



TM/SM

# OCPLA NEWSLETTER

Orange County Patent Law Association

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

Vol. 9, No. 7

July, 2003

## JULY LUNCHEON MEETING

Please join us at our next luncheon meeting on Wednesday, July 23, 2003, when we are pleased to present Jeannie Griffin who will speak on "Chemical Dependency". The lunch will be held at noon at the Wyndham Garden Hotel.

Note that the topic will qualify for that hard to get [substance abuse CLE requirement](#).

## RSVP ON TIME FOR MONTHLY LUNCHEONS

To reduce the likelihood of additional rate increases associated with last minute reservations, and attendance without advance reservations, we encourage you to 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 will be greatly appreciated, both by the hotel and the OCPLA Board of Directors.

## AUGUST BOARD MEETING

On August 6, 2003, the OCPLA Board of Directors is holding its monthly meeting at noon at the offices of Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch, LLP.

Members who wish to present items for the Board's consideration should contact our president, Stefan Kirchanski, to have their item placed on the agenda, and to verify the time and location of the meeting.

## 2003 MEMBERSHIP RENEWAL

Don't wait to renew your membership in OCPLA. Dues for 2003 will remain at \$35 for attorneys and agents. A membership form is included in this month's newsletter and is also available on our website, at [www.ocpla.org](http://www.ocpla.org).

Membership directories were distributed at last month's luncheon. If you note any corrections that should be made, please e-mail Greg Holtrigel at [gsh@patlawyers.com](mailto:gsh@patlawyers.com) so those corrections can be included in a supplement to be prepared shortly.

## MARK YOUR CALENDARS . . .

- |                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| <b>July 23, 2003</b>    | <b>Chemical Dependency (MCLE Credit)</b>  |
| <b>August 27, 2003</b>  | <b>Tips From the Bench on Handling IP Cases</b>                                     |
| <b>Sept 24, 2003</b>    | <b>Limiting Language and Alternative Embodiments – What to Do and What to Avoid</b> |
| <b>Oct. 27-28, 2003</b> | <b>PCT Seminar</b>  |

## INSIDE THIS ISSUE . . .

ITEMS	PAGE
Minutiae .....	2
Are Your Company's Crown Jewels Secure?: Building An Effective Patent Portfolio.....	2
Recent Interesting IP Cases.....	6
New Members .....	7

Services .....	8
Luncheon Reservation Form .....	12
Membership Renewal Form .....	13

### E-MAIL DISTRIBUTION OF THE NEWSLETTER



**The Newsletter is now being transmitted entirely by electronic mail.**

If you know of anyone who should be, but is not getting this e-mail distribution, please have them contact Leonard Svensson at [irs@bskb.com](mailto:irs@bskb.com).

### MINUTIAE

BY NEAL M. COHEN  
LAW OFFICES OF NEAL M. COHEN

#### How To Avoid Dismissal of A Rule 47 Petition

If an inventor cannot be found after diligent effort, or refuses to sign an oath or declaration for a patent application, then the other inventors (or persons having a sufficient interest in the application) may file on behalf of the non-signing inventor, in accordance with Rule 47 (37 CFR § 1.47). Rule 47 requires a petition "including proof of the pertinent facts".

So, if the non-signing inventor is currently involved in litigation adverse to the person applying for the patent, will a statement to that effect satisfy the requirement of "proof of the pertinent facts?" No. The pertinent facts require a showing of the "diligent effort", which generally includes proof that the non-signing inventor was presented with the application papers, understood what the papers were, and still refused to sign. See MPEP § 409.03(d).

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

### MARK YOUR CALENDAR – PCT SEMINAR

The OCPLA is pleased to announce that it will host a two day PCT Seminar on October 27 and 28, 2003 in Costa Mesa. There is a major revision of the PCT rules coming into effect on January 1, 2004 so this is a great opportunity to get up to speed with the new rules. The speakers will be Matthias Reischle, Head of the PCT Legal Affairs Section and Louis Maassel, Consultant to the Offices of the PCT. Details and reservation materials will be forthcoming.

### ARE YOUR COMPANY'S CROWN JEWELS SECURE?: BUILDING AN EFFECTIVE PATENT PORTFOLIO – PART 1

BY JOHN CARSON, ERIC NELSON AND  
NATHANIEL DURRANCE

### INTRODUCTION

A patent portfolio can be the most effective way a business protects its assets and investments. By carving out an exclusive market space for products and creating barriers to entry for competitors, an effective patent portfolio can help deter competition in the marketplace. Also, a patent portfolio is a valuable asset that can generate revenue through technology sharing and patent licensing agreements.

The substantial benefits of a patent portfolio, however, may come at a not insignificant cost. Thus, an effective patent portfolio strategy should be a carefully researched and regularly evaluated part of an overall business plan. This article will demonstrate that effective patent portfolio strategies link the reasons for building the portfolio with a company's strengths and goals. Ways of monitoring the effectiveness of the patent portfolio will also be discussed as important tools in maximizing potential in developing markets. Defining the appropriate patent portfolio strategy and

monitoring its effectiveness will ensure that the patent portfolio will be cost-effective and focused on the company's priorities.

### **What is a Patent Portfolio?**

A patent portfolio is a collection of related patents owned by a business. These patents can be obtained either by patenting ideas originating in-house through research and development, by contract research or by purchasing patent rights from other companies.

The portfolio can be related to a single invention, technology or several technologies. For example, the portfolio may include all the patents protecting a company's main product, as well as patents covering related peripheral products. Larger companies' portfolios will typically encompass a wide variety of unrelated technologies.

Before a company invests in building a patent portfolio, however, it must identify why it is seeking patent protection. Otherwise, money may be wasted on a portfolio that does not match the company's business strategy. Strategic reasons for building a patent portfolio can be categorized as offensive, defensive, or both. Offensively, patents help prevent product copying, create barriers to entry, build company assets, attract investment capital and generate revenue through patent licensing or litigation. Defensively, patents may provide a defensive shield against a competitor's patents, and may confer bargaining leverage in developing cross-licenses or other business deals.

By identifying how the patent portfolio fits within a company's plan for building technology assets, it will be easier to focus on the specific technologies and products the portfolio should include.

### **Offensive Strategies**

The most obvious benefit of patent protection is the ability to prevent

competitors from copying the company's invention. A patent grants the owner the right to exclude others from making, using, selling, offering to sell or importing the claimed invention. In effect, the patent gives a legal monopoly where the owner is free to set prices, limit output or even restrict where the invention is sold. Moreover, this protection is not limited to exact knock-offs. That is, well-drafted patents also extend to all devices, compositions or methods that share the core inventive concept.

By obtaining patent protection, a business can also erect barriers to entry for competitors. The mere existence of a comprehensive patent portfolio can deter competitors from developing similar competing products from fear of infringing the patents. For instance, the effort involved in developing a product that does not infringe a variety of patents with many claims and still is price competitive could be insurmountable. The risk would be patent enforcement to seek a court-ordered injunction that orders, on threat of contempt, the competitor to stop making the infringing product. Certain types of injunctions, such as, temporary restraining orders and preliminary injunctions, are available without a full trial and with very little delay after product launch.

An effective patent portfolio can generate significant revenue for a company, without the company ever having to offer a product or service. For example, a company can license its patented technology to competitors and generate revenue without incurring production or sales costs. Also, a company can license core technology or peripheral innovations for use in non-competitive or non-strategic markets. For example, companies like IBM stockpile patents covering peripheral innovations, including technology that has not been commercialized, which are arranged into various patent bundles that are licensed.

Additionally, a company can obtain an exclusive license for exploitation in a field that is outside of the patent owner's market. These licensing agreements can be

restricted to specific fields of use, geographic region, or a duration of time, thereby protecting the patent owner's competitive edge in their chosen market.

Care must be taken to manage a patent portfolio once it is acquired. If not, a company may unknowingly accumulate "Rembrandts in the attic." A company should continually analyze its patent portfolio, estimate the qualitative or quantitative value of each patent, and develop an overall strategy of licensing and enforcing the patent rights. A case example from the practice of one of the authors concerns a new client that had lost track of its patents and the relationship of the patents to the marketplace. After preparing a summary of the top "money maker" patents and narrowing down the portfolio to the most valuable, it was recommended that they develop a list of target companies for licensing. As a result of this analysis and licensing campaign, the client was able to generate licensing revenues of over \$2 million dollars even though the patent had nearly expired.

Even when a product fails, a patent on the product often has residual value that can help recoup costs. This is because the commercial failure of products sometimes has little to do with the value of the patent. The failure may be attributable to the marketing, manufacturing, funding or cross-licensing difficulties. As another case example, one start-up client had patented products that generated little revenue. The company was not able to develop a foothold in the marketplace. However, before collapsing, the company sold its patent portfolio for over \$1 million dollars to a company that had larger capitalization and market share.

Successful enforcement of one's patent rights through litigation can be very profitable. Every successful patent suit has a guaranteed statutory minimum of a reasonable royalty, and in many cases the patent owner is awarded lost profits. However, the cost of patent litigation can be

very high, running into hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of dollars. Before enforcing a patent, a company should therefore balance the risk of spending large amounts of money in litigation against the benefits of receiving a large damage award and/or injunction that could stop the sales of a competitive product or shut down their competitor(s).

### **Defensive Strategies**

There are also defensive strategies that make a patent portfolio valuable. For example, if a company is challenged by a competitor for patent infringement, a patent portfolio may confer bargaining leverage in developing a cross-licensing strategy. In mature industries, such as semiconductors, personal computers, pharmaceuticals and telecommunications, there are large numbers of patents, which causes a crowding affect of intellectual property rights. In such fields, effective patent portfolios deter litigation and encourage licensing due to the threat of a counter-suit. In such cases, forming a cross-licensing agreement is a way to create freedom to operate.

Filing patents can also help provide a defensive shield against potential patents issuing to a company's competitors. When patent applications are filed, the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) searches to determine whether the claimed invention is patentable. Typically, the USPTO will look to publications in the relevant field, including issued patents and filed applications. The published patent literature is by far the largest source of information used by the USPTO since it is searchable electronically. Thus, a company's patents become "prior art" and may preclude competitors from obtaining patents, even if the patent application never ultimately issues as a patent.

In addition, filing an application secures a "constructive reduction to practice," the final step of invention development. This date is important in establishing priority of invention between two or more competing interests to

an invention. If Alexander Graham Bell had not filed his own patent application to the telephone, history would recognize Elisha Gray as the inventor of the telephone.

Another mechanism to leverage patents is called bracketing. In bracketing, a competitor may own fundamental patents to a technology. However, to make the technology viable in the marketplace, components, methods of manufacture, and add-on features may have to be developed. The later arriving company must patent these improvements and thereby "bracket" the commercial use of the competitor's discoveries.

### **Ancillary Benefits**

In addition to the defensive and offensive benefits described above, a patent portfolio confers several other advantages. For instance, a patent secures proof of ownership to the patented technology. When a patent is filed, the USPTO makes a record of the current assignee of the patent rights. This patent and record of assignment confers a strong presumption of ownership that can only be overcome by clear and convincing evidence. Companies who file patents will not have to rely on weaker misappropriation of trade secret arguments when employees purloin company-owned technology.

A strong patent portfolio can be useful as leverage in non-intellectual property business transactions. Small companies with valuable patent portfolios can exert leverage on the largest companies in their market since those large companies do not want to risk infringement. For example, if a relatively smaller company with a valuable patent wants to start a joint venture project or some other deal with a relatively larger company, the patent can be used as leverage for the deal if the patent covers a current product of the larger company.

Patent ownership also attracts funding since venture capital firms are more willing to invest in companies that have

protectable intellectual property. One valuation tool most investors use is the size and nature of a company's patent portfolio. Thus, a portfolio that has both breadth and depth will impress investors and increase the valuation of the company.

Patents also validate the originality of ideas while providing a valuable source of a written description of the claimed invention. In fact, a patent may be the best description available of the technology due to the rigorous requirements for procuring protection. This detailed document may be the key item that persuades a tech savvy investor that the technology is promising and, thus, worth pursuing for funding.

Lastly, a patent portfolio may be used as collateral in debt financing. It may be sold to generate working capital. It may even be securitized such that investors provide present day money for a portion of a future royalty stream.

\*\*\*\*\*

Mr. Carson and Mr. Nelson are both partners with Knobbe, Martens, Olson & Bear, LLP. They may be contacted by telephone at (619) 235-8550 or email at [jcarson@kmob.com](mailto:jcarson@kmob.com) or [enelson@kmob.com](mailto:enelson@kmob.com). Mr. Durrance graduated from Boalt Hall School of Law in 2003 and will be clerking for the Hon. Marilyn Huff, Chief Judge of the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of California during the 2003-2004 term. He may be reached by email at [beatle1fan@yahoo.com](mailto:beatle1fan@yahoo.com).

### **MARK YOUR CALENDAR**

Please join us at our luncheon meeting on Wednesday, September 24, 2003, when we are pleased to present John King of Knobbe, Martens, Olson & Bear, LLP. Mr. King will speak about recent cases in which the Federal Circuit relied on the patent specification to narrow the patent claims. In addition, Mr. King will present a variety of patent drafting strategies that can be used to increase claim coverage.

## RECENT INTERESTING IP CASES

BY LEONARD R. SVENSSON  
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

### 1. Supreme Court Holds That Failing To Renew Copyright Presents Claim Of Reverse Passing Off Against Unaccredited Copying

*Dastar Corp. v. Twentieth Century Fox Film Corp.*, No. 02-428 (U.S. June 2, 2003)

**Issue:** Does "origin" of goods in sec. 43(a) of the Lanham Act refer to the person or entity that originated the idea that the "goods" embody? **Answer:** No.

If "origin" set forth in sec. 43(a) of the Lanham Act refers only to the manufacturer or producer of the physical "good" that is made available to the public (here, the videotapes), Dastar was the origin. If, however, "origin" includes the creator of the underlying work that Dastar copied, then someone else (perhaps Fox) was the origin of Dastar's product. Section 43(a) does not prevent the unaccredited copying of an uncopyrighted work. Dastar had taken a creative work in the public domain, copied it, made modifications (arguably minor), and produced its very own series of videotapes. Although purchasers care about ideas or communications contained or embodied in a communicative product such as a video, giving the Lanham Act special application to such communicative products would cause it to conflict with copyright law, which is precisely directed to that subject, and which grants the public the right to copy without attribution once a copyright has expired. It would also pose such serious practical problems as necessitating a search for an unlimited line of "origin" of uncopyrighted materials. Finally, reading sec. 43(a) as creating a cause of action for plagiarism would be hard to reconcile with previous Supreme Court decisions.

Using a natural understanding of "origin" of "goods" of sec. 43(a) of the Lanham Act,

Dastar was the "origin" of the physical products it sold as its own, not Fox or Time or other creators of original footage used in the *Crusade* television series. Therefore, Fox/SFM cannot prevail on their Lanham Act claim. The Supreme Court reversed the judgment of the Ninth Circuit and remanded the case for further proceeding.

### 2. Patentee's Sale Of Component Of Claimed Combination Conveys Implied License To Practice Claimed Combination

*Anton/Bauer, Inc. v. PAG, Ltd.*, No. 02-1487 (Fed. Cir. May 21, 2003)

**Issue:** Does the individual sale of one component of a claimed combination grant an implied license to practice the claimed combination? **Answer:** Yes.

The Supreme Court held in *United States v. Univis Lens Co.*, [316 U.S. 241, 62 S. Ct. 1088, 86 L. Ed. 2d 1408, 53 U.S.P.Q. \(BNA\) 404 \(1942\)](#), that the sale of an unpatented product exhausts the seller's right to control the future sale and use of the product. The Supreme Court stated that an implied license comes from the exhaustion of a patent right.

PAG argued that they did not directly infringe the '204 patent because they are protected by the exhaustion doctrine and by an implied license. PAG stated that Anton/Bauer exhausted its patent rights by individually selling the female plates, and granted an implied license to use the female plates in the claimed combination with a male plate. Anton/Bauer did not place restrictions on the use of its female plates that were sold, and therefore granted an implied license to practice the claimed combination. PAG cannot be liable for contributory or induced infringement because there was no direct infringement.

But the Court found that Anton/Bauer's sale of a component of the claimed combination granted an implied license to purchasers to practice the patented combination. Since purchasers did not directly infringe the '204

patent, there can be no contributory or induced infringement. Absent direct infringement of the claims of a patent, there can be neither contributory infringement nor inducement of infringement." *Carborundum Co. v. Molten Metal Equip. Innovations, Inc.*, 72 F.3d 872, 876 n.4, 37 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1169, 1171 n.4 (Fed. Cir. 1995). Further, Anton/Bauer's involvement prevents PAG from being a contributory or induced infringer.

### WELCOME NEW MEMBERS

We are pleased to welcome the following new members to the ranks of the OCPLA. His/her workplace and sponsors are listed.

New Member/Org.	Sponsors
Angela Wendel (Orrick Herrington & Sutcliffe, LLP)	Stefan Kirchanski Margaret Kivinski
Mark A. Finkelstein (Latham & Watkins LLP)	Perry J. Viscounty Allan Z. Litovsky
Kenneth L. Sherman Myers, Dawes, Andras & Sherman, LLP)	Joe Andras Dick Myers

Pursuant to Section 3.2 of the by-laws of the Orange County Patent Law Association, anyone having reason to believe that a new member is not qualified for membership may file a written objection with the Secretary within 30 days after this notice. If you are interested in joining our association, the amount due annually for Regular or Associate Membership is \$35 and for Student Membership is \$17.50. Annual dues are due in January of each year.

### OCPLA WEB PAGE

Check the OCPLA web site 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)."

### 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**

<b>President</b>	Stefan J. Kirchanski 310-734-5200 skirchanski@chrm.com
<b>V.P./President Elect</b>	Matthew F. Weil 949-851-0633 mweil@mwe.com
<b>Secretary</b>	Margaret A. Kivinski 949-757-1999 mkivinski@therox.com
<b>C.F.O./Treasurer</b>	John R. King 949-760-0404 jking@kmob.com
<b>Directors</b>	Leonard R. Svensson 714-708-8555 lrs@bskb.com
	Greg S. Hollrigel 949-450-1750 gsh@patlawyers.com
	Neal M. Cohen (949) 724-1849 nmc@nmcohen.com
<b>Immediate Past President</b>	Lowell Anderson 949-855-1246 landerson@stetinalaw.com

**COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSONS**

<b>Annual Seminar</b>	Matthew F. Weil 949-851-0633 mweil@mwe.com
	Greg S. Hollrigel 949-450-1750 gsh@patlawyers.com
<b>Copyright Practice</b>	Karen A. Gibbs 949-721-6900 GibbsK@howrey.com
<b>Federal Courts</b>	John B. Sganga, Jr. 949-760-0404 jsganga@kmob.com
<b>Int'l IP Practice</b>	Alexander R. Schlee 310-545-9851 alexschlee@vjp.de
<b>Law Off. Mgmt.</b>	Gabia Pakstys 949-713-8450 gpakstys@appliedmed.com
<b>Legislative</b>	A.J. Coco 714-730-3663 ajcoco@abonet.org
<b>MCLE</b>	Neal M. Cohen (949) 724-1849 nmc@nmcohen.com
<b>Meetings/Programs</b>	Greg S. Hollrigel 949-450-1750 gsh@patlawyers.com
<b>Newsletter Editor</b>	Leonard R. Svensson 714-708-8555 lrs@bskb.com
<b>Patent Practice</b>	Greg S. Hollrigel 949-450-1750 gsh@patlawyers.com
<b>Trade Secrets/Unfair</b>	James G. O'Neill 714-549-8609 oneilpatent@worldnet.att.net
<b>Competition Law</b>	Perry J. Viscounty 714-755-8288 perry.viscounty@lw.com
<b>Trademark Practice</b>	Tawnya Wojciechowski 714-513-5100 tawnya@smrh.com
<b>Luncheon Speakers</b>	Stefan J. Kirchanski 310-734-5200 skirchanski@chrm.com
	Cynthia A. Bonner 949-476-0757 cab@cph.com
<b>OCPLA Website</b>	Joseph C. Andras 949-223-9600 andras@mdalaw.com
	Daniel L. Dawes 949-223-9600 dawes@mdalaw.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 © 2003 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  
**Leonard R. Svensson**  
 Birch, Stewart, Kolasch & Birch LLP  
 650 Town Center Drive, Suite 620  
 Costa Mesa, CA 92626  
 email: [lrs@bskb.com](mailto:lrs@bskb.com)  
 Tel: (714) 708-8555  
 Fax: (714) 708-8565

**SERVICES, ANNOUNCEMENTS, WANT ADS**

**I.D. ENTITY<sup>®</sup>**  
 Building Better Brands

We can create effective trademarks for your clients and help test them in the marketplace. We also do research on brand and company names. Call us to find how we can help you and your clients.

P.O. Box 1686 ■ Brea, CA 92822  
 800.355.9817 ■ [www.identitypulse.com](http://www.identitypulse.com)

**MARCELO SROKA, CPA**  
Wertz & Company LLP  
2603 Main Street, Suite 810  
Irvine, CA 92614  
949/ 756-5000

**GAZETTEWATCH™**  
*Trademark Watching Service*  
**Bayview Center - Newport Beach, CA**  
**949.759.0255**  
**www.gazettewatch.com**

**STEPHEN T. FREEMAN, ESQ.**  
Straddling, Yocca, Carlson & Rauth  
Corporate and Tax Matters  
(949) 725-4000

**MANAGING PARTNER OR ATTORNEY**

Laguna Beach intellectual property law firm seeks managing partner or managing attorney with significant business management experience and good people management skills to manage our firm. Partner would need major portable book of business. Send email with resume and salary history or other pertinent information to [william.levin@lagunalaw.com](mailto:william.levin@lagunalaw.com).

**www.cadillustration.com**

*Professional Patent Illustrators & Drafters*



™ - Patent & Trademark Drawings  
- Litigation Exhibits

Tel: (949) 643-5535

Fax: (949) 643-0126

e-mail: [vahid@cadillustration.com](mailto:vahid@cadillustration.com)

Free Estimate - On Time Delivery -  
Satisfaction Guaranteed

**EXPERIENCED IP LITIGATOR NEEDED**

Laguna Beach intellectual property law firm seeks at least one very experienced intellectual property litigation attorney for immediate position. Five to twenty years experience desired, patent attorney preferred. Send email with resume and salary history and other pertinent information to [william.levin@lagunalaw.com](mailto:william.levin@lagunalaw.com).

**Patent & Trademark Drafting**

*Meeting Requirements of MPEP 608*  
*Quick Turn-around • Lowest Fees*

*also: 3D Rendering and Solicitation Brochures*  
*Graphic & Web Design • Product Photography*

*Current Attorney Clients Include: Patent Law Venture Group*  
*Jim O'Neill • Eric Karich • Neal Cohen • ask for more!*

**CREATIVE MINDS**  
"we fry our brains for you"

*Located near John Wayne!*  
(714) 545-2532 Fax (714) 545-2553  
[Creativeminds4u@hotmail.com](mailto:Creativeminds4u@hotmail.com)  
[www.CreativeMinds2000.com](http://www.CreativeMinds2000.com)

**POSITION AVAILABLE**  
**PATENT ATTORNEY/AGENT**

Rapidly growing Southern Californian patent prosecution/litigation firm with Fortune 500 client portfolio seeks attorneys/agents with high academic credentials and at least 2 years experience. Firm seeks candidates from all technical disciplines. We offer a competitive salary/benefit package and advancement opportunity. Mail or fax resume in confidence to:

Stout, Uxa, Buyan & Mullins, LLP  
4 Venture, Suite 300  
Irvine, CA 92618  
Fax 949-450-1750  
E-mail: [auxa@patlawyers.com](mailto:auxa@patlawyers.com)

**GOODMAN & CRAY, LLP**  
**BUSINESS & INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY MATTERS**

*Referral Fees Paid*

**(714) 836-0200 • (949) 222-2278**

- Patents
- Copyrights
- Licensing
- Trademarks
- Litigation
- Incorporation

**POSITION AVAILABLE  
ASSOCIATE ATTORNEY**

Crockett & Crockett, a Laguna Hills Patent and Trademark Law Firm, is seeking an attorney. Candidate must have a technical degree – electrical, mechanical, or biomedical engineering preferred. At least 2 years of experience required. Job duties include patent and trademark prosecution and litigation.

Fax or email cover letter and resume to Susan Crockett, Esq., Crockett & Crockett, fax #949 588 6172, email [Susancrockett@crockett-crockett.com](mailto:Susancrockett@crockett-crockett.com).

**POSITION AVAILABLE  
SECRETARY**

Duties include, 1) full time support for partner primarily in prosecution, 2) maintain database of contacts, 3) heavy preparation and filing of PTO related documents, including patent and trademark, 4) answering phones, 5) billing clients using Timeslips. Need exceptional familiarity with Outlook and MS Word. Email letter and resume to: [shimokaji@dsattorneys.com](mailto:shimokaji@dsattorneys.com) at DiPinto & Shimokaji, P.C. No phone calls or faxes please.

**POSITION WANTED  
SECRETARY**

Busy Newport Beach patent law firm seeks a full-time legal secretary who is self motivated, detail oriented, and able to handle multiple tasks. MS Office word processing and patent/trademark experience required. Fax resume to Lynne at 949-718-6756 or email to [lboisineau@jmhlaw.com](mailto:lboisineau@jmhlaw.com).

**POSITION SOUGHT**

Recent Law Graduate and U.S. Registered Patent Agent seeking Immediate Full Time or Contract Work in the area of Patent and Trademark Prosecution. Resumes and References will be provided upon request. Please contact John D. Tran 714-719-4927 or [john.316@juno.com](mailto:john.316@juno.com).

**POSITION AVAILABLE  
PATENT ATTORNEY**

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 patent prosecution experience with a preferred engineering degree in the mechanical arts. Unique associate compensation package includes a base salary with a minimum monthly billing requirement of 120 hours and additional compensation in the form of thirty three percent (33%) of any hours billed in excess of the minimum of 120 hours per month.

Please send employment inquiries to: Stetina Brunda Garred & Brucker, P.C., Recruiting Attorney, 75 Enterprise, Suite 250, Aliso Viejo, CA 92656; or via email at [recruiting@stetinalaw.com](mailto:recruiting@stetinalaw.com). Please visit us at [www.stetinalaw.com](http://www.stetinalaw.com).

**POSITION WANTED****PART TIME SECRETARY**

Duties include 1) about 30 hours/week support for partner primarily in prosecution, 2) maintain database of contacts, 3) heavy preparation and filing of PTO related documents, including patent and trademark, 4) answering phones, 5) billing clients using Timeslips. Need exceptional familiarity with Outlook and MS Word.

Email letter and resume to: DiPinto & Shimokaji, P.C., [shimokaji@dsattorneys.com](mailto:shimokaji@dsattorneys.com). No phone calls or faxes please.

**PATENT SECRETARY WANTED**

Growing Intellectual Property Firm with 12 attorneys in San Jose and Orange County is seeking a full-time or part-time patent secretary in its Irvine office. Some foreign filing experience is desirable. Please contact Tom Chen for more information at (949) 752-7040 or e-mail at [tchen@macpherson-kwok.com](mailto:tchen@macpherson-kwok.com).

MacPherson Kwok Chen & Heid LLP  
2402 Michelson Drive, Suite 210  
Irvine, CA 92612  
[www.macpherson-kwok.com](http://www.macpherson-kwok.com)

**SITUATION SOUGHT**

Patent Agent with 15 years experience and about 200 pending applications in U.S., Europe and elsewhere, wishes to merge with existing IP firm for load leveling and eventual retirement (2-3 years) with residual income arrangement. Phone: 714/668-3815 as a personal call for Mr. Jones. BEE, MIA, 27 yrs. hands-on engineering with fortune 500 companies.

**Orange County Patent Law Association**

July Meeting

**Date:** Wednesday, July 23, 2003**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:** Chemical Dependency**Speaker:** Jeannie Griffin**Cost:** \$30 for members and \$35 for non-members**Reservations:** Please make reservations by filling out the form below and mailing it with a check to Greg Hollrigel to reach his office address given below, by the Friday before the meeting. If time is short, please also email Greg at [gsh@patlawyers.com](mailto:gsh@patlawyers.com) or call in your reservation to the OCPLA Reservations Line number at (949) 450-1759 x231.

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, July 23, 2003 for the following person(s):

---

---

---

This form and check should be mailed to:

**Greg S. Hollrigel**  
**Attention: OCPLA Lunch Reservations**  
**Stout, Uxa, Buyan & Mullins, LLP**  
**4 Venture, Suite 300**  
**Irvine, CA 92618**  
**Tel: 949-450-1750**  
**Fax: 949-450-1764**  
**E-mail: [gsh@patlawyers.com](mailto:gsh@patlawyers.com)**



# Orange County Patent Law Association

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

## 2003 MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION/RENEWAL FORM

**This is an application for (please circle one):**      **Membership Renewal or New Membership**

Member / Applicant Information:

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Firm: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail Address (**required to receive newsletter**): \_\_\_\_\_

Telephone No.: \_\_\_\_\_ Facsimile No.: \_\_\_\_\_

**Professional Information:**

Are you a member of the California bar?      Yes      No      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 2003 (please circle one):**

Regular Membership (attorneys, agents):      \$35.00      **(New Member After 07/01/03)** \$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**

Two OCPLA member sponsors are required for new applicants. Two undersigned members hereby recommend the above-signed applicant for membership into the Orange County Patent Law Assn.

Sponsor Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Printed Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Sponsor Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Printed Name: \_\_\_\_\_

## 2003 OCPLA EVENTS SCHEDULE

Date	Location	Speaker/Event	Topic
July 23, 2003	Wyndham Garden Hotel	Jeannie Griffin	Chemical Dependency (MCLE credit)
August 27, 2003	Wyndham Garden Hotel	Magistrate Nakazato	Tips From the Bench on Handling IP Cases
September 24, 2003	Wyndham Garden Hotel	John R. King Knobbe, Martens, Olson & Bear, LLP	Limiting Language And Alternative Embodiments – What To Do And What To Avoid
October 27-28, 2003	Wyndham Garden Hotel	Matthias Reischle and Louis Maassel	PCT Seminar



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