



ADLI LAW GROUP P.C.

SEPTEMBER 2011 NEWSLETTER



GLOBAL EXPERTISE

CUTTING EDGE APPROACH TO INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND BUSINESS MATTERS

In This Issue

- Dr. Adli participates in recent Patent Litigation Roundtable
- Mirror, Mirror on the Wall – Does She Look Like Me?
- U.S. Patent Law Changes - - President Obama Signs Patent Reform Into Law

Events:

- Inventors Association of Manhattan Conference
- Chicago Black Inventors, 3rd Annual Inventors Conference
- Bienvenido Adli Law a Latinoamerica!
- The SEMA Show
- Adultcon - Las Vegas
- Adli Law Group to host its First Fridays Professional Networking Mixer commencing 10/7/2011
- Adli Law Group to resume its monthly complimentary wine tasting seminar 10/20/2011

New Additions:

- Paul Johnson joins Adli Law Group, P.C.

Special Announcements:

- Marketing Director, Robin Le Grand takes new last name



Dr. Dariush Adli, Ph.D., Esq., is the founder and Managing Partner of Adli Law Group P.C. His practice is primarily focused on patent litigation, representing high technology companies in the electrical and mechanical arts, including semiconductor, integrated circuit, computer hardware, architecture, software, digital processing, and communications industries.



ADLI LAW GROUP P.C.



Intellectual Property Roundtable
August 17, 2011

Excerpt below is an unpublished transcript
of Dr. Adli's participation only.

Lawyer-Patent Litigation Roundtable, October 2011

Dr. Adli recently participated in a roundtable of patent litigation experts. The discussion took place on August 17th in San Francisco, California. The various topics included: 'What is the future of patent litigation in East Texas and how is it impacted by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit transfer cases and the retirement of key judges?'; 'What is the scope of patentable matter under subject 101 of the Patent Act, and how will the recent ruling in *The Association for Molecular Pathology v. US Patent and Trademark Office* impact your practice?'; and 'What are the risks and benefits of a patent enforcement program? Are legitimate companies making a business out of it?'. The rich roundtable discussion pertaining to the various topics as well as intellectual property practices of the experts will be published in the **October** issue of **California Lawyer** magazine.

MODERATOR: What is the future of patent litigation in East Texas and how is it impacted by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit transfer cases and the retirement of key judges?

ADLI: Our local counsel in the Eastern District still advises us that only cases that have no connection at all with Texas are being transferred out. Some presence, even cosmetic, may suffice. In the early 2000's we used to conduct mock jury trials, but that was stopped by Judge Ward three or four years ago.

Bifurcation is another issue on our watch list. A few months ago Judge Davis decided in the recent *Parallel Networks* case, which had something like 120 defendants, to bifurcate the Markman proceeding. He only wanted to deal with three issues that would be dispositive for many of the defendants. It remains to be seen if this is the start of a trend in multi defendant cases.

In terms of venue, we have done studies for our clients comparing the Eastern District and other districts to the Central District of California ranks up pretty well for plaintiffs. In terms of summary judgment grants, it's kind of in the middle, but it has a higher than national average record on preliminary injunction grants. We now recommend it over some of the other plaintiff jurisdictions.

MODERATOR: What is the scope of patentable matter under subject 101 of the Patent Act, and how will the recent ruling in *The Association for Molecular Pathology v. US Patent and Trademark Office* impact your practice?

ADLI: There is a lot more skepticism about what is patentable subject matter. Although each time the question goes up to the Supreme Court, at least for business method challenges, it comes back reaffirming the basic principle that other than abstract ideas, most anything is patentable. But the significant point for patent prosecutors is the diversity of claims. In the *Association for Molecular Pathology* case, the claims at issue were method claims: the therapeutic method—the screening of the patient—and product claims, the gene itself. To me, the surprising aspect in this case was the amicus brief filed by the federal government. It said that if the genes are in the natural state in the body and unaltered, they should not be patentable subject matter. That was a change. If they are engineered or altered, they would be patentable. The court did not address that question directly, but seemed to side with the government saying that there has to be some alteration of the gene.

ADLI: This is largely a 101 (usefulness) issue, it also implicates an issue of claim drafting. We, as prosecutors, should be able to draft claims that survive a 101 challenge. With European patents, which are examined under somewhat different standards than those in the U.S., we find that the bar is a lot higher.

MODERATOR: What are the risks and benefits of a patent enforcement program? Are legitimate companies making a business out of it?

ADLI: Many companies—IBM in 1990 and before that Texas Instruments in 1985—realized that pursuing an active IP portfolio management policy can reap huge benefits for their bottom line; often making the difference between survival and bankruptcy. Texas Instruments provides a vivid example; back in 1985 it was on the verge of bankruptcy. Before filing, their attorney suggested they try licensing some of their patents in their IP portfolio. They looked at their patents, filed a couple of lawsuits and a year later signed a one and a half billion dollar licensing deal with several large Japanese companies. It was a success story from then on. Today Texas Instruments makes about a billion dollars a year in revenues from its licensing program compared to \$20 million 25 years ago.

IBM in 1990 is the same story. IBM is the number one patent owner with 3,000 to 4,000 new patents obtained each year. The second runner up registered about half that number. They started their own licensing program and within a few years went from \$30 million to \$1.5 billion, which they now reinvest in research and development.

Companies all over the U.S. that have started focusing on IP portfolio management are reaping huge benefits. The total revenue U.S. companies earned from licensing revenues has jumped from \$100 billion 25 years ago to \$400 billion today. It's expected to grow to \$500 billion by next year. That growth is mainly due to patent portfolio management.

ARTICLES:

Mirror, Mirror on the Wall – Does She Look Like Me?



**Mariana Noli,
Associate**



On July 20, 2011, socialite and reality television star Kim Kardashian filed a federal lawsuit against The Gap Inc., the parent company of Old Navy, over an Old Navy television commercial featuring Melissa Molinaro, a Canadian pop singer, who according to Kardashian “looks just like her.” Kardashian’s lawsuit, filed in the U.S. District Court for the Central District of California, specifically alleges that Old Navy violated her right-of-publicity and the trademark rights she has on her own likeness, and seeks compensatory and punitive damages as well as an injunction barring Old Navy from using Kardashian’s lookalikes in future ads.

That same afternoon, I told KTLA News in an interview that “celebrities do have a right to control the use of their likeness, their name, their image.”

And they do.

No right is unlimited, of course, and the protection against false endorsement does not grant a celebrity the right to infringe upon the rights of others, whether Old Navy’s or Melissa Molinaro’s. The First Amendment Defense has been raised by defendants and recognized by the courts as the Constitutional boundary of actions for misappropriation of a celebrity’s likeness. Free speech interests protected by the First Amendment may be a defense to a claim of false endorsement, but the rights involved in each particular case must be balanced and this process is fact-specific.

In Paris Hilton’s case against Hallmark, Hallmark argued that a birthday card — with her face superimposed on a cartoon waitress serving food and saying her “trademark” phrase “that’s hot” — was a parody and thus protected by the First Amendment. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals disagreed, holding that the card was not sufficiently “transformative” to be treated as Hallmark’s own expression.

As for Kardashian v. Old Navy, there is neither a photograph nor a cartoon nor any other depiction of Kardashian in the Old Navy ad, which merely features Molinaro singing, dancing, shopping, and getting her hair and nails done while wearing the company’s jeans. Although Kardashian has been filmed while engaging in some of the same activities (presumably without wearing the same jeans), they hardly constitute a body of work for which she is exclusively renowned. So there is a less obvious case of parody. Given that there is some resemblance between Kardashian and Molinaro, this case will likely turn on whether Kardashian can prove that Old Navy intended to appropriate her likeness or to confuse the public into believing that Kardashian endorses its products.

Conspicuously absent from the media's discussion are Molinaro's own First Amendment rights. She is an up and coming singer and actress who has appeared in *Making the Band 3* and *Pussycat Dolls Present: The Search for the Next Doll*. Should her passing resemblance to Kardashian put an end to her nascent pop music and acting career? Should it preclude her from endorsing products as herself? I hope not. I do like her music.



U.S. Patent Law Changes - President Obama Signs Patent Reform Into Law



ADLI LAW GROUP P.C.



On September 8, 2011 the Senate adopted the House version of the America Invents Act without amendment, to avoid any delay to its passage. Last Friday, President Barack Obama signed the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act into law, saying the patent reform legislation will promote innovation and lead to patents being issued more quickly.

The America Invents Act (previously known as the Patent Reform Act of 2011, and hereinafter, "the Act") makes several significant changes to U.S. patent law, among which the adoption of a "first-inventor-to-file" system has garnered the most attention.

A. First-Inventor-to-File System

Unlike most other countries, the U.S. has a "first-to-invent" system that protects the first inventor. It allows the applicant of a later-filed patent application to antedate or "swear behind" a prior art reference or another inventor by proving that the applicant conceived of the invention before the effective date of the prior art reference or the conception of the invention by the other inventor.

In contrast, the "first-to-file" system in most other countries simply awards the patent to the applicant with the earliest filing date.

The Act adopts a "first-inventor-to-file" system, with a twist. Unlike other "first-to-file" systems, where an earlier disclosure of the invention serves as an absolute bar to patentability, the Act maintains the one year grace period from the current version of Section 102(b),¹ but only for disclosures made by an inventor or another person who obtained the disclosed subject matter from him, and subsequent disclosures by others. So the Act does not completely harmonize U.S. and foreign patent law.

The "first-inventor-to-file" system eliminates patent interferences, a type of proceeding before the Patent & Trademark Office ("PTO") to determine which among multiple applicants claiming the same invention is the first to invent the invention. Instead, the Act creates a more limited "derivation" proceeding, whereby an applicant in a later application petitions against an earlier application that (1) names an inventor who had "derived" the

¹ Unless otherwise noted, all section numbers hereinafter refer to sections in Title 35 of the United States Code.

claimed invention from an inventor named in the later application, and (2) was filed without authorization (presumably, by either the applicant or the inventor named in the later application).

A derivation petition “shall be supported by substantial evidence,” a requirement that may prove difficult to meet in practice. In a patent interference, an earlier inventor only needs to show that he was the first to conceive of the claimed invention, and that he worked diligently to reduce the invention to practice. Both aspects can be proven by evidence within his possession, *e.g.*, schematics, blueprints, laboratory notebooks, etc.

However, in a derivation proceeding, the earlier inventor must prove that someone else derived the claimed invention from him. If an invention is stolen from the original inventor and changes hands before someone else files a patent application on the invention, the link to the original inventor may be nearly impossible to prove, and the “substantial evidence” required to do so would most likely not be within the original inventor’s possession. This places an onus on patentees and applicants to better safeguard their inventions, and to promptly apply for patent protection.

B. Changes Affecting Litigation

The Act changes U.S. patent law in other ways that affect patent litigation.

1. Broader On-Sale Bar

While the Act retains the one year grace period from Section 102(b), it also broadens two categories of invalidating prior art in that section, commonly referred to as the “on-sale bar.” In the current version of Section 102(b), a public use or sale of an invention more than a year prior to the filing of a patent application on the invention invalidates the resulting patent only if such use or sale occurs within the U.S. The Act broadens the Section 102(b) “on-sale bar” to include a public use or sale of the invention in a foreign country as invalidating prior art.

2. No More Best Mode Defense

The Act retains the “best mode” requirement, which requires an inventor to disclose the “best mode” for practicing the claimed invention. However, under the Act, the failure to disclose the “best mode” no longer serves as a basis to invalidate the patent.

In practice, a defendant may spend less time deposing an inventor in an attempt to get the inventor to admit that he has an optimal way of practicing or implementing the claimed invention that is not disclosed in the corresponding patent.

3. Expansion of Prior Commercial Use Defense

The prior commercial use defense currently applies only to business method patents. The Act extends that defense to all patents, except those on inventions owned or subject to an obligation of assignment to a public or non-profit university, or a related technology transfer organization.

The defense may be asserted by a defendant that has in good faith made commercial use of a patented invention at least one year prior to the earlier of (a) the filing date of the asserted patent, or (b) the date on which the patented invention was disclosed to the public.

4. Advice of Counsel / Willful Infringement

The Act codifies the Federal Circuit’s 2007 decision in *Seagate* that held that the failure by an accused infringer to obtain the advice of counsel does not give rise to an adverse inference with respect to willful infringement.

5. False Marking Plaintiff Must Show “Competitive Injury”

Currently, any person may bring an action against a defendant for false marking, and the penalty awarded is split evenly between the plaintiff and the U.S. government. In the past few years, this has allowed a frenzy of lawsuits against patentees who had inadvertently neglected to remove the marking of expired patents on products or product

packaging. The Act remedies this by requiring a plaintiff bringing a false marking case to show competitive injury resulting from the alleged false marking.

6. Suing Multiple Defendants on the Same Patent

Pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, one plaintiff's claims against multiple defendants may only be brought in a single lawsuit only if (a) "any right to relief is asserted against them jointly, severally, or ... aris[es] out of the same transaction [or] occurrence," and (b) there is a "question of law or fact common to all defendants."

Although both requirements apply to patent infringement actions, it is quite prevalent for a patentee to sue multiple accused infringers on the same patent in one lawsuit, even though their respective infringing activities are not related. The Act reaffirms the above requirements, and expressly mandates that "accused infringers may not be jointed in one action as defendants ... based solely on allegations that they each have infringed the patent or patents in suit."

This affects all patentees, especially non-practicing entities, *i.e.*, entities that own one or more patents but do not practice the patented inventions (sometimes pejoratively referred to as "patent trolls"), as these entities frequently sue many defendants in a single case to facilitate management of pending patent litigation. Indeed, Bloomberg has recently reported a ten-fold increase in patent infringement lawsuits filed against multiple defendants in anticipation of the Act's enactment, with about half of the 31 lawsuits each targeting more than 10 defendants.²

C. New Opportunities for Challenging Patents and Patent Applications

The Act also introduces new opportunities for challenging patents and patent applications before the PTO. These include:

1. Expanded Period for Third Party Prior Art Submission Prior to Issuance

Currently, a third party may only submit limited prior art references relevant to a pending published patent application within a narrow time frame. The prior art references are limited to "patents and publications," and must be submitted within two months after the pending patent application is published.

The Act adds statements by the patent owner in proceedings before a federal court or the PTO taking a position on the scope of any claim of a particular patent as a category of prior art references that may be submitted to the PTO, and expands the period for submitting any prior art references.

2. Post-Grant Review

Currently, the only way to challenge the validity of a patent at the PTO is to file a request for reexamination. The Act adds another mechanism whereby a third party may petition for a post-grant review of a patent within nine months after the patent is granted on any ground relating to the invalidity of the patent or any claim thereof.

The Act also creates a transitional post-grant review proceeding to review the validity of certain business method patents relating to financial services, which can only be initiated by those who have been charged with or sued for infringement of a covered business patent.

3. Inter Partes Review

The Act also replaces *inter partes* reexaminations with an *inter partes* review procedure that a third party may initiate nine months after a patent is granted, or after the completion of any post-grant review. An *inter partes* review is limited to grounds under Sections 102 and 103 — *i.e.*, that the patented invention lacks novelty or is obvious in view of the prior art — and must be based on prior art patents or printed publications.

² <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/print/2011-09-12/apple-google-targeted-as-patent-cases-surge-before-law-changes.html>

The Act limits any subsequent challenges to the validity of a patent by a party who has petitioned for either a post-grant review or an *inter partes* review of the patent in cases where such petition results in a final written decision affirming the validity of the patent. In such cases, the petitioner is stopped from asserting, in any subsequent proceedings before the PTO, a federal court, or the International Trade Commission ("ITC"), that the patent is invalid on any ground that the petitioner raised or reasonably could have raised in the petition for the post-grant review or the *inter partes* review. Compared to the current *inter partes* reexamination process, the Act extends the estoppel to ITC investigations as well.

D. Miscellaneous

1. Assignee as Applicant

Section 118 now severely limits the circumstances under which an assignee can apply

for a patent. An assignee can only do so if "an inventor refuses to execute the patent application or cannot be found or reached after diligent effort," and then only "on behalf of and as agent for the inventor ... to preserve the rights of the parties or to prevent irreparable damage." The Act revises Section 118 to allow an assignee to apply for a patent directly without consideration or proof of any of these circumstances.

2. Prioritized Examination Fee

The Act introduces a \$4,800 fee (in addition to the regular filing and other PTO fees) for prioritized examinations of non-provisional applications for utility or plant patents. (There is already has expedited examination of a design patent application for a \$900 fee.) The number of prioritized examinations is initially limited to 10,000 per fiscal year. There are no details yet on the requirements of or the time saved by a prioritized examination.



ADLI LAW GROUP P.C.

INTERESTING IP FACTS:

So far in 2011 about 60% of transfer motions in patent infringement lawsuits have been successful. This is well above the 48% average of the last twenty years. This means that defendants in patent infringement cases have a good chance of removing cases from plaintiff friendly jurisdictions chosen by patentees to forums that are more favorable to the defendants.

EVENTS:



ADLI LAW GROUP P.C.

Inventors Association of Manhattan Conference

Dr. Adli has been asked to be a guest speaker at the Inventors Association of Manhattan Conference on **October 10th** from **6:30 to 9:30 p.m.** The event will be held at The Midtown Executive Club located in New York, NY. **More details to follow.**



Chicago Black Inventors, NFP (CBI) Third Annual Inventors Conference



"Helping Hands For Your Idea"

Chicago Black Inventors

As America is revitalizing its leadership role globally in innovation, the **Chicago Black Inventors, NFP (CBI)** is part of today's national campaign to win the future in economic development in underserved communities. Our goal is to spur and support innovation within these communities by providing inventors, innovators and entrepreneurs with educational resources, creditable service providers, and business development support. Currently, CBI provides these services to a membership base drawn largely from minority areas in 26 states.

Bienvenido Adli Law a Latinoamerica!

About mid-2011, **Dr. Adli** and junior associate, **Mariana Noli** began a campaign to expand the firm's practice into Latin-America with the primary goal of establishing lasting relationships with companies, universities, business people and professionals. Dr. Adli and Miss Noli will be returning for a second visit during the week of **October 24, 2011.**

In Mexico, there is a planned seminar on the relationship between **Open Innovation and Intellectual Property Rights** as well as a seminar at the **IMPI Mexican Institute of Intellectual Property** on the topic of **IP and Social Media and the Patent Reform**. There are several conferences scheduled for the visit to Buenos Aires, Argentina, and Dr. Adli and Miss Noli will end the trip at an event organized by the **American Chamber of Commerce in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil**, where executives and business owners will hear Dr. Adli's presentation on **International Contracts and Intellectual Property Law in the US**.

The subjects of our seminars are topics of interest in which we have vast experience and knowledge, such as international contracts, optimization of intellectual property portfolios (patents, trademarks, copyrights), and licenses of technology, among others. We see the potential and are opening the doors in each one of our visits, and we are excited about our expansion into Latin-America!

Adli Law Group is a Gold Sponsor of the **Chicago Black Inventors, NFP (CBI) Third Annual Inventors Conference** titled **"Innovation, Patents & Profits: Commercializing Your Dream"**.

Senior Associate, **Rasheed McWilliams** and Marketing Director, **Robin Le Grand-Moore** will be attending the event which will be held at the **Illinois Institute of Technology, Hermann Hall Conference Center** on **October 22, 2011** in Chicago.

Mr. McWilliams will serve as one of the moderators on the first panel focusing on new entrepreneurs. He will serve as a Conference Keynote Speaker. His presentation will focus on the subject matter of contracts/licensing/negotiation/etc.

Mrs. Le Grand-Moore will manage the Adli Law Group booth and will greet the attendees of the event. The attendees are brand new entrepreneurs as well as inventors with products already on the market.

With a welcome reception on the eve of the event, an Inventors Award Luncheon, and a roster of highly renowned speakers, this highly anticipated event will provide 800 attendees a unique opportunity to learn from experts, share their ideas with others and see new products.

For more information, please visit: <http://cfbieo.org/cfbc/2011-inventors-conference>.

The 2011 SEMA Show



Adli Law Group is proud to announce that it is an official member of SEMA. The firm will also be participating at The SEMA Show and is also an official Silver Sponsor of the annual Speed Networking Breakfast which is powered by the SEMA Businesswomen's Network; the Wheel & Tire Council [WTC] Industry Awards Reception; and the Young Executives Network/Street Performance Council (YEN/SPC) Awards Reception. The SEMA Show takes place **November 1-4, 2011, at the Las Vegas Convention Center.**

The Show is the premier automotive specialty products trade event in the world. It draws the industry's brightest minds and hottest products to one place, the Las Vegas Convention Center. In addition, the SEMA Show provides attendees with educational seminars, product demonstrations, special events, networking opportunities and more. The 2010 Show drew more than 50,000 domestic and international buyers. The displays are segmented into 12 sections, and a [New Products Showcase](#) features nearly 1,500 newly introduced parts, tools and components. In addition, the SEMA Show provides attendees with educational seminars, product demonstrations, special events, networking opportunities and more.

ADULTCON - LAS VEGAS 2011

Adli Law Group, P.C. is once again the Official Law Firm of Adultcon

Adli Law Group, P.C. will be returning to the Adultcon show, only this time in the City of Lights -- Las Vegas.

Rasheed McWilliams, Senior Associate of Adli Law Group recently spoke at Adultcon's Los Angeles Expo which was held on Saturday, July 30th at the Los Angeles Convention Center.

Mr. McWilliams will once again host the seminar entitled **"Creating Additional Revenue Through Intellectual Property: Patents, Trademarks and Copyrights in the Adult Industry"**. This invaluable seminar provides an overview of the importance of acquiring intellectual property assets and how those assets can be leveraged to generate additional revenue for adult entertainment businesses. Topics discussed included acquiring patents, trademarks and copyrights, enforcing intellectual property rights, and licensing intellectual property assets to create additional streams.

The Adultcon Las Vegas show is scheduled to run **November 4th - 6th** at the Mirage Ballroom in Las Vegas, NV.



MIRAGE HOTEL - BALLROOM

**Thursday, November 3rd
4pm-10pm**

**Friday, November 4th
3pm-9pm**

**Saturday, November 5th
3pm-9pm**

SPECIAL EVENTS:

ADLI LAW GROUP P.C.

FIRST FRIDAYS

PROFESSIONAL NETWORKING MIXER

LET'S ALL GET ACQUAINTED & DO SOME BUSINESS

*Mrs. Robin Le Grand-Moore, Marketing Director
of Adli Law Group, P.C.,*

*cordially invites you and a friend to attend
our monthly professional networking mixer.*

**GREAT THINGS ARE HAPPENING AT
ADLI LAW GROUP, P.C.!!!**

**Tell us about your fabulous business or idea,
so that we can tell you all about ours.**

October 7, 2011 - 5:00 pm - 7:00 pm

Hors d'oeuvres, wine & beverages will be served

**US Bank Tower Building
633 West 5th Street, Suite 6900
Los Angeles, CA 90071**

Please RSVP by September 23, 2011

darlene.scaife@adlilaw.com

SAVE THE DATE!!!!



On the **3rd Thursday of each month (5:00 - 7:00 p.m.)**, Adli Law will host a complimentary wine tasting seminar featuring various industry specific topics.

Seminar announcement for **10/20/2011** to come under separate invite

TELL A FRIEND!!!!

On the **1st Friday of each month (5:00 - 7:00 p.m.) commencing 10/7/2011**, Adli Law Group's Marketing Director will host its monthly **FIRST FRIDAYS PROFESSIONAL NETWORKING MIXER.**



If you would like to receive further information or to be added to our guest list, please contact **Robin Le Grand-Moore** at robin.legrand@adlilawgroup or at **(213) 623-6549**.

NEW ADDITIONS:



Dr. Dariush Adli, founder and President of Adli Law Group P.C., is excited to announce that **Paul Johnson** has joined Adli Law Group P.C. as of counsel.

Mr. Johnson has extensive experience in providing formal legal opinions on whether making certain active pharmaceutical ingredients would infringe valid U.S. Patents. In addition, he has provided formal opinions regarding the invalidity of certain U.S. patents related to pharmaceuticals, including patents listed in the U.S. Food & Drug Administration's Orange Book by drug innovators.

Prior to joining Adli Law Group, Mr. Johnson served as Counsel to **WATSON PHARMACEUTICALS**, one of the world's largest pharmaceutical companies wherein he issued formal written opinions to Watson regarding non-infringement and invalidity of patents relating to potential new products. Prior to Watson Pharmaceuticals, Mr. Johnson was an associate with the highly respected firm of **KENYON & KENYON's** New York and D.C. offices. In this role, he prepared and prosecuted patent applications in the area of pharmaceuticals (particularly chemical and physical processes for preparing active ingredients, novel solid state forms of active ingredients and pharmaceutical formulations), as well as applications for a variety of other chemical and mechanical inventions including enabling technology for high-throughput biological assays. He began his career with the law offices of **GAMBRELL, HEWITT, KIMBALL & KREIGER** in Houston, Texas. Additionally, Mr. Johnson is admitted and has practiced with the **U.S.P.T.O.** His practice included preparation of patents related to metallocene polymerization catalysts, polymer coatings and coating processes, high temperature superconductors and a variety of other chemical and mechanical inventions.

Mr. Johnson obtained his law degree from the **UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN** where he served on the Moot Court and Environmental Law Society. He received his B.S. in Chemistry, *magna cum laude* as well as a Ph.D., Organic Chemistry from **DUKE UNIVERSITY**.



ADLI LAW GROUP P.C.

SPECIAL ANNOUNCEMENTS:



Robin Le Grand-Moore is the **Marketing Director** of Adli Law Group P.C.

Mrs. Le Grand-Moore's entrepreneurial spirit and broad-based marketing experience is what led her to join Adli Law Group, P.C. Having been an intricate player in two of the fastest growing legal search firms in the United States over the past decade, as well as having worked as a top executive with three of the most highly recognized national/international legal search firms in the world, Mrs. Le Grand-Moore was excited about the endless possibilities that she could contribute to this new and exciting firm.

Mrs. Le Grand-Moore's impressive background hosts a very distinctive and diverse roster of many top leading law firms as well as Fortune 500 corporations. She is a recognized leader in excelling at managing, negotiating, drafting, and closing business transactions that include the interplay of law and business.

In 2001, she gained one of her professional all time achievements as she was instrumental in creating one of the most profitable regions in a thriving and very successful national organization within her first year and throughout her nine year appointment as Managing Director of its West Coast operations.

Please join me on



*Dr. Dariush Adli, founder and President of Adli Law Group P.C.
and the entire legal family
would like to extend a warm congratulations to*

Mrs. Robin Le Grand-Moore

*Robin Le Grand and [Ret.] Fire Capt.
Gregory Alexander Moore
recently exchanged marriage vows on
August 27, 2011!*

The couple honeymooned in the beautiful Caribbean islands. They share three beautiful adult children, Brandon Moore [married to Ginger Moore], Crystal Moore and Ashley Le Grand, one beautiful granddaughter, Brooklyn (7) and are anxiously expecting the arrival of grandson, Blake Alexander Moore next month.

Congratulations and best wishes

Robin and Greg!

*Love,
Adli Law Group, P.C.*





ADLI LAW GROUP P.C.

ADLI LAW GROUP P.C.
633 WEST FIFTH STREET, SUITE 6900
LOS ANGELES, CA 90071
TEL: 213-623-6546
FAX: 213-623-6554



LOS ANGELES



LONDON



TAIPEI



TOKYO

LOS ANGELES

LONDON

TAIPEI

TOKYO

Disclaimer: This newsletter is provided to share knowledge and expertise with our friends and colleagues with the goal that all may benefit. The content of this Newsletter is for general informational purposes only and is not intended to serve as legal advice or as a guarantee, warranty or prediction regarding the outcome of any particular legal matter. Nothing contained within this Newsletter should be used as a substitute for legal advice and does not create an attorney-client relationship between the reader and Adli Law Group, P.C.



Adli Law Group prides itself in offering its clients **premium services at competitive rates**. For more information about Adli Law Group, P.C. please visit www.adlilaw.com. For information on obtaining brochures or other firm materials, please contact Robin Le Grand-Moore, Marketing Director, at (213) 623-6549 or you may email her directly at info@adlilaw.com.

If you would like to receive further information regarding the topics in this newsletter or if you would like to let us know of any issues or topics you would like to see addressed in future newsletters, please feel free to contact us. **To be removed from our Newsletter:** Reply to this e-mail with "Remove" in the subject line.

Follow Adli Law Group P.C. on



LinkedIn

FindLaw