

Charles L. Gholz
Oblon, McClelland,
Maier & Neustadt, L.L.P.
1940 Duke Street
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 412-6485 (dd)
cgholz@oblon.com

EDUCATION: Massachusetts Institute of Technology, B.S.M.E. & B.S. Ec. (1965); Columbia University, LL.B. (1968); George Washington University, LL.M. in Patent and Trade Regulation Law (1973).

CLERKSHIP: The Honorable Giles Sutherland Rich, United States Court of Customs and Patent Appeals (1970-72).

SPECIALIZATION: Patent law, particularly patent interference law.

ACADEMIC APPOINTMENT: Lecturer in law, George Mason University School of Law (1992 to 1995).

AWARDS: Special citation from the Board of Directors of the Patent and Trademark Office Society for "many outstanding articles and letters to the editor that have appeared in the Journal of the Patent and Trademark Office Society over a sustained number of years" (2000). Fellow, American Intellectual Property Law Association (2011-).

PUBLICATIONS:

- (1) Gholz, Commissioners for the CCPA, 53 JPOS 388 (1971).
- (2) Gholz, Patent and Trademark Jurisdiction of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, 40 Geo. Wash. L. Rev. 416 (1972), 55 JPOS 69, 184 (1973).
- (3) Gholz, Recent Developments in the CCPA Relating to the First Paragraph of 35 USC 112, 54 JPOS 768 (1972), 55 JPOS 4 (1973).
- (4) Gholz, The Defense of Patent Invalidity in Tariff Commission Patent Actions, 55 JPOS 791 (1973).
- (5) Gholz, Criminal and Disciplinary Liability for Fraud on the Patent and Trademark Office, 3 APLAQJ 177 (1975).

- (6) Gholz, Extraordinary Writ Jurisdiction of the CCPA in Patent and Trademark Cases, 58 JPOS 356 (1976), 69 FRD 119 (1976).
- (7) Gholz, "Petitions and Appeals," "Interferences," and "Correction of Issued Patents" in Patent Practice (Kayton ed., 1st ed. 1976; 2nd ed. 1983; 3rd ed. 1985; 4th ed. 1989; 5th ed. 1993; 6th ed. 1995).
- (8) Co-editor of the annual revisions to Dunner, Court Review of Patent Office Decisions: CCPA (Matthew Bender 1976 to 1984).
- (9) Gholz, The Law of Double Patenting in the CCPA, 4 APLAQJ 261 (1976), 16 Ind. Prop. 197 (1977).
- (10) Gholz, "Establishing the Time the Invention Was Made" in Non-Obviousness: The Standard of Patentability in the United States (1978).
- (11) Gholz, Review of Decisions Striking Patent Applications for Fraud, 61 JPOS 52 (1979).
- (12) Gholz, Failure to Perfect Claim to Priority During Pendency of First-Filed U.S. Patent Application, 63 JPOS 59 (1981).
- (13) Gholz, Collateral Estoppel Effect of Decisions by the Board of Patent Interferences, 30 DePaul L. Rev. 789 (1981), 65 JPOS 67 (1983).
- (14) Gholz, China's New Trademark Law, 2 China Law Reporter 103 (Summer 1982).
- (15) Gholz, Board of Appeals Jurisdiction Over Appeals from Decisions by Primary Examiners Refusing to Institute Interferences on Modified or Phantom Counts, 64 JPOS 651 (1982).
- (16) Gholz, Best Mode -- Intent to Conceal, 65 JPOS 436 (1983).
- (17) Gholz, Willful Infringement and "Magic Words" -- The Effect of Opinions of Counsel on Awards of Increased Damages and Attorney Fees, 66 JPTOS 598 (1984).
- (18) Gholz, Compelled Testimony, Testimony Abroad, and Protective Orders in Interference Proceedings Under the New Rules, 67 JPTOS 239 (1985).
- (19) Gholz, CAFC Review of Interlocutory Decisions, 67 JPTOS 417 (1985), 5 Legal Notes & Viewpoints (1985).
- (20) Gholz and Pope, The Impact of Statutory Invention Registrations on Interference Practice, 67 JPTOS 645 (1985).

- (21) Co-author of Dunner et al.: Court of Appeals For The Federal Circuit: Practice & Procedure (Matthew Bender 1985).
- (22) Gholz, Choice of Law in the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, 13 AIPLAQJ 309 (1985).
- (23) Gholz, Old Rule Interferences After the Promulgation of the New Rules, 68 JPTOS 335 (1986).
- (24) Gholz, A Critique of Recent Opinions of the Federal Circuit in Patent Interferences, 69 JPTOS 657 (1987).
- (25) Gholz, Why First-to-File Should Not Mean the End of Interferences, 69 JPTOS 711 (1987).
- (26) Gholz, A Critique of Recent Opinions of the Federal Circuit in Patent Interferences, 71 JPTOS 439 (1989).
- (27) Gholz, Jurisdiction of the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences to Decide Infringement Questions Under the Doctrine of Equivalents, 72 JPTOS 334 (1990).
- (28) Gholz, How the United States Currently Handles the Interference Issues That Will Remain in a First-to-File World, 18 AIPLAQJ 1 (1990).
- (29) Gholz, A Critique of Recent Opinions of the Federal Circuit in Patent Interferences, 73 JPTOS 700 (1991).
- (30) Gholz, A Critique of Recent Opinions of the Federal Circuit in Patent Interferences, 75 JPTOS 448 (1993).
- (31) Gholz, What Article 1709(7) of NAFTA Will Mean to Canadian Practitioners, 10 Canadian Intellectual Property Review 433 (1993).
- (32) Gholz, A Critique of Recent Opinions of the Federal Circuit in Patent Interferences, 76 JPTOS 649 (1994).
- (33) Gholz, A Critique of Recent Opinions of the Federal Circuit in Patent Interferences, 77 JPTOS 427 (1995).
- (34) Gholz, Practicing Under the New Patent Interference Rules and New Rule 131, 77 JPTOS 858 (1995).
- (35) Gholz, Kelber, & Mori, The Taking of Voluntary Testimonial Depositions in Japan for Use in U.S. Patent Interferences, 78 JPTOS 138 (1996).
- (36) Gholz, Investive Versus Divestive Actual Reductions to Practice, 78 JPTOS 195 (1996).

- (37) Gholz, Some Problems for Interference Practice Created by the GATT/TRIPs Implementing Legislation and the PTO's Implementing Rules, Inside the PTO, Questrol Publishing, 1996.
- (38) Gholz, A Critique of Recent Opinions of the Federal Circuit in Patent Interferences, 78 JPTOS 550 (1996).
- (39) Gholz, US Rulings Muddle Patent Interference Law, IP Worldwide (January/February 1997) at page 11.
- (40) Gholz, A Critique of Recent Opinions of the Federal Circuit in Patent Interferences, 79 JPTOS 271 (1997).
- (41) Gholz, Proposed Changes to the Interference Rules, 79 JPTOS 555 (1997).
- (42) Gholz, Patent Interferences -- Big Ticket Litigation With No Effective Discovery, 4 Intellectual Property Today No. 9 at page 10 (1997).
- (43) Gholz, The BPAI and the TTAB are Required to Set Forth in their Opinions Specific Findings of Fact and Conclusion of Law Adequate to Form a Basis for Appellate Review, 80 JPTOS 5 (1998).
- (44) Gholz, Is the Declaration of an Interference a Ticket to Ride to the End of the Line?, 5 Intellectual Property Today No. 5 at page 31 (1998).
- (45) Gholz, A Critique of Recent Opinions of the Federal Circuit in Patent Interferences, 80 JPTOS 321 (1998).
- (46) Gholz, The Law and Practice Under 35 USC 135(c), 80 JPTOS 561, 675 (1998).
- (47) Gholz, Why Are 35 USC 146 Actions Becoming So Popular?, 5 Intellectual Property Today No. 9 at page 6 (1998).
- (48) Gholz, What's Left of In re Braat After In re Berg?, 80 JPTOS 845 (1998).
- (49) Gholz, Multi-Patent Interference, 5 Intellectual Property Today No. 12 at page 6 (1998).
- (50) Gholz, You Can Use Interferences To Save Big Bucks in Patent Litigation, 17 Biotechnology Law Report 737 (1998).
- (51) Gholz, A Critique of Recent Opinions of the Federal Circuit in Patent Interferences, 81 JPTOS 241 (1999).
- (52) Gholz, The Decisions of the Board in an Interference Are Entitled to Issue-Preclusive Effect in a Parallel Patent Infringement Action but not Vice Versa, 6 Intellectual Property Today No. 8 at page 8 (1999).

- (53) Gholz, The Black Hole of the Interference System, 6 Intellectual Property Today No. 11 at page 26 (1999).
- (54) Pous and Gholz, Will Inter Partes Reexamination Be Embraced by Third Parties as an Alternative to Litigation?, 7 Intellectual Property Today No. 3 at page 37 (2000).
- (55) Gholz, A Critique of Recent Opinions of the Federal Circuit in Patent Interferences, 82 JPTOS 296 (2000).
- (56) Gholz, Producing Witnesses in an Interference for Cross-Examination Abroad, 7 Intellectual Property Today No. 5 at page 6 (2000).
- (57) Gholz, Why 35 USC 146 Practice Should Boom, 7 Intellectual Property Today No. 12 at page 48 (2000).
- (58) Gholz, Litigating Interfering Patents in Federal Court as an Alternative to PTO Interference Proceedings, 6 The IP Litigator No. 6 (Nov. 2000).
- (59) Gholz, First to File or First to Invent?, 82 JPTOS 891 (2000).
- (60) Gholz, A Critique of Recent Opinions in Patent Interferences, 83 JPTOS 161 (2001).
- (61) Gholz, Parallel District Court and ITC Patent Infringement Actions and PTO Interferences, Patent World (April 2001) at page 19, The John Marshall Law School News Source No. 1 (Winter 2000) at page 30, and 83 JPTOS 607 (2001).
- (62) Gholz, Is It Safe Not to File a Copy of a Settlement Agreement Entered Into After Court Review of a Board Decision in an Interference Has Begun?, 9 Intellectual Property Today No. 2 at page 28 (2002).
- (63) Gholz, A Critique of Recent Opinions in Patent Interferences, 84 JPTOS 163 (2002).
- (64) Gholz, “Patent Interference Proceedings Before the USPTO” in Building and Enforcing Intellectual Property Value (2002).
- (65) Gholz, A Critique of Recent Opinions in Patent Interferences, 85 JPTOS 401 (2003).
- (66) Gholz, Interference Practice Strategies, 85 JPTOS 531 (2003).
- (67) Gholz, Post-Interference Ex Parte Prosecution by a Losing Applicant Interferent, 10 Intellectual Property Today No. 6 at page 26 (2003).
- (68) Gholz, Binding Precedent in the Trial Section of the BPAI, 10 Intellectual Property Today No. 7 at page 10 (2003).

- (69) Gholz, Sometimes the Trial Section **Does** Handle Patent-Patent Interferences After All!, 10 Intellectual Property Today No. 8 at page 32 (2003).
- (70) Gholz, The Majority of a Three-Judge Panel of the Federal Circuit Has Approved the Two-Way Test of Winter v. Fujita—But Help May Be On the Way, 10 Intellectual Property Today No. 9 at page 36 (2003).
- (71) Gholz, Supplement to “Interference Practice Strategies,” 85 JPTOS 531 (2003), 85 JPTOS 775 (2003).
- (72) Gholz, In 35 USC 146 Actions, Should District Courts Decide Issues That Were Not Reached by the Board?, 10 Intellectual Property Today No. 10 at page 42 (2003).
- (73) Gholz & Pike, Targeting Applicants Should Be Expressly Authorized to File 37 CFR 1.313 Petitions to Withdraw Target Applications From Issuance for Consideration of a Possible Interference, 10 Intellectual Property Today No. 11 at page 12 (2003).
- (74) Gholz, How Hard Is It, Really, to Prove Derivation?, 10 Intellectual Property Today No. 12 at page 18 (2003).
- (75) Gholz, Videotaping Interference Testimony, 11 Intellectual Property Today No. 7 at page 10 (2004).
- (76) Gholz, A Critique of Recent Opinions in Patent Interferences, 86 JPTOS 464 (2004).
- (77) Gholz, Must an Expert Witness’s Opinion be “Supported by Cited Literature”?, 11 Intellectual Property Today No. 8 at page 12 (2004).
- (78) Gholz, How Should We Deal With § 16.3 of the Trial Section’s Standing Order?, 11 Intellectual Property Today No. 9 at page 8 (2004).
- (79) Gholz, What to Do if Your Client May Infringe Both of Two Interfering Patents?, 11 Intellectual Property Today No. 10 at page 20 (2004).
- (80) Gholz, How to Redact an Exhibit for Use in an Interference, 11 Intellectual Property Today No. 11 at page 16 (2004).
- (81) Gholz, What to Do if Your Client Buys Your Opponent’s Case in Interference Late in the Game, 11 Intellectual Property Today No. 12 at page 26 (2004).
- (82) Gholz, What’s the Use of 37 CFR 41.150(c)(2)?, 12 Intellectual Property Today No. 1 at page 14 (2005).
- (83) Gholz, A Critique of the New Rules and the New Standing Order in Contested Case/Interference Practice, 87 JPTOS 62 (2005).

- (84) Gholz, Are Side Agreements Between Counsel Enforceable Before the Board?, 12 Intellectual Property Today No. 2 at page 23 (2005).
- (85) Gholz, Why Should Trial Section Decisions Be Given Any Deference During District Court Review?, IP Law Bulletin (February 28, 2005).
- (86) Gholz, A Suggestion for Saving Trees--and File Space at the Board, 12 Intellectual Property Today No. 3 at page 12 (2005).
- (87) Gholz, The Impact of the CREATE Act on Interferences, 12 Intellectual Property Today No. 4 at page 39 (2005).
- (88) Gholz, Markman Hearings for Interferences?, 12 Intellectual Property Today No. 5 at page 25 (2005).
- (89) Gholz, The Trial Section Should Have an Analog to FRCP 50(a)(1), 12 Intellectual Property Today No. 6 at page 30 (2005).
- (90) Gholz and Wilcox, Does Reliance On Attorney Diligence Waive the Attorney-Client Privilege?, 12 Intellectual Property Today No. 7 at page 32 (2005).
- (91) Gholz, Errata Sheets in Interferences, 12 Intellectual Property Today No. 8 at page 10 (2005).
- (92) Gholz, Tierney Interferences, 12 Intellectual Property Today No. 9 at page 31 (2005).
- (93) Gholz, Wicklund, & VanOphem, Does the PTO Have Jurisdiction to Issue a Patent to an Applicant That Prevailed in a 35 USC 146 Action During the Pendency of an Appeal to the Federal Circuit by the Losing Patentee?, 12 Intellectual Property Today No. 10 at page 8 (2005).
- (94) Gholz and Wilcox, Expert Witness Problems-- and Proposed Solutions, 12 Intellectual Property Today No. 11 at page 30 (2005).
- (95) Gholz and Wilcox, Sequestration of Interference Witnesses, 12 Intellectual Property Today No. 12 at page 38 (2005).
- (96) Gholz, When Is the Declaration of an Interference a Ticket to Ride to the End of the Line?, 13 Intellectual Property Today No. 1 at page 12 (2006).
- (97) Rollins and Gholz, A Critique of Recent Opinions in Patent Interferences, 88 JPTOS 25, 138 (2006).
- (98) Gholz and Herman, There Are Limits to How Tricky One's Questioning Can Be, 13 Intellectual Property Today No. 2 at page 16 (2006).

- (99) Gholz and McCabe, May a Practitioner Both Act as a Counsel in an Interference and Testify as to His or Her Diligence In Preparing an Application?, 13 Intellectual Property Today No. 3 at page 31 (2006).
- (100) Gholz, A Critique of Recent Opinions in Patent Interferences, 88 JPTOS 217, 305 (2006).
- (101) Gholz, When Does Reliance on Attorney Diligence Waive the Attorney-Client Privilege?, 13 Intellectual Property Today No. 4 at page 24 (2006).
- (102) Gholz, When (If Ever) Is the Judgment of a District Court in a 35 USC 146 Action Binding on the Board?, 13 Intellectual Property Today No. 5 at page 30 (2006).
- (103) Gholz, The Board Should Have 35 USC 256 Jurisdiction, 13 Intellectual Property Today No. 6 at page 10 (2006).
- (104) Gholz, Corrections of “Obvious Mistakes” During an Interference, 13 Intellectual Property Today No. 8 at page 7 (2006).
- (105) Gholz and Wilcox, Must the Punishment Fit the Crime? 13 Intellectual Property Today No. 9 at page 20 (2006).
- (106) Gholz and U. Parker, It’s OK To Pay Fact Witnesses for Their Time, 13 Intellectual Property Today No. 10 at page 16 (2006).
- (107) Gholz and Wilcox, If You Try to Remove a 35 USC 102(a) or 102(e) Reference Via a 37 CFR 1.131 Declaration and Fail, You Have Probably Waived Your Right to Put on a Priority Case, 13 Intellectual Property Today No. 11 at page 8 (2006).
- (108) Gholz and Wilcox, What is the Time Limit for Filing a Cross-Action under 35 USC 146?, 13 Intellectual Property Today No. 12 at page 7 (2006).
- (109) Gholz, Participation By A Victorious Interferent In the Losing Interferent’s Post-Interference Prosecution, 14 Intellectual Property Today No. 1 at page 39 (2007).
- (110) Gholz, A Critique of Recent Opinions in Patent Interferences, 89 JPTOS 1 (2007).
- (111) Gholz and Gasser, Representing a Client Zealously Versus Collegiality, 14 Intellectual Property Today No. 2 at page 35 (2007).
- (112) Gholz, Who You Gonna Call?, 14 Intellectual Property Today No. 3 at page 7 (2007).
- (113) Gholz and Wilcox, Do Documents Generated by an Inventor Have to Be Corroborated?, 14 Intellectual Property Today No. 4 at page 26 (2007).

- (114) Gholz and Wilcox, What Does “Any and All Right, Title, or Interest” Mean?, 14 Intellectual Property Today No. 5 at page 16 (2007).
- (115) Gholz, Guidelines? What Guidelines?, 14 Intellectual Property Today No. 6 at page 26 (2007).
- (116) Gholz, Is Brand v. Miller Consistent With KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc?, 14 Intellectual Property Today No 7 at page 40 (2007).
- (117) Gholz, Would First-Inventor-to-File Be Better for the Basement Inventors, the Universities, or the Corporations?, 14 Intellectual Property Today No. 8 at page 35 (2007).
- (118) Gholz and Wilcox, Proving Peeler Diligence is Unnecessarily Difficult -- and Unnecessarily Costly, 14 Intellectual Property Today No. 9 at page 35 (2007).
- (119) Gholz, Would You Rather Have Your Opponent’s Patentability Issues Decided Inter Partes or Ex Parte?, 14 Intellectual Property Today No. 10 at page 37 (2007).
- (120) Gholz and Wilcox, Should the Prima Facie Case Include a Showing of the Lack of Suppression Or Concealment?, 14 Intellectual Property Today No. 11 at page 20 (2007).
- (121) Gholz and Wilcox, What To Do If A Real Party In Interest Goes Bankrupt, 14 Intellectual Property Today No. 12 at page 22 (2007).
- (122) Nissen and Gholz, Brand v. Miller Demonstrates That the Federal Circuit is Giving Insufficient Deference to the Factual Findings of the Patent and Trademark Office, 89 JPTOS 848 (2007).
- (123) Gholz and J. A. Parker, Is It Prudent to Be Named as Lead or Back-up Counsel by a Patent Practitioner Whose Power of Attorney Was Signed by the or a Named Inventor?, 15 Intellectual Property Today No. 1 at page 39 (2008).
- (124) Gholz, A Critique of Recent Opinions in Patent Interferences, 90 JPTOS 9 (2008).
- (125) Gholz, Interference Issues That Wouldn’t be Handled by The Proposed Legislation, 15 Intellectual Property Today No. 2 at page 32 (2008).
- (126) Gholz and Wilcox, What Excuses for Inactivity During a Classical Diligence Period Are (and Are Not) Good?, 15 Intellectual Property Today No. 3 at page 36 (2008).
- (127) Gholz, Can Narrowing Reissue Applications Still Be Used to Provoke Interferences?, 15 Intellectual Property Today No. 4 at page 28 (2008).

- (128) Gholz, How Detailed Does Your List of Proposed Motions Have to Be? 15 Intellectual Property Today No. 5 at page 18 (2008).
- (129) Gholz and Wilcox, Interference Estoppel is Worse Than Issue Preclusion, 15 Intellectual Property Today No. 6 at page 14 (2008).
- (130) Nissen and Gholz, Brand v. Miller Prevents Administrative Patent Judges From Using Their Common Sense in Inter Partes Proceedings, 90 JPTOS 321 (2008).
- (131) Gholz, Should an Applicant Interferent Ask to Have as Many as Possible of Its Opponent's Motions Treated as Threshold Motions?, 15 Intellectual Property Today No. 7 at page 18 (2008).
- (132) Gholz and Tarcu, If You Settle a 35 USC 146 Action With A Stipulated Judgment, What Should It Say?, 15 Intellectual Property Today No. 8 at page 9 (2008).
- (133) Gholz and Wilcox, Is 37 CFR 41.127(a) Valid Under *Tafas v. Dudas*?, 15 Intellectual Property Today No. 9 at page 34 (2008).
- (134) Gholz and Wilcox, What Will Become of Patents Issued to Prevailing Applicant-Interferents As The Result of Decisions By Unconstitutionally Appointed APJs?, 15 Intellectual Property Today No. 10 at page 12 (2008).
- (135) Gholz, Telephone's Inventorship Probed in New Book, 76 PTCJ 717 (2008).
- (136) Gholz and Pereira, When Does Outside The Count Count?, 15 Intellectual Property Today No. 11 at page 30 (2008).
- (137) Gholz and Gasser, What To Do If The Target Patent Has Expired, 15 Intellectual Property Today No. 12 at page 36 (2008).
- (138) Gholz and Joncus, Is Plausible Enough After *Brand v. Miller*?, 16 Intellectual Property Today No. 1 at page 20 (2009).
- (139) Gholz, Can Counsel for an Interferent Represent an Independent Fact Witness at a Deposition?, 16 Intellectual Property Today No. 2 at page 18 (2009).
- (140) Gholz, A Critique of Recent Opinions in Patent Interferences, 91 JPTOS 1 (2009).
- (141) Gholz, Aristocrat v. IGT: Another Reason Why Provoking an Interference May Be Preferable to Defending an Infringement Action, 16 Intellectual Property Today No. 3 at page 12 (2009).
- (142) Gholz and Wilcox, Is It Ok To Lie To Opposing Counsel? 16 Intellectual Property Today No. 4 at page 30 (2009).

- (143) Gholz, Would Derivation Proceedings Be The Same as Derivation Interferences?, 16 Intellectual Property Today No. 5 at page 8 (2009).
- (144) Gholz, Request Rehearing!, 16 Intellectual Property Today No. 6 at page 14 (2009).
- (145) Gholz and Wilcox, Have Ding v. Singer and Ryan v. Young Rationalized 35 USC 135(b)(2)?, 16 Intellectual Property Today No. 7 at page 10 (2009).
- (146) Gholz and Byerly, Can You Put An Independent Fact Witness Under a Contract That Provides That He or She Will Not Talk To Opposing Counsel Voluntarily?, 16 Intellectual Property Today No. 8 at page 31 (2009).
- (147) Gholz, How Should “Copied” Claims Be Interpreted?, 16 Intellectual Property Today No. 9 at page 11 (2009).
- (148) Gholz, Musings of a Member of the Interference Bar on *In re Bose*, 78 PTCJ 622 (09/18/2009).
- (149) Gholz and Nissen, The Board Must Afford Interferents Due Process!, 16 Intellectual Property Today No. 10 at page 8 (2009).
- (150) Gholz, When Can APJs Use Their Common Sense in Inter Partes Proceedings?, 16 Intellectual Property Today No. 11 at page 17 (2009).
- (151) Gholz, Could The ATJs Learn Something From The APJs Concerning Handling Fraud Issues?, 16 Intellectual Property Today No. 12 at page 16 (2009).
- (152) Gholz, Are District Court Orders Remanding 35 USC 146 Actions Appealable?, 17 Intellectual Property Today No. 1 at page 27 (2010).
- (153) Gholz, Prosecution of Targeting and Targeted Applications Before the Same Examiner, 17 Intellectual Property Today No. 2 at page 22 (2010).
- (154) Gholz, The Board Must Decide Every Patentability Motion That is “Fairly Raised and Fully Developed During the Interference”--But Must it Permit Every Authorized Patentability Motion to Be “Fully Developed”?, 17 Intellectual Property Today No. 3 at page 30 (2010).
- (155) Gholz and Englehart, How Good is Good Enough?, 17 Intellectual Property Today No. 4 at page 12 (2010).
- (156) Gholz, Are Agilent and Philips Limited to Claims Copied in *Ipsissimis Verbis*?, 17 Intellectual Property Today No. 5 at page 28 (2010).
- (157) Gholz, A Critique of Recent Opinions in Patent Interferences, 92 JPTOS 1 (2010).

- (158) Gholz, Are All Panels of the Federal Circuit Following Agilent and Philips?, 17 Intellectual Property Today No. 6 at page 12 (2010).
- (159) Gholz and Gasser, When, If Ever, Do Broadening Amendments Create Problems Under 35 USC 135(b)?, 17 Intellectual Property Today No. 7 at page 28 (2010).
- (160) Gholz, Would Derivation Proceedings Be the Same as Derivation Interferences?, 2 Medical Innovations & Business No. 2 at page 39 (2010).
- (161) Gholz, Should a Patent Infringement Action Be Stayed Pending Resolution of an Interference Involving the Patent Asserted in the Infringement Action?, 17 Intellectual Property Today No. 8 at page 22 (2010).
- (162) Gholz and Hibshman, Is the Respondent's Entire Specification "Prior Art" in a Motion for a Judgment of No-Interference-in-Fact?, 17 Intellectual Property Today No. 9 at page 8 (2010).
- (163) Gholz and Englehart, How Close is Close Enough?, 17 Intellectual Property Today No. 10 at page 34 (2010).
- (164) Gholz, When Should a Patentability Motion Be Deferred to the Second Phase?, 17 Intellectual Property Today No. 11 at page 7 (2010).
- (165) Gholz, You Must Aggressively Assert Your Rights Under Koninklijke!, 17 Intellectual Property Today No. 12 at page 18 (2010).
- (166) Gholz, Is the Board Putting Some Teeth into the Sanctions Rule?, 18 Intellectual Property Today No. 1 at page 30 (2011).
- (167) Gholz, What Does Your Priority Statement Buy You?, 18 Intellectual Property Today No. 2 at page 28 (2011).
- (168) Gholz, What to Do if Fewer Than All of the Named Inventors Contributed to the Subject Matter Defined by the Count, 18 Intellectual Property Today No. 3 at page 8 (2011).
- (169) Gholz, What to Do if the APJ Limits the Number of Claims to be Added to a Patent or an Application in Interference, 18 Intellectual Property Today No. 4 at page 26 (2011).
- (170) Gholz, A Critique of Recent Opinions in Patent Interferences, 93 JPTOS 74 (2011).
- (171) Gholz, Using a Suggestion of Interference to Undermine a Competitor's U.S. Patent Application, 81 PTCJ 801 (2011).
- (172) Gholz, Additional Discovery Prior to Cross-Examination, 18 Intellectual Property Today No. 5 at page 34 (2011).

- (173) Gholz, Can an Amendment Deleting a Limitation Run Afoul of 35 USC 135(b)?, 18 Intellectual Property Today No. 6 at page 8 (2011).
- (174) Gholz, Narrowing Reissue Applications Can Again be Used to Provoke Interferences!, 18 Intellectual Property Today No. 7 at page 18 (2011).
- (175) Gholz and Kera, Comparing and Contrasting Standing in the BPAI and the TTAB, 18 Intellectual Property Today No. 8 at page 25 (2011)).
- (176) Gholz and Fabre, “Good Cause” Under 37 CFR 41.202(d)(2), 18 Intellectual Property Today No. 9 at page 32 (2011).
- (177) Gholz, A Disclaimed Claim Is Not Always Treated as if it Had Never Existed!, 82 PTCJ 620 (09/02/11).
- (178) Gholz and Shekher, Should Patent Prosecution Bars Apply to Interference Counsel?, 18 Intellectual Property Today No. 10 at page 33 (2011).
- (179) Gholz and Shier, Is Dilatory Behavior in Provoking an Interference a “Failure to Engage in Reasonable Efforts to Conclude Prosecution of the Application”? 18 Intellectual Property Today No. 11 at page 8 (2011).
- (180) Gholz, The Board Does Hear Live Testimony and Make Credibility Determinations!, 18 Intellectual Property Today No. 12 at page 12 (2011).
- (181) Gholz and Hibshman, GENEVA PHARM., INC. v. GLAXOSMITHKLINE, PLC Should Be Overruled!, 19 Intellectual Property Today No. 1 at page 32 (2012).
- (182) Gholz and Kile, Are Threshold Issues Really Jurisdictional?, 19 Intellectual Property Today No. 2 at page 10 (2012).
- (183) Gholz, A Possible Solution to the Agilent v. Affymetrix Problem, 19 Intellectual Property Today No. 3 at page 18 (2012).
- (184) Gholz and Gardella, Cancellation of Patent Claims in an Interference After Those Claims Have Been Held Not Invalid in an Infringement Action, 19 Intellectual Property Today No. 4 at page 21 (2012).
- (185) Gholz and Shier, Using 35 USC 154(d) to Speed Interferences, 19 Intellectual Property Today No. 5 at page 13 (2012).
- (186) Gholz, Will *Kappos v. Hyatt* Impact 35 U.S.C. §146 Actions?, 84 PTCJ 42 (2012).
- (187) Gholz, A Critique of Recent Opinions in Patent Interferences, 94 JPTOS 32 (2012).

- (188) Gholz and Hibshman, Thompson v. Hamilton Should Be Overruled!, 19 Intellectual Property Today No. 6 at page 6 (2012).
- (189) Gholz and Mandrusiak, How Will Kappos v. Hyatt Impact 35 USC 146 Actions?, 19 Intellectual Property Today No. 7 at page 22 (2012).
- (190) Gholz and Sarnoff, Proposed Technical Amendments to § 135 of the AIA, 19 Intellectual Property Today No. 8 at page 8 (2012).
- (191) Gholz, Do You Have to Write Your Motions Before You Submit Your List of Proposed Motions?, 19 Intellectual Property Today No. 9 at page 16 (2012).
- (192) Gholz, Mandrusiak, and Barton, Spoliation in Interferences, 19 Intellectual Property Today No. 10 at page 16 (2012).
- (193) Gholz and Sarnoff, Is the Definition of “Same or Substantially the Same” in 37 CFR 42.401 Valid?, 19 Intellectual Property Today No. 11 at page 32 (2012).
- (194) Gholz, Don’t Forget That Inventorship Issues Can Be Determined in an Interference!, 85 PTCJ 115 (2012).
- (195) Gholz and Mandrusiak, Will PTAB Decisions in Interferences Declared After September 15, 2012 Be Reviewable in Court?, 19 Intellectual Property Today No. 12 at page 32 (2012).
- (196) Gholz, Kiklis, and Englehart, Is the Estoppel of the New AIA Proceedings Worse Than Interference Estoppel?, 20 Intellectual Property Today No. 1 at page 8 (2013).
- (197) Gholz, A Critique of Recent Opinions in Patent Interferences, 95 JPTOS 24 (2013).
- (198) Gholz and Mandrusiak, Will PTAB Decisions in Interferences Declared After September 15, 2012 But Before Enactment of the AIA Technical Amendments Act Be Reviewable Via Petitions For Extraordinary Writs or Actions Under the APA?, 20 Intellectual Property Today No. 2 at page 32 (2013).
- (199) Gholz, It May Now Be Possible to Use 37 CFR 1.290 to Induce The Declaration of Application-Application Interferences, 20 Intellectual Property Today No. 3 at page 28 (2013).
- (200) Gholz, Is the Federal Circuit a Paper Tiger?, 20 Intellectual Property Today No. 4 at page 28 (2013).
- (201) Gholz and Mandrusiak, A Possible Solution to the Interregnum Problem, 20 Intellectual Property Today No. 5 at page 6 (2013).

- (202) Gholz, Why Wasn't In Re Hubbell Hubbell v. Hubbell?, 20 Intellectual Property Today No. 6 at page 19 (2013).
- (203) Gholz, Do Joint Inventors Have To Be Friends?, 20 Intellectual Property Today No. 7 at page 12 (2013).
- (204) Gholz and Presper, The Burdens of Proof and Persuasion in a 35 USC 146 Action, 20 Intellectual Property Today No. 8 at page 16 (2013).
- (205) Gholz and Baker, There Was A Simpler Way to Decide Fresenius v. Baxter!, 20 Intellectual Property Today No. 9 at page 16 (2013).
- (206) Gholz and Presper, Request Rehearing! (Take Two), 20 Intellectual Property Today No. 10 at page 21 (2013).
- (207) Gholz and Englehart, Does the Doctrine of Judicial Estoppel Apply to Interferences?, 20 Intellectual Property Today No. 11 at page 28 (2013).
- (208) Gholz, Dealing with Multiple Patents Owned by the Same Party and Containing Claims of Similar Scope, 20 Intellectual Property Today No. 12 at page 13 (2013).
- (209) Gholz, Can Two Interferents Settle and Then Simply Walk Away from the Interference?, 21 Intellectual Property Today No. 1 at page 12 (2014).
- (210) Gholz and Mandrusiak, Have Board Proceedings in Interferences Been Reduced to "Trial Runs" Which a Dissatisfied Party May "Do Over" in District Court?, 21 Intellectual Property Today No. 2 at page 12 (2014).
- (211) Gholz and Ricciuti, Why the Fuss Over Post-Grant Estoppels?, 21 Intellectual Property Today No. 3 at page 6 (2014).
- (212) Gholz, A Critique of Recent Opinions in Patent Interferences, 96 JPTOS 92 (2014).
- (213) Gholz and Mandrusiak, Is the Prevailing Party in a Civil Action to Review the Judgment in a 35 USC 146 Proceeding Entitled to Its Attorney Fees?, 21 Intellectual Property Today No. 4 at page 10 (2014).
- (214) Gholz and Englehart, Will B&B Hardware v. Hargis Industries Affect Coakwell v. United States?, 21 Intellectual Property Today No. 5 at page 11 (2014).
- (215) Gholz and Englehart, Let's Hope High Court TTAB Case Doesn't Hurt PTAB Rulings, IP Law 360 (June 5, 2014).
- (216) Gholz and Ricciuti, The Standard for Attorney Diligence Is High, 21 Intellectual Property Today No. 6 at page 10 (2014).

- (217) Gholz and Englehart, Is Inurement Bi-Directional?, 21 Intellectual Property Today No. 7 at page 18 (2014).
- (218) Gholz and Ricciuti, A Work-Around in Response to the Elusoriness of the Right to Amend in Post-Grant Reviews, 21 Intellectual Property Today No. 8 at page 18 (2014).
- (219) Gholz and Mandrusiak, Board Proceedings in Interferences Have Been Reduced to “Trial Runs” Which a Dissatisfied Party May “Do Over” in District Court, 21 Intellectual Property Today No. 9 at page 24 (2014).
- (220) Gholz and Presper, The PTAB’s Primer for Derivation Proceedings, 21 Intellectual Property Today No. 10 at page 20 (2014).
- (221) Gholz and Hudis, Can Proceedings Before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board or the Trademark Trial and Appeal Board, By Themselves, Support a District Court’s Jurisdiction Over a Declaratory Judgment Action?, 21 Intellectual Property Today No. 11 at page 11 (2014).
- (222) Gholz and Englehart, Members of the Interference Bar Must Exercise Reasonable Care, But They Are Not Required to Foretell the Future!, 21 Intellectual Property Today No. 12 at page 8 (2014).
- (223) Gholz and Mandrusiak, The Relationship Between Designating Claims as Corresponding to a Count and Double Patenting, 22 Intellectual Property Today No. 1 at page 24 (2015).
- (224) Gholz and Mandrusiak, Did a Panel of the Board Incorrectly Apply the Maxim *Falsus in Uno, Falsus in Omnibus*?, 22 Intellectual Property Today No. 2 at page 20 (2015).
- (225) Gholz and Presper, 35 USC 102(g) Is Interpreted Differently in an Infringement Action Than It Is in an Interference!, 22 Intellectual Property Today No. 3 at page 18 (2015).
- (226) Gholz, A Critique of Recent Opinions in Patent Interferences and Derivation Proceedings, 97 JPTOS 57 (2015) .
- (227) Gholz and Baker, Is Sewall v. Walters Still Good Law?, 22 Intellectual Property Today No. 4 at page 18 (2015).
- (228) Gholz and Englehart, B&B Hardware, Inc. v. Hargis Industries, Inc. Leaves Patent Law Unscathed!, 90 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 2258 (June 5, 2015), 22 Intellectual Property Today No. 5 at page 7 (2015).
- (229) Gholz and Harrison, Antedating Prior Art in PTAB Patentability Trials, 90 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 2571 (July 10, 2015).

- (230) Gholz and Mandrusiak, So Long 35 U.S.C. § 146 – It’s Been Good To Know You!, 90 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 2845 (August 7, 2015).
- (231) Gholz and Ricciuti, Should the Patent Bar Try to Get Gunn v. Minton Legislatively Overruled?, 90 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 3129 (September 11, 2015).
- (232) Gholz and Englehart, Is it Time for the PTO to Reinvigorate OTDP Practice?, 90 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 3364 (October 2, 2015).
- (233) Gholz and Cappaert, Is No-Harm, No-Foul the New Rule?, 91 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 36 (November 6, 2015).
- (234) Gholz and Presper, Have We Seen the Last of Threshold Motions?, 91 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 326 (December 4, 2015).
- (235) Gholz and Ricciuti, Has Judge O’Malley Shown Us How to Dodge the Gunn?, 91 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 646 (January 8, 2016).
- (236) Gholz, Pereira, and Weinstein, Is a Reference to a Parent Case in a Sequence Appendix Good Enough?, 91 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 987 (February 5, 2016).
- (237) Gholz and Englehart, You Got It Wrong! Now What?, 91 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 1292 (March 4, 2016).
- (238) Gholz and Mandrusiak, Were the “Death Squads” Created in 1980?, 91 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 1583 (April 1, 2016).
- (239) Gholz and Weinstein, Now *Holmwood v. Sugavanam* Applies to Patent Attorneys!, 92 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 33 (May 6, 2016).
- (240) Gholz and Cappaert, The Solicitor’s Office Should Monitor District Court Reviews of Decisions by the PTAB and the TTAB and Intervene When Appropriate, 92 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 431 (June 10, 2016).
- (241) Gholz and Ricciuti, Have We Seen the Last of Prior Art Motions?. 92 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 702 (July 8, 2016).
- (242) Gholz and Presper, What’s the Point of Observations and Responses?, 92 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 1036 (August 5, 2016).
- (243) Gholz and Mandrusiak, De Minimis Infringement, 92 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 1365 (September 9, 2016).
- (244) Gholz and Englehart, What Should the APJs Do If a Petitioner Has Failed to Make What Seems to Them to Be a Good Argument?, 92 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 1697 (October 7, 2016).

- (245) Gholz and Weinstein, Why Wasn't Vapor Point LLC v. Moorhead an Interference?, 93 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 2039 (November 4, 2016).
- (246) Gholz and Mandrusiak, The More Things Change, the More They Remain the Same!, 93 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 2454 (December 9, 2016).
- (247) Gholz and Weinstein, But Sometimes the Federal Circuit Really Does Improve Things!, 93 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 2877 (January 20, 2017).
- (248) Gholz and Baker, There's One Way That AIA Proceedings Are Very, Very Different Than the First Phase of Patent Interferences, 93 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 3078 (February 10, 2017).
- (249) Gholz, Read the Rules First!, 93 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 3321 (March 10, 2017).
- (250) Gholz and Weinstein, How Continuous Must Classical Diligence Be?, 93 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 3585 (April 7, 2017).
- (251) Gholz and Ricciuti, Judge O'Malley's Escape Hatch Will Not Always Work!, 94 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 94 (May 12, 2017).
- (252) Gholz, If You Get a 37 C.F.R. § 41.202(d)(2) Order to Show Cause, You'd Better Stir Your Stumps!, 94 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 552 (June 23, 2017).
- (253) Gholz and Mandrusiak, What Should the Board Do With the Illicit Information?, 94 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 812 (July 21, 2017).
- (254) Rao and Gholz, Will TC Heartland Control Venue in BPCIA Litigation?, 94 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 1036 (August 11, 2017).
- (255) Gholz and Weinstein, What Does the Word "Misconduct" in 37 C.F.R. § 41.128(a) Mean?, 94 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 32 (September 22, 2017).
- (256) Rao and Gholz, The Implications of In re Cray on the Sharing Economy, 94 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 1470 (October 20, 2017).
- (257) Gholz and Mandrusiak, Patent Agent, Foreign Attorney Privilege Rule for Interferences?, 95 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 111 (November 24, 2017).
- (258) Rao and Gholz, Is 35 U.S.C. § 295 the Key to the AI Black Box?, 95 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 337 (January 19, 2018).

- (259) Gholz and Mandrusiak, What Gap Gives Rise to Inference of a Breach in *Peeler* Diligence?, 95 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 405 (February 2, 2018).
- (260) Gholz and Pereira, Straddle Interferences, 95 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 593 (March 16, 2018).
- (261) Gholz and Ricciuti, Determining Priority of Invention Is Not a Must in Interferences, 95 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 593 (April 06, 2018).
- (262) Gholz, The Decision Instituting the First Derivation Proceeding, 96 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 31 (May 04, 2018).
- (263) Gholz, SAS Won't Overwhelm the New APIs, 96 Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal 174 (June 08, 2018).
- (264) Gholz and Weinstein, Coakwell v. United States is Still Good Law!, Patent, Trademark & Copyright Journal Daily Edition, 159 PTD (8/16/18).
- (265) Gholz, Is the Canard that the Board Never Makes Credibility Determinations Finally Dead? <https://www.oblon.com/is-the-canard-that-the-board-never-makes-credibility-determinations-finally-dead> (March 20, 2019).
- (266) Gholz, A Derivation Proceeding is not Just a Derivation Interference by Another Name! <https://www.oblon.com/a-derivation-proceeding-is-not-just-a-derivation-interference-by-another-name> (March 27, 2019).
- (267) Gholz and Sarnoff, Derivation Without Section 102(f) Changes Substance and Procedure! <https://www.oblon.com/derivation-without-section-102f-changes-substance-and-procedure> (April 2, 2019).

LECTURER:

- (1) CCPA Judicial Conference (1975).
- (2) Continuing legal education seminars on interference law (1974, 1975, 1976, 1977, and 1980) sponsored by Patent Resources Group, Inc.
- (3) Patent bar review course sponsored by Patent Resources Group, Inc. (1977 to 1995).
- (4) Celebration Lectures on Non-Obviousness sponsored by the Bureau of National Affairs (1977).
- (5) Continuing legal education seminar on intellectual property sponsored by Federal Publications, Inc. (1978, 1979).

- (6) Recent Developments in Patent Law at the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals (1978 and 1982) sponsored by Patent Resources Group, Inc.
- (7) Annual Patent Conference sponsored by the Bureau of National Affairs (1983 and 1984).
- (8) Recent Developments in Patent Law at the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (1983 to 1999) sponsored by Patent Resources Group, Inc.
- (9) Practicing Before the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit sponsored by the Practicing Law Institute (1985).
- (10) Current Developments in Patent Law sponsored by the Practicing Law Institute (1985).
- (11) Practice Under the New Interference Rules sponsored by the American Intellectual Property Law Association (1985 and 1986).
- (12) Interference Issues in a First-to-File World sponsored by the American Intellectual Property Law Association (1989).
- (13) Annual Intellectual Property Law Seminar of the Institute of Continuing Legal Education (1990 to 1998).
- (14) 28th Annual Institute on Patent Law Seminar of the Southwestern Legal Foundation (1990).
- (15) Spring meeting of the Patent and Trademark Institute of Canada (1993).
- (16) Spring meeting of the American Intellectual Property Law Association (1993).
- (17) Spring meeting of the Association of Corporate Patent Counsel (1994).
- (18) Interference Practice (1994 and 1995) sponsored by Patent Resources Group, Inc.
- (19) IPO Day sponsored by the Intellectual Property Owners (1994).
- (20) Annual meeting of the American Intellectual Property Law Association (1994).
- (21) GATT-Related Changes in PTO Patent Rules sponsored by the Intellectual Property Owners (1995).
- (22) Annual meeting of the American Intellectual Property Law Association (1995).
- (23) Current Developments in Patent Law and Litigation sponsored by the American Law Institute - American Bar Association Course (1995).
- (24) 33rd Annual Patent Law Seminar of the Southwestern Legal Foundation (1995).

- (25) American Bar Association IP Law Section Spring CLE Meeting (1997).
- (26) Annual meeting of the Intellectual Property Owners (1997).
- (27) Joint meeting of the Intellectual Property Law Association of Chicago and the Appellate Lawyers Association (1997).
- (28) American Bar Association IP Law Section Spring CLE Meeting (1998).
- (29) The Patent, Trademark & Copyright Section of the Oklahoma Bar Association CLE Meeting (1998, 1999, 2000, and 2001).
- (30) Understanding the New Patent Law sponsored by the Practicing Law Institute (2000).
- (31) Focused Management Perspective and Tutorial on The 1999 Patent Law sponsored by the DePaul College of Law (2000).
- (32) Rochester Patent Law Association (2000).
- (33) American Bar Association IP Law Section Spring CLE Meeting (2000).
- (34) Oregon State Bar Intellectual Property Section (2000).
- (35) Columbus Intellectual Property Law Association (2000).
- (36) Colorado State Bar Intellectual Property Section (2000).
- (37) Interference Practice in the New Millennium, sponsored by the Intellectual Property Section of the Virginia State Bar (2000)
- (38) 45th Annual Conference on Developments in Intellectual Property Law, sponsored by The John Marshall Law School (2001).
- (39) The Intellectual Property Law Section of the Utah Bar (2001).
- (40) The Intellectual Property Law Section of the Michigan Bar (2001).
- (41) Appellate/Interference Practice, sponsored by the Intellectual Property Owners (2002).
- (42) The Intellectual Property Law Section of the Indiana Bar (2002).
- (43) American Bar Association IP Law Section Spring CLE Meeting (2003).
- (44) Connecticut Intellectual Property Law Association (2003).
- (45) The Intellectual Property Owner's program entitled "Appellate/Interference Practice in the New Millennium" (2004).

- (46) The Michigan Intellectual Property Law Association (2005).
- (47) The Intellectual Property Section of the Georgia State Bar Association (2005).
- (48) The Greater Richmond Intellectual Property Law Association (2005).
- (49) Intellectual Property Law Section of the D.C. Bar (2005).
- (50) New York Intellectual Property Law Association (2005).
- (51) Intellectual Property Law Association of Chicago (2005).
- (52) Silicon Valley Intellectual Property Law Association (2005).
- (53) Intellectual Property Law Section of the Metropolitan St. Louis Bar Association (2005).
- (54) Toledo Patent Law Association (2005).
- (55) Pittsburgh Intellectual Property Law Association (2005).
- (56) Kansas City Metropolitan Bar Association (2006).
- (57) Cleveland Intellectual Property Law Association (2006).
- (58) Intellectual Property Section of the State Bar of Arizona (2006).
- (59) Stanford University Law and Economics Society (2006).
- (60) Joint meeting of the Silicon Valley Intellectual Property Law Association; the Stanford Law School Law, Science and Technology Center; and The Stanford Law and Technology Association (2006).
- (61) Eastern New York Intellectual Property Association (2007).
- (62) "Ethical Issues in Patent Law," sponsored by the Columbus School of Law of The Catholic University of America (2007).
- (63) The Intellectual Property Law Section of the Oregon State Bar Association (2007).
- (64) The Salishan Conference sponsored by the Washington State Patent Law Association and the Oregon State Patent Law Association (2008).
- (65) Biennial Interference Law and Practice Conference of the Intellectual Property Owners Association (2008).
- (66) Intellectual Property Law Association of Florida (2009).

- (67) IEEE meeting re The Leahy-Smith American Invents Act (AIA) (2011).
- (68) Washington State Bar Association Intellectual Property Section re The Leahy-Smith American Invents Act (2011).

BAR MEMBERSHIPS: District of Columbia, Virginia, and the Patent and Trademark Office.

BAR ASSOCIATION MEMBERSHIPS:

American Bar Association (Patent, Copyright, and Trademark Section): chairman, Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit subcommittee of the Federal Practice and Procedure Committee, 1982-83.

American Intellectual Property Law Association: chairman, Giles Sutherland Rich Moot Court Competition subcommittee, 1973-75; ad hoc committee re proposed single court of patent appeals, 1978-79; chairman, Interference Law and Practice Subcommittee of the Interference Committee, 1983-84; chairman, Interference Committee, 1988-90; Amicus Committee, 1984 to 1999, vice-chairman, 1990-91, chairman 1994-96; Public Appointment Committee, 1999 to 2002.

Association of Former CCPA Law Clerks and Technical Advisors: president, 1978-79.

District of Columbia Bar Association (Patent, Copyright, and Trademark Section): member of steering committee, 1984-86; vice-chairman, 1985-86.

ADVISORY BOARDS:

Member of the Advisory Board of the Patent, Trademark, & Copyright Journal (1978-2016).

SERVICE AS AN EXPERT WITNESS:

- (1) Sun-Tek Industries, Inc.* v. Kennedy Sky-Lites, Inc., C.A. 82-469-ORL-CIV-R, M.D. FL (jury trial).
- (2) Black & Decker, Inc. v. Hoover Service Center,* C.A. H-87-851, D. CN (evidentiary hearing on motion for preliminary injunction).
- (3) Printex Products Corp. v. Precision Engineered Systems, Inc.,* C.A. 89-0179T, N.D. NY (affidavit in support of motion for summary judgment).

- (4) West Agro, Inc.* v. Chemland, Inc., C.A. 88-2638-TU, W.D. TN (affidavit in opposition to motion for summary judgment).
- (5) Wolf* v. Dory, C.A. 87 C 1254, N.D. IL (affidavit in opposition to motion for summary judgment).
- (6) Cipher Data Products, Inc. v. Wangtek, Inc.,* C.A. C-86-3792, N.D. CA.
- (7) Hollister Inc. v. E.R. Squibb & Sons, Inc.,* C.A. 84 C 1987, N.D. IL.
- (8) Anglia Autoflow, Ltd. v. Foodcraft Equipment Company, Inc.,* C.A. 90-2292, E.D. PA.
- (9) MOMO S.p.A.* v. DHW, Inc., C.A. 88-0622E, N.D. NY.
- (10) Smith Corona Corp.* v. Pelikan, Inc., C.A. 3-90-0479, M.D. TN (jury trial).
- (11) Monon Corp. v. Wabash National Corp.,* C.A. L90-0044, N.D. IN.
- (12) Leading Edge Technology Corp.* v. Sun Automation Inc., C.A. H-90-2316, MD (deposition; affidavits in support of and in opposition to motions for summary judgment; and jury trial).
- (13) Dery* v. NBD Bank, N.A., C.A. 88-05085, E.D. MI. (deposition).
- (14) Texas Instruments Inc. v. Dell Computer Corp.,* CA-3-90-2086, N.D. TX.
- (15) Nordberg, Inc.* v. Telsmith, Inc., C.A. 90-C-0555, E.D. WI (deposition and bench trial).
- (16) Peterson Mfg. Co. v. Adjustable Clamp Co.,* C.A. 92-C-5700, N.D. IL (deposition and bench trial).
- (17) Para-Ordnance Mfg. Inc.* v. SGS Importers International Inc., C.A. 94-117-A, E.D. VA (deposition and bench trial).
- (18) University of South Florida* v. Sherman & Shalloway, C.A. 94-504-A, E.D. VA (deposition).
- (19) Industrias Metalicas Marva, Inc. v. Caribe Glass, Inc.,* C.A. 93-2588(HL), P.R. (deposition).
- (20) Virginia Panel Corp. v. Mac Panel Co.,* C.A. 93-0006-H, W.D. VA (deposition and jury trial).
- (21) New Covent Garden Soup Co. v. Palmer,* CH 1995 T No. 848, High Court of Justice (of the United Kingdom), Chancery Division.
- (22) Baker Hughes Inc. v. Enterra Corp.,* C.A. H-95-975, S.D. TX.

- (23) Gates Formed-Fibre Products, Inc. v. Delaware Valley Corporation,* C.A. 95-10923 EFH, D. MA (deposition).
- (24) Agfa-Gevaert, N.V.* v. Presstek, Inc., ICC Case No. 8694/FMS (testimony before panel of three arbitrators).
- (25) Industrias Metalicas Marva, Inc. v. Empresas Lausell,* C.A. 96-1697 (JP), P.R. (affidavit).
- (26) Unitrode Corp. v. Burr-Brown Corp.,* C.A. No. 94-11393 RGS, D. MA.
- (27) Radisson Hotels International, Inc. v. Westin Hotel Company,* C.A. No. 3-96-48 RHK, D. MN (deposition).
- (28) Vital Signs, Inc. v. Farris,* C.A. No. 95-2124(JCL), D.N.J. (affidavits) (deposition).
- (29) Arrow International, Inc. v. Stuart Entertainment, Inc.,* 1:96- CV-1397, N.D. Ohio (affidavit).
- (30) Emory University* v. Glaxo Wellcome Inc., C.A. 1:96-CV-1868-GET, N.D. GA. (affidavit).
- (31) United States Brass Corp.* v. Mercury Plastics, Inc., T.X. No. 4:97-CV-16.
- (32) Affymetrix, Inc. v. Synteni, Inc. and Incyte Pharmaceuticals, Inc.,* C98-4507 FMS, N.D. CA (affidavit).
- (33) Allen* v. Howmedica Leibinger GmbH, CA 98-613, D. Del. (affidavit).
- (34) Uroplasty, Inc. v. Advanced UroScience, Inc.,* CA 98-2082 MJD/JBL, MN (affidavit).
- (35) Aero Industries, Inc. v. John Donovan Enterprises - Florida, Inc.,* Case No. 1P99-0671 C M/S.
- (36) National Instruments Corp. v. PPT Vision, Inc.,* Case No. A-99-CA-187 JN.
- (37) In re Certain Magnetic Resonance Injection Systems, ITC Investigation No. 337-TA-434 (retained by counsel for the respondents).
- (38) Atico International USA, Inc. v. Tofasco of America, Inc.,* S.D. Fla., Case No. 02-60984 (affidavit).
- (39) Beckman Research Institute of the City of Hope* v. Genentech, Inc., American Arbitration Association Case No. 74 Y 133 01463 00 GAP.
- (40) Gerald E. Frugoli v. Douglas V. Fougnyes; Daniel B. Harned; Larry Day; Freedom Wireless, Inc., A Nevada corporation; Wireless Pathways, Inc. f/k/a/

- Cellexis International, Inc., an Arizona corporation,* AZ CIV 02-957-PHX-RCB (deposition).
- (41) Freedom Wireless, Inc.* v. Boston Communications Group, Inc., et al., MA CIV 00-12234-EFH (deposition).
- (42) Sanders v. The Mount Sinai School of Medicine,* S.D. N.Y., 03 CV. 7937 (JGK).
- (43) Meritor Transmission Corporation* v. Eaton Corporation, W.D. NC, 1:04 CV 178 (LHT) (deposition).
- (44) Maytag Corporation* v. Electrolux Home Products Inc., d/b/a Frigidare, N.D. IA W.D., C 04-4067-MWB (deposition).
- (45) Convolve, Inc.* v. Compaq Computer Corp., S.D.N.Y., Case No. 00 Civ. 5141 (GBD) (JCF) (declaration).
- (46) Amgen Inc.* v. F. Hoffman-La Roche LTD, Roche Diagnostics GmbH, and Hoffman La Roche Inc., D. Mass., Civil Action No.: 05 Civ. 12237 (WGY).
- (47) ARAM Systems Ltd.* v. NovAtel Inc., Queen's Bench of Alberta, Judicial District of Calgary, Action No.: 0601-08106/2006.
- (48) Sprint Communications Co., LP.* v. C2 Communications Technologies, Inc., E. D. Texas, 2:06-cv-00241-TJW-CE.
- (49) Boehringer Ingelheim Vetmedica GMBH (Germany) and Boehringer Ingelheim Vetmedica, Inc. (USA)* v. Merial S.A.S. (France) and Merial LTD. (United Kingdom), domesticated in the United States as Merial LLC, ICC, International Court of Arbitration, 16166/EC.
- (50) Purdue Pharma L.P.; The P.F. Laboratories, Inc.; Purdue Pharmaceuticals and L.P.; Rhodes Technologies v. Varam, Inc. and KVK-Tech, Inc.*, District Court for the Southern District of New York, Civ. Action No. 11-civ-0766 (SHS).
- (51) G. D. Searle LLC and Pfizer Asia Pacific Pte. Ltd.* v. Lupin Pharmaceuticals, Inc., TEVA Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc., Watson Laboratories, Inc., Apotex Inc., and Apotex Corp., District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, Civ. Action No. 2:13-CV-0121.
- (52) Eli Lilly & Co. and Imclone Systems, LLC* v. Genentech, Inc. and City of Hope, Central District of California, Case No. 2:13-CV-07248-MRP-JEM (deposition).
- (53) Eli Lilly Canada Inc. v. Apotex Inc. et al.*, Federal Court of Canada, Case File No. T-556-15.

SERVICE AS AN ARBITRATOR:

- (1) Helmholtz Center For Infection Research (formerly known as Gesellschaft für Biotechnologische Forschung) (Germany) v. Bristol-Myers Squibb Company (U.S.A.), ICC, International Court of Arbitration, 16993/VRO.

8926628_1.DOC April 8, 2019