RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION

U.S. Trademark App. Serial No. 97/652797

The Examining Attorney has partially refused registration of Applicant's mark SONNET ("Applicant's Mark") because of a likelihood of confusion with the marks in U.S. Registration Nos. 5489550 and 5483703 ("the Cited Marks"). Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examining Attorney's conclusion and requests that the refusal be withdrawn in light of the amendment to the description of goods.

Registrant's goods and software are very specialized. See its website at https://deepmind.google/.   Registrant's goods and software are in general for use with data capture and analysis for artificial intelligence. The description of goods and software in the registrations reflects this.

On the other hand, Applicant's goods are for upgrading the performance of personal computers. These are very different purposes and thus the goods are significantly different. It is clear in precedential decisions that no one entity owns all rights to a trademark in connection with computer components even if the first user owns a registration. The field of computer components is just too broad.

Here, as the goods are different, they will be advertised in different channels of trade, and sold to different consumers who have different purposes for use in mind. Moreover, it is known that purchasing computer components is not an off the shelf purchase of an item. The components tend to be expensive and purchasing decisions made by sophisticated consumers. Here someone looking for AI components would not be looking for components to upgrade the performance of the user's computer.

It is noted that there are no specimens of use for Registrants' goods as the registrations are based upon an EU application. For that reason, registrant's website is the best source of how the mark is being used, and it is clearly for AI.

With this in mind, there is no evidence that the Cited Marks are strong ones. Publication is the appropriate next step to see if the Registrant even objects. In this regard, we believe Registrant is aware of Applicant's application and has not objected to it.

For all of these reasons, there is no likelihood of confusion and the application should be allowed to pass to publication.