

ESTTA Tracking number: **ESTTA1150418**

Filing date: **08/01/2021**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD

Proceeding	91267209
Party	Plaintiff Fincheck Inc.
Correspondence Address	WILLIAM SCOTT GOLDMAN GOLDMAN LAW GROUP 1300 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., N.W.; STE. 700 WASHINGTON, DC 20004 UNITED STATES Primary Email: trademarks@branding-law.com 202-880-9200
Submission	Other Motions/Submissions
Filer's Name	WILLIAM SCOTT GOLDMAN
Filer's email	trademarks@branding-law.com
Signature	/william scott goldman/
Date	08/01/2021
Attachments	Motion_12b6_91267209.pdf(83531 bytes) Memorandum_12b6_91267209.pdf(523468 bytes)

1 **UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**
2 **TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

3
4 FINCHECK INC.,

Opposition No.: 91267209

5 Opposer,

OPPOSER'S MOTION IN OPPOSITION TO
6 APPLICANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS
UNDER FRCP 12B(6)

7 vs.

8 YODLEE, INC.

9 Applicant.

10 **OPPOSER'S MOTION IN OPPOSITION TO APPLICANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS**

11 FINCHECK INC, ("OPPOSER"), by and through its undersigned counsel, hereby respectfully
12 submits this Motion in Opposition to the Motion to Dismiss filed by YODLEE, INC.
13

14 ("APPLICANT"). In support of this Motion, Opposer submits the accompanying Memorandum.
15
16

17 Date: August 1, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

18
19 /William Scott Goldman/
WILLIAM SCOTT GOLDMAN
20 **GOLDMAN LAW GROUP, PLLC**
1300 Pennsylvania Ave., NW; Ste. 700
Washington, DC 20004
21 (202) 880-9200
22
23
24
25

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

2

3

4 The undersigned attorney hereby certifies that on August 1, 2021, a true and complete copy of

5 **OPPOSER'S MOTION IN OPPOSITION TO APPLICANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS**

6 was filed electronically with the TTAB and was served on counsel for APPLICANT by

7 forwarding said copy on August 1, 2021, via electronic mail to:

8 Martin R. Greenstein

9 Angelique M. Riordan

10 TECHMARK A LAW CORPORATION

11 4820 HARWOOD ROAD, SUITE 110

12 SAN JOSE, CA 95124

13 mrg@techmark.com

14 amr@techmark.com

15 *Attorneys for Applicant*

16 *YODLEE, INC.*

17

18 /William Scott Goldman/

19 WILLIAM SCOTT GOLDMAN

20 GOLDMAN LAW GROUP, PLLC

21 Attorney for OPPOSER

22 FINCHECK INC.

23 Date: August 1, 2021

24

25

1 WILLIAM SCOTT GOLDMAN
2 GOLDMAN LAW GROUP, PLLC
3 1300 Pennsylvania Ave., NW; Ste. 700
4 Washington, DC 20004
5 (202) 880-9200

6 Attorney for
7 FINCHECK INC.
8 Opposer

9
10 **UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**
11 **TRADEMARK TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD**

12 FINCHECK INC.

Opposition No.: 91267209

13 Opposer,

**OPPOSER'S RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION
TO APPLICANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS
UNDER FRCP 12B(6)**

14 vs.

15 YODLEE, INC.

16 Applicant.

17 **OPPOSER'S RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO APPLICANT'S MOTION TO DISMISS**

18 FINCHECK INC., ("OPPOSER"), respectfully submits this Response in Opposition to the
19 Motion to Dismiss filed by YODLEE, INC. ("APPLICANT").

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TABLE OF CONTENTS 2

I. INTRODUCTION 3

II. FACTS..... 4

III. ARGUMENT : APPLICANT’s Motion to Dismiss Should be Denied 6

 A. Applicable Legal Standards. 6

 B. OPPOSER Has Pled it Claims with the Particularity Required by Fed.R.Civ.P. 9(b). ... 7

 C. OPPOSER’s Notice of Opposition meets Fed.R.Civ.P. 8(a) Pleading Requirements. 8

 D. OPPOSER Has Priority of Use and Proper Standing Under 15 U.S.C. § 1063.....10

IV. CONCLUSION 11

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 12

EXHIBIT A.....13

EXHIBIT B.....15

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2

3 APPLICANT’s current motion is in response to OPPOSER’s NOTICE OF

4 OPPOSITION pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1063.¹ APPLICANT alleges that OPPOSER’s pleadings

5 are insufficient and fail to state a claim upon which relief can be granted, requesting dismissal of

6 OPPOSER’s NOTICE OF OPPOSITION pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6). OPPOSER

7 counters that prevailing on a motion under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) requires a *de novo* standard

8 of review and pursuant to TBMP § 503.02: “In order to withstand such a motion, a complaint

9 need only allege such facts as would, if proved, establish that the plaintiff is entitled to the relief

10 sought, that is that (1) the plaintiff has standing to maintain the proceeding, and (2) a valid

11 ground exists for denying the registration sought (in the case of an opposition).” OPPOSER

12 maintains that all of the above conditions have been satisfied and that its pleadings are in

13 compliance with Fed. R. Civ. P. 9(a) and Fed R. Civ. P. 8(b) as supported by relevant case law.

14 Through the Lanham Act, Congress provided a procedural mechanism by which affected parties

15 can seek to challenge pending trademark applications. As a result, Congress expressly provided

16

17 ¹ 15 U.S.C. 1063 Opposition to registration.

18

19 (a) Any person who believes that he would be damaged by the registration of a mark upon the

20 principal register, including the registration of any mark which would be likely to cause dilution

21 by blurring or dilution by tarnishment under section 1125(c) of this title, may, upon payment of

22 the prescribed fee, file an opposition in the Patent and Trademark Office, stating the grounds

23 therefor, within thirty days after the publication under subsection (a) of section 1062 of this title

24 of the mark sought to be registered. Upon written request prior to the expiration of the thirty-day

25 period, the time for filing opposition shall be extended for an additional thirty days, and further

extensions of time for filing opposition may be granted by the Director for good cause when

requested prior to the expiration of an extension. The Director shall notify the applicant of each

extension of the time for filing opposition. An opposition may be amended under such conditions

as may be prescribed by the Director.

1 standing to OPPOSER and others for bringing Opposition proceedings before the T.T.A.B. *See*
2 15 U.S.C. § 1063.

3 With regard to compliance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 8(a) and Fed.R.Civ.P. 9(b), discussed more
4 fully below, OPPOSER submits that its NOTICE OF OPPOSITION provides enough details to
5 satisfy FRCP requirements in support of all of OPPOSER's pleadings, thereby negating
6 APPLICANT's Alternative Motion to Strike.

7 As such, OPPOSER respectfully submits that dismissing the NOTICE OF OPPOSITION
8 or granting APPLICANT's Alternative Motion to Strike would be tantamount to rendering 15
9 U.S.C. § 1063 a nullity.

10 11 **II. FACTS**

12
13 APPLICANT filed U.S. Trademark Application Serial No. 88392661 on or about April
14 18, 2019 for the mark FINCHECK covering the following goods/services in CL 09 and CL 36,
15 specifically:

16 *Downloadable computer software for aggregation of banking, financial, investment and personal*
17 *records and information; downloadable computer software for accessing online and electronic*
18 *data and for converting and transferring that data to and for use in connection with computer*
19 *software programs, personal and business electronic devices, mobile and smart phones, tablets*
20 *and other computer software applications; downloadable computer software for aggregating,*
21 *processing and analyzing data for the purpose of providing customized recommendations in the*
22 *field of finance; downloadable computer software for financial management and financial and e-*
23 *commerce transactions and Financial advisory and consultancy services; Financial information*
24 *provided by electronic means; Financial information provided by electronic means in the field of*
25 *online monitoring and tracking services for financial and e-commerce transactions relating to*
the status of securities and other financial instruments; Providing financial assessment services

1 to others; Providing financial assessment services to others, namely, providing an online
2 financial records aggregation service to aggregate and summarize personal and corporate
3 banking, financial, investment and general financial information; Providing financial assessment
4 services to others, namely, collecting and analyzing financial affairs records and summaries in
5 the nature of bank accounts, investments accounts, bill payments, mortgages, retirement
6 accounts, retirement programs, credit card accounts, insurance policies and loans all over
7 electronic communications networks; Providing financial information; Providing financial
8 information services to others; Providing financial information services to others, namely,
9 providing an online financial records aggregation service to aggregate and summarize personal
10 and corporate banking, financial, investment and general financial information; Providing
11 financial information services to others, namely, collecting and analyzing financial affairs
12 records and summaries in the nature of bank accounts, investments accounts, bill payments,
13 mortgages, retirement accounts, retirement programs, credit card accounts, insurance policies
14 and loans all over electronic communications networks; Providing financial information services
15 to others, namely, providing financial information in the form of records and summaries in the
16 fields of financial affairs, bank accounts, investments accounts, bill payment, mortgages,
17 retirement accounts, retirement programs, credit card accounts, insurance and loans by means
18 of electronic communications networks; Providing financial information services to others,
19 namely, providing online monitoring and tracking services for financial and e-commerce
20 transactions relating to status of securities and other financial instruments

21 Beginning prior to April 18, 2019 and APPLICANT's date of filing for the above-noted
22 U.S. Trademark application Serial No. 88392661 and continuing thereafter without interruption
23 or abandonment, OPPOSER has used, and/or supervised the use of, the said OPPOSER'S
24 MARK throughout the United States and worldwide for its financial services software and
25 applications. Hence, OPPOSER is alleging priority of rights to the FINCHECK mark and

1 has proper standing for bringing the present NOTICE OF OPPOSITION through use of its mark
2 in U.S. commerce for the goods identified above. Since both APPLICANT's mark and relevant
3 goods are highly-similar to OPPOSER's and OPPOSER established use in commerce prior to
4 APPLICANT, OPPOSER properly alleges a likelihood of confusion as the basis for its challenge
5 under 15 U.S.C. § 1125 and *In re E. I. DuPont de Nemours & Co.* 476 F.2d 1357 (C.C.P.A.
6 1973).

7 As such, the parties must now establish evidence of prior first use through discovery,
8 further rendering APPLICANT's motion improper. *See M.Z. Berger & Co., Inc. v. Swatch AG*,
9 787 F.3d 1368 (Fed. Cir. 2015) and *Commodore Electronics Ltd. v. CBM Kabushiki Kaisha*, 26
10 USPQ2d 1503, 1507 (TTAB 1993). Furthermore, given the notoriety of OPPOSER's mark,
11 OPPOSER contends that APPLICANT has filed in bad faith. *See Estrada v. Telefonos De*
12 *Mexico, S.A.B. de C.V.*, 447 F. App'x 197 (Fed. Cir. 2011).

14 **III. ARGUMENT : APPLICANT's Motion to Dismiss and** 15 **APPLICANT'S Alternative Motion to Strike Should be Denied**

17 **A. Standard of Review.**

18 When reviewing a motion to dismiss a NOTICE OF OPPOSITION under Fed. R. Civ. P.
19 12(b)(6) the NOTICE OF OPPOSITION is construed in the light most favorable to OPPOSER;
20 the allegations of the NOTICE OF OPPOSITION are taken as true and all reasonable inferences
21 that can be drawing from the NOTICE OF OPPOSITION are drawn in favor of OPPOSER. *See*
22 *Swierkiewicz v. Sorema N.A.*, 534 U.S. 506 (2007); *National Audubon Soc., Inc. v. Davis*, 307 F.
23 3d 835 (9th Cir. 2002). *See also Berkheimer v. HP Inc.*, 890 F.3d 1369 (Fed. Cir. 2018):

24 If patent eligibility is challenged in a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim
25 pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6), we must apply the well-settled Rule 12(b)(6) standard which
is consistently applied in every area of law. A motion to dismiss for failure to state a
claim must be denied if "in the light most favorable to the plaintiff and with every doubt
resolved in the pleader's favor—but disregarding mere conclusory statements—the

1 complaint states any legally cognizable claim for relief." 5B Charles Alan Wright &
2 Arthur R. Miller, Federal Practice and Procedure § 1357 (3d ed. 2018). In the Eleventh
3 Circuit, the Rule 12(b)(6) standard requires accepting as true the complaint's factual
4 allegations and construing them in the light most favorable to the plaintiff. Aatrix
5 Software, Inc. v. Green Shades Software, Inc., 882 F.3d 1121, 1124 (Fed. Cir. 2018).

6 Further, it has been long held that the NOTICE OF OPPOSITION should be liberally
7 construed when examining the sufficiency of the pleading, "with a view to attaining substantial
8 justice among the parties." *See e.g. B & P Development Corp. v. City of Saratoga*, 185 Cal.
9 App.3d 949, 953 (230 Cal.Rptr. 192). As noted in TBMP § 503.02: "Whenever the sufficiency
10 of any complaint has been challenged by a motion to dismiss, it is the duty of the Board to
11 examine the complaint in its entirety, construing the allegations therein so as to do justice as
12 required by Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(e)". OPPOSER has alleged sufficient facts to apprise APPLICANT
13 of the nature of the claim. In the interest of justice, the matter should continue to discovery to
14 afford OPPOSER the opportunity to substantiate its allegations.

15 The purpose of a motion to dismiss is to test the sufficiency of the Complaint, not to rule
16 on its merits. *See e.g. Gibson v. City of Chicago*, 910 F.2d 1510, 1520 (7th Cir. 1990). In
17 analyzing the motion, the court must accept the well-pleaded allegations as true, and view those
18 allegations in the light most favorable to Plaintiff. *McMillan v. Collection Professionals, Inc.*,
19 455 F.3d 754, 758 (7th Cir. 2006).

20 **B. OPPOSER Has Pled a Likelihood of Confusion Claim with the Particularity
21 Required by Fed.R.Civ.P. 9(b).**

22 The NOTICE OF OPPOSITION satisfies the requirements of Fed.R.Civ.P. 9(b).
23 APPLICANT does not and cannot deny that APPLICANT first started using FINCHECK for the
24 alleged goods/services in CL 09 and 36 at least as early as September 13, 2017 per U.S.
25 Trademark Application Serial No. 88981181.

1 The NOTICE OF OPPOSITION further alleges that APPLICANT has established
2 tremendous goodwill through its prior use in commerce of an identical name for highly-related
3 goods.

4 Hence, the only relevant factual dispute that exists in the current action is related to the
5 existence of a likelihood of confusion and OPPOSER's proper use of its mark in commerce.
6 Nonetheless, it is inappropriate to address such evidentiary issues in a motion to dismiss pursuant
7 Rule 12(b)(6), as APPLICANT has attempted. Rather, these issues are more appropriately left to
8 a fact finder to determine after discovery, testimony and briefs.

9 Therefore, pursuant to the applicable law, e.g., that the NOTICE OF OPPOSITION
10 should be liberally construed when examining the sufficiency of the pleading, and when
11 reviewing a motion to dismiss a NOTICE OF OPPOSITION under Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(6) the
12 NOTICE OF OPPOSITION is viewed in the light most favorable to OPPOSER; the allegations
13 of the NOTICE OF OPPOSITION are taken as true and all reasonable inferences that can be
14 drawn from the NOTICE OF OPPOSITION are construed in favor of OPPOSER, the Board
15 must find that the NOTICE OF OPPOSITION has met the pleading requirements under
16 Fed.R.Civ.P. 9(b) and should thus, deny APPLICANT's motion to dismiss.

17
18 **C. OPPOSER's NOTICE OF OPPOSITION meets Fed.R.Civ.P. 8(a) pleading**
19 **requirements.**

20 Fed.R.Civ.P. 8(a)(2) requires a short and plain statement of the claim showing that the
21 pleader is entitled to relief. Further, parties may allege matters "on information and belief," but
22 they must plead what information they do have that leads them to believe that such allegations
23 are true. *See* Fed.R.Civ.P.8(b)(5).

24 Once again, the purpose of a NOTICE OF OPPOSITION is to give fair notice to a
25 APPLICANT, and the present NOTICE OF OPPOSITION provides ample facts to give a more

1 than fair notice to APPLICANT and to enable APPLICANT to respond to the NOTICE OF
2 OPPOSITION.

3 The NOTICE OF OPPOSITION in the instant case meets the pleading requirements
4 under Fed.R.Civ.P. 8(a) because the NOTICE OF OPPOSITION provides far more than a plain
5 statement of the claim showing entitlement to relief. As noted above, OPPOSER has pled
6 sufficient facts to enable the Board to infer both the potential of a likelihood of confusion and
7 false designation of origin, pursuant to applicable law; thus, APPLICANT should be left to its
8 proofs through discovery, testimony and briefs.

9 The NOTICE OF OPPOSITION properly pleads that OPPOSER has priority of use over
10 APPLICANT for an identical mark covering highly-related goods, forming a sufficient basis to
11 claim likelihood of confusion. OPPOSER also pleads APPLICANT's fraud and bad faith in its
12 trademark application filing. "A claim has facial plausibility when the pleaded factual content
13 allows the court to draw the reasonable inference that the defendant is liable for the misconduct
14 alleged." *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S.662, 129 S. Ct. 1937 at 1949 (2009).

15 Furthermore, with regard to TTAB proceedings, as the Board opined in *Nike Inc. v. Palm*
16 *Beach Crossfit Inc. d/b/a/ Crossfit City Place*, No. 91218512 (T.T.A.B. Sep. 11, 2015):

17 To withstand a motion to dismiss for failure to state a claim upon which relief can be
18 granted, a plaintiff need only allege sufficient factual matter that, if proved, would
19 allow the Board to conclude, or to draw a reasonable inference, that (1) the
20 plaintiff has standing to maintain the proceeding, and (2) a valid ground exists for
21 opposing or cancelling the mark. *Doyle v. Al Johnson's Swed. Rest. & Butik*
22 *Inc.*, 101 USPQ2d 1780, 1782 (TTAB 2012) (citing *Young v. AGB Corp.*, 152 F.3d
23 1377, 47 USPQ2d 1752, 1754 (Fed. Cir. 1998)); see also TBMP § 503.02 (2015).
24 Specifically, a complaint "must contain sufficient factual matter, accepted as true,
25 to 'state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face.'" *Doyle*, 101 USPQ2d at 1782
(quoting *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, 556 U.S. 662, 678 (2009))

As noted above, the NOTICE OF OPPOSITION pleads facts with sufficient particularity
to enable a trier of fact to infer likelihood of confusion, priority of use, false representation of
fact, and filing in bad faith, unless APPLICANT is able to prove otherwise through discovery,

1 testimony and briefs. Therefore, pursuant to applicable law, the Board must deny APPLICANT's
2 motion to dismiss.

3
4 **D. OPPOSER Has Priority of Use and Proper Standing Under 15 U.S.C. § 1063.**

5 Essentially, the crux of APPLICANT's motion is the spurious argument that OPPOSER
6 cannot claim priority of use and likelihood of confusion, thereby lacking proper standing to bring
7 its Notice of Opposition. To wit, APPLICANT alleges that OPPOSER established its corporate
8 entity in Massachusetts on January 11, 2021 and filed its Notice of Opposition on January 22,
9 2021, creating a legal impossibility by which OPPOSER's entire priority claim fails. Likewise,
10 APPLICANT alleges that OPPOSER's fraud claim is legally defective for similar reasons. In
11 fact, APPLICANT goes so far as to allege, in pertinent part, on page 5 of its Motion to Dismiss:

12 *There is literally no scenario in which Opposer could validly assert its priority. Without a*
13 *potentially valid claim of priority, Opposer's priority and likelihood of confusion claim is fatally*
14 *defective and legally insufficient...*

15 OPPOSER *literally* presents such a scenario below and now introduces the Delaware
16 Secretary of State business records and the Massachusetts Secretary of State business records as
17 Exhibits A-B, respectively, of which the Board can take judicial notice. Namely, FINCHECK,
18 INC. was originally an Israeli corporation established in March of 2016 and located at Ahad
19 Ha'Am St. 28, Tel Aviv-Yafo, Israel, subsequently acquired by Boston Commerce, Inc. with all
20 assets, including the mark in question, being promptly placed under OPPOSER's corporate entity
21 in the U.S., FINCHECK INC., established in Delaware on or about March 6, 2017, and dissolved
22 on or about December 30, 2020 (*See Exhibit A*). In the interim, OPPOSER *contemporaneously*
23 formed FINCHECK INC. as a Massachusetts entity, which was then formalized on January 11,
24 2021 (*See Exhibit B*).

25 Thus, OPPOSER factually asserts both priority of use and proper standing to bring its
Notice of Opposition, thereby negating APPLICANT's contention of legal impossibility, unless

1 APPLICANT is able to prove otherwise through discovery, testimony and briefs. Likewise,
2 OPPOSER's fraud claim and Paragraphs 5b-5e in support of the same are legally sufficient and
3 should not be stricken, unless APPLICANT is able to prove otherwise through discovery,
4 testimony and briefs.

5
6 **IV. CONCLUSION**

7
8 For the foregoing reasons, OPPOSER respectfully requests that the Board dismiss
9 APPLICANT's motion to dismiss and alternative motion to strike.

10 Dated this 1st day of August 2021

11
12 /William Scott Goldman/
13 WILLIAM SCOTT GOLDMAN
14 GOLDMAN LAW GROUP, PLLC
15 Attorney for OPPOSER
16 FINCHECK INC.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned attorney hereby certifies that on August 1, 2021, a true and complete copy of OPPOSER’S RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO APPLICANT’S MOTION TO DISMISS was filed electronically with the TTAB and was served on counsel for APPLICANT by forwarding said copy on August 1, 2021, via electronic mail to:

Martin R. Greenstein
Angelique M. Riordan
TECHMARK A LAW CORPORATION
4820 HARWOOD ROAD, SUITE 110
SAN JOSE, CA 95124
mrg@techmark.com
amr@techmark.com

Attorneys for Applicant
YODLEE, INC.

/William Scott Goldman/
WILLIAM SCOTT GOLDMAN
GOLDMAN LAW GROUP, PLLC
Attorney for OPPOSER
FINCHECK INC.
Date: August 1, 2021

EXHIBIT A

Delaware.gov



Department of State: Division of Corporations

HOME

[View Search Results](#)

Entity Details

File Number:	6337312	Incorporation Date / Formation Date:	3/6/2017 (mm/dd/yyyy)
Entity Name:	FINCHECK, INC.		
Entity Kind:	Corporation	Entity Type:	General
Residency:	Domestic	State:	State:
Status:	Dissolved	Status Date:	12/30/2020

[REGISTERED AGENT INFORMATION](#)

Name:	INCorp SERVICES, INC.		
Address:	919 NORTH MARKET STREET, SUITE 950		
City:	WILMINGTON	County:	New Castle
State:	DE	Postal Code:	19801
Phone:	800.246.2677		


[Back to Entity Search](#) [Email Status](#)

or help on a particular field click on the Field Tag to take you to the help area.


EXHIBIT B

corp.sec.state.ma.us/CorpWeb/CorpSearch/CorpSummary.aspx?sysvalue=QilV3BKCAZhcyIvfBA2ThHjW4rw5uX54r1xnXPAdNCs-

Verio - Reseller Con... Rion Grand Garden... Wrought Iron Fenc... DIMINISHED VALU... Interview Bootstrap Compos... SBC 16 in. Sandston... 4 Zone Ductless Mi... Aqua Eden VTDE48... Commonwealth Ma...



William Francis Galvin
Secretary of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts



HOME DIRECTIONS CONTACT US

Corporations Division

Business Entity Summary

ID Number: 001480495

Summary for: FINCHECK INC.

The exact name of the Domestic Profit Corporation:	FINCHECK INC.			
Entity type:	Domestic Profit Corporation			
Identification Number:	001480495			
Date of Organization in Massachusetts:	01-11-2021			
Last date certain:				
Current Fiscal Month/Day:	01/31			
The location of the Principal Office:				
Address: 119 BRAINTREE ST, STE 510				
City or town, State, Zip code, Country: BOSTON, MA 02134 USA				
The name and address of the Registered Agent:				
Name: RICHARD ROGERS				
Address: 119 BRAINTREE ST, STE 510				
City or town, State, Zip code, Country: BOSTON, MA 02134 USA				
The Officers and Directors of the Corporation:				
Title	Individual Name	Address		
PRESIDENT	RICHARD ROGERS	119 BRAINTREE ST, STE 510 BOSTON, MA 02134 USA		
TREASURER	RICHARD ROGERS	119 BRAINTREE ST, STE 510 BOSTON, MA 02134 USA		
SECRETARY	RICHARD ROGERS	119 BRAINTREE ST, STE 510 BOSTON, MA 02134 USA		
DIRECTOR	RICHARD ROGERS	119 BRAINTREE ST, STE 510 BOSTON, MA 02134 USA		
Business entity stock is publicly traded: <input type="checkbox"/>				
The total number of shares and the par value, if any, of each class of stock which this business entity is authorized to issue:				
Class of Stock	Par value per share	Total Authorized		Total issued and outstanding
		No. of shares	Total par value	No. of shares
CWP	\$ 0.01	1,000	\$ 10.00	1,000

<https://corp.sec.state.ma.us/CorpWeb/CorpSearch/CorpSummary.aspx?sysvalue=QilV3BKCAZhcyIvfBA2ThHjW4rw5uX54r1xnXPAdNCs->