



# OCPLA NEWSLETTER

Orange County Patent Law Association

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

Vol. 11, No. 9

September 2005

## OCPLA SPONSORS LOCAL CHARITY EVENT

Reminder... The 2005 Legal SPIN-Bowl bowl-a-thon fundraiser is Saturday, September 24, 2005 from 2 pm to 4 pm. The \$30 registration fee will be waived for OCPLA members and family. See details inside on page 11.

## OCPLA PCT SEMINAR

AND SAVE ANOTHER DATE! On October 24-25, 2005 the OCPLA is sponsoring a PCT seminar at Whittier Law School. For more information, please see the separate flyer distributed along with this Newsletter.

## SEPTEMBER LUNCHEON MEETING

Please join us at our next luncheon meeting on Wednesday, September 28, 2005, when we are pleased to present **William Diaz** of McDermott, Will & Emery, who will speak on "What Every IP Lawyer Needs to Know to Keep His Client Out of Antitrust Trouble".

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

## OCTOBER BOARD MEETING

On October 5, 2005 the OCPLA Board of Directors is holding its monthly meeting at noon at Knobbe Martens Olson & Bear LLP, in Irvine. Members who wish to present items for the Board's consideration should contact our president, Margaret Kivinski, to have their item placed on the agenda, and to verify the time and location of the meeting.

## OCPLA HOLIDAY PARTY

MARK YOUR CALENDARS!! This year's OCPLA Holiday Party will take place at Ralph Brennan's Jazz Kitchen, in Downtown Disney, on Friday December 9, 2005 starting at 6:30 pm. The cost is \$50.00 per person, and includes a four-course meal with choice of entree, two drink tickets, and unlimited hot tea, iced tea, and soda. SPACE IS LIMITED, and tickets will be sold on a first-pay basis. The reservation form will be available in next month's OCPLA newsletter. If you have any questions in the meantime, please contact Neal Cohen at [nmc@cohen-sak.com](mailto:nmc@cohen-sak.com).

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

BY MARGARET KIVINSKI  
THEROX, INC.  
[mkivinski@therox.com](mailto:mkivinski@therox.com)



The OCPLA had another terrific monthly lunch meeting in August. A very special thanks goes out to Bill Rooklidge for coming out and speaking to us about the ongoing activity in the area of patent reform by AIPLA and others, and providing us with the most recent copy of the proposed compromise version of the revised patent statute prepared by the coalition authoring the draft. Based on the questions and commentary coming from the audience, this is clearly a subject that our members feel strongly about and can see the dramatic impact the revised legislation could have on their practice. The OCPLA will continue to keep its members apprised of the status of the legislation and any significant changes that might be introduced.

## OCPLA 2006 SPRING SEMINAR

SAVE THE DATE. OCPLA's annual Spring Seminar will be held this spring from March 24-26, 2006, at the La Costa Resprt & Spa in Carlsbad, California. See page 9 .

This month, we are going to have another very interesting presentation on Antitrust Issues in Intellectual Property practice. Please join us to hear William Diaz of McDermott Will & Emery present important issues and recent developments in the area of antitrust law and what we need to know as intellectual property law practitioners to advise our clients and keep them out of antitrust trouble.

This newsletter also contains information about the upcoming PCT Seminar in October. We are pleased to have some very special guests from WIPO in Geneva come out and speak to us on PCT practice basics and what we need to know about the recent changes to the PCT process. Please plan on joining us at Whittier Law School for this informative 2-day program on October 24 and 25.

Thanks to everyone who formed teams and are raising money for the 2005 Legal SPIN-Bowl to benefit SPIN (Serving People In Need), a non-profit organization assisting those in need in Orange County. OCPLA was proud to sponsor the registration fee for its members. The event will take place on September 24, 2005. To sign up and otherwise find out how to show your support, please contact Matt Weil at (949) 757-7153.

#### RSVP ON TIME FOR MONTHLY LUNCHESES

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

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

#### 2005 MEMBERSHIP RENEWAL

Dues for 2005 are \$35 for attorneys and agents. Members receive the monthly OCPLA newsletter, and reduced rates for the monthly luncheons and seminars. A membership form is included in this month's newsletter and is also available at [www.ocpla.org](http://www.ocpla.org). Please renew early to reduce delays in processing.

#### 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
<b>Malcolm Barnes</b>	Neal Cohen William English
<b>Valerie L. Sarigumba</b> Cohen Sakaguchi & English LLP	Neal Cohen William English
<b>Chuong Vu</b> Chapman Law School	Sean O'Neill Marlene Klein

#### OCPLA WEBSITE

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

#### E-MAIL DISTRIBUTION OF THE NEWSLETTER



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

#### OCPLA POLICY

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

## MINUTIAE

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



### **Can Congress “Promote The Progress Of Science ” By Enacting A System In Which No One Gets A Patent ?**

I think the well-known Constitutional debate over a “first-to-file” system will soon peter out if it hasn’t already, because the proposed changes in H.R. 2795 (The Patent Act of 2005) reflect a “first *inventor* to file” system. But I think a new Constitutional debate should begin. This new debate should not be over the error in the proposed new Section 103, namely referring to “... through the claimed invention” instead of “... though the claimed invention”. Nor should it be over the elimination of 35 U.S.C. § 157 (Statutory Invention Registrations). Nope, this new debate should be over Section 102.

The patent laws stem from the United States Constitution which gives Congress the power “to promote the progress of science ... by securing for limited times to ... inventors the exclusive right to their ... discoveries.” United States Constitution, Art. I, Section 8, clause 8. So can Congress enact a law that prevents anyone from getting a patent in certain situations? If the current version of H.R. 2795 passes, that’s exactly what the proposed Section 102 will do.

Specifically, the proposed changes to 35 U.S.C. § 102 provide that a patent for a claimed invention cannot be obtained if the invention: 1) was publicly known (anywhere in the world) before the date of invention; or 2) was publicly known (anywhere in the world) more than a year before the inventor’s effective filing date (EFD); or 3) was described in a U.S. patent or published U.S. patent application, by another, with an earlier EFD than the applicant’s EFD (exceptions for common ownership and derivation). So let’s look at a couple of examples.

**Example #1** - Assume Inventor #1 conceives and publicly discloses an invention on Day 1, and files on Day 10. Inventor #2 conceives and files on Day 9, for the same invention. Assume both applications publish at eighteen

months (which is a good assumption since the publication opt-out procedures are also eliminated in the current H.R. 2795). In this case, Inventor #1 cannot get a patent because the invention would be described in a published U.S. patent application by another (Inventor #2), with an earlier EFD (Day 9) than Inventor #1’s EFD (Day 10). Inventor #2 cannot get a patent because the invention would be publicly known (Day 1) before Inventor #2’s date of invention (Day 9). So thank you Inventor #1 and Inventor #2 (and Congress), for dedicating the invention to the public.

**Example #2** - Assume Inventor conceives and publicly discloses an invention on Day 1, and files on Day 10. Let’s say the public disclosure was at a public lecture. Thief hears the lecture, and rushes to the PTO to file on Day 2 for the same invention. In this case, Thief cannot get a patent because he is not an inventor. That would be unconstitutional (and also in violation of the proposed new patent laws). But what happens when Thief’s patent application is published at eighteen months? Hint: See Example #1 above. Answer: Inventor cannot get a patent because the invention would be described in a published U.S. patent application by another (Thief), with an earlier EFD (Day 2) than Inventor’s EFD (Day 10). Ouch. So what’s the penalty to Thief? If Thief signed the required inventor’s declaration, then the penalty might be fine, or imprisonment, or both, under 18 U.S.C. § 1001. But that doesn’t help Inventor.

So if the current version of Section 102 in H.R. 2795 is enacted into law, would that be “to promote the progress of science” as required by the Constitution? Would it be “securing ... inventors the exclusive right to their ... discoveries” as required by the Constitution? If not, have we reached the point in history that patents laws may now be enacted under the commerce clause of the Constitution? Let me here and now be the first to announce that if the current version of Section 102 in H.R. 2795 is enacted into law, at least one unlucky inventor will have the opportunity to, and will indeed, challenge it on these Constitutional grounds.

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

**PTO UPDATE**

BY GREG S. HOLLRIGEL  
STOUT, UXA, BUYAN & MULLINS,  
LLP  
[gsh@patlawyers.com](mailto:gsh@patlawyers.com)



Just as a reminder, the USPTO centralized fax number is now 571-273-8300. After September 15, 2005, faxes directed to the previous centralized fax number will not be forwarded to the current number.

In addition, please note that the Issue Fee fax number has also changed. It is now 571-273-2885.

**RECENT INTERESTING IP CASES**

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



### EST's Are Not Sufficiently "Useful" to Meet the Utility Requirement

**In re Fisher et al, U.S.P.Q.2d (BNA); Appeal No. 04-1465 (Fed. Cir. Sept. 7, 2005)**

**Issue:** Are ESTs patentable subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101 if the only asserted utilities are *in vitro* uses, essentially non-distinguishable from the uses for any other ESTs?

**Answer:** No.

**Facts:** Fisher et al/Monsanto filed an application directed to a number of "expressed sequence tags" or "ESTs", which are short nucleotide sequences that represent a fragment of a complete gene sequence or cDNA. The appealed claims were directed to five specific ESTs, which were generated from leaf tissue harvested during anthesis. The following was the broadest claim:

1. A substantially purified nucleic acid molecule that encodes a maize protein or fragment thereof comprising a nucleic acid sequence selected from the group consisting of SEQ ID NO: 1 through SEQ ID NO: 5.

The application generally disclosed that the five claimed ESTs could be used in a variety of

ways including (1) serving as a marker for genome mapping, (2) measuring mRNA levels via microarray, (3) providing a source for PCR primers, (4) use in polymorphism analysis, (5) isolating promoters, (6) controlling protein expression and (7) identifying homologs and orthologs.

The PTO Examiner rejected the claim for lack of utility and lack of enablement. The Examiner found no substantial or specific use, stating that the disclosed uses were generally applicable to any EST and that one skilled in the art would not know how to use the ESTs because they had no specific or substantial utility.

The PTO Board of Appeals agreed and concluded that the ESTs lacked utility. In rejecting the Applicants' arguments on utility, the Board concluded that while the Applicants asserted the ESTs could be used to monitor gene expression, the specification still did not disclose how to use gene expression data on the specific ESTs.

**CAFC Decision:** In presenting its case, Fisher/Monsanto argued that the PTO applied a heightened utility standard to the ESTs, "conditioning patentability upon 'some undefined 'spectrum' of knowledge concerning the corresponding gene function" and pointed out that the utility threshold is not high. As to actual utility, Monsanto urged that the ESTs were comparable to a microscope, i.e. a patentable research tool. Monsanto also argued that the general commercial success of ESTs in the marketplace confirms the utility of the claimed ESTs. Monsanto

The government, while agreeing that the utility threshold is not high, disagreed that a heightened standard was applied. It argued that Monsanto's alleged uses for the ESTs "are so general as to be meaningless" and asserted that the "same generic uses could apply not only to the five claimed ESTs, but also to any EST derived from any organism." It then concluded that the Monsanto utilities were merely "starting points for further research, not the end point of any research effort."

The court agreed with the government that none of Monsanto's seven asserted uses met the utility requirement. In its discussion the court underscored that a "substantial" utility "provides some immediate benefit to the

public" and that" an asserted use must show that the claimed invention has a significant and presently available benefit to the public." In addressing the "specific utility" requirement, it also discussed that the "asserted use must also show that the claimed invention can be used to provide a well-defined and particular benefit to the public."

The court concluded that there was nothing about Monsanto's seven alleged uses that set the five claimed ESTs apart from the more than 32,000 ESTs disclosed in the application or from any EST derived from any organism. Referring to Monsanto's microscope analogy, the court agreed with the government that a microscope has the specific benefit of optically magnifying an object to immediately reveal its structure. It noted that, in contrast, an EST can only be used to detect the presence of genetic material having the same structure as the EST itself and is unable to provide any information about the overall structure or function of the underlying gene.

Interestingly, the court seemed to infer that had Monsanto presented supporting data, its decision might have been different. It stated that while Monsanto's "claimed ESTs may add a noteworthy contribution to biotechnology research ...[it] does not meet the utility requirement of § 101 because [Monsanto] does not identify the function for the underlying protein-encoding genes. Absent such identification, we hold that the claimed ESTs have not been researched and understood to the point of providing an immediate, will-defined, real world benefit to the public meriting the grant of a patent."

Judge Rader dissented from the majority's opinion His dissent centered on the patentability of research tools, urging that the PTO and majority had abandoned the proper legal standard for utility. Judge Radar, though, went on to express "some sympathy with the Patent Office's dilemma". He suggested that instead of rejecting inventions like ESTs for lack of utility, the proper tool "for assessing sufficient contribution to the useful arts is the obvious requirement of 35 U.S.C. § 103. (Note: This is essentially the standard and practice of the European Patent Office for such inventions.

The full text of this opinion is available from United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit at: <http://www.fedcir.gov/opinions/04-1465.pdf>.

**OTHER ARTICLES**

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

**YOUR  
PHOTO**

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

## BOARD OF DIRECTORS AND COMMITTEE CHAIRS

### BOARD OF DIRECTORS TELEPHONE/E-MAIL

<b>President</b>	Margaret A. Kivinski	949-757-1999	mkivinski@therox.com
<b>V.P./President Elect</b>	John R. King	949-760-0404	jking@kmob.com
<b>Secretary</b>	Leonard R. Svensson	714-708-8555	lrs@bskb.com
<b>C.F.O./Treasurer</b>	Greg S. Hollrigel	949-450-1750	gsh@patlawyers.com
<b>Directors</b>	Neal M. Cohen	(949) 724-1849	nmc@cohen-sak.com
	TJ Singh	(949) 955-1920	tjsingh@koslaw.com
	Marlene Klein	949-932-3132	marlene.klein@cda.canon.com
<b>Immediate Past President</b>	Matthew F. Weil	949-851-0633	mweil@mwe.com

### COMMITTEE CHAIRPERSONS

<b>Annual Seminar</b>	John R. King	949-760-0404	jking@kmob.com
	T.J. Singh	(949) 955-1920	tjsingh@koslaw.com
<b>Copyright Practice</b>	Darren S. Rimer	(949) 367-1541	darren@rimermath.com
<b>Federal Courts</b>	Robert L. Grabarek, Jr.	(949) 263-8400	rgrabarek@crowell.com
<b>Int'l IP Practice</b>	Alexander R. Schlee	310-545-9851	alexschlee@vjp.de
<b>Law Off. Mgmt.</b>	Gabia Pakstys	650-326-3466	gpakstys@sbcglobal.net
<b>Legislative</b>			<b>Position Open</b>
<b>MCLE</b>	Marlene Klein	949-932-3132	marlene.klein@cda.canon.com
<b>Meetings/Programs</b>	T.J. Singh	949-955-1920	tjsingh@koslaw.com
<b>Newsletter Editor</b>	Neal M. Cohen	(949) 724-1849	nmc@cohen-sak.com
<b>Patent Practice</b>	Tom Dao	(949) 476-0757	tom.dao@cph.com
<b>Trade Secrets/Unfair</b>	Scott Feldmann	(949) 263-8400	rfeldmann@crowell.com
<b>Competition Law</b>	Perry J. Viscounty	714-755-8288	perry.viscounty@lw.com
<b>Trademark Practice</b>	Susan Natland	949-760-0404	smn@kmob.com
<b>Luncheon Speakers</b>	Margaret Kivinski	949-757-1999	mkivinski@therox.com
<b>OCPLA Website</b>	Marlene Klein	949-932-3132	marlene.klein@cda.canon.com
<b>OCPLA Database</b>	Greg S. Hollrigel	949-450-1750	gsh@patlawyers.com

## OCPLA NEWSLETTER

Orange County Patent Law Association

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

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

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

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

OCPLA Newsletter Editor  
**Neal M. Cohen**  
 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

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

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

**STEPHEN T. FREEMAN, ESQ.**

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

**OFFICE AVAILABLE**

Sublease 9' by 14' window office in intellectual property law suite, \$500/mo. Join a patent attorney, patent agent and a transaction attorney. Phone, fax, DSL, high speed copier/printer/FAX, postage meter. JW airport area, free parking, close to 405, 55 and 73 freeways. Call: 714/ 668-1900

Ad: xaft1205P4

**OFFICE SPACE AVAILABLE**

New class A construction in Irvine Spectrum available for sublease. 3 offices, open secretarial space, kitchen, copier room, and shared conference room. Free surface parking. Your own first floor entrance.

Contact: Michael Shimokaji  
[mshimokaji@shimokaji.com](mailto:mshimokaji@shimokaji.com).

Ad: xaft1205SK4

**PAUL HASTINGS  
ATTORNEY POSITIONS AVAILABLE**

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

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

- Electrical Engineering
- Computer Engineering
- Computer Science
- Physics

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

Please submit resumes and transcripts to:

Lisa Patterson, Attorney Recruiting & Development Coordinator

**PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFISKY & WALKER LLP**  
3579 Valley Centre Drive  
San Diego, CA 92130

[lisapatterson@paulhastings.com](mailto:lisapatterson@paulhastings.com)

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

Ad: xaft1005PH2

### EXPERIENCED PATENT ATTORNEYS

Sheldon & Mak is an intellectual property firm located in Pasadena, CA. We are seeking two patent attorneys, California-licensed, USPTO registered, with at least 2 years of patent prosecution experience and, preferably, with an electrical engineering, computer science or physics background. Our firm offers a competitive salary, 1600 billable hours requirement, non-discretionary bonus based on hours billed in excess of 1600 and excellent benefits package. Pasadena is one of the best areas to live in Southern California! Come and join our team! Fax your resume to (626) 795-6321, attention Jennifer R. McClean, or e-mail it to [jmcclean@usip.com](mailto:jmcclean@usip.com). No recruiters, please.

Ad: xaft0905SM8

### POSITION AVAILABLE Experienced Patent Legal Assistant

Cohen Sakaguchi & English LLP (CS&E), located in Irvine, by John Wayne Airport is seeking an experienced patent legal assistant.

Ideal candidate has 5+ years experience as legal assistant for patent attorneys, knowledge of U.S. and foreign prosecution, federal court litigation, and is familiar with all aspects of PTO website, PAIR, docketing procedures, and Word. Knowledge of TimeMatters and of trademark prosecution is a plus. Duties include primary support for two partners, and part-time support for up to three other attorneys, all with permanent part-time assistance.

Send resume by mail only to:

COHEN SAKAGUCHI & ENGLISH LLP  
ATTN: OCPLA AD XZFT0801NS4.  
2040 Main Street, 9th Floor  
Irvine, CA 92614

Ad: xzft0801NS4

## CHANDRAKANT M. JOSHI

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

**Phones:** +91-22-28380848, 28205425, 28324920

**Telefax:** +91-22-28380737, 28066294, 28389839

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

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

**Languages:** English, French, German & Italian  
**Other Offices:** New Delhi, Kolkata, Ahmedabad,  
Hyderabad & Chennai

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

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

#### Areas of

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

Ad: xaft0806IN



## SAVE THE DATE FOR THE UPCOMING

### OCPLA-SDIPLA SPRING SEMINAR

**24 – 26 MARCH 2006**

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

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

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

***More details will surely follow.***

## Orange County Patent Law Association

September Meeting

**Date:** Wednesday, September 28, 2005

**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:** What Every IP Lawyer Needs to Know to Keep His Client Out of Antitrust Trouble

**Speaker(s):** **William Diaz** of McDermott, Will & Emery

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

**Reservations:** Please make reservations by filling out the form below and mailing it with a check to T.J. Singh to reach his office address given below, by the Friday before the meeting. If time is short, please also email T.J. at [tjsingh@koslaw.com](mailto:tjsingh@koslaw.com) or call in your reservation to the OCPLA Reservations Line number at (949) 955-1920.

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 28, 2005 for the following person(s):

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
This form and check should be mailed to:

**T.J. Singh**  
**Attention: OCPLA Lunch Reservations**  
**Klein, O'neill & Singh, LLP**  
**2 Park Plaza, Suite 510**  
**Irvine, CA 92614**  
**Tel: (949) 955-1920**  
**Fax: (949) 955-1921**  
**E-mail: [tjsingh@koslaw.com](mailto:tjsingh@koslaw.com)**

**Orange County Patent Law Association  
presents . . .**

# **2005 LEGAL SPIN-BOWL**

*for the benefit of*



*through the generous support of McDermott Will & Emery LLP*

## ***THE 2005 LEGAL SPIN BOWL***

The Orange County Patent Law Association presents a fund raising event to help SPIN and the people SPIN serves. The “Legal SPIN-Bowl” will take place on **Saturday, September 24 from 2 pm to 4 pm**. We are organizing bowling teams of 6 people (a maximum of 40 teams) to bowl for charity and raise money.

SPIN (which stands for **Serving People In Need**) is a non-profit organization in Orange County dedicated to assisting low-income and homeless people by providing financial assistance for housing costs and comprehensive life-skill support services.

The event will take place at Irvine Lanes, located at 415 Michelson Dr., Irvine, CA 92612; 949-786-9625.

## ***TEAM CAPTAINS AND BOWLERS NEEDED!!***

We are recruiting Team Captains to organize teams of 6 bowlers. The registration fee of **\$30** per bowler will cover the cost of 2 games, shoe rental and a souvenir t-shirt. **The registration deadline is August 19; please indicate if you are an OCPLA member.**

We are asking teams to collectively raise \$600. This money can be raised in a variety of ways including asking friends and family for donations or “pledges” based on the team’s bowling performance, company matching or other supporter contributions. Team captains will be responsible for collecting and turning in the donations one week before the event (**September 16**). **All donations and pledges are 100% tax deductible.**

**Prizes will be awarded to the team and the individual bowler that raise the most money; ALL proceeds go to SPIN - Serving People in Need.**

**For more information or if you have any questions, please contact  
Matthew Weil at 949.757.7153 or Rania Sarkis at 949.757.6080**



# Orange County Patent Law Association

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

## 2005 OCPLA MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION/RENEWAL FORM

**This is an application for (please circle one):**      **Membership Renewal or 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 2005 (please circle one):**

Regular Membership (attorneys, agents):	\$35.00	<b>(New Member After 07/01/05)</b> \$17.50
Student Membership	\$17.50	\$ 8.75
Associate Membership (other)	\$35.00	\$17.50

**New Applicants please complete the following:**

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

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

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

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

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: \_\_\_\_\_

## 2005 OCPLA EVENTS SCHEDULE

Date	Location	Speaker/Event	Topic
September 28, 2005	Wyndham Garden Hotel	<b>William Diaz</b> McDermott, Will & Emery	What Every IP Lawyer Needs to Know to Keep His Client Out of Antitrust Trouble
October 26, 2005	Wyndham Garden Hotel	<b>John King</b> Knobbe Martens Olson & Bear LLP	Claims Drafting Workshop
November 23, 2005	Wyndham Garden Hotel	<b>Mimi Justice</b> Deloitte & Touche	Calculating and Proving Patent Damages in Litigation
December 9, 2005	Ralph Brennan's Jazz Kitchen (Downtown Disney)	<b>OCPLA Holiday Party</b>	Fun



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