

From: Eulin, Ingrid

Sent: 12/21/2015 5:03:37 PM

To: TTAB EFiling

CC:

Subject: U.S. TRADEMARK APPLICATION NO. 85970860 - EASY ACCESS - N/A - EXAMINER BRIEF

Attachment Information:

Count: 7

Files: EZAbbreviations.jpg, EZAcroInitAbbre003.jpg, EZAcroInitAbbdic002.jpg, EZAbbreviationsTP.jpg, EZAbbreviationsVerso.jpg, EZAcroInitAbbDic001.jpg, 85970860.doc

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (USPTO)

U.S. APPLICATION SERIAL NO. 85970860

MARK: EASY ACCESS



CORRESPONDENT ADDRESS:
INTERNET PROMISE GROUP LLC

2390 CRENSHAW BLVD STE 239

TORRANCE, CA 90501-3300

GENERAL TRADEMARK INFORMATION:

<http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/index.jsp>

TTAB INFORMATION:

<http://www.uspto.gov/trademarks/process/appeal/index.jsp>

APPLICANT: Internet Promise Group LLC

CORRESPONDENT'S REFERENCE/DOCKET NO:

N/A

CORRESPONDENT E-MAIL ADDRESS:

chand@InternetPromise.com

EXAMINING ATTORNEY'S APPEAL BRIEF

In this case, registration has been refused because Appellant's mark, when used in connection with Appellant's goods, so resembles the mark in U.S. Registration No. 4514959, as to be likely to cause

confusion, to cause mistake or to deceive under Trademark Act Section 2(d), 15 U.S.C. §1052(d); *see* TMEP §§1207.01 *et seq.*

The Applicant now appeals the Trademark Examining Attorney's refusal to register the mark.

CASE HISTORY

Appellant seeks to register the wording, "EASY ACCESS" as a standard character mark for goods described as computer system with computer hardware and computer software applications, that interfaces with wireless mobile devices and business authentication systems to provide two-factor authentication of remote users to Internet Servers. Filed June 26, 2013, Appellant seeks registration on the Principal Register based upon a bona fide intention to use the mark in commerce under Section 1(b), 15 U.S.C. §1051(b).

Upon initial examination, in July, 2013, the application was suspended pending disposition of a prior pending application. Thereafter, upon registration of the prior pending application, on August 20, 2014, the application was removed from suspension and registration refused under Trademark Act Section 2(d), based upon a likelihood of confusion with U.S. Registration No. 4514959. 15 U.S.C. §1052(d); *see* TMEP §§1207.01 *et seq.* Appellant responded to the refusal but after consideration of Appellant's response, the refusal was made FINAL on March 13, 2015.

Appellant now appeals.

ISSUE ON APPEAL

The issue for consideration in the instant appeal is whether Appellant's proposed mark, "EASY ACCESS," when used in connection with Appellant's computer system with computer hardware and computer software applications, so resembles the registered mark -- U. S. Registration No. 4514959 for the mark "EZACCESS" and also for computer software -- as to be likely to cause confusion, to cause mistake or to deceive within the meaning of Section 2(d) of the Trademark Act.

ARGUMENT

Trademark Act Section 2(d) bars registration of an applied-for mark that so resembles a registered mark that it is likely a potential consumer would be confused, mistaken, or deceived as to the source of the goods and/or services of the applicant and registrant. See 15 U.S.C. §1052(d). A determination of likelihood of confusion under Section 2(d) is made on a case-by case basis and the factors set forth in *In re E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 476 F.2d 1357, 1361, 177 USPQ 563, 567 (C.C.P.A. 1973) aid in this determination. *Citigroup Inc. v. Capital City Bank Grp., Inc.*, 637 F.3d 1344, 1349, 98 USPQ2d 1253, 1256 (Fed. Cir. 2011) (citing *On-Line Careline, Inc. v. Am. Online, Inc.*, 229 F.3d 1080, 1085, 56 USPQ2d 1471, 1474 (Fed. Cir. 2000)). Not all the *du Pont* factors, however, are necessarily relevant or of equal weight, and any one of the factors may control in a given case, depending upon the evidence of record.

Citigroup Inc. v. Capital City Bank Grp., Inc., 637 F.3d at 1355, 98 USPQ2d at 1260; *In re Majestic Distilling Co.*, 315 F.3d 1311, 1315, 65 USPQ2d 1201, 1204 (Fed. Cir. 2003); see *In re E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 476 F.2d at 1361-62, 177 USPQ at 567.

In this case, the following factors are the most relevant: similarity of the marks, similarity and nature of the goods, and similarity of the trade channels of the goods. See *In re Viterro Inc.*, 671 F.3d 1358, 1361-62, 101 USPQ2d 1905, 1908 (Fed. Cir. 2012); *In re Dakin's Miniatures Inc.*, 59 USPQ2d 1593, 1595-96 (TTAB 1999); TMEP §1207.01 *et seq.*

The Marks are Highly Similar

With respect to the similarity of the marks, when comparing marks, the test is not whether the marks can be distinguished in a side-by-side comparison, but rather whether the marks are sufficiently similar in terms of their overall commercial impression that confusion as to the source of the goods offered under the respective marks is likely to result. *Midwestern Pet Foods, Inc. v. Societe des Produits Nestle S.A.*, 685 F.3d 1046, 1053, 103 USPQ2d 1435, 1440 (Fed. Cir. 2012); *In re Davia*, 110 USPQ2d 1810, 1813 (TTAB 2014); TMEP §1207.01(b). The proper focus is on the recollection of the average purchaser, who retains a general rather than specific impression of trademarks. *United Global Media Grp., Inc. v. Tseng*, 112 USPQ2d 1039, 1049, (TTAB 2014); *L'Oreal S.A. v. Marcon*, 102 USPQ2d 1434, 1438 (TTAB 2012); TMEP §1207.01(b).

Furthermore, in assessing the similarity of the marks, there is no correct pronunciation of a mark because it is impossible to predict how the public will pronounce a particular mark. See *Embarcadero*

Techs., Inc. v. RStudio, Inc., 105 USPQ2d 1825, 1835 (TTAB 2013) (quoting *In re Viterra Inc.*, 671 F.3d 1358, 1367, 101 USPQ2d 1905, 1912 (Fed. Cir. 2012); *In re The Belgrade Shoe Co.*, 411 F.2d 1352, 1353, 162 USPQ 227, 227 (C.C.P.A. 1969)); TMEP §1207.01(b)(iv). Thus, slight differences in the sound of similar marks will not avoid a likelihood of confusion. *In re Energy Telecomm. & Elec. Ass'n*, 222 USPQ 350, 351 (TTAB 1983); see *In re Viterra Inc.*, 671 F.3d 1358, 1367, 101 USPQ2d 1905, 1912 (Fed. Cir. 2012).

In this case, Appellant's proposed mark is for the wording "EASY ACCESS" and Registrant's mark is a truncated version, "EZACCESS." However, Appellant contends that the marks are not similar and are not likely to be confused. In particular, Appellant asserts that the marks are distinguishable based upon their visual differences, sound distinctions, and differing connotations/commercial impressions. However, these claims fail.

Again, in considering the commercial impressions, the test is not whether the marks can be distinguished in a side-by-side comparison, but rather whether the overall commercial impressions are sufficiently similar so that source confusion is likely to result. *Midwestern Pet Foods, Inc. v. Societe des Produits Nestle S.A.*, 685 F.3d 1046, 1053, 103 USPQ2d 1435, 1440 (Fed. Cir. 2012); *In re Davia*, 110 USPQ2d 1810, 1813 (TTAB 2014); TMEP §1207.01(b). In this case, source confusion is highly likely because of the marks identical pronunciation or sound, identical meanings, and similar appearances and commercial impressions. Moreover, the marks have similar visual appearances. Average consumers encountering the marks that retain general impressions of trademarks, are likely to be confused as to the source of the Appellant's and Registrant's goods.

Here, the marks are similar because of their similar and shared elements. Where the registered mark includes the element “E Z,” the proposed mark includes “EASY.” These elements are similar because they have identical pronunciations. The examining attorney request that the Board take judicial notice of the dictionary pronunciation of the term “Easy.” Please take judicial notice of the pronunciation of “easy” from the American Heritage Dictionary at

<https://www.ahdictionary.com/word/search.html?q=easy>.¹ Accordingly, as pronounced, these elements are identical, namely, “E Z.”

In addition, here the “EASY” and “EZ” elements are combined with the identical term ACCESS.

Accordingly, as combined here, the marks sound similar in that they have identical pronunciations.

Moreover, the proposed and registered marks have identical meanings because Appellant’s “EZ” component is a recognized abbreviation for “easy.” The examining attorney request that the Board take judicial notice of the attached dictionary evidence establishing that “EZ” means “EASY.” As such,

¹ The Trademark Trial and Appeal Board may take judicial notice of dictionary definitions that (1) are available in a printed format, (2) are the electronic equivalent of a print reference work, or (3) have regular fixed editions. TBMP §1208.04; *see In re Driven Innovations, Inc.*, 115 USPQ2d 1261, 1266 n.18 (TTAB 2015) (taking judicial notice of definition from *Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary* at www.merriam-webster.com); *In re Petroglyph Games Inc.*, 91 USPQ2d 1332, 1334 n.1 (TTAB 2009) (taking judicial notice of definition from Dictionary.com because it was from *The Random House Unabridged Dictionary*); *In re Red Bull GmbH*, 78 USPQ2d 1375, 1378 (TTAB 2006) (taking judicial notice of definition from *Encarta Dictionary* because it was readily available in specifically denoted editions via the Internet and CD-ROM); TMEP §710.01(c); *see also* Fed. R. Evid. 201; 37 C.F.R. §2.122(a).

although the visual presentations are slightly different, the sound and meanings remain identical as EZACCESS is equivalent to EASY ACCESS.

In addition, comparing the visual appearances, the noted slight differences do not sufficiently distinguish the commercial impressions so that the marks differ. Even though the marks have differing renditions of the term “easy,” they still appear similar as both marks begin with the letter E and are combined with the term ACCESS. Moreover, given the identical pronunciation and meaning of the “EZ” and “EASY” elements, both marks still visually convey “easy” combined with “access” and are very similar. Furthermore, the Board has previously affirmed refusal where the terms “EZ” and “EASY” were combined with identical elements as here.

This case, like the case *In re Team Worldwide Corp.*, Serial No. 76430485 (March 15, 2007), has been properly refused.

As in *In re Team Worldwide*, where the Board affirmed the refusal to register under Section 2(d), Appellant’s proposed mark and Registrant’s mark have similar overall commercial impressions. There, the Board affirmed the refusal to register under Trademark Action Section 2(d), finding the terms EZ and EASY to be “very similar” in overall appearance, identical in sound and conveying of the same meaning when combined with identical elements “EASYBED” as was the case with the registrant’s mark in that case, and “EZ BED” as was the case with the proposed mark.

Here, neither mark includes any other word element or additional design feature to distinguish their commercial impressions from the plain meaning of the wording. Thus, the combinations EASY ACCESS/EZACCESS, contrary to Appellant's claims, are highly similar if not identical.

Furthermore, given that the marks in question could clearly be pronounced the same; such similarity alone is sufficient to support a finding that the marks are confusingly similar. *In re White Swan Ltd.*, 8 USPQ2d 1534, 1535 (TTAB 1988); see *In re 1st USA Realty Prof'ls, Inc.*, 84 USPQ2d 1581, 1586 (TTAB 2007); TMEP §1207.01(b)(iv).

Additionally, consumer confusion has been held likely for marks that do not physically sound or look alike but convey the same idea, stimulate the same mental reaction, or may have the same overall meaning. *Proctor & Gamble Co. v. Conway*, 419 F.2d 1332, 1336, 164 USPQ 301, 304 (C.C.P.A. 1970) (holding MISTER STAIN likely to be confused with MR. CLEAN on competing cleaning products); see *In re M. Serman & Co.*, 223 USPQ 52, 53 (TTAB 1984) (holding CITY WOMAN for ladies' blouses likely to be confused with CITY GIRL for a variety of female clothing); *H. Sichel Sohne, GmbH v. John Gross & Co.*, 204 USPQ 257, 260-61 (TTAB 1979) (holding BLUE NUN for wines likely to be confused with BLUE CHAPEL for the same goods); *Ralston Purina Co. v. Old Ranchers Canning Co.*, 199 USPQ 125, 128 (TTAB 1978) (holding TUNA O' THE FARM for canned chicken likely to be confused with CHICKEN OF THE SEA for canned tuna); *Downtowner Corp. v. Uptowner Inns, Inc.*, 178 USPQ 105, 109 (TTAB 1973) (holding UPTOWNER for motor inn and restaurant services likely to be confused with DOWNTOWNER for the same services); TMEP §1207.01(b). As Appellant's and Registrant's marks are similar in appearance and convey the same idea and have identical meaning, the marks are sufficiently similar and Appellant's claims that the marks are not similar are not persuasive.

The Goods are Closely Related

With respect to the goods, when the goods are compared, the goods of the parties need not be identical or even competitive to find a likelihood of confusion. See *On-line Careline Inc. v. Am. Online Inc.*, 229 F.3d 1080, 1086, 56 USPQ2d 1471, 1475 (Fed. Cir. 2000); *Recot, Inc. v. Becton*, 214 F.3d 1322, 1329, 54 USPQ2d 1894, 1898 (Fed. Cir. 2000) (“[E]ven if the goods in question are different from, and thus not related to, one another in kind, the same goods can be related in the mind of the consuming public as to the origin of the goods.”); TMEP §1207.01(a)(i).

The respective goods need only be “related in some manner and/or if the circumstances surrounding their marketing [be] such that they could give rise to the mistaken belief that [the goods and/or services] emanate from the same source.” *Coach Servs., Inc. v. Triumph Learning LLC*, 668 F.3d 1356, 1369, 101 USPQ2d 1713, 1722 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (quoting *7-Eleven Inc. v. Wechsler*, 83 USPQ2d 1715, 1724 (TTAB 2007)); TMEP §1207.01(a)(i). Generally however, the greater degree of similarity between the applied-for mark and the registered mark, the lesser the degree of similarity between the goods of the respective parties that is required to support a finding of likelihood of confusion. *In re Davey Prods. Pty Ltd.*, 92 USPQ2d 1198, 1202 (TTAB 2009); *In re Thor Tech, Inc.*, 90 USPQ2d 1634, 1636 (TTAB 2009). Thus here, given the highly similar nature of the marks, if not identical, the degree of similarity between the goods of the respective parties need not be great. *Id.*

It is noted that when assessing the relatedness of the goods, the question of likelihood of confusion is determined based on the description of the goods stated in the application and registration at issue, not on extrinsic evidence of actual use. See *Stone Lion Capital Partners, LP v. Lion Capital LLP*, 746 F.3d

1317, 1323, 110 USPQ2d 1157, 1162 (Fed. Cir. 2014) (quoting *Octocom Sys. Inc. v. Hous. Computers Servs. Inc.*, 918 F.2d 937, 942, 16 USPQ2d 1783, 1787 (Fed. Cir. 1990)). Absent restrictions in an application and/or registration, the identified goods are “presumed to travel in the same channels of trade to the same class of purchasers.” *In re Viterra Inc.*, 671 F.3d 1358, 1362, 101 USPQ2d 1905, 1908 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (quoting *Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Packard Press, Inc.*, 281 F.3d 1261, 1268, 62 USPQ2d 1001, 1005 (Fed. Cir. 2002)). Additionally, unrestricted and broad identifications are presumed to encompass all goods of the type described. *See In re Jump Designs, LLC*, 80 USPQ2d 1370, 1374 (TTAB 2006) (citing *In re Elbaum*, 211 USPQ 639, 640 (TTAB 1981)); *In re Linkvest S.A.*, 24 USPQ2d 1716, 1716 (TTAB 1992).

In this case, neither identification set forth in the application nor registration include any restrictions as to nature, type, channels of trade, or classes of purchasers. Therefore, it is presumed that these goods travel in all normal channels of trade, and are available to the same class of purchasers.

Again, as specified in the registration, Registrant’s services are described as follows: computer software, namely, computer software for user authentication, authorization and login to protected website accounts and secure computer network resources. Appellant specifies the following description in its application: computer system with computer hardware and computer software applications that interfaces with wireless mobile devices and business authentication systems to provide two-factor authentication of remote users to Internet Servers. Registrant’s broad wording is presumed to encompass all goods of the type described, including those in Appellant’s more narrow identification. Thus here, the services are sufficiently related.

In its claims that the goods are not sufficiently related, Appellant improperly imposes use, user and trade channel restrictions and limitations not contained in the application or registration. To that end, the Appellant has improperly submitted new evidence with its appeal brief. Specifically, Exhibit B – Introduction to Computers Hardware and Software.

The record in an application should be complete prior to the filing of an appeal. 37 C.F.R. §2.142(d); TBMP §§1203.02(e), 1207.01; TMEP §710.01(c). Because Appellant's new evidence was untimely submitted during appeal, the trademark examining attorney objects to this evidence and requests that the Board disregard it. See *In re Fiat Grp. Mktg. & Corp. Commc'ns S.p.A*, 109 USPQ2d 1593, 1596 (TTAB 2014); *In re Pedersen*, 109 USPQ2d 1185, 1188 (TTAB 2013); TBMP §§1203.02(e), 1207.01; TMEP §710.01(c).

Registrant's software includes computer software for user authentication and authorization to secure computer network resources. The registration contains no limitation as to the user of these goods or trade channels and broadly characterizes the use to include secure computer network resources.

Although Appellant's goods includes hardware where the Registrant's goods do not, Appellant also specifies software applications that interface with wireless mobile devices and business authentication systems to provide two-factor authentication of remote users to Internet Servers. The Appellant now attempts to narrowly define its authentication software but the provided limitations are neither supported by evidence nor so specified with restrictive language in the identification of goods.

In support of its position that the goods are unrelated, Appellant relies upon the cases *In re Octocom Systemes, Inc. v. Houston Computers Services, Inc.*, 918 F.2d 937, 16 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1783 (Fed.Cir. 1990) and *Information Resources Inc. v. X*Press Information Services*, 6 U.S.P.Q. 2d 1034 (TTAB 1988). As asserted by Appellant, these cases establish that it is not enough that both Registrant and Appellant both provide computer goods to find the goods sufficiently related. However here, the goods are more than simply computer goods. As described in their respective identifications, the goods are both authenticating software. Hence here, the goods are sufficiently related.

Trade Channels Are Similar

Appellant also asserts that consumers of its goods are sophisticated clients and that its goods are purchased with care, deliberation, and thought. However, the record is devoid of evidence that would establish that Appellant's consumers are sophisticated or that its goods require careful deliberation or thought with respect to use, selection, or purchase. There is no evidence that the goods are expensive or specialized. As noted supra, the goods are simply described as computer systems with computer hardware and computer software applications, that interfaces with wireless mobile devices and business authentication systems to provide two-factor authentication of remote users to Internet Services. Hence here, it appears that the goods are available to any wireless mobile device user. As such, contrary to Appellant's claims, its consumers do not appear to be sophisticated or different from Registrant's.

Moreover, comparing the goods as described in the application and registrations, because neither the application nor registration include restrictions, the identified goods are "presumed to travel in the

same channels of trade to the same class of purchasers.” *In re Viterra Inc.*, 671 F.3d 1358, 1362, 101 USPQ2d 1905, 1908 (Fed. Cir. 2012) (quoting *Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Packard Press, Inc.*, 281 F.3d 1261, 1268, 62 USPQ2d 1001, 1005 (Fed. Cir. 2002)).

Accordingly, registration has been properly refused.

CONCLUSION

In this case, refusal of the proposed mark not only prevents buyer confusion as to the source of Appellant’s and Registrant’s goods, but also protects Registrant from adverse commercial impact due to use of a similar mark by a newcomer. *See In re Shell Oil Co.*, 992 F.2d 1204, 1208, 26 USPQ2d 1687, 1690 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Moreover, resolving all doubts in favor of the prior registrant, registration has been properly refused. TMEP §1207.01(d)(i); *see Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Packard Press, Inc.*, 281 F.3d 1261, 1265, 62 USPQ2d 1001, 1003 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *In re Hyper Shoppes (Ohio), Inc.*, 837 F.2d 463, 464-65, 6 USPQ2d 1025, 1026 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Accordingly, the examining attorney respectfully requests that the Board affirm the refusal to register the proposed mark under Section 2(d) of the Trademark Act. Trademark Act Section 2(d), 15 U.S.C. §1052(d); *see* TMEP §§1207.01 *et seq.*

Respectfully submitted,

/IngridCEulin/

Ingrid C. Eulin

Examining Attorney

Law Office 111

(571) 272-9380

Ingrid.Eulin@uspto.gov

Robert L. Lorenzo

Managing Attorney

Law Office 111

(SAUC) **EYP** - El Yopal (Colombia) (Airport symbol) (OAG)
EYP - El Yopal (Puerto Rico) (Seismograph station code, US Geological Survey) (Cland) (SEIS)
EYP - European Youth Parliament (GTF)
EYP - East York, MI (Location identified) (FAA) (FAAL)
EYP - Swamp Tech, Galson, LA (Manufacturer code for watercraft hull identification number) (USCG)
EYPC - Eyepiece (MSA)
EYPLD - CMOS PLDs Programmed with EyPROM (Electrically Erasable Programmable Read-Only Memory) Switching Arrays (SAUS)
EyPROM - electrically erasable programmable read-only memory (SAUS)
EyPROM - Electrically Erasable PROM (Programmable Read-Only Memory) (SAUS)
EYPSF - Energy Power Systems Ltd. (OTCBB symbol)
EYO - Detroit Cooperative Cataloging Center, Detroit, MI (OCLC symbol) (OCLC)
EYO - Eagle 2 Boats Inc., Riverview, FL (Manufacturer code for watercraft hull identification number) (USCG)
EYO - Element Youth Quarters (GTF)
EYR - East Yorkshire Regiment (Military unit) (Brit)
EYR - Enhance Your Romance (GTF)
EYR - Eyewest (New Zealand) (Geomagnetic observatory code)
EYR - Fantasy Island Boats Inc., Pittsburgh, PA (Manufacturer code for watercraft hull identification number) (USCG)
EYR - Oakland University, Rochester, MI (OCLC symbol) (OCLC)
Eyre - Eyre's English King's Bench Reports Terms Writen In (A publication) (DLA)
Eyre MS - Eyre's Manuscript Notes of Cases, published in (DLA)
EYRE - Elevated Yet Remote, Inhabitation Eagles (A neologism acronym category of buildings)
EyROM - electrically erasable read-only memory (SAUS)
EYRY - Eagle Young's Restroom Yesterday (A neologism acronym category of places)
EYS - Board of Education for the Borough of East York (UTLAS symbol)
EYS - Early Years of Schooling (GTF)
EYS - Ecumenical Youth Services (SAUC)
EYS - Edmonds Yacht Sales, Edmonds, WA (Manufacturer code for watercraft hull identification number) (USCG)
EYS - European Youth Centre (SAUC)
EYS - Experimental Yacht Society (Defunct) (EA)
EYS - Extended Year Services
EYS - St. Clair County Library System, Port Huron, MI (OCLC symbol) (OCLC)
EYS - World Council of Churches Ecumenical Youth Service (EA)
EYT - Detroit Institute of Arts, Research Library, Detroit, MI (OCLC symbol) (OCLC)
EYT - Enjoy Yourself Tonight (GTF)
EYT - Ernst & Young Technologies (GTF)

EYW - Everything You Want (GTF)
EYW - Key West (Florida) (Airport symbol) (OAG)
EYW - Key West, FL (Location identified) (FAA) (FAAL)
EYW - Wayne State University, Detroit, MI (OCLC symbol) (OCLC)
EYWA - Eastern Yellow Wagtail (Common English name) (Scientific name: *Motacilla Trichurachensis*) (American Ornithologists Union four-character bird identification) (IBP)
EYX - Industrial Farm Tank Inc., Leavittown, OH (Manufacturer code for watercraft hull identification number) (USCG)
EYY - Embassy Yachts Ltd., Staten Island, NY (Manufacturer code for watercraft hull identification number) (USCG)
EYY - Mercy College of Detroit, Detroit, MI (OCLC symbol) (OCLC)
EYZ - European Yacht Sales, Marco Island, FL (Manufacturer code for watercraft hull identification number) (USCG)
EYZ - Madonna College, Livonia, MI (OCLC symbol) (OCLC)
EZ - Czech Republic (NCIC country-territory code) (NCIC)
EZ - Eastern Zone
EZ - Easy (Slang)
EZ - Easy Listening (Radio) (NTCM)
EZ - Ecosystem Zone (SAUS)
EZ - Eczema (Medicine) (EDAA)
EZ - Eczema (Medicine)
EZ - Ereignis Zeitlinge (Monocyclic Time) (Psychology)
EZ - Eriofolius (Exposure) (GGC)
EZ - Electrical Zero
EZ - Emile Zola (SAUS)
EZ - Engagement Zone (Army) (ADDF)
EZ - Enterprise Zone (British)
EZ - Enzymology (Medicine) (EDAA)
EZ - Equal Zero (MDC)
EZ - Ergogenic Zone (MELI)
EZ - Ersatzzeiten (Spare time)
EZ - Excessive Zeros (SAUS)
EZ - Exclusion Zone (SAUS)
EZ - Extraction Zone (Military) (AFM)
EZ - Ezekiel (Old Testament book)
EZ - Ezra (Old Testament book)
EZ - Sun-Air of Scandinavia (ICAO designator) (AD)
EZ - Turkmenistan (Civil aircraft markings - international) (IPPC)
EZA - Alma College, Alma, MI (OCLC symbol) (OCLC)
EZA - Mailplan Services Inc., Milford, DE (Manufacturer code for watercraft hull identification number) (USCG)
EZA - Newark, NJ (Location identified) (FAA) (FAAL)
EZAACMO - Eastern Zone Army Air Corps Mail Operations (SAUC)
EZAC - EZA Manufacturing Company (NCIC trailer make code)
EZACC - Easy Access

Ref.
PE
1693
G35
2013

GALE
CENGAGE Learning

Acronyms, Initialisms & Abbreviations
Dictionary, 47th Edition, Volume 1

Project Editor: Kristin Mallegg
Editorial Support Services: Scott Flaugher
Composition and Electronic Prepress: Gary
Oudersluys
Manufacturing: Rita Wimberley
Product Management: Michele P. LaMeau

© 2013 Gale, Cengage Learning

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. No part of this work covered by the copyright herein may be reproduced, transmitted, stored, or used in any form or by any means graphic, electronic, or mechanical, including but not limited to photocopying, recording, scanning, digitizing, taping, Web distribution, information networks, or information storage and retrieval systems, except as permitted under Section 107 or 108 of the 1976 United States Copyright Act, without the prior written permission of the publisher.

This publication is a creative work fully protected by all applicable copyright laws, as well as by misappropriation, trade secret, unfair competition, and other applicable laws. The authors and editors of this work have added value to the underlying factual material herein through one or more of the following: unique and original selection, coordination, expression, arrangement, and classification of the information.

For product information and technology assistance, contact us at
Gale Customer Support, 1-800-877-4253.
For permission to use material from this text or product,
submit all requests online at www.cengage.com/permissions.
Further permissions questions can be emailed to
permissionrequest@cengage.com

While every effort has been made to ensure the reliability of the information presented in this publication, Gale, a part of Cengage Learning, does not guarantee the accuracy of the data contained herein. Gale accepts no payment for listing; and inclusion in the publication of any organization, agency, institution, publication, service, or individual does not imply endorsement of the editors or publisher. Errors brought to the attention of the publisher and verified to the satisfaction of the publisher will be corrected in future editions.

EDITORIAL DATA PRIVACY POLICY. Does this publication contain information about you as an individual? If so, for more information about our editorial data privacy policies, please see our Privacy Statement at www.gale.com.

Gale
27500 Drake Rd.
Farmington Hills, MI, 48331-3535

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOG CARD NUMBER 81-643188

ISBN-13: 978-1-4144-8862-2 (Vol. 1 Complete)
ISBN-10: 1-4144-8862-9 (Vol. 1 Complete)
ISBN-13: 978-1-4144-8863-9 (Part 1: A-C only)
ISBN-10: 1-4144-8863-7 (Part 1: A-C only)
ISBN-13: 978-1-4144-8864-6 (Part 2: D-I only)
ISBN-10: 1-4144-8864-5 (Part 2: D-I only)
ISBN-13: 978-1-4144-8865-3 (Part 3: J-P only)
ISBN-10: 1-4144-8865-3 (Part 3: J-P only)
ISBN-13: 978-1-4144-8866-0 (Part 4: Q-Z only)
ISBN-10: 1-4144-8866-1 (Part 4: Q-Z only)

ISSN 0270-4404

This title is also available as an e-book.

ISBN-13: 978-1-4144-8792-2
ISBN-10: 1-4144-8792-4

Contact your Gale sales representative for ordering information.

Printed in the United States of America
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 17 16 15 14 13

TRADEMARK LAW LIBRARY

Abbreviations Dictionary

Tenth Edition

Dean Stahl
Karen Kerchelich

Originated by Ralph De Sola

★ Abbreviations ★ Acronyms ★ Airlines and Airports ★ Appellations
★ Astronomical Terminology ★ Baffle-gab Divulged (euphemisms
explained) ★ Birthstones ★ Chemical Elements ★ Citizen's-Band Call
Signs ★ Computer Terms ★ Contractions ★ Corrections Facilities
★ Criminalistic Terms ★ Currencies ★ Diacritical Marks ★ Dysphemistic
Place Names ★ Earthquake Data ★ Eponyms ★ Genealogical Terms
★ Geographical Equivalents ★ Government Agencies ★ Greek
Alphabet ★ Historical, Musical, and Mythological Data ★ International
Conversions ★ International Vehicle License Letters ★ Inventions and
Inventors ★ Medical Terms ★ Military Terms ★ National Parks
★ Nations and Capitals ★ Nicknames ★ Numbered Abbreviations
★ Numeration ★ Phobias ★ Ports of the World ★ Principles and Laws
★ Railroads ★ Roman Numerals ★ Russian Alphabet ★ Short Forms
★ Signs & Symbols ★ Slang ★ Steamship Lines ★ Superlatives ★ U.S.
Presidents & Vice Presidents ★ Weather Symbols (Beaufort Scale)
★ Wedding Anniversaries ★ Winds and Rains ★ Zip Coding ★ Zodiac



CRC Press

Boca Raton London New York Washington, D.C.

Rec
PE
1693
.D4
2001

ABBREVIATIONS
SYMBOLS

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Stahl, Dean
Abbreviations dictionary / Dean Stahl, Karen Kercheli; originated by Ralph De Sola. -- 10th ed.
p. cm.
Rev. ed. of: Abbreviations dictionary / Ralph De Sola, 9th ed. 1995.
ISBN 0-8493-9003-6 (alk. paper)
1. Abbreviations, English. 2. Signs and symbols--Dictionaries. 3. Acronyms. I. Kercheli, Karen. II. De Sola, Ralph, 1908- Abbreviations dictionary. III. Title.

PE1693 .D4 2000
423'.1--dc21

00-058549
CIP

This book contains information obtained from authentic and highly regarded sources. Reprinted material is quoted with permission, and sources are indicated. A wide variety of references are listed. Reasonable efforts have been made to publish reliable data and information, but the author and the publisher cannot assume responsibility for the validity of all materials or for the consequences of their use.

Neither this book nor any part may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, microfilming, and recording, or by any information storage or retrieval system, without prior permission in writing from the publisher.

The consent of CRC Press LLC does not extend to copying for general distribution, for promotion, for creating new works, or for resale. Specific permission must be obtained in writing from CRC Press LLC for such copying.

Direct all inquiries to CRC Press LLC, 2000 N.W. Corporate Blvd., Boca Raton, Florida 33431.

Trademark Notice: Product or corporate names may be trademarks or registered trademarks, and are used only for identification and explanation, without intent to infringe.

Visit the CRC Press Web site at www.crcpress.com

© 2001 by CRC Press LLC

No claim to original U.S. Government works
International Standard Book Number 0-8493-9003-6
Library of Congress Card Number 00-058549
Printed in the United States of America 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0
Printed on acid-free paper

This is the short and the
—Sf

ISSN 0270-4404

TRADEMARK LAW LIBRARY

Acronyms, Initialisms & Abbreviations Dictionary

*A Guide to Acronyms, Abbreviations,
Contractions, Alphabetic Symbols, and Similar Condensed Appellations*

Covering: Aerospace, Associations, Banking, Biochemistry, Business, Data Processing, Domestic and International Affairs, Economics, Education, Electronics, Energy, Genetics, Government, Information Technology, Internet, Investment, Labor, Language, Law, Medicine, Military Affairs, Pharmacy, Physiology, Politics, Publishing, Religion, Science, Societies, Sports, Technical Drawings and Specifications, Telecommunications, Trade, Transportation, and Other Fields

47th Edition

Volume 1

Part 2

D-I

Kristin Mallegg
Project Editor

 GALE
CENGAGE Learning

Detroit • New York • San Francisco • New Haven, Conn. • Waterville, Maine • London