

## Appeal Decision

Appeal No. 2019-11255

Appellant OTANI, Kan

Patent Attorney OTANI, Kan

Patent Attorney OKAMURA, Taichi

The case of appeal against the examiner's decision of refusal of Trademark Application No. 2018-30044 has resulted in the following appeal decision:

### Conclusion

The appeal of the case was groundless.

### Reasons

#### No. 1 The trademark in the Application

The trademark in the application consists of the standard characters of "六本木通り特許事務所 (Roppongi Dori Tokkyo Jimusho)", and the application for its registration was filed on March 14, 2018 by setting the services as described in the application which belonging to Class 35, Class 41, Class 42, and Class 45 as the designated services. Thereafter, the designated services of the application were finally amended to Class 45 "legal services relating to patents for start-ups" as a result of correction by the written amendment dated on February 10, 2019 in the examination process, and the written amendment dated on August 27, 2019 and the written amendment dated on July 25, 2020 in the appeal process.

#### No. 2 Gist of reasons for refusal stated in the examiner's decision

In the examiner's decision, it is acknowledged and determined that the characters of "六本木通り (Roppongi Dori)" in the trademark in the application is "the common name of a road from Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo to Shibuya, Shibuya-ku, Tokyo", and that the characters of "特許事務所 (Tokkyo Jimusho)" represent a name of an office that provides patenting and other services. According to information on the Internet, there are facts of using a name obtained by combining a provision location and a patent attorney office name, and thus the trademark in the application is merely acknowledged as a

combination of a provision location and an office name of patent or the like. Further, the applicant's use of the trademark in the application configured as above has not resulted in the trademark being recognizable to consumers as the services pertaining to the applicant's business, and even if the applicant uses the trademark for the designated services, consumers will not be able to recognize the services as those pertaining to the services of a certain business. Therefore, the trademark in the application falls under Article 3 (1) (vi) of the Trademark Act, and the present application was rejected.

#### No. 3 Inquiry by the body

In the inquiry made on June 10, 2020, the chief administrative judge notified the appellant of the facts as stated in Attachment 1 indicating that patent attorney offices provide services for startups, and the facts as stated in Attachment 2 indicating that, in the field of handling services related to the legal business provided by a lawyer, the characters of "〇〇通り〇〇事務所 (〇〇 Dori 〇〇Jimusho; 〇〇 Street 〇〇Office)" that is a combination of the characters of "〇〇通り (〇〇 Dori)" and the characters of "〇〇事務所 (〇〇 Jimusho; 〇〇 Office)", which is the common name of an office providing the services, are adopted and used as the name of an office located near the road commonly called "〇〇通り (〇〇 Dori)". Further, the chief administrative judge expressed an opinion stating that use of the trademark in the application will not necessarily make it known nation-wide and the consumers may not necessarily recognize the trademark as the services pertaining to a certain business, and further expressed an opinion stating that: when the trademark in the application is used for the designated services, the traders and consumers coming into contact with the trademark will only understand and recognize the trademark in the application to be "a patent attorney office located near a road commonly called 六本木通り (Roppongi Dori)"; and since the trademark in the application simply indicates a location where services are provided or a location of a party that provides the services, it is not proper in terms of public interest for acknowledging a specific person to use the trademark exclusively for the designated services in the application, and the trademark is not distinct enough to distinguish between the services provided by the applicant and other services and does not fulfill the functions of a trademark. The chief administrative judge then specified a reasonable period of time for the Appellant to provide a reply to the inquiry.

#### No. 4 Gist of reply of the Appellant to the inquiry

In reply to the inquiry in the above No. 3, the Appellant submitted a Written Opinion on July 25, 2020 and provided the following allegations.

- 1 All examples of use presented in Attachment 2 are "〇〇通り法律事務所 (〇〇 Dori Horitsu Jimusho)" and not a single example shows the use of "〇〇通り (〇〇 Dori)" for the name of a "特許事務所 (Tokkyo Jimusho)". The actual circumstances of transaction are far from the real situation and have been arbitrarily abstracted.
- 2 None of the examples of use presented in Attachment 2 is especially shown to be an example of use in providing the designated services of the trademark in the application, and the examples of use cannot be said to indicate the actual circumstances of transaction for the designated service of the trademark in the application.
- 3 The examples of use presented in Attachment 1 are irrelevant and meaningless in determining whether there are the actual circumstances in which the characters of "〇〇通り□□事務所 (〇〇 Dori □□ Jimusho)" are widely adopted and used.
- 4 The examples of use presented in Attachment 2 are all names of individual law offices and indicate the places of origin for the respective law offices.
- 5 With regards to the examples of "骨董通り法律事務所 (Kotto-dori Horitsu Jimusho)" and "青山通り法律事務所 (Aoyama-dori Horitsu Jimusho)" among the examples of use presented in Attachment 2, "骨董通り (Kotto-dori)" and "青山通り (Aoyama-dori)" are streets adjoining to each other and thus may cause traders and consumers to understand as including the same place or having the same implication, but such understanding is not a socially accepted idea.
- 6 If the characters of "〇〇通り (〇〇 Dori)" refer not to a specific place but to the entire road that is called by that name of the characters, characters representing such a wide area would not be understood by traders and consumers as a term for a place for providing specific services in the first place.
- 7 Since the trademark in the application is the name of an existing office, there is no room for others to use it in general based on the laws and other regulations.

#### No. 5 Judgment by the body

##### 1 Applicability of Article 3(1) (vi) of the Trademark Act

###### (1) Regarding the trademark in the present application

The trademark in the application consists of the standard characters of "六本木通り特許事務所 (Roppongi Dori Tokkyo Jimusho)" as described in No. 1 above, and the designated services are "legal services relating to patents for start-ups" under Class 45.

###### (2) Actual circumstances of transaction in the industry or the like handling the designated services of the application

(a) According to the facts presented in Attachment 1, it is widely recognized that patent

attorney offices provide services to startups.

(b) According to the facts presented in Attachment 2, it is acknowledged that: in the field of handling services related to the legal business provided by a lawyer, the characters of "〇〇通り〇〇事務所 (〇〇 Dori 〇〇Jimusho; 〇〇 Street 〇〇Office)", which is a combination of the characters of "〇〇通り (〇〇 Dori)" and the characters of "〇〇事務所 (〇〇 Jimusho; 〇〇 Office)" that is the common name of an office providing the services, are widely adopted and used as the name of an office located near the road commonly called "〇〇通り (〇〇 Dori)", like the "海岸通り法律事務所 (Kaigandori Horitsu Jimusho)", "西堀通り法律事務所 (Nishibori Dori Horitsu Jimusho)", "国会通り法律事務所 (Kokkai-Dori Horitsu Jimusho)", "骨董通り法律事務所 (Kotto-Dori Horitsu Jimusho)", "並木通り法律事務所 (Namikidori Horitsu Jimusho)", "新虎通り法律事務所 (Shin Tora-Dori Horitsu Jimusho)", "平成通り法律事務所 (Heisei-Dori Horitsu Jimusho)", "土佐堀通り法律事務所 (Tosabori Dori Horitsu Jimusho)", "長良橋通り法律事務所 (Nagarabashidori Horitsu Jimusho)", "錦華通り法律事務所 (Kinkadori Horitsu Jimusho)", "夷川通り法律事務所 (Ebisugawa-dori Horitsu Jimusho)" and "青山通り法律事務所 (Aoyama-dori Horitsu Jimusho)".

(3) Use of the trademark in the application by the Appellant

(a) Since the Appellant alleges that distinguishment between the services provided by the applicant and other services is acquired as a result of using the trademark in the application, this point is considered as follows.

According to the evidence (A3) submitted by the Appellant and the complete gist of the Appellant's allegations, it is acknowledged that the Appellant has been using the trademark in the application since January 5, 2017.

However, since the trademark in the application has only been in use for a little more than three years, there are no advertisements and its business results provided by the appellant, and there are no objective facts that can be ascertained such as articles introducing the trademark by persons other than the Appellant, it cannot be said that the trademark in the application was so widely recognized that consumers could recognize it to be services pertaining to a certain business, and no other evidence sufficient to reverse this finding has been submitted.

(b) In this case, it is difficult to say that the trademark in the application is known nationwide as a result of its use, and it is not acknowledged that consumers can recognize the trademark to be services related to a certain business.

(4) Judgment

(a) The meaning of the characters of "六本木通り (Roppongi Dori)" in the configuration

of the trademark in the application is "the common name of the road from Kasumigaseki, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo to Shibuya, Shibuya-ku" (Digital Daijisen (Shogakukan, <https://kotobank.jp/word/六本木通り-674215>)), and the meaning of the characters of "特許事務所 (Tokkyo Jimusho)" in the configuration of the trademark in the application is "a patent attorney's office" (Kojien, 7th edition (published by Iwanami Shoten, Publishers on January 12, 2018)), whereas the meaning of the characters of "弁理士 (Benrishi)" is "a person who engages in the business of practicing agency for or giving opinions on applications for registration of patents, utility models, designs or trademarks, and for whom certain qualifications and registration in the Registry of Patent Attorneys are required." (Kojien, 7th edition (same as above)). Therefore, it is acknowledged that the trademark in the application is recognized and understood to be a combination of the characters of "六本木通り (Roppongi Dori)" and the characters of "特許事務所 (Tokkyo Jimusho)".

In light of the above meaning of "特許事務所 (Tokkyo Jimusho)", it is clear that patent attorney offices widely provide services of "legal services relating to patents", and as described in (2) (a) above, patent offices widely provide services to startups. In this case, the characters of "特許事務所 (Tokkyo Jimusho)" can be said to be a common name meaning a party that provides the designated services of the application.

Furthermore, as described in (2) (b) above, in the field of handling services related to the legal business provided by a lawyer, the characters of "〇〇通り□□事務所 (〇〇 Dori □□Jimusho; 〇〇 Street □□Office)", which is a combination of the characters of "〇〇通り (〇〇 Dori)" and the characters of "□□事務所 (□□ Jimusho; □□ Office)" that is the common name of an office providing the services, are widely adopted and used as the name of an office located near the road commonly called "〇〇通り (〇〇 Dori)".

In addition, since the trademark in the application consists of the standard characters, there are no notable features in the configuration mode of the trademark.

(b) In view of the above, when the trademark in the application is used for the designated services, the traders and consumers coming into contact with the trademark will only understand and recognize the trademark in the application to be "a patent attorney office located near a road commonly called 六本木通り (Roppongi Dori)". Since the trademark in the application simply indicates a location where services are provided or a location of a party that provides the services, it is not proper in terms of public interest for acknowledging a specific person to use the trademark exclusively for the designated services in the application, and the trademark is not distinct enough to distinguish between the services provided by the applicant and other services and does not fulfill the functions of a trademark.

Therefore, the trademark in the application falls under Article 3 (1) (vi) of the Trademark Act since the consumers will not be able to recognize the trademark to be services related to a certain business.

## 2 Regarding the Appellant's allegations

(1) The Appellant alleges that all examples of use presented in Attachment 2 are "〇〇通り法律事務所 (〇〇 Dori Horitsu Jimusho)" and not a single example shows the use of "〇〇通り (〇〇 Dori)" for the name of a "特許事務所 (Tokkyo Jimusho)". Therefore, the actual circumstances of transaction are far from the real situation and have been arbitrarily abstracted.

However, the term "法律事務所 (Horitsu Jimusho; Law office)" means "a place where lawyers handle various legal services" (Kojien, 7th edition (same as above)), and the term "弁護士 (Bengoshi; Lawyer)" means "a person who, at the request of a party or other concerned parties or upon entrustment of a public agency, performs acts concerning lawsuits or other general legal services" (Kojien, 7th edition (same as above)), and thus it can be said that traders and consumers of the designated services of the application will recognize and understand that lawyers can provide the designated services of the application. In fact, "legal services relating to patents for start-ups", which are the designated services of the application, include services for patent-related lawsuits and trial cases, and it is clear that there are many lawyers who provide such legal services, and it is not the case that these lawyers do not provide such services because the services are requested by start-ups.

Thus, it is reasonable to assume that traders and consumers of the designated services of the application will recognize and understand that they can receive the designated services not only from patent attorneys but also from lawyers, and thus will come into contact with the trademark in consideration of the actual circumstances of the name of the "法律事務所 (Horistu Jimusho; Law Office)" which is the lawyer's office.

(2) The Appellant alleges that none of the examples of use presented in Attachment 2 is especially shown to be an example of use in providing the designated services of the trademark in the application, and that the examples of use cannot be said to indicate the actual circumstances of transaction for the designated services of the trademark in the application.

However, even if the law offices mentioned in the examples of use do not explicitly advocate providing the designated services of the application, since these law offices are staffed by lawyers, as explained in (1) above, it can be said that traders and consumers of the designated services of the application will recognize and understand that the law offices are capable of providing the designated services of the application. In addition,

as explained in (1) above, traders and consumers of the designated services of the application will come into contact with the trademark in the application in consideration of the actual circumstances of the name of the law office as well.

(3) The appellant alleges that the examples of use presented in Attachment 1 are irrelevant and meaningless in determining whether there are actual circumstances in which the characters of "〇〇通り□□事務所 (〇〇Dori □□ Jimusho)" are widely adopted and used.

However, as acknowledged in 1 (4) (a) above, the trademark in the application is recognized and understood to be a combination of the characters of "六本木通り (Roppongi Dori)" and the characters of "特許事務所 (Tokkyo Jimusho)". There should be no problem in recognizing, based on the examples of use presented in Attachment 1, how the characters of "特許事務所 (Tokkyo Jimusho)" in the trademark is recognized and understood by the traders and consumers of the designated services of the application.

(4) The Appellant alleges that the examples of use presented in Attachment 2 are all names of individual law offices and indicate the places of origin for the respective law offices.

However, even if each of the examples of use pertains to the name of an individual law office, it does not affect the fact that in the field of handling services pertaining to the legal business provided by a lawyer, the characters of "〇〇通り□□事務所 (〇〇 Dori □□ Jimusho)" is widely used as the name for an office located near a road commonly called "〇〇通 (り) (〇〇 Dori)". Accordingly, as acknowledged in 1 (4) (b) above, since the trademark in the application simply indicates a location where services are provided or a location of a party that provides the services, it is not proper in terms of public interest for acknowledging a specific person to use the trademark exclusively for the designated services of the application, and the trademark is not distinct enough to distinguish between the services provided by the applicant and other services, and the trademark does not fulfill the functions of a trademark.

(5) With regards to the examples of "骨董通り法律事務所 (Kotto-dori Horitsu Jimusho)" and "青山通り法律事務所 (Aoyama-dori Horitsu Jimusho)" among the examples of use presented in Attachment 2, the Appellant alleges that, "骨董通り (Kotto-dori)" and "山通り (Aoyama-dori)" are streets adjoining to each other and thus may cause the traders and consumers to understand as including the same place or having the same implication, but such understanding is not a socially accepted idea.

However, the traders and consumers of the designated services of the application simply recognize and understand "骨董通り法律事務所 (Kotto-dori Horitsu Jimusho)"

as the name of a law office located near a street called "骨董通り (Kotto-dori)", and "青山通り法律事務所 (Aoyama-dori Horitsu Jimusho)" as the name of a law office located near a street called "青山通り (Aoyama-dori)". The fact that "骨董通り (Kotto-dori)" and "青山通り (Aoyama-dori)" are streets adjoining to each other does not affect the above recognition and understanding.

(6) The appellant allege that if the characters of "〇〇通り (〇〇 Dori)" refer not to a specific place but to the entire road that is called by that name of the characters, the characters representing such a wide area would not be understood by traders and consumers as a term for a place for providing specific services in the first place.

However, even if the place near the road called "六本木通り (Roppongi Dori)" is extensive, it does not change the fact that the concept signifies a place. Given the facts as described in 1 (2) (b) above, it can be said that the traders and consumers of the designated services of the application recognize and understand the location where the services are provided or the location of the party that provides the services as being near a road called "六本木通り (Roppongi Dori)".

(7) The Appellant alleges that since the trademark in the application is the name of an existing office, there is no room for others to use it in general based on the laws and other regulations.

However, even if the Patent Attorneys Act stipulates that no party that is not a patent attorney or a patent professional corporation may use the name of a patent office or a similar name, and the Japan Patent Attorneys Association's "Guidelines for Office Names" stipulates that "a name that is likely to cause confusion with those of other existing offices" must not be used, as stated in 1 (3) above, it cannot be said that the characters "六本木通り特許事務所 (Roppongi Dori Tokkyo Jimusho)" of the trademark in the application is widely recognized among the traders and consumers of the trademark in the application to be the name of an existing patent office. Therefore, it does not mean that traders and consumers who come into contact with the trademark in the application do not understand and recognize it to mean "a patent attorney's office located near a road commonly called Roppongi Dori". Therefore, the Appellant's allegation does not affect the findings of 1 (4) above.

(8) The Appellant alleges that the combination of the characters of "六本木通り (Roppongi Dori)" and the characters of "特許事務所 (Tokkyo Jimusho)" makes a unique and unforeseen coined name, and that there is no example where such a combined name has been used in the past.

However, even if there are no examples of using the name made by combining the characters of "六本木通り (Roppongi Dori)" and the characters of "特許事務所

(Tokkyo Jimusho)" in the past, given the actual circumstances as described in 1 (2) (b) above, it cannot be said that the trademark in the application is an unique and unforeseen coined name. In any event, the Appellant's allegation does not affect the findings in 1 (4) above.

(9) The Appellant alleges that there are past registration cases such as "外苑西通りビル (Gaien Nishidori Building)" and "Tenjin Nishidori Square (天神西通りスクエア)". However, these registration cases differ from the trademark in the application in terms of constituent characters and configuration mode. Moreover, the judgement of specific cases should not be bound to past registration cases, and in an examiner's decision or a trial decision on an application for trademark registration, decisions should be made on a case-by-case basis according to the configuration mode of the trademark and the actual circumstances of transaction. Therefore, the existence of these cases does not affect the findings in 1 above.

(10) The Appellant alleges that, in relationship with the consumers of the designated services of the trademark in the application, there is no specific evidence that a name made by combining a street name and a general name of a patent office lacks distinctiveness. However, the findings in 1 above applies.

### 3 Summary

As described above, the trademark in the application falls under Article 3(1) (vi) of the Trademark Act, and thus cannot be registered.

Therefore, the appeal decision shall be made as described in the conclusion.

September 7, 2020

Chief administrative judge: KIMURA, Kazuhiro

Administrative judge: YAMAMURA, Hiroshi

Administrative judge: SHOJI, Miwa

Attachment 1: Cases that patent attorney offices provide services to startups (underlines were added by the body)

(1) On the website of "Aarwer International Intellectual Property Firm", under the headline "For Startups, Venture Businesses, and SMEs", it is described that "So far, in the realm of patents in Japan, there have been significant differences in various aspects between startups, venture businesses, SMEs, and large corporations... However, the patent system is a system to protect inventions regardless of the scale of the applicant's

business. We may not have the power to significantly change everything in the world of intellectual property, but we are strongly motivated to change the outlook on intellectual property, even if it is only within our field of operation. We, the Aarwer International Intellectual Property Firm, provide the same level of service to those who are familiar with the content of a patent application and those who are not. This also comes from our belief, on which we have been placing great importance, in providing true valuable services."

(<https://www.tateishi-ip.com/index.files/venture.htm>)

(2) On the website of "Karasuma IP Firm", it is described that "Patent Attorneys are experts in intellectual property rights!

We provide total support for venture businesses, start-ups and small and medium-sized enterprises!"

(<https://www.karasumaip.kyoto/>)

(3) On the website of "Minato Mirai Patent Firm", under the headline "Patent Applications for Start-ups and IT Companies from 280,000 JPY", it is described that "Minato Mirai Patent Firm will provide its full support to start-ups and IT companies in obtaining patents at a reliable price."

(<https://www.app-patent.com/>)

(4) On the website of "Shin-Yokohama General Patent Firm", under the headline "Support Services for Start-ups and Venture Businesses", it is described that "We support start-ups and venture businesses from an Intellectual Property aspect by proposing how to obtain patent and trademark rights from a mid-to-long term perspective. " and that "As mentioned above, the government offers various favorable plans for startups and venture businesses. Based on the above plans, our firm will actively support your company from an intellectual property aspect."

(<http://www.shinyoko-pat.jp/venture-corporation-support>)

(5) On the website of "Mizogami & Co.", under the headline "Support for Start-ups", it is described that "Mizogami & Co. provides support for trademark assessment and registration for corporations that have been in business for less than three years or sole proprietors who have been in business for less than three years."

([http://www.mizogami.gr.jp/trademark/request/request\\_002.html](http://www.mizogami.gr.jp/trademark/request/request_002.html))

(6) On the website of "Hikaru International Patent Firm", under the headline "Support for Start-ups and Venture Businesses", it is described that "Our patent attorney, Hori, became a member of a General Incorporated Association, that is, TX Entrepreneur Partners (TEP) in April this year. TEP is an organization that supports technology start-ups and venture businesses. We plan to supporting startups and venture businesses mainly from an aspect

of intellectual property rights. The firm will provide advice on how to build business entry barriers for technology companies. Please do not hesitate to contact us!"

([http://www.hikaru-](http://www.hikaru-pat.jp/)

[pat.jp/%e3%82%b9%e3%82%bf%e3%83%bc%e3%83%88%e3%82%a2%e3%83%83%e3%83%97%e3%83%bb%e3%83%99%e3%83%b3%e3%83%81%e3%83%a3%e3%83%bc%e4%bc%81%e6%a5%ad/%e3%82%b9%e3%82%bf%e3%83%bc%e3%83%88%e3%82%a2%e3%83%83%e3%83%97%e3%83%bb%e3%83%99%e3%83%b3%e3%83%81%e3%83%a3%e3%83%bc%e4%bc%81%e6%a5%ad%e6%94%af%e6%8f%b4/\)](http://www.hikaru-pat.jp/)

(7) On the website of "Takamatsu Patent Office", under the headline "Intellectual Property for Startups": A Service by Takamatsu Patent Office to Support the Acquisition of Rights and Exclusively for Those Who Plan to Start a Business," it is described that "Specifically, we offer a discount on the fees for obtaining intellectual property rights such as patent and trademark rights."

(<http://www.takamatsu-po.jp/startup/>)

(8) On the website of "Hokusetsu International Patent Office", there is a link to "Free AI/IoT-related Patent Consultation for Startups" under the headline "Our 7 Services", and it is described on the page directed to by the link that "Many startups may be seeking an IPO for their AI/IoT-related technology or idea. However, the concerning aspect is that most companies do not incorporate the cost of acquiring and managing intellectual property when raising funds. The company cannot compete in the world in this way. Therefore, we offer free consultation services for startups. Nothing can begin without first having a consultation. Then a patent attorney specializing in this field will support you in tactical aspects, including the acquisition of rights. Few patent attorneys are skilled in AI/IoT-related fields, and there are only a handful of patent attorneys who are skilled in AI/IoT-related fields and are also capable of providing support for trademarks. We can provide seamless support for IP strategies required for startups."

(<https://www.b-mall.ne.jp/company/hokupat>, <https://www.b-mall.ne.jp/prdetail-76860/>)

(9) On the website of "Chiiku Patent Firm", under the headline "Introduction of the Director", it is described that "Director of Chiiku Patent Firm, Patent Attorney... He has given numerous lectures at various business organizations, including the Chamber of Commerce and Industry. The firm supports not only manufacturers, start-up businesses, and individual inventors, but also design firms, marketing companies, Michelin-listed restaurants and many others."

(<https://chizai-media.com/>)

(10) On the website of "FOX International Patent Office", it is described that "My name

is Toru Kano. I am a patent attorney and the head of FOX International Patent Office... When I started my business, I wondered if I could start a unique patent firm that could not be found anywhere else. I wondered if I could offer services to startups that were not offered by large patent firms... So I wondered if I could provide services not only for IP (intellectual property) but also for attracting customers on the WEB (SEO, etc.). My derived corporate philosophy was this "IP × SEO Concept". IP means Intellectual Property and SEO means Search Engine Optimization. The "IP × SEO" concept is to protect our client's business with IP and support monetization by promoting the client's business with SEO... We believe that attracting customers using the WEB is an important part of promotional activities, especially for start-up companies."

(<https://getpatent.biz/patent-office-outline/>)

(11) On the website of "Itoh Patent Office", under the heading "Venture Support Division", it is described that "Purpose and Details of the Venture Support Division: The Division is engaged in the business of supporting start-ups and early-stage venture businesses. In particular, we support venture businesses by creating intellectual assets that generate free cash flow considering the financing, developing intellectual property strategies, and assisting in obtaining grants. We operate with the aim of helping venture businesses avoiding the "Death Valley", and making the path to success for venture businesses as short and smooth as possible. We also have a program to invest our operation and other expenses in early-stage venture businesses with limited funds."

(<https://www.itoh-pat.com/service>)

Attachment 2: Cases that, in the field of handling services pertaining to the legal business provided by a lawyer, the characters of "○○通り□□事務所 (○○ Dori □□Jimusho; ○○ Street □□Office)", which is a combination of the characters of "○○通り (○○ Dori)" and the characters of "□□事務所 (□□ Jimusho; □□ Office)" that is the common name of an office providing the services, are widely adopted and used as the name of an office located near the road commonly called "○○通り (○○ Dori)"

(1) "海岸通り法律事務所 (Kaigan Dori Law Office)"

The office is located on "5F of Minato Ise Building, 3-12-1 Kaigan Dori, Naka-ku, Yokohama-shi, Kanagawa Prefecture" and is in close proximity to a road named "海岸通り (Kaigan Dori)".

(<http://www.kaiganst.com/office/>)

(<https://www.google.com/maps/place/%E6%B5%B7%E5%B2%B8%E9%80%9A%E3%82%8A%E6%B3%95%E5%BE%8B%E4%BA%8B%E5%8B%99%E6%89%80/@35.4497066,139.6397762,19z/data=!4m5!3m4!1s0x0:0x858ac8d20ad52fc1!8m2!3d35.4>)

49688!4d139.639803)

(2) "西堀通り法律事務所 (Nishibori Dori Law Office)"

The office is located on "5F of Nissei No. 5 Building, 1554 Nanaban-cho, Nishibori-dori, Chuo-ku, Niigata-shi" and is in close proximity to a road named "西堀通り (Nishibori Dori)".

(<http://www.nishiboridori-law.jp/info.html>)

(3) "国会通り法律事務所 (Kokkai Dori Law Office)"

The office is located on "4F, 1-3 Hibiya Park, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo" and is in close proximity to a road named "国会通り (Kokkai Dori)".

(<http://kokkaidori-law.jp/access.html>)

(<https://www.google.com/maps/place/%E5%9B%BD%E4%BC%9A%E9%80%9A%E3%82%8A%E6%B3%95%E5%BE%8B%E4%BA%8B%E5%8B%99%E6%89%80/@35.671414,139.753458,17z/data=!3m1!4b1!4m5!3m4!1s0x60188bedbd4951bb:0x56a5eca81282b146!8m2!3d35.671414!4d139.7556467>)

(4) "骨董通り法律事務所 (Kotto Dori Law Office)"

The office is located on "1F, Minami Aoyama Point, 5-18-5 Minami Aoyama, Minato-ku, Tokyo" and is in close proximity to a road named "骨董通り (Kotto Dori)".

(<http://www.kottolaw.com/access.html>)

(5) "並木通り法律事務所 (Namiki-dori Law Office)"

The office is located on "2F of Hase Daiichi Building, 7-5-5 Ginza, Chuo-ku, Tokyo" and is in close proximity to a road named "並木通り (Namiki Dori)".

(<http://www.namikidori-law.jp/office.html#access>)

(6) "新虎通り法律事務所 (Shintora Dori Law Office)"

The office is located at "806 Bengoshi Building, 1-21-8 Nishi-Shinbashi, Minato-ku, Tokyo" and is in close proximity to a road named "新虎通り (Shintora Dori)".

(<http://www.shintoradori.jp/html/access.html>)

(7) "平成通り法律事務所 (Heisei Dori Law Office)"

The office is located at "1-9-13-802 Tsukiji, Chuo-ku, Tokyo" and is in close proximity to a road named "平成通り (Heisei Dori)".

(<http://www.heiseidori-law.jp/#access>)

(<https://www.google.com/maps/place/%E5%B9%B3%E6%88%90%E9%80%9A%E3%82%8A%E6%B3%95%E5%BE%8B%E4%BA%8B%E5%8B%99%E6%89%80/@35.6693395,139.7693359,17z/data=!3m1!4b1!4m5!3m4!1s0x60188bdfdd72e479:0x93001b03cc3927a!8m2!3d35.6693395!4d139.7715246>)

(8) "土佐堀通り法律事務所 (Tosabori Dori Law Office)"

The office is located on "5F of Aledville Higobashi, 1-15-27 Edobori, Nishi-ku,

Osaka-shi, Osaka" and is in close proximity to a road named "土佐堀通 (Tosabori Dori)".  
(<https://www.sosapo.org/lp/tosaboridori02/>)

(<https://www.google.com/maps/place/%E5%9C%9F%E4%BD%90%E5%A0%80%E9%80%9A%E3%82%8A%E6%B3%95%E5%BE%8B%E4%BA%8B%E5%8B%99%E6%89%80/@34.6912795,135.4931955,17z/data=!3m1!4b1!4m5!3m4!1s0x6000e6de18fe3fb1:0x8b5db4fe57ab8bd8!8m2!3d34.6912795!4d135.4953842>)

(9) "長良橋通り法律事務所 (Nagarabashi Dori Law Office)"

The office is located at "Komori Building, 1-10-2 Kandacho, Gifu-shi, Gifu Prefecture" and is in close proximity to a road named "長良橋通り (Nagarabashi Dori)".  
(<http://www.nagarabashi-law.jp/>)

(<https://www.google.com/maps/place/%E9%95%B7%E8%89%AF%E6%A9%8B%E9%80%9A%E3%82%8A%E6%B3%95%E5%BE%8B%E4%BA%8B%E5%8B%99%E6%89%80/@35.4226405,136.758715,17z/data=!3m1!4b1!4m5!3m4!1s0x6003a944c938aafd:0xfe780e9850001980!8m2!3d35.4226405!4d136.7609037>)

(10) "錦華通り法律事務所 (Kinka Dori Law Office)"

The office is located on "2F of UT Building, 1-2-3 Kanda-Sarugakucho, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo" and is in close proximity to a road named "錦華通り (Kinka Dori)".  
(<http://kinkadori.jp/access.php>)

(<https://www.google.com/maps/place/%E9%8C%A6%E8%8F%AF%E9%80%9A%E3%82%8A%E6%B3%95%E5%BE%8B%E4%BA%8B%E5%8B%99%E6%89%80/@35.6973831,139.757431,17z/data=!3m1!4b1!4m5!3m4!1s0x60188c16d3cab739:0xfe332c5464b95de7!8m2!3d35.6973831!4d139.7596197>)

(11) "夷川通り法律事務所 (Ebisugawa-dori Law Office)"

The office is located on "2F of Muro Building, 300 Nishiiri Tawaraya-cho, Tominokoji-Ebisugawa-dori, Nakagyo-ku, Kyoto-shi" and is in close proximity to a road named "夷川通り (Ebisugawa Dori)".  
(<https://www.ebisugawadori-law.com/>)

(<https://www.google.com/maps/place/%E5%A4%B7%E5%B7%9D%E9%80%9A%E3%82%8A%E6%B3%95%E5%BE%8B%E4%BA%8B%E5%8B%99%E6%89%80/@35.015018,135.7625164,17z/data=!3m1!4b1!4m5!3m4!1s0x600108893db7433b:0xb807569ab974d1e5!8m2!3d35.015018!4d135.7647051>)

(12) "青山通り法律事務所 (Aoyama Dori Law Office)"

The office is located at "705 Caprice Aoyama, 3-12-7 Kita-Aoyama, Minato-ku, Tokyo" and is in close proximity to a road named "青山通り (Aoyama Dori)".  
(<http://www.koutsubengo.com/office>)