

From: Keeley, Alison

Sent: 10/19/2015 10:45:55 AM

To: TTAB E Filing

CC:

Subject: U.S. TRADEMARK APPLICATION NO. 86350120 - VULCAN - 706584.803 - Request for Reconsideration Denied - Return to TTAB - Message 1 of 3

Attachment Information:

Count: 81

Files: 74215806P001OF002.JPG, 74215806P002OF002.JPG, 74283895P001OF003.JPG, 74283895P002OF003.JPG, 74283895P003OF003.JPG, 75124702P001OF003.JPG, 75124702P002OF003.JPG, 75124702P003OF003.JPG, 76665415P001OF003.JPG, 76665415P002OF003.JPG, 76665415P003OF003.JPG, 77429055P001OF004.JPG, 77429055P002OF004.JPG, 77429055P003OF004.JPG, 77429055P004OF004.JPG, 77713938P001OF003.JPG, 77713938P002OF003.JPG, 77713938P003OF003.JPG, 77760866P001OF003.JPG, 77760866P002OF003.JPG, 77760866P003OF003.JPG, 78182173P001OF002.JPG, 78182173P002OF002.JPG, 85097222P001OF003.JPG, 85097222P002OF003.JPG, 85097222P003OF003.JPG, 85363711P001OF003.JPG, 85363711P002OF003.JPG, 85363711P003OF003.JPG, 85383889P001OF003.JPG, 85383889P002OF003.JPG, 85383889P003OF003.JPG, 85497263P001OF002.JPG, 85497263P002OF002.JPG, 85590155P001OF003.JPG, 85590155P002OF003.JPG, 85590155P003OF003.JPG, 85876719P001OF003.JPG, 85876719P002OF003.JPG, 85876719P003OF003.JPG, 86026011P001OF003.JPG, 86026011P002OF003.JPG, 86026011P003OF003.JPG, 86245008P001OF003.JPG, 86245008P002OF003.JPG, 86245008P003OF003.JPG, 77334167P001OF003.JPG, 77334167P002OF003.JPG,

77334167P003OF003.JPG, 77334473P001OF003.JPG, 77334473P002OF003.JPG,
77334473P003OF003.JPG, 78872986P001OF003.JPG, 78872986P002OF003.JPG,
78872986P003OF003.JPG, 85163520P001OF002.JPG, 85163520P002OF002.JPG,
85285175P001OF003.JPG, 85285175P002OF003.JPG, 85285175P003OF003.JPG,
85564733P001OF003.JPG, 85564733P002OF003.JPG, 85564733P003OF003.JPG,
85874577P001OF003.JPG, 85874577P002OF003.JPG, 85874577P003OF003.JPG,
85874621P001OF003.JPG, 85874621P002OF003.JPG, 85874621P003OF003.JPG,
86177755P001OF003.JPG, 86177755P002OF003.JPG, 86177755P003OF003.JPG, 10-19-2015 10-29-35
AM.jpg, 10-19-2015 10-30-07 AM.jpg, 10-19-2015 10-30-11 AM.jpg, 10-19-2015 10-30-15 AM.jpg, 10-19-
2015 10-30-19 AM.jpg, 10-19-2015 10-30-31 AM.jpg, 10-19-2015 10-30-36 AM.jpg, 10-19-2015 10-31-01
AM.jpg, 86350120.doc

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (USPTO)
OFFICE ACTION (OFFICIAL LETTER) ABOUT APPLICANT'S TRADEMARK APPLICATION**

U.S. APPLICATION SERIAL NO. 86350120

MARK: VULCAN



CORRESPONDENT ADDRESS:

ARKADIA DELAY OLSON

HUSCH BLACKWELL LLP

190 CARONDELET PLZ STE 600

SAINT LOUIS, MO 63105-3433

GENERAL TRADEMARK INFORMATION:

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

[VIEW YOUR APPLICATION FILE](#)

APPLICANT: SAS Safety Corporation

CORRESPONDENT'S REFERENCE/DOCKET NO:

706584.803

CORRESPONDENT E-MAIL ADDRESS:

pto-sl@huschblackwell.com

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION DENIED

ISSUE/MAILING DATE: 10/19/2015

The trademark examining attorney has carefully reviewed applicant's request for reconsideration and is denying the request for the reasons stated below. *See* 37 C.F.R. §2.63(b)(3); TMEP §§715.03(a)(ii)(B), 715.04(a).

In the previous Office Action, dated March 27, 2015, the examining attorney:

- Made Final the Section 2(d) Refusal due to a Likelihood of Confusion with the mark in U.S. Registration Nos. 1390642, 2657580 and 4064128

In the Response, dated September 28, 2015, the applicant:

- Provided arguments and evidence against the Section 2(d) Refusal; and
- Amended the Identification of Goods.

The examining attorney has reviewed the Request for Reconsideration and has determined the following:

The following refusal made final in the Office action dated March 27, 2015 is maintained and continues to be final:

- Section 2(d) Refusal – Likelihood of Confusion with respect to U.S. Registration Nos. 2657580 and 4064128

See TMEP §§715.03(a)(ii)(B), 715.04(a).

The following refusal made final in the Office action is withdrawn:

- Section 2(d) Refusal – Likelihood of Confusion with respect to U.S. Registration No. 1390642.

See TMEP §§715.03(a)(ii)(B), 715.04(a).

In the present case, applicant's request has not resolved the outstanding issue, nor does it raise a new issue or provide any new or compelling evidence with regard to the outstanding issue in the final Office action. In addition, applicant's analysis and arguments are not persuasive nor do they shed new light on the issues. Accordingly, the request is denied.

The specific reasons for this denial are set forth below.

SECTION 2(d) REFUSAL – LIKELIHOOD OF CONFUSION

For the reasons set forth below, the Section 2(d) Refusal with respect to U.S. Registration Nos. 2657580 and 4064128 is ***maintained and continues to be FINAL***.

Applicant's mark, as amended, is VULCAN (design plus words) for "Safety eyewear excluding heat resistant eyewear and eyewear for riding and motorcyclists" in Class 9.

The registered marks are:

- U.S. Registration No. 2657580 VULCAN for "face and head protection equipment, namely, hard hats, bump caps, and combined headgear and eye-protective visors for workplace use" in Class 9.
- U.S. Registration No. 4064128 VULCAN HELMETS for "Helmets for motorcyclists; Motorcycle helmets; Protective helmets; Riding helmets; full face, half face, open face and motocross helmets" in Class 9.

Similarity of the Marks

The applicant has argued that the marks are dissimilar.

First, applicant argues that the key design in its mark creates a significance that distinguishes it from the other marks. This is not persuasive.

Specifically, both of the registered marks here are in typed or standard characters. A mark in typed or standard characters may be displayed in any lettering style; the rights reside in the wording or other literal element and not in any particular display or rendition. *See In re Viterra Inc.*, 671 F.3d 1358, 1363, 101 USPQ2d 1905, 1909 (Fed. Cir. 2012); *In re Mighty Leaf Tea*, 601 F.3d 1342, 1348, 94 USPQ2d 1257, 1260 (Fed. Cir. 2010); 37 C.F.R. §2.52(a); TMEP §1207.01(c)(iii). Thus, a mark presented in stylized characters and/or with a design element generally will not avoid likelihood of confusion with a mark in typed or standard characters because the marks could be presented in the same manner of display. *See, e.g., In re Viterra Inc.*, 671 F.3d at 1363, 101 USPQ2d at 1909; *Squirtco v. Tomy Corp.*, 697 F.2d 1038, 1041, 216 USPQ 937, 939 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (stating that "the argument concerning a difference in type style is not viable where one party asserts rights in no particular display").

Moreover, as previously stated, the design here merely underlines the word VULCAN, and does not alter the meaning or commercial impression of this wording. The design is so incorporated into the wording that consumers would not perceive this design as creating a separate commercial impression.

Therefore, this argument is not persuasive.

Applicant also argues that the word HELMETS in U.S. Registration No. 4064128 alters the appearance and meaning of the marks. However, as stated in the previous Office Action HELMETS is generic for this registrant's goods, which include "motorcycle helmets" and "protective helmets". Although marks are compared in their entireties, one feature of a mark may be more significant or dominant in creating a commercial impression. See *In re Viterro Inc.*, 671 F.3d 1358, 1362, 101 USPQ2d 1905, 1908 (Fed. Cir. 2012); *In re Nat'l Data Corp.*, 753 F.2d 1056, 1058, 224 USPQ 749, 751 (Fed. Cir. 1985); TMEP §1207.01(b)(viii), (c)(ii). Disclaimed matter that is descriptive of or generic for a party's goods is typically less significant or less dominant when comparing marks. See *In re Dixie Rests., Inc.*, 105 F.3d 1405, 1407, 41 USPQ2d 1531, 1533-34 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *In re Nat'l Data Corp.*, 753 F.2d at 1060, 224 USPQ at 752; TMEP §1207.01(b)(viii), (c)(ii).

Therefore, comparing the marks as a whole, because HELMETS is generic for this registrant's goods, consumers are likely to perceive this wording as merely indicating the type of goods, and not distinguishing the type, brand, or source of the goods. Therefore, this argument is not persuasive.

Therefore, when comparing the marks in their entireties, applicant's mark is confusingly similar to both of the registered marks.

Similarity of the Goods

In the Request for Reconsideration, applicant amended the Identification of Goods to "Safety eyewear excluding heat resistant eyewear and eyewear for riding and motorcyclists" in Class 9.

U.S. Registration No. 2657580

This amendment does not limit or exclude any of the goods in U.S. Registration No. 2657580, which are "face and head protection equipment, namely, hard hats, bump caps, and combined headgear and eye-protective visors for workplace use" in Class 9. Therefore, for the reasons stated in the March 27, 2015 Office Action, these goods are related.

Furthermore, the examining attorney has attached additional evidence showing that hard hats, pump caps, and headgear with eye protective visors commonly originate from the same sources. See

<http://www.elvex.com/safety-glasses-start.htm>; <http://www.elvex.com/SC-50.htm>;
<http://www.elvex.com/face-protection-start.htm> (company making safety glasses, hard hats, and face protection visors); <http://www.radians.com/radsite/index.php/industrial/dewalt/safety-glasses>;
<http://www.radians.com/radsite/index.php/industrial/dewalt/hard-hats>; (company producing a variety of safety eyewear and hard hats);
<http://www.ergodyne.com/products/pages/default.aspx?PCA=216&ShowPro=1>;
<http://www.ergodyne.com/products/pages/default.aspx?PCA=202&PRD=616> (company producing bump caps and safety eyewear under the same mark);
<http://us.pipglobal.com/en/products/?sclD=2562&cclD=11554&chID=ind>;
<http://us.pipglobal.com/en/products/?sclD=2569&cclD=11575>;
<http://us.pipglobal.com/en/products/?sclD=2569&cclD=11575&slD=27941&sslD=79138> (selling eyewear and hardhats, including safety eyewear adapted for use with hardhats);
<http://www.cordovaisc.com/product-category/eye-protection/safety-glasses/>;
<http://www.cordovaisc.com/product-category/head-protection/bump-caps/> (company providing bump caps and safety glasses); The examining attorney also notes that applicant itself offers both hard hats and safety eyewear. See <http://www.sassafety.com/head-face/>; <http://www.sassafety.com/eyewear/> (applicant's website offering both hard hats and safety eyewear). Therefore, as these goods commonly originate from the same sources, these goods are related.

Finally, the trademark examining attorney has attached evidence from the USPTO's X-Search database consisting of a number of third-party marks registered for use in connection with the same or similar goods as those of both applicant and registrant in this case. See attached U.S. Registration Nos. 1844150, 1883341, 2461927, 2841763, 3559363, 3718040, 3740618, 4030799, 4108382, 4186246, 4305508, 4481237, 4614550, 4630020, 4664115, and 4742029. This evidence shows that the goods listed therein, namely, safety eyewear and hard hats and bump caps, are of a kind that may emanate from a single source under a single mark. See *In re Anderson*, 101 USPQ2d 1912, 1919 (TTAB 2012); *In re Albert Trostel & Sons Co.*, 29 USPQ2d 1783, 1785-86 (TTAB 1993); *In re Mucky Duck Mustard Co.*, 6 USPQ2d 1467, 1470 n.6 (TTAB 1988); TMEP §1207.01(d)(iii).

Therefore, because the goods are similar in nature and commonly originate from the same sources, the applicant's goods and the goods in U.S. Registration No. 2657580 are related.

U.S. Registration No. 4064128

The goods in U.S. Registration No. 4064128 are "Helmets for motorcyclists; Motorcycle helmets; Protective helmets; Riding helmets; full face, half face, open face and motocross helmets" in Class 9.

While applicant has specifically excluded motorcycle helmets and riding helmets, this registration includes the broad wording “protective helmets” in Class 9.

With respect to applicant’s and registrant’s, 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 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, the identification set forth in the application and registration has no 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. Here, while applicant has restricted its goods to exclude riding, motorcycle, and heat resistant eyewear, applicant has not otherwise limited the field or use of the goods. Similarly the registration’s “protective helmets” contains no such restriction.

Furthermore, safety eyewear and protective helmets are commonly sold together in a wide range of industries, for instance, in skiing and lacrosse. *See* <http://www.bolle.com/products/search?attributes=58>; <http://www.bolle.com/products/osmoz/soft-black-and-green-emerald-green-lens> (making ski helmets and safety eyewear for skiing); <http://www.anooptics.com/search?query=goggles>; <http://www.anooptics.com/helmets/youth> (making goggles and protective helmets); http://www.giro.com/us_en/snow/mens/snow-helmets.html; http://www.giro.com/us_en/snow/womens/goggles.html (producing snow helmets and goggles); <http://brine.com/womens-lacrosse/products/goggles/>; <http://brine.com/mens-lacrosse/products/helmets/>; <http://brine.com/product/dynasty-3/>; <http://brine.com/product/str/> (producing lacrosse helmets and lacrosse goggles); <http://www.cascadelacrosse.com/The-R;>

<http://www.cascadelacrosse.com/PolyArc> (producing lacrosse helmets and lacrosse goggles).

Therefore, applicant's amendment to the identification does not overcome the similarity of the goods.

Additionally, the trademark examining attorney has attached evidence from the USPTO's X-Search database consisting of a number of third-party marks registered for use in connection with the same or similar goods as those of both applicant and registrant in this case. See attached U.S. Registration Nos. 3209128, 3595956, 3699575, 3718040, 4206627, 4339223, 4418485, 4418486, 4664796, and 4682383. This evidence shows that the goods listed therein, namely, safety eyewear and protective helmets generally, are of a kind that may emanate from a single source under a single mark. See *In re Anderson*, 101 USPQ2d 1912, 1919 (TTAB 2012); *In re Albert Trostel & Sons Co.*, 29 USPQ2d 1783, 1785-86 (TTAB 1993); *In re Mucky Duck Mustard Co.*, 6 USPQ2d 1467, 1470 n.6 (TTAB 1988); TMEP §1207.01(d)(iii).

Therefore, as applicant's and registrant's goods are broadly defined and encompass goods in the same fields, and these kinds of goods commonly originate from the same sources, these goods are related.

Applicant's Arguments

Applicant argues that the coexistence of the two cited registrations establishes that the mark is diluted. Applicant also attaches additional registrations for VULCAN for power tools, gloves, drilling tools, flashlights, and machine parts. This argument is not persuasive.

Applicant has submitted printouts of third-party registrations for marks containing the wording VULCAN to support the argument that this wording is weak, diluted, or so widely used that it should not be afforded a broad scope of protection. The weakness or dilution of a particular mark is generally determined in the context of the number and nature of similar marks *in use in the marketplace* in connection with *similar* goods. See *Nat'l Cable Television Ass'n, Inc. v. Am. Cinema Editors, Inc.*, 937 F.2d 1572, 1579-80, 19 USPQ2d 1424, 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1991); *In re E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.*, 476 F.2d 1357, 1361, 177 USPQ 563, 567 (C.C.P.A. 1973).

Evidence of weakness or dilution consisting solely of third-party registrations, such as those submitted by applicant in this case, is generally entitled to little weight in determining the strength of a mark, because such registrations do not establish that the registered marks identified therein are in *actual use* in the marketplace or that consumers are accustomed to seeing them. See *AMF Inc. v. Am. Leisure*

Prods., Inc., 474 F.2d 1403, 1406, 177 USPQ 268, 269 (C.C.P.A. 1973); *In re Davey Prods. Pty Ltd.*, 92 USPQ2d 1198, 1204 (TTAB 2009); *In re Thor Tech, Inc.*, 90 USPQ2d 1634, 1639 (TTAB 2009); *Richardson-Vicks Inc. v. Franklin Mint Corp.*, 216 USPQ 989, 992 (TTAB 1982). Furthermore, the goods listed in the third-party registrations submitted by applicant are different from those at issue and thus do not show that the relevant wording is commonly used in connection with the goods at issue. Specifically, applicant's argument that safety eyewear and protective headgear are as closely related as these protective goods and machine parts is not persuasive.

Applicant argues that machine parts and safety equipment travel through the same channels of trade and so there are a wide range of goods. However, applicant does not show that these goods actually originate from the same sources, and so does not establish that these goods are as closely related. Moreover, these goods are not also for the same purposes, for safety protection. Therefore, this argument is not persuasive.

Applicant further argues that the evidence shows that a wide variety of construction related goods travel through the same channels of trade and gives three examples of channels of trade evidence. However, this does not show that these goods are as closely related as the applicant's safety eyewear and the protective helmets, which also originate from the same sources. Therefore, this argument is not persuasive.

Moreover, the fact that the two cited registrations coexist also does not demonstrate that the marks are diluted in actual use. First, prior decisions and actions of other trademark examining attorneys in registering other marks have little evidentiary value and are not binding upon the USPTO or the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board. TMEP §1207.01(d)(vi); see *In re Midwest Gaming & Entm't LLC*, 106 USPQ2d 1163, 1165 n.3 (TTAB 2013) (citing *In re Nett Designs, Inc.*, 236 F.3d 1339, 1342, 57 USPQ2d 1564, 1566 (Fed. Cir. 2001)). Each case is decided on its own facts, and each mark stands on its own merits. See *AMF Inc. v. Am. Leisure Prods., Inc.*, 474 F.2d 1403, 1406, 177 USPQ 268, 269 (C.C.P.A. 1973); *In re Binion*, 93 USPQ2d 1531, 1536 (TTAB 2009). Therefore, the existence of these two coexisting registrations is not persuasive.

Second, the examining attorney notes that, while applicant has specifically excluded motorcycle and heat-resistant eyewear, applicant has not otherwise limited the field or type of use of the safety eyewear. Therefore, applicant's more broadly-defined eyewear encompasses several fields of use, and so may be confused with both workplace safety goods, such as those in U.S. Registration No. 2657580, and the broadly-defined "protective helmets" in U.S. Registration No. 4064128. The coexistence of

these two registrations does not demonstrate that the goods are in actual use in the same kind of marketplace. Therefore, this argument is not persuasive.

Therefore, as applicant's mark and the registered marks are confusingly similar, the applicant's goods and registrants' respective goods are related, and applicant's arguments are not persuasive, the Section 2(d) Likelihood of Confusion Refusal is ***maintained and continues to be FINAL***.

RESPONSE GUIDELINES

If applicant has already filed a timely notice of appeal with the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board, the Board will be notified to resume the appeal. See TMEP §715.04(a).

/Alison R. Keeley/

Examining Attorney

Law Office 113

(571) 272-4514

Alison.Keeley@uspto.gov



Safety Glasses, Safety Eyewear, Eye Protection

This is an introductory page for safety glasses with links to 25 product pages for safety glasses, safety eyewear and safety goggles. You will be able to learn more about specific safety glasses and goggles by clicking on the pictures or descriptions below. Enjoy your tour!

Picture	Description Pricing is referencing clear lens model.	Suggested List price
	Flex-Pro™ has it All! Aggressive Style, Light Weight Comfort & Ballistic Protection. Read more...	\$7.95
	VISUALLY improving the safety of glasses! Be seen at night or in low light conditions with patented Reflect Specs™ Read more...	\$5.25
	Introducing the New generation Sphere-X Ultimate with ventilated lens and V0 Ballistic Rating! Read more...	\$5.50
	Read more... Dual temple system, ballistic rated, anti-fog coated GG-45, Go-Specs II.	\$11.95
	Now we fit more workers! Avion™ SF (slim fit) has a slimmer design to fit and protect more facial profiles. Read more...	\$5.50
	Check out our special selection of safety glasses for slimmer facial profiles that are specially designed to fit and look great! Read more...	NA
	Brow Specs™ are equipped with a Cushioned Brow guard keeps debris out and has standard anti fog lens! Check it out...	\$9.15

<http://www.elvex.com/safety-glasses-start.htm>



Tectra™ Safety Helmet

Product of the year award from OHS!

Elvex proudly introduces a stunning new safety cap design. Safety caps have not changed much in 50 years -- until now.



A quick summary of design elements and features:

<http://www.elvex.com/SC-50.htm>

A quick summary of design elements and features:

- Striking contemporary design
- A lightweight Polypropylene shell
- Four head hugging suspensions
- Vented and non vented versions
- Non conductive and general duty models
- Suspension langers hidden in the design
- Rain trough for water disbursement
- Contour at ears to accommodate hearing protection
- Design for accessories: 30 mm accessory slot
- Complies with ANSI Z89.1-2009



Pictures above show the Tectra safety helmet equipped with Elvex cap mount earmuffs (HM-2529-4ef) picture and HM-6629-right picture) Visor Bracket (VB-30) and steel mesh visor (SV-70) and spherical Lexan visor (FS-12L).



Product of the Year!

Suspensions

The most important aspect of a safety helmet suspension is that it holds the helmet securely on the head. The head hugging suspensions of the Tectra helmet have a low center of gravity than what is offered on other safety helmets. This feature results in a very secure feeling of a helmet that stays on the head. Four different suspensions are offered: four and six point ratchet suspensions and four and six point pin-lock.

The most important aspect of a safety helmet suspension is that it holds the helmet securely on the head. The head hugging suspensions of the *Tecrua* helmet have a low centre of gravity than what is offered on other safety helmets. This feature results in a very secure feeling of a helmet that stays on the head. Four different suspensions are offered: four and six point ratchet suspensions and four and six point pin-lock suspensions. All suspensions have three height adjustments.



6 and 4 point ratchet suspensions



6 and 4 point pin-lock suspensions

Vented and non vented

The *Tecrua* helmet is available in vented and non vented versions. The vented version has eight ventilation holes at the crown of the helmet. On the non vented version the ventilation holes are permanently closed, and look like cosmetic decorations. Ventilated helmets cannot meet Class E (electrical) requirement of ANSI Z89.1-2009.

Types and Classes

Tecrua is a Type I helmet, meaning that it is designed to provide protection from impacts to the top of the head. There are three classes of helmets: Class E (electrical) is rated 20,000 Volts, Class G (general) is tested to 2,200 Volts, and Class C (conductive) are not intended to provide protection against electrical hazards.

Standards Compliance

The *Tecrua* helmet complies with ANSI Z89.1-2009 requirements for a Type I helmet. The non vented version complies with Class E, G and C, and the vented version complies with Class C. Certification to CE EN 397 is pending.

Designed for accessories

The *Tecrua* helmet is designed to work with accessories and comes with standard 30 mm slots. It works with Evex hearing protection and face protection, as well as with many competitive hearing protectors. Use any of our four cap mount muff models, with suffix 29 or 30, such as HM-6039 or HM-6030. Use visor bracket model VB-10, in combination with any of 20 different face shields and wire mesh visors.

Available colors

Tecrua helmet is available in the following colors: white, yellow, orange, red, blue and silver graphite. Vented version will initially be available only in white and orange color.



Product Name	Product Number	Product Description	Suggested List Price
Tectura Non Vented	SC-50-4P	Tectura™ Safety Cap, Non-vented, w/ Four Point Pinlock Fabric Suspension, Class E, G and C	\$9.50
Tectura Non Vented	SC-50-6P	Tectura™ Safety Cap, Non-vented, w/ Six Point Pinlock Fabric Suspension, Class E, G and C	\$10.35
Tectura Non Vented	SC-50-4R	Tectura™ Safety Cap, Non-vented, w/ Four Point Ratchet Fabric Suspension, Class E, G and C	\$13.25
Tectura Non Vented	SC-50-6R	Tectura™ Safety Cap, Non-vented, w/ Six Point Ratchet Fabric Suspension, Class E, G and C	\$14.00

[Buy Now](#)

Product Name	Product Number	Product Description	Suggested List Price
Tectura Vented	SC-50V-4P	Tectura™ Safety Cap, Vented, w/ Four Point Pinlock Fabric Suspension, Class C	\$9.90
Tectura Vented	SC-50V-6P	Tectura™ Safety Cap, Vented, w/ Six Point Pinlock Fabric Suspension, Class C	\$10.75
Tectura Vented	SC-50V-4R	Tectura™ Safety Cap, Vented, w/ Four Point Ratchet Fabric Suspension, Class C	\$13.65
Tectura Vented	SC-50V-6R	Tectura™ Safety Cap, Vented, w/ Six Point Ratchet Fabric Suspension, Class C	\$14.40
Tectura Chin Safety Strap	SCNS-30	Tectura™ Safety Cap Chin Strap	\$1.20

Non Vented Colors: Orange, White, Red, Yellow, Blue & Graphite Silver Metallic.
Vented Colors: Orange, White.

[Buy Now](#)

[User instructions and video showing how to adjust the height of the suspension, or crown strap.](#)

[Links](#) | [Safety Caps, Hard Hats](#) | [Hard Hat Warnings](#) | [Cap Mount Muffs](#) | [Cap Mount Face Shields](#) | [OSHA's Head Protection Regulation](#) | [Hard Hat Test Requirements to ANSI Z89.1-2009](#)

[Direct links to main product pages:](#) [Safety Glasses](#) | [Bifocal Safety Glasses](#) | [Safety Goggles](#) | [Laser Glasses](#)



Face Protection, Face Shields, Start Page

This is an introductory page for face shields and face protection products with links to several specialized product pages. You will be able to learn more about specific face shield applications, such as impact, chemical splash and radiation clicking on the pictures or descriptions below. Enjoy your tour!

	<p>This page shows different carriers for face shields, such as Headgear and Visor Brackets for safety helmets. Page also shows a listing of materials and measurements of Elvex full line of face shields.</p> <p>More information!</p>
	<p>This page shows Elvex full line of face shields in pictures. It is sometimes easier to find what you need by looking at this presentation.</p> <p>More information!</p>
	<p>This page shows Elvex arc shields and Visor Bracket, and provides guidance to electric arc protection requirements.</p> <p>More information!</p>
	<p>Our new line, Flash Pro™ Electric ARC Hood systems are designed to maximize worker safety and protect them from thermal energy releases of 40 cal/cm² and lower.</p> <p>More information!</p>
<p>Face Shield Performance Requirements according to ANSI Z87.1-2010. Face shields are tested to ANSI Z87.1-2010, and below you will find a summary of the Requirements and Test Procedures.</p>	



Our new line, Flash Pro™ Electric ARC Hood systems are designed to maximize worker safety and protect them from thermal energy releases of 40 cal/cm² and lower.

[More information!](#)

Face Shield Performance Requirements according to ANSI Z87.1-2010.

Face shields are tested to ANSI Z87.1-2010, and below you will find a summary of the Requirements and Test Procedures.

Criteria	Requirement
Minimum Thickness	1.0 mm (.039 in) at thinnest point
High Mass Impact	Face shield shall be capable of resisting impact from a pointed projectile weighing 500g (17.6 oz.) dropped from a height of 127 cm (50 in.).
High Velocity Impact	Face shield shall be capable of resisting impact from a 6.35 mm (.25 in) diameter steel ball traveling at a velocity of 51.4 mps (300 fps). For sample size of 20, no failures may occur.
Drop-Ball Impact	Basic impact requirement for all devices: 1 inch diameter steel ball weighing 85 g (2.4 oz) dropped at 127 cm (50 inches)
Penetration Test	Face shield shall be capable of resisting penetration from a weighted projectile weighing 44.2 g (1.56 oz) dropped from a height of 127 cm (50 in.)
Prismatic Power	The prismatic power shall not exceed 0.37 prism diopter in any direction. Vertical and horizontal prism imbalance shall not exceed 1/4 prism diopter and horizontal prism imbalance shall not exceed 0.175 diopter "base in" or 0.175 diopter "base out".
Refractive Power and Astigmatism	No requirement
Haze	Lenses shall not exhibit more than 3% haze, when tested in accordance with...
Optical Quality	No striae, bubbles, waves or other visible defects that would impair optical quality is allowed.
Transmittance	Clear and filter plano lenses shall comply with table one of Z87.1. Special purpose lenses shall comply with Table 2.
Cleanability	After cleaning the function of the face shield shall not be impaired. Lense: Manufacturers mark, and if applicable "S" for lenses with less than 85% visible light transmission.
Markings	All major components shall bear Manufacturers mark and shall be marked "Z87"

[Click here to check our FAQ, frequently asked questions about face protection!](#)



Safety Glasses



FINISH: BLACK
■ ■ ■

DEWALT DPG100
Crosscut™ Safety Glass



FINISH: BLACK
■ ■ ■

DEWALT DPG55 DC™
Safety Glass



FINISH: BLACK
■ ■ ■

DEWALT DPG101 Auger™
Safety Glass



FINISH: BLACK
■ ■ ■

DEWALT DPG102 Recip™
Safety Glass



Waiting for www.radians.com...