



OCPLA NEWSLETTER

Orange County Patent Law Association

www.ocpla.org

Vol. 13, No.4

April 2007

APRIL 2007 LUNCHEON

Please join us on Wednesday, April 25th, to hear Michael Elmer from Finnegan Henderson to speak on Global IP Litigation strategies, including global offensive and defensive strategic plans.

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

CALL FOR SPEAKERS

Topic suggestions may be submitted to the Board by contacting Greg Hollrigel at ghollrigel@coopervision.com or at 949-597-4700 x3341.

MAY BOARD MEETING

The May board meeting will be held on May 9, 2007 at noon at the offices of Canon USA, Inc. in Irvine. Members who wish to present items for the Board's consideration should contact our president, Greg Hollrigel, to have their items placed on the agenda, and to verify the time and location of the meeting.

2007 SPRING SEMINAR

This year's Spring Seminar will be held on June 8-10 at the Ritz Carlton Hotel in Dana Point. The seminar flyer is attached at the end of this newsletter. Members are encouraged to register early for the seminar and the hotel to

ensure availability. OCPLA members pay the same price as LAIPLA members.

NEW MEMBERS

We are pleased to welcome the following new member(s) to the OCPLA:

Jerry A. Crandall of Law office of Jerry Crandall;

Irfan Lateef of Knobbe Martens Olson & Bear LLP;

Feng Ma of Myers, Dawes, Andras & Sherman;

Helen C. Macleod of Howrey, Simon, Arnold & White; and

Jinghua Karen Tang, Student

PLEASE 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 noon on the Friday preceding the meeting, so that we can provide more accurate numbers of luncheon attendees to the hotel. Your effort to register at least five days in advance of the lunches is greatly appreciated by the hotel and the OCPLA Board.

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

PTO UPDATE**BY GREG S. HOLLRIGEL
COOPERVISION, INC.****PROPOSED USPTO RULES**

It has been mentioned on several websites that the US Commissioner for Patents, John Doll, indicated at a District of Columbia Bar meeting that the USPTO has submitted modifications to the proposed rules regarding limits of patent claims and continuing applications for approval. If the discussions are correct, there will be at least 90 days until final rules are approved. Currently, it is possible that the new rules, if approved, could go into effect around August or September 2007.

The rules regarding Information Disclosure Statements are still being considered.

APRIL 1, 2007 PCT CHANGES

On April 1, 2007, the PCT Regulations have been revised to reflect an addition of a method for applicants to request the right to claim priority be restored in certain applications, provide a method for applicants to add a missing portion of a PCT patent application without the loss of the international filing date; and clarify situations and procedures for correcting an obvious mistake in the PCT application.

On March 30, 2007, the USPTO published a notice of interim procedures that it will follow until the proposed regulation changes are finalized. In the interim procedures, the USPTO will implement the PCT changes that became effective April 1, 2007 regarding the addition of a missing portion or correction of an obvious mistake in the international PCT application. To request the restoration of the right of priority, requests must be filed within two months from the date of expiration of the priority period, and must be accompanied by the required fee (currently \$400), a notice adding the priority claim if the priority claim is

not contained in the international application, and a statement that the delay in filing the international application within the priority period was unintentional.

For further information, see the notice at

http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opa/preognotice/pct_interim_procedures.pdf

INTERNET SIGHTINGS**BY JIM HAWES**

This column highlights some of the more notable recent internet newsletters and blogs dealing with IP prosecution issues. For more information, go to the site cited. If your favorite IP related site isn't here, email Jim at onejehawes@aol.com.

Hal Wegner's newsletter –
hwegner@foley.com -

- 3/19/07 issue: criticizes the “non-precedential” designation of the CAFC’s Cellco decision because it is a case of first impression.
- 3/22/07 issue: criticizes the Pfizer decision for the panel’s failure to cite the controlling precedent; also bemoans today’s unpredictable patent claim construction situation due to narrow claim construction based on narrow disclosure support coupled with tough standards for enablement and written description.
- 3/26/07 issue: summarizes and attaches Amgen cert. brief blasting the CAFC for its de novo practices; a second newsletter on this date discusses the SanDisk CAFC decision regarding declaratory judgment jurisdiction – see also his 3/27 posting re SanDisk.
- 3/29/07 issue: in Merck the CAFC holds that a patent term extension can be applied to a patent subject to a terminal disclaimer.

- 4/2/07 issue discusses the KSR, Translogic, Pharma. Res. and BMC cases on appeal. Also attaches his top ten cases on appeal list. Another posting on this date summarizes the discussion of “reasonable apprehension” and the Medimmune decision in an attached paper.
- 4/3/07 issue discusses the CAFC decision in Central Admixture vacating a patent’s certificate of correction.

Rethink(IP) – a newsletter of recent PTO matters – feedblitz@mail.feedblitz.com -

- 3/19/07 issue reports the use by the PTO, beginning soon, of emails announcing OAs in trademark applns.
- 3/26/07 issue discusses the PTO’s just released 5 year strategic plan.
- 3/29/07 issue has a thorough discussion of (1) signature authority, (2) post – reg. forms, (3) pdf. files and (4) clarification of signature authority.
- 3/31/07 issue discusses interim procedures for implementing 4/1/07 PCT changes.

Daily Dose of IP – a blog by Mark Reichel – www.dailydoseofip.blogspot.com -

- an ongoing series of synopses of recent notable CAFC decisions Copyright Office News – copynews@loc.gov -
- issue 309 announces the submission to Congress of a fee analysis and new \$35 filing fee proposal which likely will go into effect about July 1, 2007.

Patently-O – a blog written by Dennis Crouch – patent@gmail.com

- also discusses the Cellco, Cross Med. and eSpeed decisions in the 3/20/07 issue.
- Dennis reports in the 3/21/07 blog that dueling “pull my finger” dolls have resulted in a winner being declared by the Seventh Circuit. Really.
- The 3/26 blog discusses the Amgen and Pfizer decisions – see Hal Wegner supra.
- The 4/2/07 blog reports interesting observations and suggestions for dealing with the PTO patent quality

review group – ways to draft and prosecute that will avoid patent quality problems. A must read.

TTABlog – a blog written by John Welch – www.TTABlog.com

- the 3/19/07 posting discusses the Hurley decision and fraud resulting from non-use of a mark on certain of the goods/services listed in an appln.

PTO notices – www.uspto.gov/main/newsandnotices

- the official PTO website for news and notices – usually slower than some of the blogs.
- a 3/8/07 notice discusses representation of tm. applicants before the PTO and use of the TEAS form by non-US attorneys; also see the 2/28/07 notice discussing changes to representing others before the PTO.

IP law 360 – a newsletter covering all IP, but focusing mainly on litigation –

web address: www.iplaw360.com

- 3/23/07 posting reports numerous case developments, including one against Disney for licensing a video already exclusively licensed to another.
- In the 3/28/07 posting, the guest columnist opines that Google has not surrendered its safe harbor in the YouTube dispute.
- 3/30/07 reports that the Jenkins & Gilchrist firm has closed.
- 4/2/07 posting includes a guest column discussing the scope of a waiver resulting from reliance on an opinion of patent non-infringement.
- 4/3/07 posting cites a recent Second Circuit Court of Appeals decision limiting rights of famous trademarks.

Cal Bar IP Section – alerts when appropriate - mitch.wood@calbar.ca.gov

- 3/22/07 discusses AB1484 and the changes it proposes to CA trademark laws.

The Invent blog – also from feedblitz@mail.feedblitz.com

- 3/24/07 blog discusses the pending PTI case, and cites a report that PTI and other invention promo businesses

received over \$61 million from more than 17,000 customers in six years without a single license being achieved.

- 3/29/07 blog has what must be the first and only patent atty. joke ever.
- 4/2/07 blog discusses the new patent case law (and much more) search function available at www.fedcirc.us. Check it out.

WIPO notices – about the Madrid system posted at www.wipo.int/madrid/en/notices

- the 3/29/07 notice states that the Ninth Edition of the Nice Classification system is now in affect.

RECENT IP CASES

BY IRFAN LATEEF
KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR

In *In re Princo Corporation, et al.*, Case No. M-841, the Federal Circuit granted a petition for writ of mandamus and directed the district court to stay its proceedings under 28 U.S.C. § 1659 until ITC proceedings on the same issues are final, including any appeals. Philips filed an infringement complaint against Princo in the district court asserting that Princo infringed six patents. Shortly thereafter, the ITC initiated an investigation related to the same patents. Then, the district court issued a stay under § 1659. After the ITC ruled on the patent misuse defense but before Philips appealed, the district court lifted the § 1659 stay. The Court held that § 1659 requires that the stay of district court proceedings continue until the ITC proceedings are no longer subject to judicial review.

In *Walter Kidde Portable Equipment, Inc. v. Universal Security Instruments, Inc.*, Case No. 06-1420, the Federal Circuit affirmed the district court's grant of dismissal without prejudice. Kidde sued USI for patent infringement. At the time of the suit, USI asserted that Kidde did not have standing to bring the patent infringement claim because

the PTO's records showed that MITCL, not Kidde, owned the patent in suit. After discovery and rulings on motions in limine, Kidde attempted to eliminate questions about its standing by filing a motion for voluntary dismissal without prejudice, pursuant to Rule 41(a)(2), and filed a new lawsuit. The district court granted the motion despite the pendency of counterclaims.

The Court held that the district court did not abuse its discretion by granting dismissal of Kidde's claims without prejudice and without conditions because USI failed to show how it has been prejudiced or why the case should have been seen as having advanced too far to be dismissed. With respect to the counterclaims, the Court held that the district court erred by dismissing them but that the dismissal was harmless because USI can assert them in the new case.

In *In re Arnold B. Serenkin*, Case No. 06-1242, the Federal Circuit affirmed the PTO Board's decision sustaining the examiner's rejection of claims of a reissue application because the error upon which the applicant based his reissue application is not correctable error under 35 U.S.C. § 251. In the original application's prosecution, the applicant's attorney acquiesced to the examiner's requirement of making a choice between a filing date based upon an international filing date and a later filing date that included drawings. The patentees choose the later date later. The patentee sought to correct the priority claim to claim priority to the earlier date through a reissue application. The PTO held that the applicant made a deliberate choice, rather than an innocent error of judgment, to forgo the earlier filing date in exchange for inclusion of the drawings in his application. The Court held that the deliberate action of an inventor or attorney during prosecution fails to qualify as a correctable error under § 251.

In *Espeed, Inc., et al. v. Brokertec USA, L.L.C., et al.*, Case No. 06-1385, the Federal Circuit affirmed the district court's judgment that the patent-in-suit is unenforceable due to inequitable conduct. The patentee submitting several declarations regarding a prior art system as well as 1139 pages of information (including material source code) describing the system during the prosecution. The Court held that the declarations included false statements about the system. The Court also held that declarations left the examiner with the impression that the examiner did not need to analyze the "blizzard of paper" including the material source code. The Court inferred intent from the disingenuous declarations.

In *Cross Medical Products, Inc. v. Medtronic Sofamor Danek, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 05-1415, the Federal Circuit reversed the district court's grant of summary judgment of infringement. The Court held that Medtronic's redesigned screws do not literally infringe and that *Festo* bars capturing these screws under the doctrine of equivalents. The Court held that the patentee narrowed a claim to address a § 112 rejection and that neither the narrow tangential rebuttal principle nor the foreseeability principle applies to this case. The case provides a succinct overview of both of these principles. In the concurrence, Judge Rader argues that this case is a classic example of how the tangentiality principle in the doctrine of equivalents runs counter to principles of public notice.

In *Pfizer, Inc. v. Apotex, Inc. (formerly known as TorPharm, Inc.)*, Case No. 06-1261, the Federal Circuit reversed district court's final judgment that the patent-in-suit would not have been obvious. The patent at issue relates to Norvasc® for treating hypertension and chronic stable and vasospastic angina. The district court did not find the patent invalid, but in its analysis stated that the PTO examiner's rejection of the claimed invention as obviousness during prosecution establishes that defendant had made a prima facie

showing on obviousness. The Court found this statement a serious misconception regarding the proper burden of proof each party bears in a patent litigation. The Court stated that the examiner's rejection does not lessen or otherwise affect the defendant's burden of proof, nor does it require that unless the patentee introduces evidence of secondary considerations to establish non-obviousness, the patent challenger will necessarily prevail. The presumption of validity remains intact and the ultimate burden of proving invalidity remains with the challenger throughout the litigation. The Court went on to examine the *Graham* factors in detail and held that a reasonable fact-finder could only conclude that the skilled artisan would have found the patent obvious.

In *Liebel-Flarsheim Company, et al. v. Medrad, Inc.*, Case No. 06-1156, the Federal Circuit affirmed the district court's summary judgment that Liebel's patents are invalid -- the front-loading patents for lack of enablement and the syringe-sensing patents for anticipation. Regarding enablement, the Court found that the specification taught away from a system that was within the scope of the claims and that such a system could not have been produced at the time of filing. Accordingly, the Court held that the specification fails to enable the full scope of the claims as required under § 112. The Court went on to note that the irony of this situation is that Liebel successfully pressed for a broad construction so that its claims would include such a system, but, having won that battle, it then had to show that such a claim was fully enabled, a challenge it could not meet. It went on to state that the motto, 'beware of what one asks for,' is applicable here. Regarding anticipation, the Court noted that Liebel argued for a broad construction of the term "physical indicia" and in fact broadened its claims during prosecution. The Court held that the broad construction resulted in anticipation of the claims. The Court noted, again, that Liebel argued for a broad meaning, and succeeded, but suffered a Pyrrhic victory.

In *Sandisk Corp. v. Stmicroelectronics, Inc., et al.*, Case No. 05-1300, the Federal Circuit vacated and remanded the district court's dismissal of SanDisk's second through twenty-ninth claims relating to declaratory judgment of noninfringement and invalidity for failure to present an actual controversy. The Court recognized that the Supreme Court's opinion in *MedImmune* represented a rejection of its reasonable apprehension of suit test. Unlike *MedImmune*, this case involved informing one party of patents and possible infringement. The Court held that declaratory judgment jurisdiction generally will not arise merely on the basis that a party learns of the existence of a patent owned by another or even perceives such a patent to pose a risk of infringement, without some affirmative act by the patentee. The Court went on to hold that Article III jurisdiction may be met where the patentee takes a position that puts the declaratory judgment plaintiff in the position of either pursuing arguably illegal behavior or abandoning that which he claims a right to do. The Court held that where, as here, a patentee asserts rights under a patent based on certain identified ongoing or planned activity of another party, and where that party contends that it has the right to engage in the accused activity without license, an Article III case or controversy will arise and the party need not risk a suit for infringement by engaging in the identified activity before seeking a declaration of its legal rights.

In *Merck & Co., Inc. v. HI-TECH Pharmacal Co., Inc.*, Case No. 06-1401, the Federal Circuit held that a patent term extension under the Hatch-Waxman Act, 35 U.S.C. § 156, may be applied to a patent subject to a terminal disclaimer under 35 U.S.C. § 253, filed to overcome an obviousness-type double-patenting rejection. The Court held that the language of § 156 is unambiguous and fulfills a purpose unrelated to and not in conflict with that of § 253.

Accordingly, the Court held that a Hatch-Waxman term extension may be applied.

In *Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. v. Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation, et al.*, Case No. 06-1181, the Federal Circuit reversed district court's dismissal of DJ action in light of the Supreme Court's recent decision in *MedImmune*. Novartis listed five patents in the FDA Orange Book, each directed to various aspects of Famvir®. Teva filed an ANDA on a generic. Novartis brought an infringement suit against Teva on the '937 patent alone and did not include in the action related patents on the same drug. Teva then brought this declaratory judgment action on the four remaining method patents. The Court held that Novartis' selective '937 suit creates uncertainty as to Teva's legal rights under its ANDA. The Court reasoned that if Teva is successful in defending the pending '937 infringement suit, it would remain subject to four additional infringement actions by Novartis. The Court held that this threat of protracted litigation creates a present and real harm that is a relevant circumstance in finding that a justiciable controversy exists.

OCPLA WEBSITE

Check the OCPLA website at www.ocpla.org for current and archived copies of the OCPLA newsletters, membership information, current events of interest to members, and online reservations for OCPLA events. 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."

NEWSLETTER VIA EMAIL ONLY

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 Tom Dao at tom.dao@cph.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.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS AND COMMITTEE CHAIRS**BOARD OF DIRECTORS****TELEPHONE/E-MAIL**

President	Greg Holtrigel	(949) 597-4700 gholtrigel@coopervision.com
V.P./President Elect	Neal M. Cohen	(949) 724-1849 nmc@viplawgroup.com
Secretary	T.J. Singh	(949) 955-1920 tjsingh@koslaw.com
C.F.O./Treasurer	Marlene Klein	(949) 932-3132 marlene.klein@cda.canon.com
Directors	Tom Dao	(949) 476-0757 thd@cph.com
	Stacey Halpern	(949) 721-6301 stacey.halpern@kmob.com
	Cliff Cousins	(949) 752-7040 ccousins@macpherson-kwok.com
Immediate Past President	John King	(949) 760-0404 jking@kmob.com

COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSONS

Annual Seminar	Neal M. Cohen	(949) 724-1849 nmc@viplawgroup.com
	Stacey Halpern	(949) 721-6301 stacey.halpern@kmob.com
Copyright Practice	Darren S. Rimer	(949) 367-1541 darren@rimermath.com
Federal Courts	Robert L. Grabarek, Jr.	(949) 263-8400 rgrabarek@crowell.com
Int'l IP Practice	Alexander R. Schlee	310-545-9851 alexschlee@vjp.de
Law Off. Mgmt.	Gabia Pakstys	650-326-3466 gpakstys@sbcglobal.net
Legislative		Position Open
MCLE	Cliff Cousins	(949) 752-7040 ccousins@macpherson-kwok.com
Meetings/Programs	Stacey Halpern	(949) 721-6301 stacey.halpern@kmob.com
Newsletter Editor	Tom Dao	(949) 476-0757 thd@cph.com
Patent Practice	Tom Dao	(949) 476-0757 tom.dao@cph.com
Trade Secrets/Unfair	Scott Feldmann	(949) 263-8400 rfeldmann@crowell.com
Competition Law	Perry J. Viscounty	714-755-8288 perry.viscounty@lw.com
Trademark Practice	Susan Natland	949-760-0404 smn@kmob.com
Lunch Speakers	Greg Holtrigel	(949) 597-4700 gholtrigel@coopervision.com
OCPLA Website	Marlene Klein	949-932-3132 marlene.klein@cda.canon.com
OCPLA Database	Greg S. Holtrigel	(949) 597-4700 gholtrigel@coopervision.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 © 2007 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:

OCPLA Newsletter Editor
Tom H. Dao
Christie, Parker & Hale, LLP
3501 Jamboree Road, Suite 6000
Newport Beach, CA 92660
Tel: (949) 476-0757
Fax: (949) 476-8640
E-mail: tom.dao@cph.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

***IP CONTINGENCY ENFORCEMENT
THROUGHOUT THE U.S.A.***

A consortium of patent, trademark, and copyright law firms able to pursue your client's case on a contingency basis. Referral fees paid.

www.ipcontingency.com
info@ipcontingency.com

EXP 03/08

OFFICE ADMINISTRATOR SOUGHT

Part time office administrator sought for law firm in Irvine Spectrum. About 4 to 8 hours per week. Primary duties include oversight of billing functions, bookkeeping functions, insurance, equipment, and personnel. Should be familiar with Timeslips and Quickbooks. Duties are to be carried out in-house, not remotely, two days per week. Send cover letter and resume to mshimokaji@shimokaji.com

EXP 05/07

IP Counsel

Advanced Medical Optics, is a global medical device leader and spin-off from Allergan, Inc. based in Santa Ana, CA.

Serves as business lawyer supporting the acquisition and protection of the intellectual property of AMO. Support and manage intellectual property litigation and licensing efforts. Includes: Patent drafting, prosecution and strategy, including oppositions and appeals; Clearance, counseling and opinion work; Litigation ;Licensing and contracts; Trademark prosecution, maintenance and enforcement.

Requirements: J.D. plus at least 4-5 years IP experience in patent prosecution and counseling; Permitted to practice in California; USPTO Licensed; Technical background in physics, optical, biomechanical or electrical engineering; Experience drafting and prosecuting medical device patents; licensing and litigation experience. Email Resumes to: resume@amo.inc.com. AA/EOE M/F/D/V

EXP 04/07

**Patent Researcher, Part-Time
Canon USA, Inc**

Responsibilities: Conduct patent searches in technology areas specified by the Intellectual Property Division; create a patent map based on the results of the conducted patent searches and follow through on the process. Other duties include updating patent searches and administrative support for the IP team.

Qualifications: The ideal candidate will have an Associate degree or junior level education with a concentration of study in Engineering. Must be detail oriented, have excellent communication and computer skills (MS Word, Excel, Power Point and Access). Previous IP experience a plus! 20 hours a week, work hours are flexible.

To be considered for this position, please visit www.usa.canon.com and apply to Job Code 06-300. This position pays approximately \$16 - \$17/hour.

EXP 06/07

Orange County Patent Law Association

Date: Wednesday, April 25, 2007

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: Global IP Litigation Strategies

Speakers: *Michael Elmer from Finnegan Henderson et al.*

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

Reservations: Please make reservations by using our online system at www.ocpla.org or by filling out the form below and mailing it with a check to Stacey Halpern at her office address given below. If time is short, please also email Stacey at ocpla@kmob.com or call in your reservation to her at [949-721-7654](tel:949-721-7654).

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.

Reservation Form

Enclosed is a check for \$_____ payable to ORANGE COUNTY PATENT LAW ASSOCIATION for the OCPLA General Membership luncheon on Wednesday, April 25, 2007 for the following person(s):

This form and check should be mailed to:

Stacey R. Halpern
Knobbe Martens Olson & Bear LLP
2040 Main Street, 14th Floor
Irvine, CA 92614-3641
[949-721-7654](tel:949-721-7654)
949-760-9502 (Fax)
Email: ocpla@kmob.com



Orange County Patent Law Association
 Orange County Patent Law Association
 WWW.OCPLA.ORG • P.O. Box 7632 Newport Beach, CA 92658

2007 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 2007 (please circle one):

Regular Membership (attorneys, agents):	\$35.00	(New Member After 08/01/07) \$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

Date	Location	Speaker/Event	Topic
April 25, 2007	Wyndham Garden Hotel	Michael Elmer of Finnegan, Henderson, Farabow, Garrett & Dunner	Worldwide Patent Litigation Strategies
May 23, 2007	Wyndham Garden Hotel	Francis G. Rushford of The Eclipse Law Group LLP	Generating revenue from patent portfolios through sales, licenses and litigation
June 8-10	Ritz Carlton Hotel, Dana Point, CA	2007 SPRING SEMINAR	See attached seminar flyer
July 25, 2007	Wyndham Garden Hotel	TBD	TBD
August 22, 2007	Wyndham Garden Hotel	TBD	TBD

LA IPLA

Los Angeles Intellectual Property Law Association

Spring Seminar 2007

PRESENTED BY

THE LOS ANGELES INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW ASSOCIATION,
THE SAN DIEGO INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW ASSOCIATION,
THE ORANGE COUNTY PATENT LAW ASSOCIATION,
AND THE VENTURA COUNTY BAR ASSOCIATION IP SECTION



The Ritz-Carlton Laguna
Laguna Beach/Dana Point, Southern California
Overlooking the Pacific Ocean

June 8-10, 2007



SDIPLA

The San Diego Intellectual Property Law Association

VENTURA
COUNTY IP

REGISTRATION FORM

1. Spring Seminar 2007

The Ritz Carlton Laguna

Friday, June 8 - Sunday, June 10, 2007

You are invited to join the LAIPLA, the SDIPLA, the OCPLA, the VCBA, and their sponsors at this year's Spring Seminar being held at the beautiful beachfront property of **The Ritz Carlton Laguna Niguel, Laguna/Dana Point, Southern California.**

Hotel reservations need to be made directly with the resort by calling 1-800-241-3333. Please mention that you are attending the Spring Seminar to ensure that you receive the special room rates of \$290.00 per night. **ALL HOTEL ROOMS ARE ON FIRST-COME, FIRST-SERVED BASIS FOR GROUP RATE. Please reserve early as we expect a sold out event.** After May 8, 2007 at 5:00 p.m. we cannot guarantee group rate. Please visit www.ritzcarlton.com for further information about the resort and activities.

a. PROGRAM REGISTRATION FORM

Please complete the following and return it with your payment to:

LAIPLA - 1430 South Grand Avenue, # 256, Glendora, CA 91740

OR Fax the form to: (626) 974-5439

Name: _____ Title: _____

Company/Firm: _____

Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ ZIP: _____

Tel: _____ Fax: _____ E-Mail: _____

Name(s) (for Badges): _____

Registrant: _____ Guest: _____

Accompanying Children:

Name(s)/Age(s): _____

Name(s)/Age(s): _____

Basic Registration Fees: Includes admission for registrant and one guest to breakfasts, receptions, and dinner

\$845 ___ Members

\$995 ___ Non-Members

EVENTS INCLUDED WITH BASIC REGISTRATION

The following events are included in the registration fee for you and one guest. Please indicate which events you and/or your guest plan to attend.

Friday		Number
6:00 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.	Welcome Reception/Food Stations	_____
Saturday		
8:00 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.	Continental Breakfast	_____
6:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.	Cocktail Reception	_____
7:30 p.m. – 10:00 p.m.	Dinner	_____
Sunday		
8:00 a.m. – 9:00 a.m.	Continental Breakfast	_____

OPTIONAL EVENTS (NOT INCLUDED WITH BASIC REGISTRATION FEE)

Please indicate whether you and/or your guest will participate in any of the following optional events:

Children's Evening Program _____ Yes

**Reservations Required – \$ 40 Per Child/Per Evening*

of Children ___ Friday ___ Saturday

TOTAL: \$\$ _____

SPECIAL EVENTS:

Golf, Beach Picnic, Hiking, Biking, Shopping, Tennis and Spa Treatments. Check out www.ritzcarlton.com website for additional activities and schedule your activities directly with the hotel concierge.

PAYMENT OPTIONS:

___ Company Check ___ Visa ___ MasterCard ___ AmExp

Credit Card Number: _____ Exp. Date: _____

Code on Back of Card: _____ Print Name: _____

Signature: _____

Member Rate Non-Member Rate

Register at Member Rate and Sign Up for LAIPLA

LAIPLA Spring Seminar 2007 SCHEDULE OF EVENTS

FRIDAY, June 8, 2007	SATURDAY, June 9, 2007	SUNDAY, June 10, 2007
1:00 – 2:00 p.m. REGISTRATION	8:00 – 9:00 a.m. BREAKFAST	8:00 – 9:00 a.m. BREAKFAST
2:00 – 3:00 p.m. Expert Advice to In-House Counsel on How to Adopt and Implement a Successful, Profitable IP Program ◆ Victor Sapphire , Jeffer Mangels	9:00 – 9:15 a.m. Welcoming Remarks ◆ Gary J. Nelson , Christie, Parker & Hale, LLP	9:00 – 9:45 a.m. Trademark Year In Review ◆ Christine Lofgren , Jeff Mangels
3:00 – 4:00 p.m.] The Advice of Counsel Defense: Who Waives What, When, and to What Extent? ◆ David A. Dillard , Christie, Parker & Hale ◆ Charles Barquist , Morrison & Foerster ◆ Stan Gibson , Jeffer Mangels	9:15 – 11:00 a.m. The U.S. Patent System -- Do Not Fix That Which Is Not Broken (Part II) ◆ Stephen T. Schreiner , Hunton & Williams LLP ◆ Ron D. Katznelson ◆ John Howells , Aarhus School of Business ◆ Jf. Scott Kieff , Washington U. School of Law	9:45-10:30 a.m. Copyright Year in Review ◆ Prof Tyler Ochoa , Santa Clara Univ.
4:00 – 5:00 p.m. The U.S. Patent System -- Do Not Fix That Which Is Not Broken (Part I) ◆ Patrick A. Doody , Hunton & Williams LLP ◆ Lawrence B. Ebert , ipABC	11:00-11:15 a.m. BREAK	10:45 – 12:15 p.m. Patent Year in Review ◆ Jay Campbell , Renner, Otto ◆ Josh Ryland , Renner, Otto
5:00 - 6:00 p.m. BREAK	11:15 a.m.– Noon The Trouble with “Trolls” ◆ Kevin McBride , Jones, Day ◆ Brian K. Brookey , Christie, Parker & Hale ◆ Eric Spanenberg	12:15 – 12:20 p.m. FAREWELL REMARKS ◆ Gary J. Nelson , Christie, Parker & Hale, LLP
6:00 – 7:00 p.m. RECEPTION	Noon - 6:30 p.m. FREE TIME AND RESORT ACTIVITIES	
7:30 - 10:00 p.m. SPEAKERS' DINNER (by invitation only)	6:30 - 7:30 p.m. RECEPTION	
	7:30 - 11:00 p.m. DINNER – All Attendees	

The activities have been approved for Minimum Continuing Legal Education credit by the State Bar of California in the amount of ___ hours general credit. The LAIPLA certifies that this activity conforms to the standards for approved educational activities prescribed by the rules and regulations of the State Bar of California Governing Minimum Continuing legal Education and that LAIPLA is a State Bar of California approved MCLE provider.