
Subject: Re: Trademarks and intellectual property rights
Posted by [MQracing](#) on Wed, 14 Sep 2005 12:24:05 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Manualblock:hey...nice post and some good questions for lay people... and interesting fodder intellectually.you wrote;:::The final consensus up to this point is that anyone can build a trans just don't name it Peerless.:::again, I have no problem with Dougie or anyone else who wants to go into the transformer business... but use John Atwood's model... design and build or have built your products identify them with your own name or brand name... and build up your reputation the ole fashion way... by building one quality product after another...taking or misappropriating the namesake of a company who common sense you know that your mis-using... is the lazy, shyster way of doing business...just as would be the case if I copied Wayne's designs and called them Pi Dynamics or Pi Sound... it would be an attempt to cash in on Wayne's hard work and good will...I'm not sure if I follow the "indigenous" part... there has not been to my knowledge confusion such as perhaps clouds the Kleenex trademark... where a registered mark becomes known as designating a generic class or type of goods.Peerless transformers made a wide range of transformers.... from entry level to reasonably sophisticated. They also made transformers for differing industries (they were not solely an audio transformer manufacturer)...I've never seen anyone use the phrase "I need a Peerless for my EL84 amp's output stage" as a generic calling that they need an "output transformer" and perhaps they would prefer a Peerless branded output.msl
