

## Request for Reconsideration after Final Action

**The table below presents the data as entered.**

| Input Field   | Entered   |
|---|---|
| <b>SERIAL NUMBER</b>  | 86347651  |
| <b>LAW OFFICE ASSIGNED</b>  | LAW OFFICE 106  |
| <b>MARK SECTION</b>   |   |
| <b>MARK</b>   | <a href="http://tmng-al.uspto.gov/resting2/api/img/86347651/large">http://tmng-al.uspto.gov/resting2/api/img/86347651/large</a> |
| <b>LITERAL ELEMENT</b>  | ALII  |
| <b>STANDARD CHARACTERS</b>  | YES   |
| <b>USPTO-GENERATED IMAGE</b>  | YES   |
| <b>MARK STATEMENT</b>   | The mark consists of standard characters, without claim to any particular font style, size or color.                            |
| <b>ARGUMENT(S)</b>  |   |
| <p><b>REMARKS</b> The Trademark Office refuses registration of the Applicant's mark ALII for "athletic apparel, namely, shirts, pants, jackets, headwear, hats and caps, undergarments, athletic uniforms and specifically excluding footwear" stating that it is likely to cause confusion with U.S. Registration No. 4,163,947 for ALI?I COLLECTION for "footwear." The Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses the refusal. The proposed mark is ALII. In contrast, the cited mark is ALI?I COLLECTION. These marks are not highly similar, and the meanings imparted by each mark differentiate these marks upon sight. The Applicant contends that the proposed mark and the pending mark vastly differ in sight, sound and meaning. With respect to sound, "[s]imilarity in sound is one factor in determining whether the marks are confusingly similar." See <i>In re E. I. du Pont de Nemours &amp; Co.</i>, 476 F.2d 1357, 1361, 177 USPQ 563, 567 (C.C.P.A. 1973); <i>In re White Swan, Ltd.</i>, 8 USPQ2d 1534, 1535 (TTAB 1988). TTAB 1207.01(b)(iv). In the present case, the Applicant's proposed mark is ALII, one word and one syllable while the Registrant's mark is ALI?I COLLECTION, two words and four syllables. Thus, visually, and auditorily, these marks present different commercial impressions. Further, "[s]imilarity in meaning or connotation is another factor in determining whether the marks are confusingly similar." See <i>In re E. I. du Pont de Nemours &amp; Co.</i>, 476 F.2d 1357, 1361, 177 USPQ 563, 567 (C.C.P.A. 1973); <i>In re Cynosure, Inc.</i>, 90 USPQ2d 1644, 1645-46 (TTAB 2009). TMEP 1207.01(b)(v). In analyzing meaning or connotation, "[t]he meaning or connotation of a mark must be determined in relation to the named goods or services." TMEP 1207.01(b)(v). In the present case, the Registrant's mark is ALI?I COLLECTION. In this instance, the "ALI?I" is also known to mean "royal" and thus the meaning essentially becomes "royal collection." While the Applicant's mark ALII could be interpreted as "royal" or as the term "Al two." Here, the word "ALII" and "ALI?I" conveys potentially the same</p> |   |

meaning or a different meaning altogether. When coupled with the fact that the Applicant's goods specifically disclaim footwear, these vastly different meanings differentiate and distinguish these marks such that no likelihood of confusion would be created by the existence of both marks in the marketplace. Indeed, as stated above, the Applicant's mark, ALII, at most, suggests that the product, e.g., is of fine quality, is excellent, for example, for a particular purpose. Thus, it is likely that the mark will be perceived by consumers as either an entirely arbitrary designation, or arguably, as being suggestive of the type of product, especially if the consumer is not aware of Hawaiian culture and terminology. Accordingly, the proposed mark creates a sufficiently different commercial impression when applied to the goods such that no likelihood of confusion would result. (Even marks that are identical in sound and/or appearance may create sufficiently different commercial impressions when applied to the respective parties' goods or services so that there is no likelihood of confusion. See, e.g., *In re Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 2 USPQ2d 1312, 1314 (TTAB 1987) (holding CROSS-OVER for bras and CROSSOVER for ladies' sportswear not likely to cause confusion, noting that the term "CROSS-OVER" was suggestive of the construction of applicant's bras, whereas "CROSSOVER," as applied to registrant's goods, was "likely to be perceived by purchasers either as an entirely arbitrary designation, or as being suggestive of sportswear which "crosses over" the line between informal and more formal wear . . . or the line between two seasons?); *In re British Bulldog, Ltd.*, 224 USPQ 854, 856 (TTAB 1984) (holding PLAYERS for men's underwear and PLAYERS for shoes not likely to cause confusion, agreeing with applicant's argument that the term "PLAYERS" implies a fit, style, color, and durability suitable for outdoor activities when applied to shoes, but "implies something else, primarily indoors in nature" when applied to men's underwear); *In re Sydel Lingerie Co.*, 197 USPQ 629, 630 (TTAB 1977) (holding BOTTOMS UP for ladies' and children's underwear and BOTTOMS UP for men's clothing not likely to cause confusion, noting that the wording connotes the drinking phrase "Drink Up" when applied to men's clothing, but does not have this connotation when applied to ladies' and children's underwear).) If CROSS-OVER for bras and CROSSOVER for ladies' sportswear, PLAYERS for shoes and PLAYERS for men's underwear, and BOTTOMS UP for ladies' and children's underwear and BOTTOMS UP for men's clothing, could each be found to not create a likelihood of confusion, despite the exact same mark in each instance (except for the hyphen in CROSS-OVER) and highly related goods, then ALII for "athletic apparel, namely, shirts, pants, jackets, headwear, hats and caps, undergarments, athletic uniforms and specifically excluding footwear," and ALI/I COLLECTION for "footwear" are similarly not likely to cause confusion. In the present case, the proposed mark and the cited mark are not identical, and do not connote similar meanings or commercial impressions. As set forth in the TMEP, "[t]he issue is not whether the respective marks themselves, or the goods or services offered under the marks, are likely to be confused but, rather, whether there is a likelihood of confusion as to the source or sponsorship of the goods or services because of the marks used thereon." See, e.g., *Paula Payne Prods. Co. v. Johnson's Publ'g Co.*, 473 F.2d 901, 902, 177 USPQ 76, 77 (C.C.P.A. 1973) ("[T]he question is not whether people will confuse the marks, but rather whether the marks will confuse people into believing that the goods they identify emanate from the same source."); *In re Shell Oil Co.*, 992 F.2d 1204, 1207, 26 USPQ2d 1687, 1689 (Fed. Cir. 1993) ("The degree of "relatedness" must be viewed in the context of all the factors in determining whether the services are sufficiently related that a reasonable consumer would be confused as to source or sponsorship."); *In re Binion*, 93 USPQ2d 1531, 1534, 1535 (TTAB 2009). TMEP 1207.01. In the present matter, the totality of the circumstances dictates that no likelihood of confusion will result from the concurrent use and registration of the proposed mark. The goods identified in Registrant's registration are directed to footwear, which require the consumer to associate the product with products that go on one's feet. In contrast, Applicant's goods are directed to a very specific aspect of the marketplace, namely, those interested in athletic apparel. These consumers are typically seeking stylistic fashions for use in the consumer's athletic activities. These two categories do not automatically lend themselves to a cross-over of consumers in the marketplace. Due to the differences in the products, it is

unlikely that anyone who encounters different products will likely confuse Applicant's mark, or believe that the products associated with each mark emanates from a common source. Even in the event of some minimal overlap, consumers in each marketplace are sophisticated and would not be confused by the coexistence of the Applicant's mark. In light of the above, the Applicant respectfully contends that there is no likelihood of confusion between the proposed mark and the cited registration. The Trademark Office states on page 3 of the Final Rejection that Applicant's previously submitted arguments are "without merit." This claim is without merit. The presumption under Trademark Act Section 7(b), 15 U.S.C. §1057(b), is that the registrant is the owner of the mark and that use of the mark extends to all goods and/or services identified in the registration. The presumption also implies that the registrant operates in all normal channels of trade and reaches all classes of purchasers of the identified goods and/or services. In re Melville Corp., 18 USPQ2d 1386, 1389 (TTAB 1991); McDonald's Corp. v. McKinley, 13 USPQ2d 1895, 1899 (TTAB 1989); RE/MAX of Am., Inc. v. Realty Mart, Inc., 207 USPQ 960, 964-65 (TTAB 1980); see TMEP §1207.01(a)(iii). Yet there is a specific disclaimer in the Applicant's goods for "footwear" and no mention of "apparel" in the Registrant's goods description. The Trademark Office has a presumption that the mark extends to "all claimed goods," but there is no mention of shared goods in the Applicant's and Registrant's marks. As for the Trademark Office's statement that "attached stories from the Internet "athletic apparel" and "footwear" are considered as part of the same industry and are at the very least inter-related articles of clothing that are sold in the same market place" is flawed. The Registrant's mark ALI'I COLLECTION is associated with premium men's footwear "celebrating the Ancient Hawaiian Royals." Exhibit A (<http://www.supthemag.com/news/industry-news-olukai-introduces-the-exclusive-alii-collection/>). Furthermore, the Registrant's product announcement states: "OluKai's most exclusive product release to date, the Ali'I Collection, is a pedestal line of ultra-premium, limited-edition, limited-distribution footwear for men (only 300 pairs per 6 skus will be made and sold)." (Emphasis added). Also, the Registrant's goods are not for athletic footwear, but for "footwear for the environment in mind." See Exhibit B (<http://www.werd.com/14700/olukai-alii-collection/>). Thus, it is highly unlikely that ultra-premium "footwear" for environmentally conscious showing dress shoes, sandals and moccasins are likely to be associated with athletic apparel because the channels of trade are vastly different. For these reasons, Applicant believes its mark ALII should be allowed.

## EVIDENCE SECTION

| EVIDENCE FILE NAME(S)             |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| ORIGINAL PDF FILE                 | <a href="#">evi_10415144249-20151130223822420006_2015-11-30_Exhibit_A_-_Ali_i_Collection.pdf</a> |
| CONVERTED PDF FILE(S)<br>(1 page) | <a href="#">\\TICRS\EXPORT16\IMAGEOUT16\863\476\86347651\xml8\RFR0002.JPG</a>                    |
| ORIGINAL PDF FILE                 | <a href="#">evi_10415144249-20151130223822420006_2015-11-30_Exhibit_B_-_Ali_i_Collection.pdf</a> |
| CONVERTED PDF FILE(S)<br>(1 page) | <a href="#">\\TICRS\EXPORT16\IMAGEOUT16\863\476\86347651\xml8\RFR0003.JPG</a>                    |
| DESCRIPTION OF EVIDENCE FILE      | Print screens from websites showing the Registrant's mark as used.                               |

## SIGNATURE SECTION

|                    |               |
|--------------------|---------------|
| RESPONSE SIGNATURE | /Robert Hart/ |
|--------------------|---------------|

|                                       |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| <b>SIGNATORY'S NAME</b>               | Robert Hart  |
| <b>SIGNATORY'S POSITION</b>           | Attorney of Record   |
| <b>SIGNATORY'S PHONE NUMBER</b>       | (312) 834-7701   |
| <b>DATE SIGNED</b>                    | 11/30/2015   |
| <b>AUTHORIZED SIGNATORY</b>           | YES  |
| <b>CONCURRENT APPEAL NOTICE FILED</b> | NO   |
| <b>FILING INFORMATION SECTION</b>     |  |
| <b>SUBMIT DATE</b>                    | Mon Nov 30 22:42:42 EST 2015   |
| <b>TEAS STAMP</b>                     | USPTO/RFR-XXX.XX.XXX.XXX-<br>20151130224242049871-8634<br>7651-54053d525b1e49ddb71b<br>20023825c26e692eaf11512c3<br>d71ad76c1533f69e8f8-N/A-N<br>/A-20151130223822420006 |

## **Request for Reconsideration after Final Action To the Commissioner for Trademarks:**

Application serial no. **86347651** ALII(Standard Characters, see <http://tmng-al.uspto.gov/resting2/api/img/86347651/large>) has been amended as follows:

### **ARGUMENT(S)**

**In response to the substantive refusal(s), please note the following:**

REMARKS The Trademark Office refuses registration of the Applicant's mark ALII for "athletic apparel, namely, shirts, pants, jackets, headwear, hats and caps, undergarments, athletic uniforms and specifically excluding footwear" stating that it is likely to cause confusion with U.S. Registration No. 4,163,947 for ALI?I COLLECTION for "footwear." The Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses the refusal. The proposed mark is ALII. In contrast, the cited mark is ALI?I COLLECTION. These marks are not highly similar, and the meanings imparted by each mark differentiate these marks upon sight. The Applicant contends that the proposed mark and the pending mark vastly differ in sight, sound and meaning. With respect to sound, "[s]imilarity in sound is one factor in determining whether the marks are confusingly similar." See *In re E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 476 F.2d 1357, 1361, 177 USPQ 563, 567 (C.C.P.A. 1973); *In re White Swan, Ltd.*, 8 USPQ2d 1534, 1535 (TTAB 1988). TTAB 1207.01(b)(iv). In the present

case, the Applicant's proposed mark is ALII, one word and one syllable while the Registrant's mark is ALI'I COLLECTION, two words and four syllables. Thus, visually, and auditorily, these marks present different commercial impressions. Further, "[s]imilarity in meaning or connotation is another factor in determining whether the marks are confusingly similar." See *In re E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 476 F.2d 1357, 1361, 177 USPQ 563, 567 (C.C.P.A. 1973); *In re Cynosure, Inc.*, 90 USPQ2d 1644, 1645-46 (TTAB 2009). TMEP 1207.01(b)(v). In analyzing meaning or connotation, "[t]he meaning or connotation of a mark must be determined in relation to the named goods or services." TMEP 1207.01(b)(v). In the present case, the Registrant's mark is ALI'I COLLECTION. In this instance, the "ALI'I" is also known to mean "royal" and thus the meaning essentially becomes "royal collection." While the Applicant's mark ALII could be interpreted as "royal" or as the term "Al two." Here, the word "ALII" and "ALI'I" conveys potentially the same meaning or a different meaning altogether. When coupled with the fact that the Applicant's goods specifically disclaim footwear, these vastly different meanings differentiate and distinguish these marks such that no likelihood of confusion would be created by the existence of both marks in the marketplace. Indeed, as stated above, the Applicant's mark, ALII, at most, suggests that the product, e.g., is of fine quality, is excellent, for example, for a particular purpose. Thus, it is likely that the mark will be perceived by consumers as either an entirely arbitrary designation, or arguably, as being suggestive of the type of product, especially if the consumer is not aware of Hawaiian culture and terminology. Accordingly, the proposed mark creates a sufficiently different commercial impression when applied to the goods such that no likelihood of confusion would result. (Even marks that are identical in sound and/or appearance may create sufficiently different commercial impressions when applied to the respective parties' goods or services so that there is no likelihood of confusion. See, e.g., *In re Sears, Roebuck & Co.*, 2 USPQ2d 1312, 1314 (TTAB 1987) (holding CROSS-OVER for bras and CROSSOVER for ladies' sportswear not likely to cause confusion, noting that the term "CROSS-OVER" was suggestive of the construction of applicant's bras, whereas "CROSSOVER," as applied to registrant's goods, was "likely to be perceived by purchasers either as an entirely arbitrary designation, or as being suggestive of sportswear which 'crosses over' the line between informal and more formal wear . . . or the line between two seasons?"); *In re British Bulldog, Ltd.*, 224 USPQ 854, 856 (TTAB 1984) (holding PLAYERS for men's underwear and PLAYERS for shoes not likely to cause confusion, agreeing with applicant's argument that the term "PLAYERS" implies a fit, style, color, and durability suitable for outdoor activities when applied to shoes, but "implies something else, primarily indoors in nature" when applied to men's underwear); *In re Sydel Lingerie Co.*, 197 USPQ 629, 630 (TTAB 1977) (holding BOTTOMS UP for ladies' and children's underwear and BOTTOMS UP for men's clothing not likely to cause confusion, noting that the wording connotes the drinking phrase "Drink Up" when applied to men's clothing, but does not have this connotation when applied to ladies' and children's underwear).) If CROSS-OVER for bras and CROSSOVER for ladies' sportswear, PLAYERS for shoes and PLAYERS for men's underwear, and BOTTOMS UP for ladies' and children's underwear and BOTTOMS UP for men's clothing, could each be found to not create a likelihood of confusion, despite the exact same mark in each instance (except for the hyphen in CROSS-OVER) and highly related goods, then ALII for "athletic apparel, namely, shirts, pants, jackets, headwear, hats and caps, undergarments, athletic uniforms and specifically excluding footwear," and ALI'I COLLECTION for "footwear" are similarly not likely to cause confusion. In the present case, the proposed mark and the cited mark are not identical, and do not connote similar meanings or commercial impressions. As set forth in the TMEP, "[t]he issue is not whether the respective marks themselves, or the goods or services offered under the marks, are likely to be confused but, rather, whether there is a likelihood of confusion as to the source or sponsorship of the goods or services because of the marks used thereon." See, e.g., *Paula Payne Prods. Co. v. Johnson's Publ'g Co.*, 473 F.2d 901, 902, 177 USPQ 76, 77 (C.C.P.A. 1973) ("[T]he question is not whether people will confuse the marks, but rather whether the marks will confuse people into believing that the goods they identify emanate from the same source."); *In re Shell Oil Co.*, 992 F.2d 1204, 1207, 26 USPQ2d 1687, 1689 (Fed. Cir. 1993) ("The degree of 'relatedness' must be viewed in the context of all the factors in

determining whether the services are sufficiently related that a reasonable consumer would be confused as to source or sponsorship.); In re Binion, 93 USPQ2d 1531, 1534, 1535 (TTAB 2009). TMEP 1207.01. In the present matter, the totality of the circumstances dictates that no likelihood of confusion will result from the concurrent use and registration of the proposed mark. The goods identified in Registrant's registration are directed to footwear, which require the consumer to associate the product with products that go one one's feet. In contrast, Applicant's goods are directed to a very specific aspect of the marketplace, namely, those interested athletic apparel. These consumers are typically seeking stylistic fashions for use in the consumer's athletic activities. These two categories of do not automatically lend itself to a cross-over of consumers in the marketplace. Due to the differences in the products, it is unlikely that anyone who encounters different products will likely confuse Applicant's mark, or believe that the products associated with each mark emanates from a common source. Even in the event of some minimal overlap, consumers in each marketplace are sophisticated and would not be confused by the coexistence of the Applicant's mark. In light of the above, the Applicant respectfully contends that there is no likelihood of confusion between the proposed mark and the cited registration. The Trademark Office states on page 3 of the Final Rejection that Applicant's previously submitted arguments are "without merit." This claim is without merit. The presumption under Trademark Act Section 7(b), 15 U.S.C. ?1057(b), is that the registrant is the owner of the mark and that use of the mark extends to all goods and/or services identified in the registration. The presumption also implies that the registrant operates in all normal channels of trade and reaches all classes of purchasers of the identified goods and/or services. In re Melville Corp., 18 USPQ2d 1386, 1389 (TTAB 1991); McDonald's Corp. v. McKinley , 13 USPQ2d 1895, 1899 (TTAB 1989); RE/MAX of Am., Inc. v. Realty Mart, Inc., 207 USPQ 960, 964-65 (TTAB 1980); see TMEP ?1207.01(a)(iii). Yet there is a specific disclaimer in the Applicant's goods for "footwear" and no mention of "apparel" in the Registrant's goods description. The Trademark Office has a presumption that the mark extends to "all claimed goods," but there is no mention of shared goods in the Applicant's and Registrant's marks. As for the Trademark Office's statement that "attached stories from the Internet "athletic apparel" and "footwear" are considered as part of the same industry and are at the very least inter-related articles of clothing that are sold in the same market place" is flawed. The Registrant's mark ALI?I COLLECTION is associated with premium men's footwear ?? celebrating the Ancient Hawaiian Royals.? Exhibit A (<http://www.supthemag.com/news/industry-news-olukai-introduces-the-exclusive-alii-collection/>). Furthermore, the Registrant's product announcement states: "OluKai's most exclusive product release to date, the Ali?I Collection, is a pedestal line of ultra-premium, limited-edition, limited-distribution footwear for men (only 300 pairs per 6 skus will be made and sold).? (Emphasis added). Also, the Registrant's goods are not for athletic footwear, but for "footwear for the environment in mind.? See Exhibit B (<http://www.werd.com/14700/olukai-alii-collection/>). Thus, it is highly unlikely that ultra-premium "footwear" for environmentally conscious showing dress shoes, sandals and moccasins are likely to be associated with athletic apparel because the channels of trade are vastly different. For these reasons, Applicant believes its mark ALII should be allowed.

## **EVIDENCE**

Evidence in the nature of Print screens from websites showing the Registrant's mark as used. has been attached.

### **Original PDF file:**

[evi\\_10415144249-20151130223822420006\\_ . 2015-11-30 Exhibit A - Ali i Collection.pdf](#)

**Converted PDF file(s)** ( 1 page)

[Evidence-1](#)

### **Original PDF file:**

[evi\\_10415144249-20151130223822420006\\_ . 2015-11-30 Exhibit B - Ali i Collection.pdf](#)

**Converted PDF file(s)** ( 1 page)

[Evidence-1](#)

**SIGNATURE(S)**

**Request for Reconsideration Signature**

Signature: /Robert Hart/ Date: 11/30/2015

Signatory's Name: Robert Hart

Signatory's Position: Attorney of Record

Signatory's Phone Number: (312) 834-7701

The signatory has confirmed that he/she is an attorney who is a member in good standing of the bar of the highest court of a U.S. state, which includes the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and other federal territories and possessions; and he/she is currently the owner's/holder's attorney or an associate thereof; and to the best of his/her knowledge, if prior to his/her appointment another U.S. attorney or a Canadian attorney/agent not currently associated with his/her company/firm previously represented the owner/holder in this matter: (1) the owner/holder has filed or is concurrently filing a signed revocation of or substitute power of attorney with the USPTO; (2) the USPTO has granted the request of the prior representative to withdraw; (3) the owner/holder has filed a power of attorney appointing him/her in this matter; or (4) the owner's/holder's appointed U.S. attorney or Canadian attorney/agent has filed a power of attorney appointing him/her as an associate attorney in this matter.

The applicant is not filing a Notice of Appeal in conjunction with this Request for Reconsideration.

Serial Number: 86347651

Internet Transmission Date: Mon Nov 30 22:42:42 EST 2015

TEAS Stamp: USPTO/RFR-XXX.XX.XXX.XXX-201511302242420

49871-86347651-54053d525b1e49ddb71b20023

825c26e692eaf11512c3d71ad76c1533f69e8f8-

N/A-N/A-20151130223822420006

NEWS

SEARCH

INDUSTRY NEWS: OLUKAI INTRODUCES THE EXCLUSIVE ALI'I COLLECTION

By: Joe Carberry / Posted on Thursday, March 15, 2012

Like 1 Tweet G+1 0 Pin It Share 3

Introducing the Ali'i Collection: A Collection of Premium Men's Footwear Celebrating the Ancient Hawaiian Royals

OluKai's most exclusive product release to date, the Ali'i Collection, is a pedestal line of ultra-premium, limited-edition, limited-distribution footwear for men (only 300 pairs per 6 skus will be made and sold).

We've spent years researching and designing this special collection which marks a pinnacle in OluKai's commitment to quality and style. This collection, with its material references to the royal ahu'ula capes, its highest quality camel leathers, and meticulous hand stitching, has been created as an offering to the ancient Polynesian royals who held together a flourishing culture. Each pair is etched with the traditional Hawaiian phrase of community strength: Pupukahi i holomua. Unite in order to progress.

[Show as slideshow]



We are also offering a Collector's Box Set that includes all three limited addition styles packages in a custom wooded shoe box along with a personalized letter from designer Bill Worthington. For every Box Set purchased, we will plant an endemic Koa tree in Maui's Honokowai Valley in honor of our ongoing partnership with Maui Cultural lands. Only 50 Box Sets were made, so they will be very rare.



FOLLOW US [Facebook] [Twitter] [Pinterest] [Instagram] [Email] [RSS]



INDUSTRY NEWS

- Industry News | Werner Paddles Introduces Rip Stick 11.13.2015
Industry News | Werner Paddles Introduces Rip Stick by Werner Paddles One design won't get it done when it
Industry News | Defining The Sea Eagle NeedleNose Inflatable 11.13.2015
Defining The Sea Eagle Needle Nose Inflatable The patented NeedleNose Inflatable Standup Paddleboard.
Event Coverage | 14-Year-Old Crowned Canadian SUP Surf Champ 11.12.2015
14-year-old Jeffrey Spencer was crowned the Canadian SUP champion of the 2nd Annual Tofino Paddle Surf
More >>

#SUPTHEMAG ON INSTAGRAM





## OluKai Ali'i Collection

OluKai's authentic Hawaiian footwear is all made with the environment in mind. Their new, limited edition Ali'i Collection is a tribute to traditional Hawaiian royalty using premium materials like leather and suede from earth-friendly tanneries as well as red velvet trims and coconut closures. A portion of proceeds from the collection will benefit the brand's 'Ohana Giveback Program and for each pair sold a Koa tree will be planted in Maui's Honokowai Valley.

[Tweet](#)

[Pin it](#) 21

[Share](#) 12