

**IN THE MATTER OF
INTERNATIONAL REGISTRATION No 676988
AND THE REQUEST BY MICHAEL SPAHN
TO PROTECT A TRADE MARK IN CLASS 25**

AND

**IN THE MATTER OF OPPOSITION THERETO
UNDER No 70048 BY ASDA STORES LIMITED**

**IN THE MATTER OF
International Registration No 676988
and the request by Michael Spahn
to protect a Trade Mark in Class 25**

and

**IN THE MATTER OF Opposition thereto
under No 70048 by Asda Stores Limited**

BACKGROUND

1. On 7 May 1997 (claiming priority from an earlier filing in Germany dated 14 December 1996), Michael Spahn of Ascheberg, Germany, on the basis of a registration in that country, requested protection in the United Kingdom of the following trade mark under the provisions of the Madrid Protocol:



The colours claimed were: HKS 23 N red, HKS 45 N blue, and white.

2. The international registration is numbered 676988 and protection was sought in Class 25 for a specification of goods which reads as follows:-

"Ladies' wear, particularly knitwear, namely pullovers, waistcoats and cardigans".

3. On 21 April 1998 Asda Stores Limited filed notice of opposition to the protection of this trade mark. They say that they are the proprietors of the applications/registrations shown in the Annex to this decision. Objection is said to arise under Sections 5(2)(b), 5(3), 5(4), 56, 3(1)(a), 3(1)(b) 3(3), 3(4) and 3(6). There is also a reference to the Registrar's discretion. However, under the Trade Marks Act 1994 the Registrar does not have a discretion to refuse an application as she did under the old law. An application can only be refused if it fails to comply with the requirements of the Act and Rules in one or more respect.

4. The applicant filed a counterstatement denying the above grounds. Both sides ask for an award of costs in their favour. The matter came to be heard on 18 June 2001 when the applicant was represented by Dr Lawrence of Counsel, instructed by Saunders & Dolleymore. The opponents were not represented at the hearing but filed written submissions under cover of a letter dated 15 June 2001. In coming to my decision I have taken full account of the

written submission made by the opponent.

Opponents' Evidence

5. This consists of a statutory declaration by Nicholas Cooper dated 22 January 1999. Mr Cooper is the Assistant Company Secretary of Asda Stores Limited, a position he has held since 7 November 1994.

6. Mr Cooper states that Asda Stores Limited is a subsidiary of Asda Group PLC which is an FTSE 100 company and is therefore one of the largest companies in the United Kingdom. Asda Stores Limited is a major component of Asda Group PLC. He goes on to state that there are currently over 215 stores throughout the United Kingdom which are branded ASDA. These stores are large supermarkets which stock a wide range of goods and it is estimated that 6 million customers per week pass through the stores.

7. Next, Mr Cooper states that in the years 1992 to 1997 the turnover of Asda Stores Limited represented 95% or more of the turnover of Asda Group PLC which was as follows:

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>TURNOVER (£ Million)</u>
1992	4,529,000,000
1993	4,613,000,000
1994	4,822,000,000
1995	5,285,000,000
1996	6,042,000,000
1997	6,952,000,000

8. Mr Cooper explains that the Trade Mark ASDA has been widely advertised and promoted by the usual means. In 1977 the approximate amount spent on promoting the ASDA brand name was £1,499,600 rising to £21,311,077 in 1997.

9. Mr Cooper believes the trade mark ASDA is very well known in the United Kingdom. At Exhibit NC 1 to his declaration, he provides various press releases and press extracts relating to certain health care matters. Also, the opponents received prominent media coverage when they attacked the law relating to Retail Price Maintenance on books, were involved in a high profile legal case against McVities relating to the opponents' PUFFIN chocolate biscuits, and were also involved in a case concerning parma ham.

10. Mr Cooper states that since February 1990 the opponent's stores have sold GEORGE - branded clothing, a brand exclusive to Asda. In 1990/91 the approximate turnover in relation to a wide range of clothing was £160,000,000 rising to £333,000,000 in 1996/97. Mr Cooper would expect advertising/promotional expenditure in relation to clothing to be well over £1,000,000 per year. At Exhibit NC2 to his declaration, Mr Cooper provides examples of clothing promotion literature. He goes on to say that the opponents have also received extensive promotion in magazines and newspapers. Exhibit NC3 provides copies of pages from national magazines and a printout of a number of articles from magazines or newspapers

referring to the opponents' clothing. Exhibit NC4 includes four photographs showing the use of ASDA in relation to a typical ASDA store. Exhibit NC5 provides one style of an ASDA branded bag.

Applicant's Evidence

11. The applicant filed statutory declarations by:

- Ian Kells - dated 5 January 2000
- Maurice Sheldon - dated 7 January 2000
- Pauline Susan Malloy - dated 25 January 2000
- Michael Spahn - dated 25 July 2000
- Margaret Trebble - dated 13 January 2000

12. In his statutory declaration Mr Spahn states that he is the proprietor of International Registered Trade Mark No. 676988, is the only shareholder in Anton Spahn GmbH & Co and prior to 1 October 1999 was the Managing Director. He goes on to explain that the mark ASPA is derived from Anton Spahn and as far as he is aware has no meaning in any language.

13. Mr Spahn states that the trade mark has been used continuously in the United Kingdom in relation to clothing since 1992.

	DM	Approx equivalent in £ sterling
1992	16,661.00	5,554.00
1993	307,006.00	102,336.00
1994	469,853.00	156,618.00
1995	456,719.55	152,240.00
1996	439,428.00	146,476.00
1997	254,676.50	84,892.00
1998	245,719.50	81,907.00

14. At Exhibit MS1 Mr Spahn provides sample invoices showing the supply of clothing to outlets in the UK, and at MS2 a copy of a letter from the Event Director of Premier Womenswear confirming that the applicant regularly attends clothing fairs in the UK. Exhibit MS3 contains samples of labels and packaging of clothing marked ASPA.

15. Mr Spahn says that he is not aware of any instances of confusion between the marks ASPA and ASDA. He states that Asda Stores Limited have never asked him to stop using the mark despite contacting his lawyers in March 1998 to ask him to withdraw this designation.

16. In the statutory declarations filed by Mr Kells, Mr Sheldon and Ms Molloy, they explain that the applicant has supplied their companies with clothing marked ASPA since at least 1992. All the ASPA clothing sold have labels or swing tags attached bearing the mark ASPA. They know of no instances where their customers have confused or associated such clothing with that sold by Asda Stores PLC.

17. Ms Trebble is a Registered Trade Mark Attorney and a partner in Saunders & Dolleymore, Registered Trade Mark Attorneys. Her declaration deals with a visit on 26 October 1999 to the Asda Stores PLC supermarket at Odhams Industrial Estate, Watford. Ms Trebble says that in this store a wide range of clothing was sold to one side of the store occupying (in her estimation) 10 - 15% of the floor area used for displaying goods for sale. She goes on to say that this part of the store was dominated by large signs bearing the mark GEORGE in the style shown at Exhibit JMT 1. Ms Trebble examined many items of clothing and found that they all bore the mark GEORGE. Also, there was a separate pay desk situated in the clothing area with signs encouraging customers to pay for GEORGE clothing at that desk.

18. Ms Trebble purchased 3 sweaters, one of which (and the receipt for all three) is exhibited at JMT 2. She goes on to say that she paid for the sweaters at the GEORGE paydesk. At Exhibit JMT 3 Ms Trebble provides a sample of the tags for GEORGE clothing and a sample of the bags used for other products sold through the general checkouts. She states that she gained the impression that this was a franchised outlet for GEORGE clothing ie. that ASDA had let an area of their store for another party to sell its own goods.

Opponents' Evidence in Reply

19. This comes in the form of a Witness Statement from Anthony Paul Brierley, a partner in Appleyard Lees. He responds to Mr Spahn's declaration and in particular his failure to specify the type of clothing. He exhibits (APB1) a past copy of a letter dated 27 May 1998 from Kordt & Poczozzi referring to the trade mark ASPA and advising that Michael Spahn "produces only ladies knitwear".

20. As regards Janice Margaret Trebble's declaration, Mr Brierley states that ASDA stores are delineated into areas which sell certain goods or provide certain services. Also, whilst Ms Trebble noted a separate pay desk in the store she visited, Mr Brierley explains that this is not true of all stores. He goes on to note that the bag in Exhibit JMT 3 (in which articles of clothing were placed) includes both the GEORGE and ASDA trade marks. If clothing is purchased through the normal check-outs, it is bagged in the same style of bag which is used for food, household items etc. and includes prominent use of the Trade Mark ASDA (as shown in Exhibit JMT 3).

21. Mr Brierley refers to Ms Trebble's impression, gained from her visit to the ASDA supermarket in Watford, that part of the store was a franchised outlet for GEORGE. He maintains it is not an impression that would be gained from a visit to the Halifax or Huddersfield ASDA stores. He also points out that the bag provided at Exhibit JMT 3 carries both the GEORGE and ASDA trade marks.

22. That completes my review of the evidence.

DECISION

23. I will deal firstly, and briefly, with the objections based on absolute grounds, that is to say those under Section 3(1)(a), (b), 3(3)(b), 3(4) and 3(6).

24. In their written submissions the opponents state that from the applicant's evidence the origin of goods sold under the mark ASPA is not clear ie. the applicant claims to use the mark ASPA. However, a company called Anton Spahn GmbH & Co. also appears to have an interest in the mark. Also, whilst the applicant claimed to have licensed use of the mark and provided "authorisation", there is no evidence of the existence of a licence. Therefore, the opponents maintain that there is no guarantee, on the basis of the evidence filed, that there is a single origin for goods marked ASPA and accordingly there is no guarantee that the mark ASPA can do the job of distinguishing one party's goods from those of another. The opponent goes on to say that the mark ASPA can't be taken to be distinctive within the terms of Section 3(1)(b) (at least) of the Trade Marks Act. However, the above does not amount to a challenge to the mark's inherent capacity to distinguish or support a contention that the mark in suit is devoid of any distinctive character. The grounds of opposition under Section 3(1)(a) and (b) therefore fail.

25. The next ground of opposition is under Section 3(3)(b) which reads:

"3(3) A trade mark shall not be registered if it is -

(a)

(b) of such a nature as to deceive the public (for instance as to the nature, quality or geographical origin of the goods or service)."

26. In their written submissions the opponents contend that, as there is no restriction on whether or not the applicant supplies goods which are made in Germany, the mark applied for could deceive the public. At the hearing, Dr Lawrence on behalf of the applicant made a statement of intent to the effect that the mark will only be used on goods made in Germany. There is no evidence that Germany has any relevant reputation. Therefore, there is nothing to suggest that the average consumer would rely upon the "Made in Germany" indication and consequently there is no real capacity for the mark to deceive the public into expecting material characteristics in the goods which are not present.

27. Of the remaining two absolute grounds, Section 3(4) is unexplained and offers no obvious basis for success and as such it is dismissed. The objection founded under Section 3(6) is also based on the "guarantee of origin" issue discussed above in relation to the 3(1)(a) and (b) objections. On behalf of the applicant, Dr Lawrence explained that the applicant and company Anton Spahn GmbH & Co are one and the same. The applicant is the Company's Managing Director and sole shareholder, and there is in fact a licence. In asserting that the application was made in bad faith, the onus rests with the opponents to make a prima facie case. A claim that an application was made in bad faith implies some deliberate action by the applicant which a reasonable person would consider to be unacceptable behaviour, or as put by Lindsay J in the GROMAX trade mark case [1999] RPC 10:-

"includes some dealings which fall short of the standards of acceptable commercial behaviour".

28. The opponent has filed no evidence to support such a claim and as such this ground of

opposition is also dismissed.

29. The remaining objections are based on Sections 56, 5(2)(b), 5(3) and 5(4)(a). Dr Lawrence informed me that she has been told by the opponents that they had abandoned their ground of opposition under Section 56 and indeed this matter was not referred to in their written submissions. However, in the absence of a formal withdrawal of this ground and for the sake of completeness, I will briefly comment on this ground.

30. To come within Section 56 of the Trade Marks Act 1994 the opponents need to establish that the mark is well known in the United Kingdom as being the mark of a person who is (a) a national of a Convention country or (b) is domiciled in, or has a real and effective or commercial establishment in a Convention country. A Convention country is defined in Section 55(1)(b) of the Trade Marks Act 1994 as a country that is party to the Paris Convention other than the United Kingdom. Therefore, only trade marks which are owned by proprietors who are domiciled or have a base in a country signatory to the Paris Convention other than the United Kingdom can claim protection under this head. From the evidence it appears that the opponents do not fit into that category. Consequently, the opponents cannot claim protection under this provision of the Act and therefore this ground of opposition is dismissed.

31. Section 5(2)(b) reads as follows:

"5.-(2) A trade mark shall not be registered if because -

- (a)
- (b) it is similar to an earlier trade mark and is to be registered for goods or services identical with or similar to those for which the earlier trade mark is protected,

there exists a likelihood of confusion on the part of the public, which includes the likelihood of association with the earlier trade mark."

32. An earlier right is defined in Section 6 of the Act, the relevant part of which states:

"6.- (1) In this Act an 'earlier trade mark' means -

- (a) a registered trade mark, international trade mark (UK) or Community trade mark which has a date of application for registration earlier than that of the trade mark in question, taking account (where appropriate) of the priorities claimed in respect of the trade marks,

(b).....

(c)....."

33. In determining the question under section 5(2), I take into account the guidance provided by the European Court of Justice (ECJ) in *Sabel BV v Puma AG* [1998] R.P.C. 199, *Canon Kabushiki Kaisha v Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Inc* [1999] E.T.M.R. 1, *Lloyd Schuhfabrik Meyer & Co GmbH v Klijsen Handel B.V.* [2000] F.S.R. 77 and *Marca Mode CV v Adidas AG*

[2000] E.T.M.R. 723. It is clear from these cases that:-

- (a) the likelihood of confusion must be appreciated globally, taking account of all relevant factors; *Sabel BV v Puma AG*, page 224;
- (b) the matter must be judged through the eyes of the average consumer of the goods/services in question; *Sabel BV v. Puma AG*, page 224, who is deemed to be reasonably well informed and reasonably circumspect and observant - but who rarely has the chance to make direct comparisons between marks and must instead rely upon the imperfect picture of them he has kept in his mind; *Lloyd Schuhfabrik Meyer & Co. GmbH v. Klijsen Handel B.V.* page 84, paragraph 27.
- (c) the average consumer normally perceives a mark as a whole and does not proceed to analyse its various details; *Sabel BV v. Puma AG*, page 224;
- (d) the visual, aural and conceptual similarities of the marks must therefore be assessed by reference to the overall impressions created by the marks bearing in mind their distinctive and dominant components; *Sabel BV v. Puma AG*, page 224;
- (e) a lesser degree of similarity between the marks may be offset by a greater degree of similarity between the goods, and vice versa; *Canon Kabushiki Kaisha v. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Inc*, page 7, paragraph 17;
- (f) there is a greater likelihood of confusion where the earlier trade mark has a highly distinctive character, either per se or because of the use that has been made of it; *Sabel BV v. Puma AG*, page 8, paragraph 24;
- (g) mere association, in the sense that the later mark brings the earlier mark to mind, is not sufficient for the purposes of Section 5(2); *Sabel BV v. Puma AG*, page 224;
- (h) further, the reputation of a mark does not give grounds for presuming a likelihood of confusion simply because of a likelihood of association in the strict sense; *Marca Mode CV v. Adidas AG*, page 732, paragraph 41;
- (i) but if the association between the marks causes the public to wrongly believe that the respective goods come from the same or economically linked undertakings, there is a likelihood of confusion within the meaning of the section; *Canon Kabushiki Kaisha v. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Inc*, page 9 paragraph 29.

34. In this particular case the opponents have a large number of registrations in a wide range of classes. It seems to me that the opponents can be in no better position than in respect of their trade mark registration No. 1583335 for "All goods included in Class 25". I have noted

that this particular registration has in fact been merged with other registrations and now continues as registration No: 1583337. Nothing turns on this.

35. It was conceded by the applicant that at face value the goods covered by the applicant's specification are either identical or very similar to those covered by the opponent's earlier trade mark. However, it was Dr Lawrence's submission that, in applying the test proposed in *British Sugar PLC v James Robertson & Sons Ltd* [1996] RPC 281 (the TREAT case), the respective goods were not similar. In her view, supermarket clothing is quite different from clothing sold in the ordinary retail sector, particularly that which is sold in small boutiques at the exclusive end of the market. However, under Section 5(2) I must consider notional and fair use of the opponent's trade marks as they appear on the register and the applicant's trade mark as applied for - see the comments in *REACT Trade Mark* [2000] R.P.C. 285 at page 288. Neither parties' specification is restricted in terms of quality, segment of the market they address or the nature of the retail outlets for their goods. The use that the opponents have actually made of the mark is a matter for consideration under Section 5(4)(a). Therefore, the goods being identical, the matter falls to be determined on a comparison of the trade marks. This is a global test, taking into account the factors outlined above including the guidance that a lesser degree of similarity between the marks may be offset by the degree of similarity (or identity) between the goods.

36. The opponents' written submissions invited me to take account of the substantial goodwill in the trade mark ASDA and also the inherent distinctiveness of the mark. In my view the opponents' mark, being an invented word, is inherently strongly distinctive. Furthermore, where the turnover figures in relation to clothing are, as in the case here, in excess of £300m per annum coupled with substantial advertising/promotional expenditure throughout the period, in my view it would entitle me to find that the trade mark ASDA had acquired a reputation and a highly distinctive character, not only per se but because of the use that has been made of it. However, matters are not that straightforward.

37. On behalf of the applicant Dr Lawrence maintained that the opponents had no reputation or goodwill in the ASDA name for clothing. She argued that it was clear from the opponents' evidence that clothing was sold under the name GEORGE and any reputation and goodwill would go to the GEORGE element. Furthermore, there was no evidence to suggest that the general public recognise GEORGE as an ASDA own brand. Dr Lawrence provided numerous examples of the use in advertising/promotional literature of the GEORGE brand. She also referred to the impression gained by Ms Trebble, on a visit to an ASDA store, that an area of the store was a franchised outlet for GEORGE clothing. In her submission Dr Lawrence claims that it is quite clear why ASDA have chosen to use a completely separate brand for their sales of clothing. The market for groceries is quite different from the market for clothing where style is everything and the right label is the key to success. In her view, nobody wants to be seen to be wearing clothes from the supermarket.

38. In their evidence the opponents explain that they have sold their clothing in their stores for many years and since February 1990 their stores have sold GEORGE - branded clothing - a brand exclusive to ASDA. Annual turnover figures are provided only from 1990/91 but I have no indication if these sales relate solely to the GEORGE brand or to a mixture of the ASDA and GEORGE brands. They go on to explain that bags into which articles of clothing are

placed include both the GEORGE and ASDA marks and where clothing is purchased through the normal check-outs the clothing is placed in the same style bags.

39. I have no evidence before me of how the general public perceive this matter and, having regard to the evidence filed I do not intend to pursue the impossible task of apportioning relative degrees of reputation to the ASDA and GEORGE brands. I have already said that ASDA is in my view a highly distinctive mark per se and I propose to undertake my comparison of the respective marks on this basis.

40. In considering the visual, aural and conceptual similarities of the two marks, both the applicant and the opponents seek to draw attention to various elements of the two marks. In coming to a view on these questions I must take into account the fact that the average consumer rarely has the chance to make a direct comparison between the two trade marks but instead must rely upon the imperfect picture of them he has kept in his mind. So called "imperfect recollection".

41. At first sight the two trade marks have certain visual similarities. When comparing the mark in suit ASPA to the opponents' mark ASDA, visually the respective marks have the first, second and fourth letters in common. In written submissions the opponents point out that the mark applied for is presented in a stylised format in which the letter P is somewhat squat, making it much more likely to be confused with a letter D.

42. For the applicant Dr Lawrence argued that I cannot ignore the fact that the ASPA application is limited to the colours red, blue and white, contains two underlines in blue and red, and includes the words "Made in Germany". I do not accept this contention. "Made in Germany" adds nothing distinctive. Colour and underlining is common on labels etc. in all fields of trade and the general public would not, in my view, attach much importance to such devices. In my view, the word ASPA would be taken to be the distinctive and dominant component of the applicant's mark and as such the two trade marks are visually quite close.

43. I now turn to consider the likelihood of aural confusion. In the REACT Trade Mark case mentioned above, Mr Simon Thorley QC, sitting as the Appointed Person said that the selection of clothing was primarily by the eye. Therefore, I must in taking into account the likelihood of aural confusion bear in mind the fact that the primary use of trade marks in the purchasing of clothing is a visual act.

44. Aurally, the marks have two syllables, the first being identical. Dr Lawrence on behalf of the applicant maintains that the two marks sound quite different. In particular, the 'D' in ASDA gives the 'S' a heavy 'Z' sound, whereas the 'P' in ASPA gives the 'S' a light, hissing sound. I take the view that overall, ASPA and ASDA sound similar enough to be mistaken in oral use. It is important to remember that the notional nature of the test excludes me from assuming that ASDA clothes are always sold through its own retail outlets.

45. On the basis that customers (actual or potential) will regard the marks as invented words there is no basis for finding conceptual similarity but equally no basis for distinguishing between them as might be the case with dictionary words.

46. Mr Hobbs QC sitting as the Appointed Person in BALMORAL trade mark case [1998] R.P.C. 297 at page 301, found that Section 5(2) raised a single composite question. Adapted to this case it can be stated as follows:- are there similarities (in terms of marks and goods) which would combine to create a likelihood of confusion if the applicant's ASPA mark and the opponents' ASDA mark were used concurrently in relation to the goods for which they are respectively registered and proposed to be registered.

47. Taking all these factors into account, and in particular the inherent distinctiveness of the opponents' trade mark and imperfect recollection, I am of the view that the question posed above must be answered in the affirmative. Having particular regard to visual confusion I find that there is a likelihood of confusion between the two trade marks within the meaning of Section 5(2)(b) of the Trade Marks Act 1994. In reaching this decision I am mindful of the fact that the applicant has provided actual use of their mark prior to the material date in these proceedings.

48. Section 5(3) reads:

“5.(3) A trade mark which -

- (a) is identical with or similar to an earlier trade mark, and
- (b) is to be registered for goods or services which are not similar to those for which the earlier trade mark is protected,

shall not be registered if, or to the extent that, the earlier trade mark has a reputation in the United Kingdom (or, in the case of a Community trade mark, in the European Community) and the use of the later mark without due cause would take unfair advantage of, or be detrimental to, the distinctive character or the repute of the earlier trade mark”.

49. An objection under Section 5(3) must be based on an earlier trade mark but can only be brought to bear if or to the extent that the earlier trade mark has a reputation in the United Kingdom and the goods of the mark proposed for registration are not similar. The opponents have not attempted to establish a reputation in goods which can be regarded as dissimilar to the goods applied for and a case has not been made out that the mark applied for would take unfair advantage of or cause detriment to the distinctive character or repute of the opponent's earlier trade mark. The opposition, therefore, fails under Section 5(3).

50. Finally, I consider the ground of opposition under Section 5(4)(a). I have already highlighted the difficulties of the opponents' claim to a reputation within the United Kingdom in my consideration of the objection under Section 5(2). There is nothing in the evidence to support a more advantageous attack under Section 5(4)(a).

51. As the opposition has been successful, the opponents are entitled to a contribution towards their costs. I order the applicant to pay the opponents the sum of £835. This sum to be paid within seven days of the expiry of the appeal period or within seven days of the final determination of this case if any appeal against this decision is unsuccessful.

Dated this 6TH day of September 2001

**DAVID C MORGAN
For the Registrar
The Comptroller-General**

ANNEX

Trade Mark No.	Registered Proprietor	Mark	Class
1284390	Asda Stores Ltd	ASDA	1
1284391	Asda Stores Ltd	ASDA	2
1284392	Asda Stores Ltd	ASDA	3
1284393	Asda Stores Ltd	ASDA	4
1000934	Asda Stores Ltd	ASDA	6
1426173	Asda Stores Ltd	ASDA	6
1284395	Asda Stores Ltd	ASDA	7
1284396	Asda Stores Ltd	ASDA	8
1284397	Asda Stores Ltd	ASDA	9
1284398	Asda Stores Ltd	ASDA	11
1284399	Asda Stores Ltd	ASDA	16
1284400	Asda Stores Ltd	ASDA	18
1284401	Asda Stores Ltd	ASDA	20
1000936	Asda Stores Ltd	ASDA	24
980605	Asda Stores Ltd	ASDA	25
1583335	Asda Stores Ltd	ASDA	25
1284404	Asda Stores Ltd	ASDA	29
980606	Asda Stores Ltd	ASDA	30
1284405	Asda Stores Ltd	ASDA	31
1465883	Asda Stores Ltd	ASDA	31
1057557	Asda Stores Ltd	ASDA	33
1284406	Asda Stores Ltd	ASDA	33
1284407	Asda Stores Ltd	ASDA	34
1361827	Asda Stores Ltd	ASDA	36
2160195	Asda Stores Ltd	ASDA	1,2,4,9,10,11 12,13,18,19,2 0,23,24,28,31