

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

June 9, 2021

In re Application of:

WATTS REMOVAL PRODUCTS, LLC.

Docket No.: WRP 401

Serial No. : 90/269,086

Trademark Examining Attorney:  
Douglas A. Mondell

Filed : October 21, 2020

Law Office: 127

For : CLEANSWEEP

Commissioner for Trademarks  
P.O. Box 1451  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1451

**AMENDMENT AND REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Reconsideration of the March 22, 2021 first Office action for the above-identified trademark application is requested in view of the clarifying amendments to the identification of goods that are being submitted with this response, and in view of the following remarks. In the Office action, registration of Applicant's CLEANSWEEP mark in Class 3 is refused under Section 2(d) for allegedly creating a likelihood of confusion with U.S. Registration No. 2,560,990 of the stylized KLEEN SWEEP mark for a chemical preparation for dissolving and removing carbon, grease, and oil from surfaces of hoods over commercial food cooking stoves, grills, and popcorn kettles in Class 1. As discussed in more detail herein, Applicant amends its identification of goods to provide clarification regarding Applicant's Class 3 goods. In addition, Applicant presents detailed arguments as to why reconsideration and withdrawal of the refusal of registration is appropriate.

### **Identification of Goods**

With this response, Applicant is amending the original identification of goods to clarify the goods for which registration is sought. Specifically, while the as-filed application broadly identifies Applicant's goods as "cleaning agents for cleaning surfaces," Applicant's more specific goods that will be sold under the CLEANSWEEP mark are graffiti removal products to remove markings made by the likes of spray paint, wax crayon, markers, felt pens, etc. from smooth and/or coated surfaces, such as walls, buildings, signs, and other plastic and metal surfaces, including painted surfaces. Thus, Applicant's identification of the goods is hereby amended to clarify the goods in the application, and now identifies the goods as "cleaning preparations for removing graffiti from surfaces." Applicant believes that this amendment is permissible because it is a narrowing amendment, in that it is within the scope of, and specifies a species of, the originally identified "cleaning agents for cleaning surfaces." Applicant also believes its amended identification is sufficiently clear and definite to be acceptable. If the Examining Attorney disagrees or recommends any additional clarifying amendments to Applicant's identification of goods, the Examining Attorney is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney directly at 503.224.7529 or amy@dgip.law if doing so may help avoid the need for a further Office action.

### **Section 2(d) Refusal**

Registration of Applicant's CLEANSWEEP mark is refused under section 2(d) over U.S. Registration No. 2,560,990 of the stylized KLEEN SWEEP mark, which is registered for a chemical preparation for dissolving and removing carbon, grease, and oil from surfaces of hoods over commercial food cooking stoves, grills, and popcorn kettles in Class 1. As set forth in the Office action, Applicant's CLEANSWEEP mark, as used on Applicant's goods in the field of cleaning agents, is likely to cause confusion with use of the Registrant's KLEEN SWEEP mark, due to the phonetic equivalency of the marks, the broad wording originally specified by Applicant that encompass all goods of the type

described (thereby making Applicant's goods legally identical to those of Registrant), and a presumptive overlap of channel of trade and class of purchaser for both Applicant's and Registrant's goods.

As detailed above, Applicant presently amends its description of goods to clarify the goods for which registration is sought. In view of these clarifying amendments, Applicant submits that there is no likelihood of confusion between its CLEANSWEEP mark and Registrant's stylized KLEEN SWEEP mark. Applicant's reasons include, but are not limited to, the following:

- The registered mark is entitled to only a narrow scope of protection, as used on the goods at issue, due to the widespread use and registration of phonetically identical marks and variants thereof for related goods and/or services; and
- Applicant's as-amended graffiti removal goods are sufficiently distinct from Registrant's registered chemicals for cleaning hoods over commercial cooking surfaces so as to preclude a likelihood of confusion, especially in view of the crowded field of phonetically identical marks.

Beginning with the weakness of the cited KLEEN SWEEP mark, Applicant submits that the cited mark is a weak mark that is only entitled to a narrow scope of protection within Class 1 because so many different parties are using phonetically equivalent marks and variants thereof.

The TMEP states that "[i]f the evidence establishes that the consuming public is exposed to third-party use of similar marks on similar goods, it 'is relevant to show that a mark is relatively weak and entitled to only a narrow scope of protection.'" *Palm Bay Imps., Inc. v. Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin Maison Fondée en 1772*, 396 F.3d 1369, 1373-74, 73 USPQ2d 1689, 1693 (Fed. Cir. 2005); TMEP § 1207.01(d)(iii).

As Professor McCarthy explains in 3 J. Thomas McCarthy, *MCCARTHY ON TRADEMARKS AND UNFAIR COMPETITION*, Section 11: 85-88 at 11-143 to 11-150 (1996):

The ultimate test of relative strength is the distinctiveness of a mark in the mind and perception of the relevant customer group. But a mark that is hemmed in on all sides by similar marks on similar goods cannot be very "distinctive." It is merely one of a crowd of marks. In such a crowd, customers will not likely be confused between any two of the crowd and may have learned to carefully pick out one from the other.... In a "crowded" field of similar marks, each member of the crowd is relatively "weak" in its ability to prevent use by others in the crowd.... Evidence of third party use of similar marks on

similar goods is admissible and relevant to show that the mark is relatively weak and entitled to only a narrow scope of protection.



A case that shows how a mark can be entitled only to a narrow scope of protection in a crowded field of similar marks for related goods is *In re J.C. Penney Co.*, 179 USPQ 184 (TTAB 1973), where an application was filed to register the EL TIGRE mark for automotive parts. Under the doctrine of foreign equivalents, the English equivalent of the mark, THE TIGER, was used when determining the registrability of the mark. Registration was refused on the ground that the mark was likely to cause confusion with the TIGER TRAC mark for new and re-treaded tires, the SUNBEAM TIGER mark for automobiles, and the TIGER mark for bicycles. The Board noted that there were several additional third-party registrations of TIGER for automotive parts that were not cited by the Examining Attorney, including the TIGER 'TREAD' mark for retreaded tires, the TIGER-FOOT mark for rubber vehicle tires, and the TIGER TANK and design mark for truck bodies, and held that TIGER was "a weak mark in the automotive parts and accessories field." *Id.* at 186. Accordingly, the Board held that marks containing TIGER were entitled only to a narrow scope of protection, and therefore the applicant's mark could distinguish the applicant's goods in the crowded field of automotive supplies, equipment, and accessories. *Id.* Significantly, the EL TIGRE mark was found to be registrable not only over various two-word marks involving TIGER, but also over TIGER alone.




Another case that shows how a mark can be entitled only to a narrow scope of protection in a crowded field of similar marks for related goods is *Marcal Paper Mills, Inc. v. American Can Co.*, 212 USPQ 852 (TTAB 1981), where an application was filed to register the AQUA-QUILT mark for paper towels. The Examining Attorney refused registration on the ground that the mark was likely to cause confusion with the AQUA-GARD mark for paper towels. The Board noted that there were several third-party registrations of AQUA for paper goods that were not cited by the Examining Attorney, including AQUA PHIL, AQUA SOFT, AQUALIZED, AQUA KRAFT, AQUA-TUF, AQUA-FIBR, AQUA-CORD, and AQUASTRONG, and held that "the presence of the 'AQUA' prefix in two otherwise dissimilar marks can be an insufficient basis upon which to predicate a holding that the marks as a whole are likely to conflict in the marketplace." *Id.* at 862-863.

Accordingly, the Board held that the applicant’s mark could distinguish the applicant’s goods in the crowded field of paper goods. *Id.* at 863.

The present case is like these cases because marks that are or include various versions of “KLEEN SWEEP” are used by a wide variety of different parties for cleaning-related goods and/or services, just as TIGER and AQUA were respectively used for automotive parts and paper products by a variety of different parties. Therefore, marks including the terms KLEEN and SWEEP and variants thereof are only entitled to a narrow scope of protection. In support, Applicant submits the following table of representative federally registered marks containing the widely used terms CLEAN and SWEEP and variants thereof. Each of these marks is registered for goods and/or services related to some form of cleaning, and thus each mark is registered for goods and/or services related to those for which the cited mark is registered. Furthermore, Applicant submits evidence showing actual use of many of these third party marks in the U.S. for the registered goods and/or services, thereby also demonstrating not only registration, but also use, of these marks for these goods and/or services. Copies of these registrations, the most recent specimen submitted for each registration, and evidence of actual use (where applicable) of the corresponding marks are submitted with this response as Exhibits 1a-1s.

| <u>Mark</u>  | <u>Owner</u>                                    | <u>Goods/Services</u>  |
|--|---|--|
| CLEAN SWEEP<br>Reg. No. 4,548,586  | The Tetra Corporation<br>Eaton Rapids, Michigan | Antimicrobial preparations for use on the skin, cuticles and nails and in shoes in Class 5   |
| CLEEN SWEEP (stylized)<br>Reg. No. 4,477,895<br><br><b>CLEEN<br/>SWEEP</b> | Keith Manufacturing Co.<br>Madras, Oregon       | Motorized tarp system comprising a tarp and motorized winding assembly, which extends and retracts a tarpaulin over a reciprocating slat conveyor to simultaneously clean the surface while bulk material is removed from the conveyor in Class 7  |
| CLEANSWEEP<br>Reg. No. 4,233,252   | Precision Planting, LLC<br>Wilmington, Delaware | Parts and accessories for agricultural seed planting machines, namely, a row cleaner down pressure system in the nature of linear actuators and a controller therefor for setting and adjusting the down pressure of the row cleaner planter attachment for clearing crop residue during planting in Class 7 |

| <u>Mark</u>   | <u>Owner</u>   | <u>Goods/Services</u>   |
|---|--|---|
| CLEAN SWEEP<br>Reg. No. 3,320,538   | Structural Concepts Corporation<br>Muskegon, Michigan            | Refrigeration equipment, namely, refrigeration coil cleaning apparatus featuring brushes for automatically cleaning refrigeration coils in Class 7  |
| CLEAN SWEEP<br>Reg. No. 4,268,550   | Hellas Construction, Inc.<br>Austin, Texas                       | Machines designed for the grooming, cleaning, and maintenance of synthetic turf surfaces in Class 7   |
| CLEAN SWEEP<br>Reg. No. 3,709,054   | Biocurv Medical Instruments, Inc.<br>Canton, OHIO                | Tongue scrapers in Class 10   |
| CLEAN SWEEP<br>Reg. No. 1,879,233   | Continental Commercial Products, LLC<br>Bridgeton, Missouri      | Brooms in Class 21  |
| CLEAN SWEEP (stylized)<br>Reg. No. 1,693,075<br>       | John J. Jacoby, an individual<br>Huntingdon Valley, Pennsylvania | Wiper clearing device; namely, wiper clearing field strip consisting of discrete scraping elements for adhesive or other bonding application onto a surface, such as a windshield serviced by a wiper for the purpose of clearing debris and other foreign matter from the wiper, for use on automobiles, aircraft, control towers, farm equipment, plant machines, military vehicles, windows, and any other surface serviced by a wiper in Class 21 |
| KLEENSWEEP<br>Reg. No. 1,805,811  | Heat and Control, Inc.<br>Hayward, California                    | Machines for removing fine particles of food products from cooking oil in Class 7   |
| CLEAN SWEEP<br>Reg. No. 1,104,149   | Aerus Concepts, L.P.<br>Dallas, Texas                            | Air freshener deodorant for use in vacuum cleaners in Class 5   |
| POWER CLEAN SWEEP & Design<br>Reg. No. 5,249,542<br> | Superior Sweeps, Inc.<br>Macon, Georgia                          | Dust absorbing compositions in Class 4  |
| DIXIE CLEAN & SWEEP<br>Reg. No. 5,103,848   | Straight Stripe Painting, Inc.<br>St. George, Utah               | Street sweeping services in Class 37  |
| CLEANSWEEP<br>Reg. No. 5,141,743  | Nufarm Americas Inc.<br>Alsip, Illinois                          | Algicides; biocides; fungicides; herbicides; insect growth regulators for agricultural use; insect repellents; insecticides; nematicides; parasiticides; pesticides; preparations to destroy mildew; rodenticides; slug exterminating preparations; soil-sterilising preparations in Class 5  |

| <u>Mark</u>  | <u>Owner</u>  | <u>Goods/Services</u>   |
|--|---|---|
| KLEEN SWEEP<br>Reg. No. 2,102,821  | Minuteman International,<br>Inc.<br>Pingree Grove, Illinois                                       | Battery-operated sweepers for hard floors, carpeting and pavement, for indoor and outdoor use, and for industrial or commercial use in Class 9  |
| CLEAN SWEEP<br>Reg. No. 5,956,656  | Curology, Inc.<br>San Francisco, California   | Non-medicated facial cleansers in Class 3   |
| CLARIFIER CLEANSWEEP<br>Reg. No. 4,321,442   | Kershner Innovations, LLC<br>Reisterstown, Maryland   | Equipment, namely, machines for preventing the accumulation of algae and other impurities on the surfaces of liquid holding units used in water treatment; equipment, namely, machines for removing algae and other impurities from the surfaces of liquid holding units used in water treatment in Class 7 |
| CLEEN SWEEP<br>PROFESSIONAL SERVICES<br>& Design<br>Reg. No. 6,198,041<br> | Tolor M. Guidry, an individual<br>dba CleanSweep<br>Professional Services<br>Palmdale, California | Cleaning of commercial premises in Class 37   |
| MOP DOC A CLEAN<br>SWEEP & Design<br>Reg. No. 5,267,246<br>               | NoCo Tech, LLC<br>Fort Collins, Colorado  | Vacuum device for removing debris from mops, brooms, and dusters in Class 7   |
| VIPER CLEAN SWEEP<br>SYSTEM & Design<br>Reg. No. 2,165,063<br>            | Duct Doctor Ltd.<br>New Richland, Minnesota   | High-pressure air operated scraper for use in air duct cleaning comprised of conjoinable rods and conduit which delivers a cleaning nozzle and a cleaning whip into ductwork, for purpose of blowing high-pressure air in such a way as to remove unwanted material from ductwork in Class 7                |

Notably, at least thirteen different parties have registered the exact phonetic equivalent of Registrant's mark for cleaning-related goods and/or services. These registrations include the KLEEN SWEEP mark, which is registered for battery-operated sweepers for hard floors, carpeting and pavement

(i.e., for cleaning floors), and having the exact spelling and spacing of Registrant's stylized KLEEN SWEEP mark. These registrations also include the KLEENSWEEP mark (sharing the exact spelling of Registrant's stylized mark), which is registered for machines for removing fine particles of food from cooking oil, and thus even shares overlap in industry with the cited KLEEN SWEEP mark for products for removing oil and grease from commercial cooking stoves. In addition to these two marks, the above registrations include the CLEAN SWEEP mark for cleaning conveyor surfaces, the CLEAN SWEEP mark for cleaning crop residue during planting, the CLEAN SWEEP mark for refrigerator coil cleaning equipment, the CLEAN SWEEP mark for wiper cleaning devices, the CLEAN SWEEP mark for cleaning machines for synthetic turf, and the CLEAN SWEEP mark for facial cleansers. Other cleaning-related registrations include the CLEAN SWEEP mark for antimicrobial preparations for use on skin and nails, the CLEAN SWEEP mark for tongue scrapers (used to clean the tongue), the CLEAN SWEEP mark for brooms (used for cleaning), the CLEAN SWEEP mark for air fresheners for use in vacuum cleaners (used for cleaning), and the CLEAN SWEEP mark for soil sterilizing preparations and preparations for removal of mildew (also related to cleaning soil and mildew). Applicant also found over a dozen other phonetically equivalent marks (spelled CLEAN SWEEP, CLEAN SWEEP, or CLEAN-SWEEP) registered for other goods and services, such as metal covers for rain gutters, audio interface devices, arcade games, chairs, suction apparatus, database management, and beer. These less-related registrations are not included in the table above, for brevity, though Applicant includes a copy of these registrations attached hereto as Exhibit 2. Thus, consumers are very accustomed to seeing such phonetically identical marks used in a wide variety of industries in addition to the many examples discussed above for cleaning-related goods and/or services.

At least six additional parties have registered marks that include "CLEAN SWEEP" (or various spellings thereof) in combination with one or more additional terms for cleaning-related goods and/or services. For example, the POWER CLEAN SWEEP & design mark is registered for dust absorbing compositions, the DIXIE CLEAN & SWEEP mark is registered for street sweeping services, the CLARIFIER



CLEANSWEEP mark is registered for machines for removing algae and impurities from surfaces of liquid holding units, the CLEEN SWEEP PROFESSIONAL SERVICES & design mark is registered for cleaning of commercial premises, the MOP DOC A CLEAN SWEEP mark is registered for a vacuum device for cleaning mops, brooms, and etc., and the VIPER CLEAN SWEEP SYSTEM is registered for a scraper for use in air duct cleaning. These additional marks provide further evidence that the terms “CLEAN” and “SWEEP” are widely used together in marks for goods and services in the cleaning industry.

In addition to the above-presented registered marks that utilize various phonetically equivalent CLEAN (or CLEEN or KLEEN) and SWEEP marks for cleaning-related goods and/or services, Applicant also submits the following fifteen additional unregistered uses of KLEEN SWEEP marks in the U.S. for cleaning-related products and/or services, all but three of which use the exact two-word spelling of Registrant’s KLEEN SWEEP mark (as opposed to Applicant’s one-word presentation of its CLEANSWEEP mark with different spelling). Printouts from websites from which each of these goods and/or services may be purchased or accessed are attached with this response as Exhibit 3.

| <b>Product/Service Name</b>                | <b>Goods/Services</b>   |
|--|---|
| KLEEN SWEEP PROFESSIONAL CLEANING SERVICES | Post-construction cleaning, janitorial services, floor care, exterior maintenance, residential house cleaning |
| I AM KLEEN SWEEP                           | House cleaning, move in/move out cleaning, deep cleaning  |
| KLEENSWEEP                                 | Sweeping compound   |
| KLEEN SWEEP JANITORIAL                     | Residential and commercial cleaning services  |
| KLEEN SWEEP                                | Residential and commercial cleaning and floor care  |
| KLEEN SWEEP                                | Fireplace and chimney cleaning  |
| KLEEN SWEEP                                | Windshield washer antifreeze  |
| KLEENSWEEP CLEANING CO.                    | Cleaning, floors, restrooms, windows, janitorial services   |
| KLEEN SWEEP CLEANING SERVICES              | Home cleaning, steam cleaning, vacuuming  |
| KLEEN SWEEP MAINTENANCE                    | Dryer vent cleaning, duct cleaning, machine, fireplace, and furnace cleaning                                  |
| KLEEN-SWEEP POOL & SPA SUPPLIES            | Pool and spa cleaning services and products (e.g., robotic pool cleaner, cleaning chemicals)                  |
| KLEEN SWEEP CHIMNEY SERVICE                | Chimney flue sweeping, power washing, dryer vent cleaning, etc.   |
| KLEEN SWEEP COMMERCIAL CLEANING CO.        | Residential, commercial, carpet cleaning, power washing   |
| KLEEN SWEEP JANITORIAL                     | Office and commercial cleaning  |

| Product/Service Name                       | Goods/Services  |
|--|---|
| KLEEN SWEEP PROFESSIONAL CLEANING SERVICES | Post-construction cleaning, janitorial services, floor care, exterior maintenance, residential house cleaning |
| KLEEN SWEEP LLC DUMPSTERS                  | Dumpster rentals, demolition services   |

The above-listed registrations and unregistered uses demonstrate that marks that include or consist of KLEEN SWEEP (or its phonetic equivalents) are commonly used for cleaning-related goods and services in various industries. This widespread use of marks containing the terms “KLEEN SWEEP” (or phonetic equivalents) for related goods and services is reinforced by the evidence of actual use of the registered marks that is included in Exhibits 1a-1s and 2, and of the unregistered marks that is included in Exhibit 3. Because of this widespread use by many different parties, the cited KLEEN SWEEP mark should be afforded a comparatively narrow scope of protection, just as TIGER and AQUA were afforded narrower scopes of protection in the cases cited above.

Applicant is not arguing that the cited mark should not have been registered or has no scope of protection. Instead, Applicant requests reconsideration of the refusal of registration in view of the weakness of the cited mark for cleaning-related goods and/or services, and thus the narrow scope of protection that should be afforded to the cited mark. Simply put, because consumers are so used to seeing many different parties use variants of Registrant’s KLEEN SWEEP mark for cleaning-related goods and services, it follows that the cited mark does not offer much distinctiveness and thus its scope of protection should be limited to the more particular presentation of the mark (two words, atypical spelling, and stylized), as well as to the more particular goods for which it is registered, namely, chemical preparations for dissolving and removing carbon, grease, and oil from surfaces of hoods over commercial food cooking stoves, grills, and popcorn kettles.

The Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit and the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board have recognized that a weak mark may be entitled to a narrower scope of protection than an entirely arbitrary or coined word. *See Juice Generation, Inc. v. GS Enters. LLC*, 794 F.3d 1334, 1338-39, 115

USPQ2d 1671, 1674 (Fed. Cir. 2015). “Third-party registrations may be relevant to show that a mark or a portion of a mark is ... so commonly used that the public will look to other elements to distinguish the source of the goods or services.” See, e.g., *Id.* at 1338-40; 115 USPQ2d at 1674-75; *Jack Wolfskin Ausrüstung Fur Draussen GmbH & Co. KGAA v. New Millennium Sports, S.L.U.*, 797 F.3d 1363, 116 USPQ2d 1129 (Fed. Cir. 2015).

“[E]vidence of third-party use bears on the strength or weakness of an opposer’s mark. *Juice Generation*, 794 F.3d at 1338, 115 USPQ2d at 1674. “The weaker [a] mark, the closer an applicant’s mark can come without causing a likelihood of confusion and thereby invading what amounts to its comparatively narrower range of protection. *Id.* “Evidence of third-party use of similar marks on similar goods is relevant to show that a mark is relatively weak and entitled to only a narrow scope of protection.” *Palm Bay Imps. Inc. v. Veuve Clicquot Ponsardin Maison Fonden En 1772*, 376 F.3d 1369, 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2005). Recently, third-party registrations were used to determine that a commonly used mark (FAVORITES for mail order catalogs featuring sporting goods and other goods) was sufficiently weak that a likelihood of confusion did not exist for the applicant’s phonetically similar mark (FAVORIT for goods that include bicycles and sporting goods). See *In re Favorit Czechoslovakia s.r.o.*, Serial No. 79133133 (TTAB April 22, 2016) (non-precedential). Similarly, Registrant’s KLEEN SWEEP mark is rendered weak due to the widespread use and registration of phonetically equivalent marks by many different parties for related goods and services.

In addition, when determining whether there is a likelihood of confusion between Applicant’s CLEANSWEEP mark and the cited registration of the KLEEN SWEEP mark for chemical preparations for dissolving and removing carbon, grease, and oil from surfaces of hoods over commercial food cooking stoves, grills, and popcorn kettles in Class 1, the distinctions between Applicant’s as-amended goods and Registrant’s goods should be given additional weight in the face of the narrow scope of protection of Registrant’s mark, due to the large number of third parties using phonetically equivalent marks for

cleaning-related goods and/or services. Specifically, Applicant's presently amended goods are cleaning preparations for removing graffiti from surfaces in Class 3. As noted, Applicant's goods are used to remove graffiti markings made by the likes of spray paint, wax crayon, markers, felt pens, and etc. from smooth and/or coated surfaces, such as walls, buildings, signs, and other plastic and metal surfaces, including painted surfaces. Such specific goods would have no typical use or application in the space of cooking stoves, grills, and popcorn kettles, on which Registrant's goods are specifically used to clean cooking grease and carbon buildup. Applicant's presently amended goods are thus distinct from Registrant's goods because they are used on different surfaces, to remove different types of substances in different industries, and would be marketed to different consumers. In other words, consumers shopping for products to remove grease from cooking stove hoods and popcorn kettles are very unlikely to be confused by products for removing graffiti, and would not expect such products to emanate from the same source, given their different nature of application.

Thus, the above-discussed third-party registrations of various marks containing the terms "KLEEN" (or "CLEAN" or "CLEEN") and "SWEEP" sufficiently limit the distinctiveness of Registrant's stylized KLEEN SWEEP mark such that Applicant's use of the CLEANSWEEP mark for cleaning preparations for removing graffiti from surfaces does not create a likelihood of confusion. Specifically, because so many third parties already are using phonetically equivalent marks for cleaning-related goods and/or services, it follows that Registrant's mark is only entitled to a limited scope of protection limited to its specific stylized, two word, atypical spelling presentation of KLEEN SWEEP, and limited to its specific goods for cleaning oil and grease off of cooking stoves, such that there is no likelihood of confusion from Applicant's use of CLEANSWEEP for its graffiti removal goods.

