, insurance services, on-line price comparator services, catering services, and transportation services, since the dates referred to above, the Opponent has acquired a significant reputation and goodwill in the aforesaid trade marks and use by the Applicant of the trade mark EEZEE PAY YOUR EASY WAY TO PAY would constitute a misrepresentation as to the origin of the goods/services which would damage such goodwill”.

- Under Section 5(3). It is said “In the event that any of the goods and services of the Opponent’s earlier registrations and applications are considered dissimilar goods and services to those covered by application no 2291237, registration of the Trade mark also offends the provision of Section 5(3). This is because there are earlier similar trade marks and the use of the later mark without due cause would take unfair advantage of, or be detrimental to, the distinctive character or the repute of the earlier marks, and all the goods/services of the later mark are considered not similar to those for which the earlier marks are protected. In this respect, the earlier Trade marks EASYJET/easyJet, easyRentacar/EASYRENTACAR, EASYEVERYTHING/easyEverything and easy.com of the Opponent have a reputation in the UK and use of the later mark EEZEE PAY YOUR EASY WAY TO PAY on any of the goods and services covered by the application without due cause would take unfair advantage, or be detrimental to the distinctive character and repute of the earlier trade marks”.

7. The applicant filed a counterstatement in which they essentially deny each of the above grounds.

8. Both parties make a request for an award of costs.

9. Despite the registrar indicating that an oral hearing appeared to be appropriate, the parties have confirmed that they wish a decision to be taken from the papers and without recourse to a hearing. Neither party furnished written submissions. After a careful study of the papers I now give this decision.

### **Opponent’s evidence**

10. This takes the form of a witness statement of James Rothnie dated 21 February 2003. Mr Rothnie says he is the Director of Corporate Affairs for easyJet Airline Company Ltd and its related companies. He provides an outline of easyGroup’s structure which, he says, administers the intellectual property generated by the companies in the group.

11. Mr Rothnie explains that easyJet Airline was launched in November 1995 as an operator of low cost scheduled airline services. Its business is very much Internet based with, in August 2000, over 75% of its airline seats being sold via the Internet. Mr Rothnie states that easyJet Airline has become well-known for low-cost, widely accessible and e-tailored travel. He submits much material to support his claim that easyJet has acquired a considerable reputation in relation to the services it provides. I do not intend to summarise this material but note that total passenger figures have increased from 30,000 in 1995 to 1,140,000 in 1997 and to 3,670,000 in 1999. Turnover figures are given as £77m for 1997/98, £264m for 1999/2000 and £552m for 2001/02.

12. The easyGroup has, says Mr Rothnie, diversified its trade from the original airline business and its attributes of low cost, simplicity and accessibility have been embraced by the other “easy” businesses.

13. Mr Rothnie says that in August 1998 it was announced that car rental services were to be provided under the trade mark easyRentacar with extensive publicity beginning in May 1999. Advertising and other material is exhibited to show that easyRentacar was promoted as a diversification of existing “easy” businesses. Again Internet based, over 40,000 rental day bookings were taken in the first month. It began trading in April 2000 and by August 2001 it had over 1.4m vehicle rental days booked. Turnover for the year ending September 2001 is said to be around £18.5m.

14. In June 1999 a chain of Internet cafes was launched across Europe beginning with a 500 seat branch in London. The business was initially carried out under the brand name easyEverything but since October 2001 it has traded as easyInternetCafe. Mr Rothnie states there are currently (his statement is dated February 2003) 7 shops in London, with others in Manchester, Edinburgh, Glasgow, other Mainland European cities and New York. No separate visitor figures are given for the UK however, Mr Rothnie provides figures to show the London sites to have a total of 1949 PCs for use, the Scottish sites 805 and Manchester 344. Turnover in the UK for the three months June to 30 September 1999 is given as £392k and the 12 months to 30 September 2000 as £6,704,895.

15. Mr Rothnie says that easyGroup (UK) is the investment vehicle for the group of companies and acts as an incubator for Internet start-up “easy” ventures in new fields. These have included easy.com/easydotcom which provide e mail services, easyMoney, an on-line financial services company and easyValue, an Internet price comparator which allows potential purchasers to compare prices of goods and services on-line. Mr Rothnie exhibits printouts from a variety of the websites along with newspaper cuttings, some of which are dated after the relevant date. No details are given of e.g.turnover.

16. Mr Rothnie says that his company is active under the “easy” brand in business including air travel, airline services, magazines, car hire, financial services and the provision of Internet access. The businesses are, he says, promoted as a family. easyJet Airline’s ethos of simplicity, low cost and accessibility have been applied to the other businesses and the “easy + element” mark is key to the brand identity. Key features of this, he says, are the short trade marks used, often consisting of two words with the prefix easy combined to form one new word where the suffix often has connotations with the services provided. Generally the prefix is in lower case followed by a word or words in which the first letter is in upper case. Mr Rothnie says that the exhibits he has provided show examples of the use of the marks, in identical font, and show that there is identical get-up. Group branding and cross-promotion is, he says, a feature and material is exhibited to support this.

17. The remainder of Mr Rothnie’s witness statement is made up of submission and comments on the applicant’s counterstatement and whilst I will not summarise them here, I do take them into account in reaching my decision and will refer to them as necessary.

### **Applicant’s evidence**

18. This consists of a witness statement of Joe Sykes and dated 9 June 2003. Mr Sykes says he has been a director of the applicant company since March 2002. He

denies the applicant is attempting to associate itself with the easy brand. He denies there is any conflict between the marks but does offer to exclude goods in class 16 from his application if it becomes necessary.

19. Mr Sykes explains that Eezeepay is “ a method of payment via a plastic swipecard through and (sic) electronic terminal. In all cases track 2 of the magnetic stripe would be encoded”. He goes on to say that the networks used are Post Office Counters, Pay Point and Pay Zone and provides exhibits to support this. He summarises by stating that the cards supplied by the applicant are encoded cards and the services provided are the provision of a payment facility.

20. Much of the rest of Mr Sykes’ statement is submission which again I take into account in reaching my decision and will refer to as necessary.

**Opponent’s evidence in reply**

21. This takes the form of a second witness statement of James Rothnie and dated 1 August 2003. The statement consists essentially of a critique of Mr Sykes’ evidence. I do not summarise it but will refer to it as necessary.

**Decision**

22. The opposition has been brought under Sections 5(2)(b), 5(3) and 5(4)(a) of the Act. These read as follows:

“5.-(2) A trade mark shall not be registered if because -

- (a) .....
- (b) it is similar to an earlier trade mark and is to be registered for goods or services identical with or similar to those for which the earlier trade mark is protected,

there exists a likelihood of confusion on the part of the public, which includes the likelihood of association with the earlier trade mark.

(3) A trade mark which -

- (a) is identical with or similar to an earlier trade mark, and
- (b) is to be registered for goods or services which are not similar to those for which the earlier trade mark is protected,

shall not be registered if, or to the extent that, the earlier trade mark has a reputation in the United Kingdom (or, in the case of a Community trade mark, in the European Community) and the use of the later mark without due cause would take unfair advantage of, or be detrimental to, the distinctive character or the repute of the earlier trade mark.

(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, or
- (b) by virtue of an earlier right other than those referred to in subsections (1) to (3) or paragraph (a) above, in particular by virtue of the law of copyright, design right or registered designs.

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.”

23. The first two grounds require the opponent to be the proprietor of earlier trade marks. As not all of the trade marks relied on are as yet registered, sections 6(1)(a) and 6(2) are also relevant:

“6.-(1) In this Act an "earlier trade mark" means -

- (a) a registered trade mark, international trade mark (UK) or Community trade mark which has a date of application for registration earlier than that of the trade mark in question, taking account (where appropriate) of the priorities claimed in respect of the trade marks,
- (b) .....
- (c) .....

(2) References in this Act to an earlier trade mark include a trade mark in respect of which an application for registration has been made and which, if registered, would be an earlier trade mark by virtue of subsection (1)(a) or (b), subject to its being so registered.”

24. For objections under sections 5(2)(b), 5(3) and 5(4)(a) to succeed, it must be found that there is similarity between the trade mark in suit and the opponent’s earlier trade marks.

25. The opponent’s statement of grounds lists more than 80 earlier trade marks on which they rely. With no hearing requested and absent any written submissions in lieu of a hearing the opponent, somewhat unhelpfully, has provided no indication of where they consider their best case lies. Whilst I have looked carefully at each of these 80 plus marks, I do not think it necessary to set out an individual consideration of each of them in this decision.

26. The goods and services of the application as set out earlier in this decision relate primarily to goods and services in what could be broadly called the financial market.

27. As Mr Rothnie states in his evidence, the opponent's marks consist of two words, the prefix easy combined with another word where that other word has connotations with the goods or services being provided. I therefore intend to consider first, those earlier marks of the opponent where the second part of the trade mark has an allusion or reference to the financial market.

Mark	Number	Classes
easyCard/EASYCARD	UK 2184827A	25, 29, 30, 32, 33
	UK 2184827B	9, 35, 38, 42
easyMoney/EASYMONEY	UK 2184834	9, 25, 29, 30, 32, 33, 35, 38, 42
easyLife	CTM 1343359	16, 35, 39
EASYMONEY	CTM1731223	9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42
easyLife	CTM 1796564	16, 35, 36, 39
easyLife	UK 2241945	16, 35, 36, 39




UK 2265184	9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42
CTM 2153575	9, 35, 36, 38, 41



UK 2269333	9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 42
------------	-----------------------



UK 2269335	9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 42
------------	-----------------------





UK 2269338

9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 42



UK 2269343

9, 16, 35, 36, 38, 42

and



UK 2272076 9, 16, 25, 29, 30, 32, 33,  
35, 36, 38, 39, 41, 42

28. With the exception of No. 2184834, none of the above marks are registered. They cannot support objections under sections 5(3) and 5(4)(a) as they did not have the required reputation or goodwill at the relevant date.

29. In determining the question under section 5(2), I take into account the guidance provided by the European Court of Justice (ECJ) in *Sabel BV v Puma AG* [1998] RPC 199, *Canon Kabushiki Kaisha v Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Inc* [1999] RPC 117 and *Lloyd Schuhfabrik Meyer & Co. GmbH v Klijsen Handel BV* [2000] FSR 77.

30. The average consumer normally perceives a mark as a whole and does not proceed to analyse its various details (*Sabel BV v Puma AG page 224*). The visual, aural and conceptual similarities of the marks must be assessed by reference to the overall impressions created by the marks bearing in mind their distinctive and dominant components (*Sabel BV v Puma AG page 224*). I take into account the matter must be judged through the eyes of the average consumer of the goods/services in question (*Sabel BV v Puma AG page 224*) who is deemed to be reasonably well informed and reasonably circumspect and observant - but who rarely has the chance to make direct comparisons between marks and must instead rely upon the imperfect picture of them he has kept in his mind (*Lloyd Schuhfabrik Meyer & Co. GmbH v Klijsen Handel BV page 84, paragraph 27*).

31. Each of the earlier trade marks set out in paragraph 27 above, consists of the word EASY combined with another word which, in my view, is non-distinctive for goods and services in the financial market. The word EASY describes something that is uncomplicated and easy to use. The words card, money, life, funds, credit, bank and giro are descriptive of goods and services relating to cards, money, life assurance, funds, credit, banking and giro transactions. In the case of No. 2272076 the additional words and device do not detract from this descriptiveness but emphasise the financial link and also suggest the goods and services are available via the Internet.

32. Each of the elements of the marks are descriptive but in combination they form trade marks which are not devoid of distinctive character. I have to consider that there is a greater likelihood of confusion where the earlier trade mark has a highly distinctive character, either per se or because of the use that has been made of it (*Sabel BV v Puma AG* page 224). The distinctive character of a trade mark can be appraised only, first, by reference to the goods or services in respect of which registration is sought and, secondly, by reference to the way it is perceived by the relevant public (*European Court of First Instance Case T-79/00 Rewe Zentral v OHIM (LITE)*). In determining the distinctive character of a mark and, accordingly, in assessing whether it is highly distinctive, I must make an overall assessment of the greater or lesser capacity of the mark to identify the goods or services for which it has been registered as coming from a particular undertaking, and thus to distinguish those goods or services from those of other undertakings (see, to that effect, the judgement of 4 May 1999 in *Joined Cases C-108/97 and C-109/97 Windsurfing Chiemsee v Huber and Attenberger* [1999] ECR I-0000, paragraph 49).

33. In respect of each of the goods and services in issue, the trade marks listed above make an obvious and direct allusion to goods and services which are easy to use. Although I find that these marks are not devoid of any distinctive character, I am of the view that they possess a low degree of inherent distinctiveness. This being so, the public are likely to be able to distinguish them from other trade marks where the differences are limited.

34. The applicant's mark consists of the word EEZEE in yellow plain block capitals on a red rectangular background separated from and above the word PAY in red plain block capitals on a yellow rectangular background separated from and above the words YOUR EASY WAY TO PAY... in white plain block capitals of a smaller font size and on a red rectangular background. The applicant claims the colours red (Pantone ®32) and yellow (Pantone ®123) as an element of the mark. The earlier marks each consist of the word EASY conjoined with another word which itself alludes to an area of the financial market. In addition No. 2272076 contains additional wording and a device. Visually the overall impression of the respective trade marks is very different.

35. There is some aural similarity between the beginning of each of the respective marks in that each of them begin with a word which will be pronounced EASY. However, comparing the respective trade marks in their entirety, I do not consider them to be aurally similar.

36. In respect of the marks consisting of the words EASY MONEY this is a dictionary term with its own specific and well known financially related meaning. In respect of all the earlier marks the second words of each of them all relate to various aspects of the financial market. The financial market covers many individual areas. Whilst each of the earlier trade marks are linked by a broad theme, the words used are not directly interchangeable and they are not linked by any direct meaning. EEZEE is the phonetic equivalent of the word EASY but whilst there is a conceptual association between these words, I do not consider, when taking each of the respective trade marks as a whole, that they are conceptually similar. In reaching this conclusion I have taken into account the comments of the European Court of Justice in *Sabel*:

“In that perspective, the more distinctive the earlier mark, the greater will be the likelihood of confusion. It is therefore not impossible that the conceptual similarity resulting from the fact that two marks use images with analogous semantic content may give rise to a likelihood of confusion where the earlier mark has a particularly distinctive character, either per se or because of the reputation it enjoys with the public. However, in circumstances such as those in point in the main proceedings, where the earlier mark is not especially well known to the public and consists of an image with little imaginative content, the mere fact that the two marks are conceptually similar is not sufficient to give rise to a likelihood of confusion.”

37. I have already found that the earlier rights do not have a particularly distinctive character. The evidence before me does not support use of any of these marks at the relevant date such as to give them any enhanced reputation.

38. Taking into account all the above I consider that the respective trade marks are not similar. For me to find that there is a likelihood of confusion the respective signs have to be similar. As was stated in *Sabel*:

“it is to be remembered that Article 4(1)(b) of the Directive is designed to apply only if by reason of the identity or similarity both of the marks and of the goods or services which they designate, “there exists a likelihood of confusion on the part of the public”.”

39. Without similarity there cannot be confusion. In respect of Nos. 2184827A, 2184827B and 2184834 none of these trade marks encompass goods or services in the same classes as that covered by the application in suit. For the remaining earlier marks, certain of the goods and/or services encompassed by them are identical to those covered by the application in suit, however, this cannot assist the opponent where the trade marks are not confusingly similar.

40. In reaching the conclusion that there is a lack of confusing similarity between the trade marks I have taken into account the fact that the public rarely have the opportunity to compare trade marks directly but rely on their recollection, which could well be imperfect. I also bear in mind that nature of the goods and services of the application. These are goods and services which, in my opinion, are likely to be obtained only after a fair degree of consideration. They are not goods or services that are likely to be purchased on an impulse and there will likely be some discussion, research and documentation to go through before any transactions are completed.

41. The trade marks set out in paragraph 27 above are not the only ones on which the opponent relies. I therefore go on to consider a second group which I set out below.

Mark	No	Classes
easyPay/EASYPAY	UK 2184833A	9, 35, 38, 42
easyPay/EASYPAY	UK 2184833B	25, 29, 30, 32, 33

42. There is some aural similarity between the marks in that each begins/consists of words which will be pronounced “easy pay”. Conceptually, there is some similarity between them in that they both suggest something that makes payment simple. Visually, however, the overall impression of the respective trade marks are very different. Taking everything into account I find the trade marks to have some similarity.

43. The applicant has applied for goods and services in classes 16 and 36. The opponent’s marks cover goods in the classes set out above. I take the view that as the opponent’s goods and services have been placed in different classes to the goods and services covered by the application in suit, they cannot be identical.

44. In considering whether there is similarity of goods and/or services the European Court of Justice held in *Canon* that the following factors, among others, should be taken into account: the nature of the goods and/or services, their end users, their method of use and whether they are in competition with each other or are complementary.

45. No. 2184833A covers computer hardware and software, pre-recorded CD ROMs and other disk carriers and sunglasses in class 9, business information services in class 35, telecommunications services in class 38 and restaurant, bar and catering services, computer software design services, access to computer and online/Internet related services in class 42. The nature of all of these goods and services are very different to the goods and services of the application in suit. I have no evidence before me of any sales or preparation for sale of goods or services under this mark and therefore cannot say who the specific end users might be. However, at its broadest the end users could be members of the general public. The applicant’s goods and services are set out earlier in this decision and Mr Sykes’ evidence suggests the users are those who pay bills or receive those payments. The method of use of the goods and services is likely to be very different to those of the earlier marks and I can see no competition nor anything complementary between them. The goods and services of the earlier mark have no similarity to the goods and services of the application.

46. No. 2184833B covers goods and services which can broadly be described as clothing and comestibles. There is no similarity with the goods and services of the application in suit. The evidence does not support any enhanced reputation.

47. The third group of marks which I consider are set out below.

Mark	No.
EASY	CTM 1699792



CTM 1976679  
UK 2253872

48. The goods and services of these pending marks cover identical goods and services to those applied for in the application in suit.

49. All of these earlier marks are still pending applications. The word EASY is an everyday, dictionary word the meaning of which is commonly understood. It seems to me to be a word which would be apt to describe a very wide range of goods and services. If it is capable of achieving registration, I believe it would have a very low level of distinctiveness. I also take note of the somewhat unusual spelling of EEZEE in the applicant's mark which diminishes the effect of any conceptual link to the opponent's marks. Taking all of this into consideration, I have no doubt that the relevant public would be readily able to distinguish them from the application in suit.

50. If the opponent cannot succeed on the basis of any of the trade marks set out in the above three groups I cannot see that they can succeed in relation to any others, all of which are more distant. The opponent has provided a substantial amount of evidence of use of some of the other marks, e.g. easyJet, easyRentacar/easyCar and easyInternetcafe/easyEverything but there is no defined evidence of use in respect of the others. I do not dispute they have a substantial reputation in easyJet and some reputation in respect of easyRentacar/easyCar and easyInternetcafe/easyEverything. However, each of these marks is a very different trade mark to the mark in suit and any reputation they might have cannot make them similar. A positive finding under section 5(3) requires the trade marks to be similar. For a finding of passing-off, deception or confusion must be found and this again requires there to be similarity of the signs. For passing-off the comparison would also be for the services for which there is a goodwill. The opponent would, in the case of easyJet, easyRentacar/easyCar and easyInternetcafe/easyEverything have the problem not only of the difference in the signs but also in the distance in the goods and services, for which there is no obvious link. As Millet LJ in *Harrods v Harrodian School* [1996] RPC 697 stated:

“To be known to everyone is not to be known for everything.”

51. Given my findings the opposition fails in its entirety.

### **Costs**

52. The applicant has been successful and is entitled to an award of costs. The opponent relied on more than 80 marks many of which found no support in the

evidence filed. The opponent filed a significant amount of evidence although in this case, quantity of evidence is not balanced by quality of evidence. From my own experience of the papers it is clear that going through that evidence would have taken the applicant a considerable amount of time and effort. I therefore reflect this in the costs award. There was no hearing. Taking everything into account I order the opponent to pay the applicant the sum of £1000. This sum is to be paid within seven days of the expiry of the appeal period or within seven days of the final determination of this case if any appeal against this decision is unsuccessful.

**Dated this 9<sup>th</sup> day of December 2003**



**A Corbett  
For the Registrar  
the Comptroller-General**





## Annex 1

easyPay/EASYPAY	UK2184833A
easyPay/EASYPAY	UK 2184833B
EASYJET	UK 2016785
EASYTRAIN	UK 2112957
EASYBUS	UK 2112956
easyTrak/EASYTRAK	UK 2168662
easyWeb/EASYWEB	UK 2168668
easyExtras/EASYEXTRAS	UK 2168672
easyExtras/EASYEXTRAS	CTM 848424
EASYCAFE	CTM 931790
EASY EVERYTHING	UK 2182641
easyCard/EASYCARD	UK 2184827A
easyCard/EASYCARD	UK 2184827B
easyMoney/EASYMONEY	UK 2184834
easyJet. the web's favourite airline	CTM 1132596
easyTech	CTM 1128743
easyKiosk/EASYKIOSK	UK 2198933
easyKiosk/EASYKIOSK	CTM 1196138
EASYJET	CTM 1232909
	UK 2202916 CTM 1243948
easyrentacar	CTM 1261502
easyLife	CTM 1343359
easy.com	CTM 1343300



	UK 2212473 CTM 1360981
easyJet tours	CTM 1383157
easyJet Services	UK 2219661
easyJet Services	CTM 1472273
easydotcom logo	CTM 1588326
easyJet.com & logo	CTM 1593326
EASYEVERTHING	CTM 1590561
EASYCLICKIT	UK 2230279
easyJet ramp	UK 2232031
EASY	CTM 1699792
EASYMONEY	CTM 1731223
EASYCLICKIT	CTM 1770593
	UK 2240412
easyLife	CTM 1796564
easyLife	UK 2241945
easyServices	UK 2242495
easyServices	CTM 1821354
easyRamp	UK 2242492
easyRamp	CTM 1821370
EASYVALUE/easyValue	UK 2245768
EASYVALUE/easyValue	CTM 1857705
EASYHOTEL/easyHotel	UK 2246286
EASYHOTEL/easyHotel	CTM 1866706
easy.com	UK 2247942
EASYODDS/easyOdds	UK 2248962
EASYODDS/easyOdds	CTM 1902394



	UK 2249416
	
Easy	CTM 1976679
EASYJET GIFTS/easyJet Gifts	UK 2253810
EASYJET GIFTS/easyJet Gifts	CTM 1983667
	UK2253812 CTM 1984079
GO EASYJET	UK 2254310
	UK 2254310

<p><b>EASYJET.COM</b> THE WEB'S FAVOURITE AIRLINE</p> <p>easyJet.com the web's favourite airline</p>  	<p>UK 2255933 CTM 2015287</p>
<p>easyJet</p>	<p>UK 2260901</p>
 <p>easyElectrical</p>	<p>UK 2263118</p>
<p>easyKiosk</p>	<p>UK 2263914 CTM 2140812</p>
 	<p>UK 2265184 CTM 2153575</p>
<p>easyCar</p>	<p>CTM 2168714</p>
<p>easyCar</p>	<p>UK 2266270</p>

<b>easyCar</b>	UK 2266267 CTM 2168763
<b>easyPoints</b>	UK 2266451 CTM 2181667
<b>easyFunds</b>	UK 2269333
<b>easyCredit</b>	UK 2269335
<b>easyBank</b>	UK 2269338
<b>easyGiro</b>	UK 2269343

 <p data-bbox="467 555 735 607"><b>EASYAIR</b></p> <p data-bbox="504 685 699 741"><b>easyAir</b></p>	<p data-bbox="1090 197 1257 226">UK 2271732</p>
   	<p data-bbox="1090 768 1257 797">UK 2272076</p>