



# OCPLA NEWSLETTER

Orange County Patent Law Association

[www.ocpla.org](http://www.ocpla.org)

Vol. 12, No. 1

January 2006

## JANUARY LUNCHEON

Please join us at our next luncheon meeting on Wednesday, January 25, 2006, when we are pleased to present **Diane F. Wyzga, R.N., J.D.**, of Lightning Rod Communications, who will speak on "Discrimination: I know It When I See It." [Note: This presentation has been certified by OCPLA for 1 hour of MCLE Elimination of Bias credit].

*The lunch will be held at noon at the Wyndham Garden Hotel.*

## CHANGING OF THE GUARD

The newly-elected OCPLA directors will begin their terms in January 2006. Note that the new second-year director will be Marlene Klein, and therefore all lunch reservations should be sent to her attention. The reservation form has been updated accordingly. Also note that the new OCPLA Newsletter Editor is TJ Singh, and therefore all ad inquiries, articles, etc., should be sent to his attention.

## OCPLA 2006 SPRING SEMINAR

SAVE THE DATE. It's almost here!! OCPLA's annual Spring Seminar will be held this spring from March 24-26, 2006, at the La Costa Resort & Spa in Carlsbad, California.

## FEBRUARY BOARD MEETING

The February Board meeting will be held February 1, 2006 at noon at Canon, in Irvine. Members who wish to present items for the Board's consideration should contact our president, John King, to have their item placed on the agenda, and to verify the time and location of the meeting.

## NEW MEMBERS

Please encourage your colleagues to renew their OCPLA membership or to join as new members!

## RSVP ON TIME FOR MONTHLY LUNCHEONS

To reduce the likelihood of additional rate increases associated with last minute reservations, please RSVP early, i.e., no later than by noon on the Friday preceding the meeting, so that we can provide more accurate numbers of luncheon attendees to the hotel. Your efforts to register at least five days in advance of the lunches is greatly appreciated by the hotel and the OCPLA Board.

The costs for the monthly luncheon meetings for student members is \$15.

## 2006 MEMBERSHIP RENEWAL

Dues for 2006 are \$35 for attorneys and agents. Members receive the monthly OCPLA newsletter, and reduced rates for the monthly luncheons and seminars. A membership form is included in this month's newsletter and is also available at [www.ocpla.org](http://www.ocpla.org). Please renew early to reduce delays in processing.

## OCPLA WEBSITE

Check the OCPLA website at [www.ocpla.org](http://www.ocpla.org) for copies of the OCPLA newsletter, for membership information and for current events of interest to members. Let us have your comments. We will be making changes and improvements as time passes, and your comments will be useful in knowing what to change and what to leave alone. Send comments to "[webmaster@ocpla.org](mailto:webmaster@ocpla.org)."

### E-MAIL DISTRIBUTION OF THE NEWSLETTER



**The Newsletter is now being transmitted solely by electronic mail.** If you know of anyone who should be, but is not getting this e-mail distribution, please have them contact TJ Singh at [tjsingh@koslaw.com](mailto:tjsingh@koslaw.com).

### OCPLA POLICY

Although we are open to comments and suggestions, present policy concerning publication of advertisements in this newsletter is as follows: (1) "Positions Wanted," "Positions Available," and other similar ads will be printed free of charge and, unless otherwise requested, will run for two months; (2) Other ads such as word processing, legal support services, and firm announcements will be published for \$15 per issue or \$150 per year (for all 12 issues), payable in advance. We reserve the right to edit each advertisement. Please contact the Newsletter editor to place your ad or with your comments and suggestions.

#### MINUTIAE

BY NEAL M. COHEN  
COHEN SAKAGUCHI & ENGLISH LLP  
[nmc@cohen-sak.com](mailto:nmc@cohen-sak.com)



This month's Minutiae was prepared 100% by Leonard Svensson (except for this paragraph). So...

#### MINUTIAE

BY LEONARD R. SVENSSON  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH &  
BIRCH, LLP  
[lrs@bskb.com](mailto:lrs@bskb.com)



### USPTO PROPOSES MAJOR RULE CHANGES LIMITING THE NUMBER OF CONTINUING APPLICATIONS THAT MAY BE FILED AND THE NUMBER OF CLAIMS THAT WOULD BE EXAMINED

On 3 January 2006, the United States Patent & Trademark Office ("USPTO") published proposed rule changes for continuing applications and the examination of claims. The USPTO is proposing to limit the number of continuing applications that may be filed as a

matter of right to one, and the number of claims that would be examined in each application to ten. The USPTO states that the changes are needed to reduce rework and increase efficiency. Public comments on these proposals are due by 3 May 2006. Below is a summary of the major points of each proposal.

#### Summary of Changes to Practice for Continuing Applications, Requests for Continued Examination, and Applications Containing Patentable Indistinct Claims

- As a matter of right, the USPTO will permit the filing of only a **single** continuation, continuation-in-part (CIP), request for continued examination (RCE), or voluntary divisional application.
- Any second or subsequent such filing must be supported by a showing via a petition as to why the amendment, argument, or evidence **could not have been** submitted previously.
- A divisional application is defined as an application that is filed claiming subject matter that was not elected subject matter resulting from a restriction requirement or a requirement for lack of unity. A single continuing application or RCE of this type of divisional application is permitted. Continuations or RCEs of "voluntary divisionals" are not permitted as a matter of right.
- Multiple simultaneous continuations or RCEs of a single parent application are also not permitted. Not only are a series of more than two applications not permitted without the granting of a petition, two parallel continuations or RCEs filed from a single parent are likewise not permitted.
- This rule would be **retroactive** to the extent that as of the effective date of the rule no second or subsequent continuing application or RCE would be permitted. If you had already filed one continuation at that point, no more would be permitted.

- If multiple applications are filed with a common inventor, common owner, or obligation to assign on the same date or within two months of each other, the applicant is required to identify each application. If they contain patentably indistinct claims, the Office may require elimination of the claims from all but one application.
- If multiple applications with a common inventor, owner, or obligation to assign are filed with overlapping subject matter, there will be a rebuttable presumption that double patenting exists and applicant must either file a terminal disclaimer or explain how the subject matter is patentably distinct. Therefore applicant will be responsible for identifying obvious-type double patenting situations themselves.
- If an application is a CIP, applicant must identify which claim or claims are disclosed in the manner of 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraph 1 in the prior application.

#### Summary of Changes to Practice for the Examination of Claims in Patent Applications

- The USPTO will examine up to 10 representative claims in an application. All independent claims will be examined as well as designated dependent claims as long as the total is 10 or less.
- If the applicant presents more than 10 independent claims for examination or requests that more than 10 claims be initially examined, then applicant will be required to submit an examination support document (ESD) so as to “share the burden” of examining the application.
- This change is **retroactive** to include any application that is currently pending and has not received an action on the merits. Applicant may designate up to 10 claims for

examination. All independent claims must be designated. If applicant fails to designate claims for examination, then **only** the independent claims will be examined. This could result in fewer than 10 claims receiving an examination.

- The examination of dependent claims in excess of 10 will be held in abeyance until the application is in condition for allowance. At that point dependent claims that depend from allowable claims may be examined for formal requirements and allowed in the application.
- Multiple dependent claims will be counted as multiple claims and if such claim is identified as a representative claim, all claims referred to in the multiple dependent claim must be designated for examination.
- A claim which refers to a claim of a different statutory class of invention will be treated as an independent claim for fee calculation and for calculation of 10 representative claims for examination.
- The USPTO is requesting input on how to count Markush claims. They will either count each alternative as a separate claim, or count each alternative as a separate claim unless applicant shows that each alternative in the claim contains a common core property that is patentable and essential.
- The examining support document (ESD) must be submitted if the applicant wants more than 10 claims initially examined. The ESD must include:
  - A statement that a search was conducted, indicating the field of search by class and subclass, the databases searched with search logic and the date of the search.

- An IDS citing the most relevant art related to the designated claims.
  - An indication of all of the claim limitations disclosed in the prior art cited.
  - An explanation of how all of the claims are patentable over the art cited.
  - A concise explanation of the utility of the invention claimed.
  - A showing of where each limitation of each claim finds support under 35 U.S.C. 112 paragraph 1 in the written description of the application and any parent application from which benefit is claimed.
- A search report from a foreign patent office will **not** satisfy the ESD requirements.
  - The USPTO may require **consolidation of applications** that contain patentably indistinct claims if there is a common inventor, assignee, or obligation of assignment. Additionally only 10 claims from the multiple applications will be examined.

Public comments on these proposals are due by 3 May 2006, but no public hearing is scheduled. The USPTO will then consider the comments and publish final rules at some future date.

A copy of the complete proposed rules can be found at [www.uspto.gov/web/offices/com/sol/notices/71fr48.pdf](http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/com/sol/notices/71fr48.pdf) and [www.uspto.gov/web/offices/com/sol/notices/71fr61.pdf](http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/com/sol/notices/71fr61.pdf)

Please e-mail any questions, comments, or submissions for future *Minutiae* columns, to Neal M. Cohen, at [nmc@cohen-sak.com](mailto:nmc@cohen-sak.com). (Note: all submissions must be approved by the Editor prior to publication).

## RECENT INTERESTING IP CASES

BY LEONARD R. SVENSSON  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH &  
BIRCH, LLP  
[lrs@bskb.com](mailto:lrs@bskb.com)



### 1. Intent to Deceive the USPTO May be Inferred from Applicant's Actions

*Pharmacia Corp. v. Par Pharma., Inc.*, No. 04-1478,-1496 (Fed. Cir. Aug. 10, 2005)

**Issue A:** Does an Applicant have a duty to disclose to the USPTO a reference that takes a contradictory position to that asserted by the Applicant before the USPTO?

**Answer:** Yes.

**Issue B:** Does a terminal disclaimer bind patents together such that inequitable conduct in one application automatically renders the other application unenforceable?

**Answer:** No.

**Facts:** Pharmacia is the owner of the '368 and '504 patents, which are directed to the glaucoma drug "Xalatan." During prosecution of the '368 patent, claims directed to "the 17-phenyl compound" were rejected as being obvious over a prior art patent that disclosed a generic group of compounds that included the 17-phenyl compound. Pharmacia argued that the preferred compound of the prior art reference was "the 20-ethyl compound" and in support of their arguments submitted a declaration from an expert, which compared the 17-phenyl and 20-ethyl compounds. The declaration stated, in paragraph 10 that, "10. Even at dosages of 45 mg, the 20-ethyl compound does not cause statistically significant decrease in IOP [intraocular pressure]." However, paragraph 10 contradicts a journal article co-authored by the declarant, which stated that the prior art compound causes a statistically significant IOP reduction. The '504 patent is a sibling to the '368 patent and both applications were filed simultaneously as continuations of U.S. Patent Application No. 07/469,442 (the '442

application). A terminal disclaimer was filed in the '504 patent in view of '368 patent.

**Argument A:** Par argued that Pharmacia had a duty to submit the contradictory journal article to the USPTO and failure to do so was inequitable conduct.

**Argument B:** Par further argued that the terminal disclaimer filed in the '504 patent bound the two patents together such that the inequitable conduct in the '368 patent automatically rendered the '504 patent unenforceable.

**Conclusion A:** The failure to submit a copy of directly conflicting articles amounts to the withholding of material information from the USPTO. The highly material nature of the misleading actions and the failure to submit a directly conflicting article that was authored by the declarant is a basis to infer an intent to deceive the USPTO. Thus, the '368 patent was found unenforceable for inequitable conduct.

**Conclusion B:** A terminal disclaimer alone does not bind patents together for purposes of unenforceability due to inequitable conduct. Thus, the inequitable conduct in the '368 patent does not automatically render the '504 patent unenforceable.

## 2. Catalyst "supplied" from the U.S. for use in a patented process violates section 271 (f)

*Union Carbide Chemicals & Plastics Technology Corporation v. Shell Oil Company*, No. 04-1475,-1512 (Fed. Cir. Oct. 3, 2005)

**Issue A:** Does exportation of a catalyst for use outside of the U.S. in a process covered by a U.S. patent for generating ethylene oxide gas gives rise to liability under 35 USC § 271(f).

**Answer:** Yes.

**Facts:** Union Carbide and Shell compete in the production of ethylene oxide (EO) gas, and the sales of monoethylene glycol (which is produced by EO gas). The process for creating EO gas requires a chemical reaction between ethylene and oxygen at a

temperature of 250-300° C. However, silver catalysts can be used to decrease the reaction temperature and increase reaction efficiency, without consuming or altering the silver itself. Union Carbide conducted research into silver catalysts, in which certain other alkali metals are added to the silver to increase the reaction efficiency for generating EO gas. This research resulted in U.S. Patent No. 4,916,243 ('243 patent). Union Carbide sued Shell for infringement of claim 4 of the '243 patent. Claim 4 recites a process for the production of EO gas using a catalyst containing certain amounts of silver, cesium, and lithium. At trial in the district court, the jury found that Shell's sale of certain catalysts contributorily infringed claim 4 of the '243 patent. However, the damages awarded to Union Carbide did not account for Shell's exportation of the catalysts, because the district court ruled in limine that 35 USC § 271(f) damages are not available for process claims. Union Carbide appealed the district court's ruling on 271(f) damages.

**Holding:** 35 USC § 271(f) applies to components used in the performance of patented process/method inventions. Thus, the district court erred in refusing to consider evidence of Shell's foreign sales of catalysts for the purpose of recovering additional damages under § 271(f)(2). Remanded for additional findings on Shell's potential liability under § 271(f).

**Reasoning/Conclusion:** In *Eolas Techs. v. Microsoft Corp.*, 399 F.3d 1325, 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2005), the Federal Circuit found that § 271(f) makes no distinction between patentable method/process inventions and other forms of invention. In *Eolas*, the court held that "components" under the statute covered program code, which was exported by the defendant on a master computer disc. Similar to this case, *Eolas* dealt with the exportation of a component (i.e., computer disc with program), which was used, in the performance of a patented process or method (i.e., the method steps executed by the computer in response to the program code). The Court went on to say that here, there is an even stronger case for applying §271(f) than in *Eolas*. In *Eolas*, the exported

master disc was further copied abroad, and the copies were installed on computers. Here, Shell directly supplies the catalysts from the U.S. to its foreign affiliates. Shell's foreign affiliates do not copy the catalysts and use the copies in a foreign process; instead, they use the catalysts directly supplied by Shell in their processes. Therefore, the Federal Circuit has clearly ruled that 35 USC 271 (f) applies to process inventions and remanded the case to the district court for a new determination of damages.

**OTHER ARTICLES  
BY YOU  
YOUR FIRM  
YOUR E-MAIL**

**YOUR  
PHOTO?**

Do you have an article you'd like published in next month's OCPLA Newsletter? If so, please submit it to the OCPLA Newsletter editor, TJ Singh, for review, at [tjsingh@koslaw.com](mailto:tjsingh@koslaw.com). All submissions become the property of OCPLA and may be published without compensation.

## BOARD OF DIRECTORS AND COMMITTEE CHAIRS

### BOARD OF DIRECTORS                      TELEPHONE/E-MAIL

<b>President</b>	John R. King	(949) 760-0404 jking@kmob.com
<b>V.P./President Elect</b>	Leonard R. Svensson	714-708-8555 lrs@bskb.com
<b>Secretary</b>	Greg S. Hollrigel	(949) 450-1750 gsh@patlawyers.com
<b>C.F.O./Treasurer</b>	Neal M. Cohen	(949) 724-1849 nmc@cohen-sak.com
<b>Directors</b>	TJ Singh	(949) 955-1920 tjsingh@koslaw.com
	Marlene Klein	(949) 932-3132 marlene.klein@cda.canon.com
	Tom Dao	(949) 476-0757 thd@cph.com
<b>Immediate Past President</b>	Margaret A. Kivinski	949-757-1999 mkivinski@therox.com

### COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSONS

<b>Annual Seminar</b>	Leonard R. Svensson	714-708-8555 lrs@bskb.com
	Marlene Klein	(949) 932-3132 marlene.klein@cda.canon.com
<b>Copyright Practice</b>	Darren S. Rimer	(949) 367-1541 darren@rimermath.com
<b>Federal Courts</b>	Robert L. Grabarek, Jr.	(949) 263-8400 rgrabarek@crowell.com
<b>Int'l IP Practice</b>	Alexander R. Schlee	310-545-9851 alexschlee@vjp.de
<b>Law Off. Mgmt.</b>	Gabia Pakstys	650-326-3466 gpakstys@sbcglobal.net
<b>Legislative</b>		<b>Position Open</b>
<b>MCLE</b>	Tom Dao	(949) 476-0757 thd@cph.com
<b>Meetings/Programs</b>	Marlene Klein	(949) 932-3132 marlene.klein@cda.canon.com
<b>Newsletter Editor</b>	TJ Singh	(949) 955-1920 tjsingh@koslaw.com
<b>Patent Practice</b>	Tom Dao	(949) 476-0757 tom.dao@cph.com
<b>Trade Secrets/Unfair</b>	Scott Feldmann	(949) 263-8400 rfeldmann@crowell.com
<b>Competition Law</b>	Perry J. Viscounty	714-755-8288 perry.viscounty@lw.com
<b>Trademark Practice</b>	Susan Natland	949-760-0404 smn@kmob.com
<b>Luncheon Speakers</b>	John R. King	(949) 760-0404 jking@kmob.com
<b>OCPLA Website</b>	Marlene Klein	949-932-3132 marlene.klein@cda.canon.com
<b>OCPLA Database</b>	Greg S. Hollrigel	949-450-1750 gsh@patlawyers.com

## OCPLA NEWSLETTER

Orange County Patent Law Association

The OCPLA Newsletter is a copyrighted publication that is normally published shortly before each OCPLA General Meeting. Copyright © 2004 The Orange County Patent Law Association. All rights reserved. Printed in the United States of America. Reproduction of this newsletter is authorized if the source, author and copyright notice information are provided on all reproductions.

This document is provided for informational purposes only. The articles contributed by identified authors express only the views of the particular author or authors, and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the Orange County Patent Law Association or its editorial staff. Any questions or comments concerning the articles should be directed to the author. Any errors should be brought to the attention of the Editor so that appropriate corrections can be published in a subsequent edition of the Newsletter.

The OCPLA reserves the right to determine which, if any, submitted articles will appear in this Newsletter.

We hope that the Newsletter is helpful, informative, entertaining and interesting. Comments, ideas, announcements, proposed articles, suggestions and any other communications concerning the content, form or other aspect of this newsletter may be directed to:

### NEW NEWSLETTER EDITOR FOR 2006

OCPLA Newsletter Editor

#### **TJ Singh**

Klein, O'Neill & Singh  
2 Park Plaza, Suite 510  
Irvine, CA 92614

Tel: (949) 955-1920

Fax: (949) 955-1921

E-mail: tjsingh@koslaw.com

**SERVICES, ANNOUNCEMENTS, WANT ADS****MARCELO E. SROKA, CPA**

Wertz & Co., CPAs  
5450 Trabuco Road  
Irvine, CA 92620-5074  
949-756-5000 x218

**STEPHEN T. FREEMAN, ESQ.**

Straddling, Yocca, Carlson & Rauth  
Corporate and Tax Matters  
(949) 725-4000

**OFFICE SPACE FOR LEASE**

Bright large furnished office with windows in Tustin/Santa Ana IP law suite. Over-flow work is possible. Close to 5 and 55 with ample parking, use of conference room, library and kitchen. Price \$450-650. Call David at (949)606-4842

Ad: xaft060906

**POSITIONS AVAILABLE  
PATENT ATTORNEYS**

Stetina Brunda Garred & Brucker, P.C., a growing intellectual property law office located in Aliso Viejo, CA, has immediate openings for patent attorneys having 1-5 years of experience. Qualified candidates will have significant experience in either patent prosecution and/or intellectual property litigation, with a preferred engineering degree in the mechanical or electrical arts.

Please send employment inquires to:

Stetina Brunda Garred & Brucker, P.C.  
Recruiting Attorney  
75 Enterprise, Suite 250  
Aliso Viejo, CA 92656

or email at [recruiting@stetinalaw.com](mailto:recruiting@stetinalaw.com)

Please visit us at [www.stetinalaw.com](http://www.stetinalaw.com)

Ad: xaft0606K2

## Paul Hastings Attorneys

**Grow Your Intellectual Property Career  
at Paul Hastings**

Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker LLP has a full-service intellectual property practice dedicated to serving leading information technology and life sciences companies all over the world. From Shanghai to Southern California, Palo Alto to Paris, our fast-growing practice includes more than 80 full time IP attorneys, many with advanced degrees in physics, mechanical engineering, electrical engineering, chemical engineering, biology, biochemistry, molecular biology and chemistry. We combine in-depth technical expertise and sophisticated legal talent to provide our clients with the best possible representation.

Paul Hastings currently has openings Los Angeles, Palo Alto and San Diego for motivated intellectual property attorneys with 2 to 5 years of patent litigation and/or patent prosecution experience in the following areas:

- Electrical Engineering
- Computer Engineering
- Computer Science
- Physics

Excellent academic credentials and writing skills required; technical degrees are preferred (but not required).

Please submit resumes and transcripts to:

Lisa Patterson  
Attorney Recruiting & Development Coordinator  
PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER LLP  
3579 Valley Centre Drive  
San Diego, CA 92130  
[lisapatterson@paulhastings.com](mailto:lisapatterson@paulhastings.com)

Please specify the location(s) you are interested in.

Ad: xzft0606K4

**IP LITIGATION ATTORNEY**

Growing IP firm in Tustin/Santa Ana with emphasis on electrical/computer patents is seeking an attorney with 2 or more years of IP experience preferably in litigation (Federal or State courts) with income partnership possibility. Please email resume to [djafari@jafarilawgroup.com](mailto:djafari@jafarilawgroup.com) and call David at (949) 606-4842.

Ad: xaftb060906

**PATENT ATTORNEY/AGENT POSITION**

MacPherson Kwok Chen & Heid LLP seeks a patent prosecution attorney/agent for its Irvine Office. The ideal candidate has an Electrical Engineering, Computer Science, or Physics degree with some engineering and patent prosecution experience. For more information about our firm, visit our website at [www.macpherson-kwok.com](http://www.macpherson-kwok.com). Please provide resume to Greg Michelson at [gmichelson@macpherson-kwok.com](mailto:gmichelson@macpherson-kwok.com).

Ad: xaft012206S2

**CHANDRAKANT M. JOSHI**

INDIAN PATENT & TRADEMARK ATTORNEYS  
5<sup>th</sup> & 6<sup>th</sup> Floor, Vishwananak, Chakala Road,  
Andheri (East), Mumbai – 400 099, **INDIA**

**Phones:** +91-22-28380848, 28205425, 28324920  
**Telefax:** +91-22-28380737, 28066294, 28389839

**Emails:**

[cmjoshi@bom3.vsnl.net.in](mailto:cmjoshi@bom3.vsnl.net.in)  
[chandrakantmjoshi@vsnl.net](mailto:chandrakantmjoshi@vsnl.net)  
[chandrakantjoshi@vsnl.net](mailto:chandrakantjoshi@vsnl.net)

**Website:**

[www.cmjoshi.us](http://www.cmjoshi.us)

**Languages:** English, French, German & Italian

**Other Offices:** New Delhi, Kolkata, Ahmedabad,  
Hyderabad & Chennai

**Member:** IPR Professional Associations: U.S.A.,  
U.K., Germany, Japan, France, Italy, et. al.

**Contact Person:** Mr. Hiral Chandrakant Joshi

**Areas of**

- Patent & Trademark Search
- Patent & Trademark Watch
- Registration, post registration
- Infringement, etc.
- Translation of Patent Specification
- Franchise & Joint Venture Agreements
- Cyberlaw, Mergers & Acquisitions

Ad: xzft0806D3



## SAVE THE DATE FOR THE UPCOMING

### OCPLA-SDIPLA SPRING SEMINAR

**24 – 26 MARCH 2006**

**Location:** The La Costa Resort and Spa in Carlsbad, San Diego

**Legal Program:** Saturday and Sunday mornings, including the annual patent law, trademark law and copyright law reviews.

**Social Program:** Friday evening reception  
Saturday evening banquet  
Saturday afternoon golf, tennis, spa, etc.

**More details will surely follow.**

## Orange County Patent Law Association

**Date:** Wednesday, January 25, 2006

**Time:** 12:00 Noon; Lunch will be served promptly at 12:15 p.m.

**Location:** Wyndham Garden Hotel  
3350 Avenue of the Arts  
Costa Mesa, California

**Topic:** Discrimination: "I Know It When I See It."

**Speakers:** **Diane F. Wyzga, R.N., J.D.**, Lightning Rod Communications

**Cost:** \$30 for members, \$15 for students (proof of student status required), and \$35 for non-members

**Reservations:** Please make reservations by filling out the form below and mailing it with a check to Marlene Klein to reach her office address given below, by the Friday before the meeting. If time is short, please also email Marlene at [Marlene.Klein@cda.canon.com](mailto:Marlene.Klein@cda.canon.com) or call in your reservation to her at (949) - 932-3132.

The Orange County Patent Law Association certifies that this activity has been approved for minimum Continuing Legal Education credit by the State Bar Association of California in the amount of 1.0 hour. The Orange County Patent Law Association certifies that this activity conforms to the standards for approved education activities prescribed by the rules and regulations of the State Bar of California governing Minimum Continuing Legal Education. The Orange County Patent Law Association is a State Bar of California MCLE-approved provider. **This event has been certified by OCPLA for 1 hour MCLE Elimination of Bias credit.**

### Reservation Form

**[NOTE NEW MAILING ADDRESS BEGINNING JANUARY 1, 2006]**

Enclosed is a check for \$\_\_\_\_\_ payable to ORANGE COUNTY PATENT LAW ASSOCIATION for the OCPLA General Membership luncheon on Wednesday, January 25, 2006 for the following person(s):

---

---

This form and check should be mailed to:

Marlene Klein  
Attention: OCPLA Lunch Reservations  
Canon USA  
IP Dept  
15975 Alton Pkwy  
Irvine, CA 92618-3731  
**Tel:** (949) -932-3132  
**E-mail:** [Marlene.Klein@cda.canon.com](mailto:Marlene.Klein@cda.canon.com)



# Orange County Patent Law Association

WWW.OCPLA.ORG • P.O. Box 7632 Newport Beach, CA 92658

## 2006 OCPLA MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION/RENEWAL FORM

This is an application for (please check one):

- Membership Renewal  
 New Membership

Member / Applicant Information:

Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Firm/Employer: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
 E-mail Address (required to receive newsletter): \_\_\_\_\_  
 Telephone No.: \_\_\_\_\_ Facsimile No.: \_\_\_\_\_

**Professional Information:**

	Yes	No	
Are you a member of the California bar?	___	___	Bar No. _____
Are you a member of the bar of another state or the District of Columbia?	___	___	Jurisdiction/Bar No. _____
Are you registered to practice before the U.S.P.T.O.?	___	___	Reg. No. _____
Are you a student?	___	___	School: _____

**Please circle not more than TWO committees in which you would like to participate:**

Annual Seminar	Law Office Management	Membership
Copyright Practice	Legislation	Patent Practice
Federal Courts	MCLE	Trademark Practice
International Practice	Meetings/Programs	Trade Secret/Unfair Competition

**Dues Membership Year 2006 (please circle one):**

Regular Membership (attorneys, agents):	\$35.00	<b>(New Member After 08/01/06)</b> \$17.50
Student Membership	\$17.50	\$ 8.75
Associate Membership (other)	\$35.00	\$17.50

**New Applicants please complete the following:**

I believe I qualify for membership in the Orange County Patent Law Association.

Applicant's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Printed Name: \_\_\_\_\_

**Send Application to OCPLA P.O. Box 7632 Newport Beach, CA 92658**

## 2006 OCPLA EVENTS SCHEDULE

<b>Date</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Speaker/Event</b>	<b>Topic</b>
January 25, 2006	Wyndham Garden Hotel	<b>Diane F. Wyzga, R.N., J.D.</b> , Lightning Rod Communications	Discrimination: "I Know It When I See It."
February 2006	Wyndham Garden Hotel	<b>Luis Villalobos</b> Tech Coast Angels	"How Patent Attorneys Can Help with Venture Capital"
March 24-26	La Costa Resort & Spa in Carlsbad, California.	See enclosed flyer	See enclosed flyer



**Orange County Patent Law Association**  
P.O. Box 7632  
Newport Beach, CA 92658