



OCPLA NEWSLETTER

Orange County Patent Law Association

www.ocpla.org

Vol. 10, No. 9

September 2004

SEPTEMBER LUNCHEON MEETING

Please join us at our next luncheon meeting on Wednesday, September 22, 2004, when we are pleased to present John R. King of Knobbe, Martens, Olson & Bear LLP, who will speak on "Patent Allowance, Now What? Continuation Strategies That Significantly Increase Patent Value". The lunch will be held at noon at the Wyndham Garden Hotel.

OCTOBER BOARD MEETING

On October 6, 2004, the OCPLA Board of Directors is holding its monthly meeting at noon at TherOx, Inc.

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

INSIDE THIS ISSUE . . .

ITEMS	PAGE
PTO Update	2
Minutae	3
Recent Interesting IP Cases.....	3
Services	8
Luncheon Reservation Form	11

MARK YOUR CALENDARS . . .

September 22, 2004 Patent Allowance, Now What? Continuation Strategies That Significantly Increase Patent Value

October 27, 2004 TBA

November 17, 2004 Enjoining the Serial Copyist

December 15, 2004 OCPLA Annual Holiday Party (Club 33)

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 Greg Hollrigel at gsh@patlawyers.com.

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.

In addition, several members have inquired about ordering fruit plates for the lunches. If you wish to order a fruit plate, or a vegetarian dish, please indicate your meal preference when you RSVP.

2004 OCPLA HOLIDAY PARTY

Please remember to mark your calendars.

This year the OCPLA will be hosting its annual holiday party at Club 33 at Disneyland on **December 15, 2004**. Additional information and a reservation form will be provided in the near future. We look forward to celebrating the 2004 holiday season with you and a guest at Club 33.

2004 MEMBERSHIP RENEWAL

Dues for 2004 will remain at \$35 for attorneys and agents and entitle you to receive the monthly OCPLA newsletter, frequent announcements, and reduced rates for the monthly luncheons and seminars. A membership form is included in this month's newsletter and is also available on our website, at www.ocpla.org. If you have not already done so, please renew now!

PTO UPDATE

BY GREG S. HOLLRIGEL
STOUT, UXA, BUYAN & MULLINS,
LLP
gsh@patlawyers.com



Changes to the Rules of Practice Before the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences

As of September 13, 2004, new rules will be in effect regarding procedures for both Ex

Parte and Inter Partes Appeals before the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences. These new rules have been adopted to address concerns regarding the duration of proceedings before the Board.

Many of the new procedures are identified in Part 41 of Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations.

Some changes regarding Ex Parte Appeals include

- only one copy of an Appeal Brief is required (instead of three copies);
- an Appeal Brief must be filed within two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal;
- both a statement of the status of all the claims in the proceeding, and an identification of those claims that are being appealed is required;
- a concise explanation of the invention is required for each of the independent claims involved in the appeal, which includes reference to the specification by page and line numbers;
- the grouping of claims requirement set forth in 37 CFR 192(c)(7) has been removed;
- an evidence appendix is required for any evidence relied upon by appellant in the appeal;
- an Examiner's Answer may include a new ground of rejection;
- a Supplemental Examiner's Answer may be submitted to respond to any new issue raised in an Appellant's Reply Brief; and
- a Supplemental Reply Brief may be submitted in response to a Supplemental Examiner's Answer.

Additional information may be obtained at the following website:

<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/com/sol/notices/69fr49960.pdf>

MINUTIAE

BY NEAL M. COHEN
COHEN SAKAGUCHI & ENGLISH LLP
nmc@cohen-sak.com

**PTO DEPOSIT ACCOUNT ERRORS**

If you have a deposit account with the PTO, that's a good thing. If the PTO withdraws the wrong amount of money, that's a bad thing (assuming the PTO withdraws too much, of course). It's bad for several reasons. First, as of August 23, 2004, you can no longer get miles for dollars paid to the PTO through your deposit account. Second, once you send the required written request to the PTO for a refund, you will not receive a letter of receipt until about three months later. Then, within about two more months, you should receive the refund. In the meantime, not only will you have lost the cash flow for five months, but if your account dipped below the minimum \$1,000 by the end of any month (due to the PTO error, for example), you will have been charged a \$25 service fee. Then you could go through the same process to get back your \$25 (or not).

Here are a couple of ways to test this article for accuracy:

1. Check the "small entity" box on the Utility Patent Application Transmittal form (SB/05), but leave the "small entity" box blank on the Fee transmittal (SB/17). The PTO will probably charge you the large entity fees.
2. File a PCT application claiming the discounted search fee for a prior U.S. search, but be sure to do it before you have the serial number for the U.S. application (in PCT-EASY, you could enter 00/000,000 for the serial number). The PTO will probably charge you the full search fee.
3. Do either of the above when your deposit account is just above \$1,000. The PTO will probably hit you for the \$25 service fee.

To seek a refund, you should fax your request to "PTO – REFUNDS" at 703 308-6778. If you have questions, you can call them at 703 305-4631.

Please e-mail any questions, comments, or submissions for future Minutiae columns, to Neal M. Cohen, at 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



**1. PATENT TERM EXTENSION
PROTECTS ACTIVE INGREDIENTS
AND THEIR SALTS OR ESTERS**

Pfizer, Inc. v. Dr. Reddy's Labs., Ltd., Nos. 03-1227, -1258, 359 F.3d 1361, 69 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 2016 (Fed. Cir. Feb. 27, 2004)

Issue: Does the extended term of a patent cover the active ingredient and any salt or ester thereof? **Answer:** Yes.

Pfizer, Inc. ("Pfizer") received a patent term extension for its marketed drug Norvasc®, which is amlodipine besylate. Dr. Reddy's Laboratories, Ltd. and Dr. Reddy's Laboratories, Inc. ("Dr. Reddy") filed a new drug application ("Paper NDA") for a different salt of the same active ingredient (amlodipine maleate) and relied on the safety and efficacy data of Pfizer's drug. Pfizer filed suit against Dr. Reddy for patent infringement. The district court found that Dr. Reddy's drug does not infringe the extended patent term of Pfizer's patent. Pfizer appealed.

Dr. Reddy acknowledges that amlodipine maleate is covered by the claims of the patent, but argues that Pfizer's patent term extension is restricted to the amlodipine besylate salt only. Dr. Reddy argues that

amlodipine maleate is a different "active ingredient" and that only the specific salt for which Pfizer obtained approval is protected by the patent's extended term. Dr. Reddy stresses that in filing its request for extension, Pfizer identified the approved product as amlodipine besylate. Pfizer argues that the patent term extension applies to the "salt or ester of the active ingredient" and since amlodipine is the active ingredient, simply changing the salt does not exempt Dr. Reddy from infringement.

The active ingredient is amlodipine, and that is the same whether administered as the besylate salt or the maleate salt. "The statutory definition of 'drug product' is met by amlodipine and its salts." The statute foresaw variation in the salt or ester of an active ingredient, and guarded against this very event. 35 U.S.C. sec. 156(f) states "(2) The term 'drug product' means the active ingredient of ... *including any salt or ester of the active ingredient*, as a single entity or in combination with another active ingredient" (emphasis added).

Conclusion: The judgment of non-infringement is reversed. The extended term of the patent covers amlodipine and any salt or ester, as provided by 35 U.S.C. sec. 156(f), and the extension is not limited to the besylate salt of amlodipine.

2. BEST MODE REQUIREMENT NOT VIOLATED BY AN UNINTENTIONAL OMISSION OF INFORMATION THAT IS READILY KNOWN IN THE ART

High Concrete Structures, Inc. v. New Enter. Stone & Lime Co., No. 03-1477 (Fed. Cir. July 29, 2004)

Issue: Is the best mode requirement violated by an unintentional omission of information that is readily known to people in the field of the invention? **Answer:** No.

High Concrete Structures, Inc. ("High Concrete") owns U.S. Patent No. 5,947,665 ("the '665 patent"), which is directed to a device for adjusting the orientation, and thereby facilitating the transport, of heavy

and bulky cargo such as pre-formed concrete structures called "double-tees." Double-tees are concrete modules used to support heavy loads and are typically transported lying flat on a truck bed. Lying flat, the width of the double-tee causes trucks to be classified as carrying an oversize load. The patented invention allows cargo to be carried on a frame at an angle, thereby reducing the effective cargo width so that the truck is not considered to be carrying an oversize load. Although not described in the '665 patent specification, a crane is used in operation when the double-tee is loaded onto the frame and rotated to the transport angle. The specification of the '665 patent states the cargo can be rotated on the frame to the transport angle manually, without heavy equipment.

After being sued for infringement, New Enterprise Stone & Lime Co. ("New Enterprise") filed a motion for summary judgment, alleging that the '665 patent is invalid for not disclosing the best mode of practicing the claimed invention -- i.e., using a crane when the cargo is loaded and rotated on the frame to its transport position. The district court granted the defendants' summary judgment motion on this ground and High Concrete appealed.

High Concrete argued that the claims are not invalid under the best mode requirement because the use of a crane to load heavy cargo was well known and would not be necessary for many types of cargo. New Enterprise argued that, regardless of whether a crane would be needed in all circumstances, the inventors preferred using a crane for heavy loads, and failed to disclose this preferred mode of practicing the claimed invention.

According to 35 U.S.C. sec. 112, the specification must set forth the best mode known to the inventor for practicing the claimed invention. Invalidity under the best mode requirement requires a finding that the inventor: (1) knew of a better mode of practicing the claimed invention than the one disclosed; and (2) intentionally concealed

that better mode. New Enterprise did not dispute that anyone with experience with transporting heavy loads would know to use a crane when moving such loads. Absent evidence of intent to deliberately withhold information, known techniques for performing an operation cannot be deemed intentionally concealed.

In this case, the best mode requirement was not violated by the inventors' unintentional omission of information that would have been readily known to persons in the field of the invention. Thus, the district court's grant of summary judgment of invalidity was reversed, and the case was remanded for further proceedings.

3. CAFC UNVEILS ITS FIRST OPINION ON TEMPORARY PRESENCE RULE

***Nat'l Steel Car, Ltd. v. Canadian Pac. Ry., Ltd.*, No. 03-1256 (Fed. Cir. Jan. 29, 2004)**

Issue: Does 35 U.S.C. sec. 272, which provides a potential patent infringement defense for vehicles that enter the U.S. only temporarily, extend only to vehicles staying in the U.S. for a short period of time?

Answer: No.

Plaintiff-Appellee National Steel Car, Ltd. ("NSC"), is a railway car manufacturer that owns U.S. Patent No. 4,951,575 ("the '575 patent"), directed to a depressed center-beam flat railway car used to haul lumber. Defendants-Appellants Canadian Pacific Railway, Ltd., et al. (collectively "CPR") are Canadian railroad companies that operate trains in Canada and in the U.S. In 2002, CPR invited bids for a new fleet of depressed center-beam flat cars. NSC submitted bids and notified CPR of the existence of the '575 patent. When CPR awarded the contract to a different bidder, NSC sued CPR asserting infringement of the '575 patent and moved for a preliminary injunction, which the district court granted.

CPR's chief defense against NSC's motion for preliminary injunction was that its intended use of the accused cars in the U.S. is protected by 35 U.S.C. sec. 272, which is

titled "Temporary presence in the United States" and provides that "the use of certain foreign-owned means of transit or transport entering ... the United States 'temporarily or accidentally' is not an infringing use provided [certain] conditions are satisfied." In denying this defense, the district court concluded that the "temporary" condition of sec. 272 should be based on: (1) the duration of the vehicle's stay in the U.S. relative to the duration of its stay elsewhere; and (2) the affect on the rights of the patent owner. The district court concluded CPR's intended use fails to satisfy the "temporary" condition because the railroad cars at issue would be in the U.S. the majority of the time, at a significant benefit to CPR.

Reasoning/Conclusion: In a case of first impression, the CAFC declined to adopt the criteria for "temporary" presence in the U.S. relied on by the district court. Although the plain meaning of the word "temporarily" is "for a brief period" or "during a limited time," neither definition is sufficient for determining applicability of sec. 272 in any given case. The legislative history of sec. 272 suggests that "temporarily" refers to "the vehicle's purpose to participate in international commerce at the time of entry -- namely, a purpose to enter the United States, engage in international commerce, and then depart."

Thus, the CAFC concluded that "temporarily" merely requires that the vehicle's entry be: (1) for a finite duration; and (2) for the sole purpose of engaging in international commerce, regardless of the length of stay in the U.S. Because CPR's sec. 272 defense does not lack substantial merit, the district court's preliminary injunction is reversed.

4. PRESUMPTION THAT A CLAIMED "MEANS" IS SUBJECT TO INTERPRETATION UNDER 35 U.S.C. SEC. 112, 6TH PARAGRAPH LIMITATION OVERCOME BY THE RECITATION OF STRUCTURE

***TI Group Auto. Sys. (N. Am.), Inc. v. VDO N. Am., LLC*, No. 02-1630, 03-1482, 71 U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA) 1328 (Fed. Cir. June 30,**

2004)

Issue: Can the recitation of structure in a claim reciting "means" for performing a function overcome the presumption that the claim element should be interpreted under 35 U.S.C. sec. 112, 6th paragraph? **Answer:** Yes.

TI Group Auto. Sys. (N. Am.), Inc. ("TI"), a manufacturer/supplier of fuel tanks, fuel pump assemblies, and complete fuel tank systems, owns U.S. Patent No. 4,860,714 ("the '714 patent"), which is directed to an in-tank fuel assembly for fuel-injected engines. The assembly disclosed and claimed in the '714 patent supplies fuel consistently, even when the fuel in the fuel tank is low, or when the vehicle is navigating a sharp turn, traveling over a steep incline, or has been parked on an incline for an extended period of time.

Independent claim 2 is at issue in the appeal and states:

Apparatus for pumping fuel from a fuel tank to an engine comprising:

...

(d) pumping means for pumping fuel into the reservoir, said means being located within the reservoir in the region of the opening and including a nozzle and a venturi tube in alignment with the nozzle, the passage of fuel out of the nozzle and through the venturi tube causing fuel to be entrained through the opening into the interior of the reservoir.

After receiving written notice from TI of suspected infringement of the '714 patent, VDO N. Am., LLC ("VDO") filed a declaratory judgment action against TI, seeking a finding of non-infringement and invalidity. The district court held a *Markman* hearing to construe certain claim elements, including the "pumping means" of claim 2. The court concluded that the term is a means-plus-function limitation, which must be interpreted

under 35 U.S.C. sec. 112, paragraph 6. Thus, the court narrowly construed the "pumping means" based on the particular arrangement described in the specification, resulting in a holding of non-infringement.

TI argues that the district court erroneously construed the term "pumping means" as a means-plus-function limitation, resulting in an unduly narrow definition. More specifically, TI asserts that the "pumping means" element was not claimed merely in terms of function, and instead recited structural features, such that it cannot be treated as a means-plus-function limitation. VDO argues that the phrase "pumping means" creates a presumption that sec. 112, paragraph 6 applies and that TI has failed to rebut this presumption.

Reasoning/Conclusion: The claim limitation recites not only a pumping means, but also its structure, location, and operation. While the use of the word "means" creates a presumption that sec. 112, paragraph 6 applies, this presumption is overcome by the recitation of the structure needed to perform the recited function. In this case, the proper construction of the "pumping means" limitation is "a pump including a nozzle and a venturi tube in alignment with the nozzle," as recited in the claim. The district court erroneously treated the "pumping means" limitation as a means-plus-function limitation since the claim recites the structure necessary to perform the pumping function.

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
Charles T. Silberberg The Boeing Company	Neal M. Cohen William A. English
Vincent Bailey	Neal M. Cohen William A. English

OCPLA WEBSITE

Check the OCPLA website at 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."

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	Matthew F. Weil 949-851-0633 mweil@mwe.com
V.P./President Elect	Margaret A. Kivinski 949-757-1999 mkivinski@therox.com
Secretary	John R. King 949-760-0404 jking@kmob.com
C.F.O./Treasurer	Leonard R. Svensson 714-708-8555 lrs@bskb.com
Directors	Greg S. Hollrigel 949-450-1750 gsh@patlawyers.com
	Neal M. Cohen (949) 724-1849 nmc@cohen-sak.com
	TJ Singh (949) 955-1920 tjsingh@koslaw.com
Immediate Past President	Stefan J. Kirchanski 310-734-5200 skirchanski@reedsmith.com
COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSONS	
Annual Seminar	Margaret A. Kivinski 949-757-1999 mkivinski@therox.com
	Neal M. Cohen (949) 724-1849 nmc@cohen-sak.com
Copyright Practice	Darren S. Rimer (949) 367-1541 darren@rimermath.com
Federal Courts	Position Open
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	T. J. Singh (949) 955-1920 tjsingh@koslaw.com
Meetings/Programs	Neal M. Cohen (949) 724-1849 nmc@cohen-sak.com
Newsletter Editor	Greg S. Hollrigel 949-450-1750 gsh@patlawyers.com
Patent Practice	Neal M. Cohen (949) 724-1849 nmc@cohen-sak.com
Trade Secrets/Unfair	Position Open
Competition Law	Perry J. Viscounty 714-755-8288 perry.viscounty@lw.com
Trademark Practice	Susan Natland 949-760-0404 smn@kmob.com
Luncheon Speakers	Matthew F. Weil 949-851-0633 mweil@mwe.com
OCPLA Website	Marlene Klein 949-932-3132 marlene.klein@cda.canon.com
OCPLA Database	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:

OCPLA Newsletter Editor
Greg S. Holtrigel
 Stout, Uxa, Buyan & Mullins, LLP
 4 Venture, Suite 300
 Irvine, CA 92618
 email: gsh@patlawyers.com
 Tel: 949-450-1750
 Fax: 949-450-1764

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

NEWPORT PATENT DRAWINGS, INC.

- High quality drawings
- Reasonable rates
- USPTO/PCT compliance
- Email or hard copy of drawings
- Fast turnaround

(949) 260-0440 (tel.) / (949) 733-8600 (fax)
www.newportpatentdrawings.com

Now available: cost-effective software for professional patent attorneys/agents. Using artificial intelligence, **iClaim®** scans each claim individually and studies the interrelationship between claims, to determine where the Patent Office regulations have not been complied with (e.g. missing antecedent basis, dependency rules and more). **iClaim®** additionally performs automatic renumbering of claims and dependencies by a given increment/decrement.

The \$399 **iClaim®** Software by Brux Software Solutions can be explored at www.ibrux.com. Evaluation software is available for FREE download at: <http://www.ibrux.com/Try.asp>.

iClaim® software is installed as an add-in to Microsoft Word®. It is very easy to use and requires no training.

Contact us at: ronny.fogel@ibrux.com or Nizani@ibrux.com.

Patent Attorney/Agent Wanted

MacPherson Kwok Chen & Heid LLP is seeking a first or second year patent attorney/agent in its Irvine office. Preferrably, the candidate will have a degree in EE, Comp. Sci., or Physics with some engineering experience. For more information about the firm, please visit our web site at www.macpherson-kwok.com. Please direct any questions or resumes to Tom Chen at tchen@macpherson-kwok.com.

PATENT ASSOCIATE WANTED:

The growing IP group of the Orange County office of Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker LLP is seeking an IP associate with two to three years of experience in patent prosecution and/or IP litigation. Candidates must possess either a degree in Electrical Engineering or Computer Science. JD required; admittance to the California State Bar and USPTO is a plus.

Please send resumes and transcript to marilynradley@paulhastings.com or direct fax to 714 668-6570

POSITIONS OPEN

Patent Associate

Duties include mechanical and electrical patent preparation and prosecution. Must have at least 5 years US and PCT experience, and ability to work as primary client contact. Technical background is preferably EE, physics, or mechanical.

Supervising Attorney

Duties include 1) ensuring that patent applications/amendments written by other attorneys meet written quality control standards of firm; 2) working 2-3 days per week – about 10-20 hours per week; 3) writing own cases outside of office if desired.

Email letter and resume to: Shimokaji & Associates, P.C., swedo@shimokaji.com.

AMGEN Inc.

Company Background: Amgen, the world's largest biotechnology company, uses science and innovation in an effort to dramatically improve people's lives. Amgen aspires to be the world's best human therapeutics company. Our researchers harness the powerful tools of cellular and molecular biology and medicinal chemistry to discover, develop and commercialize naturally occurring proteins, antibodies and small molecules, with the goal of extending the reach of science to unleash the body's own powerful therapeutic responses.

Position No. 1

Title: Corporate Counsel II

Department: Amgen Legal / Patent Law Group

Location: Thousand Oaks, CA

Job Description

This candidate will be involved primarily in patent litigation, drafting opinions and developing legal strategies associated with Amgen's business and research endeavors and may be involve in some patent prosecution and licensing

Experience

The position requires a minimum of 5-7 years of experience in patent litigation, including trial experience, preferably in biotechnology related cases, and a solid background in all aspects of U.S. intellectual property law, and the ability to travel. This position requires a J.D. degree and admission to practice before a state bar and the U.S. Patent Office.

Position No. 2

Title: Corporate Counsel II

Department: Amgen Legal / Patent Law Group

Location: South San Francisco, CA and Thousand Oaks, CA

Job Description

This candidate will be involved in patent application drafting and prosecution, drafting and negotiation of various research and licensing agreements in coordination with licensing counsel, drafting opinions and developing legal strategies associated with Amgen's business and research endeavors, as well as the potential for having involvement in some copyright, trademark and litigation matters. The position requires a minimum of 4 years of experience in all aspects of U.S. foreign intellectual property law relating to chemistry, preferably in the pharmaceutical or agrichemical industries. This position requires a J.D. degree and admission to practice before a state bar and the U.S. Patent Office.

How to Apply:

If you are interested in applying for these , please apply online on Amgen's website at www.amgen.com and please contact Craig Seipel at (805) 313-4534 or cseipel@amgen.com if you have any questions.

As an EEO/AA M/F/D/V employer, Amgen values and encourages diversity in the workplace.

1 to 6 window offices on 11th floor of the Class A Newport Gateway office towers in Irvine, located near the intersection of MacArthur and Jamboree. Beautifully appointed. and recently remodeled. Comes w/wo work stations, access to 3 conference rooms and kitchen use. Copiers and mail service available. Receptionist to greet. Covered parking. Airport and freeway close. Call 949-223-9601. Ask for Mylene.

Office Available

Sublease 12' by 14' fully furnished window office available in patent law suite. Join a patent attorney, patent agent and a patent drafter as 4th party. Phone, fax, DSL, high speed copier/printer, computer work station, postage meter. JW airport area, easy parking, close to 405, 55 and 73 freeways. Call: 714/ 668-1900

IRVINE OFFICE SPACE

Orange County Patent Law Association September Meeting

Date: Wednesday, September 22, 2004

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: Patent Allowance, Now What? Continuation Strategies That Significantly Increase Patent Value

Speaker: John R. King, Knobbe, Martens, Olson & Bear, LLP

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 Neal M. Cohen to reach his office address given below, by the Friday before the meeting. If time is short, please also email Neal at nmc@cohen-sak.com or call in your reservation to the OCPLA Reservations Line number at (949) 724-1849.

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, September 22, 2004 for the following person(s):

This form and check should be mailed to:

Neal M. Cohen
Attention: OCPLA Lunch Reservations
Cohen Sakaguchi & English LLP
2040 Main Street, 9th Floor
Irvine, CA 92614
Tel: (949) 724-1849
Fax: (949) 625-8955
E-mail: nmc@cohen-sak.com

**Knobbe Martens Olson & Bear and Chapman University School of Law
in association with the Orange County Patent Law Association
invite you to attend the**

***Third Annual Preview of the Supreme Court:
“An Update of Intellectual Property Law”***

Panelists:

Lowell Anderson, Stetina Brunda
Joe Cianfrani, Knobbe Martens Olson & Bear
Dan Harbottle, Rutan & Tucker
John Sganga, Knobbe Martens Olson & Bear
Professor John Tehranian, University of Utah, Of Counsel Turner Green & Afrasiabi
Charles Wu, Wu and Cheung
Moderator: Professor Thomas Bell, Chapman University School of Law

**Tuesday, October 12, 2004
Lunch and Program: 11:30 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.**

**Sponsored by
Knobbe Martens Olson & Bear LLP**

Chapman University School of Law
370 N. Glassell Street
Orange, CA 92866

Intellectual Property Supreme Court and Federal Circuit cases to be discussed:

KP Permanent Make-Up v. Lasting Impression I, 828 F.3d 1061 (9th Cir. 2003)
cert. granted - Trademark

Phillips v. AWH Corp., 363 F.3d 1207, 2004 U.S. App. LEXIS 6758 (Fed. Cir. 2004)
rehearing en banc – Claims Construction

Parking: Parking is available in the structure on Sycamore and Lemon by permit only. Parking permits are available for purchase in the parking lot for \$2.00 from the dispensers on the first, third, or fifth floors adjacent to the elevators.

The above activity has been approved for minimum Continuing Legal Education by the State Bar of California. Chapman University certifies that this activity conforms to the standards for the approved education activities prescribed by the rules and regulations of the State Bar of California governing minimum continuing legal education.

Reservation Form

**Third Annual Preview of the Supreme Court Symposium
October 12, 2004**

Name(s): _____

_____ Law Faculty/Student/Judge @ \$5.00 = \$ _____

_____ Attorney @ \$30.00 = \$ _____

Reservations and Cancellations are due by October 8. After this date we will bill for no-shows and cancellations, and charge an additional \$10.00 for walk-ins.

Please send form and payment to “Chapman University, School of Law” to: Chapman University, School of Law, Career Services, One University Drive, Orange, CA 92866.

2004 OCPLA EVENTS SCHEDULE

Date	Location	Speaker/Event	Topic
September 22, 2004	Wyndham Garden Hotel	John R. King Knobbe, Martens, Olson & Bear, LLP	Patent Allowance, Now What? Continuation Strategies That Significantly Increase Patent Value
October 27, 2004	Wyndham Garden Hotel	TBA	TBA
November 17, 2004	Wyndham Garden Hotel	Paul Stewart Knobbe, Martens, Olson & Bear, LLP	Enjoining the Serial Copyist



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