



Volume 3, Nos. 3/4
March/April 2002

ONLINE

TODAY

Office of Public Affairs
Washington, DC 20231
703/305-8341

James E. Rogan
Under Secretary of Commerce
for Intellectual Property and
Director of the United States
Patent and Trademark Office

Richard Maulsby
Director
Office of Public Affairs

Brigid Quinn
Deputy Director
Office of Public Affairs

Ruth Ann Nyblod
Managing Editor

The USPTO TODAY online is published monthly by the United States Patent and Trademark Office for its customers. The magazine is intended to inform and bring into focus the views and actions of the USPTO. Any product or service names that appear in the magazine are for informational purposes only and do not in any way constitute an endorsement by the USPTO.

Comments and suggestions are welcome by e-mail to ruth.nyblod@uspto.gov.

INSIDE:

Cover Story

page

- 3 The World Intellectual Property Organization's Conference on the International Patent System

Features

- 6 States Sovereign Immunity Subject of Senate Judiciary Hearing
- 8 Patent System Important to Homeland Security
- 11 Intellectual Property Subcommittee Chair Applauds Patent and Trademark Depository Libraries
- 14 What People Are Saying About TEAS

Departments

- 2 In Touch With the Under Secretary for IP
- 13 Helpful Hints
for trademark applicants

Outreach

- 16 April Schedule of e-Government Seminars
- 17 New Exhibit Coming Soon to USPTO Museum
"Trademarks, the Fingerprints of Commerce"



In Touch
With the Under Secretary for IP

James E. Rogan

*Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and
Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office*

On March 26, 2002, I made my first presentation before the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) in Geneva at a conference on the international patent system. The purpose of the conference was to identify and analyze measures to help reshape the international patent system to ensure that no patent applicant is disadvantaged when filing abroad.

While many might question whether there is any single international patent system, there can be no question that the foundation of an international patent system exists in the Patent Cooperation Treaty, the Patent Law Treaty, and in the Agreement on the Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property. WIPO member organizations should seek opportunities to build maximum efficiencies into the existing foundation.

The idea of an international patent system based on mutual recognition of a single patent granted from a single application is not new. In the United States, for example, the 1966 findings of the President's Commission on the Patent System stated, "the ultimate goal in the protection of inventions should be the establishment of a universal patent, respected throughout the world, issued in the light of, and inventive over, all of the prior art of the world, and obtained quickly and inexpensively on a single application, but only in return for a genuine contribution to the program of the useful arts."

To achieve that goal, the 1966 Commission urged pursuit of a number of activities that WIPO members have been working on in this forum and elsewhere for at least three decades. Those activities include the international reconciliation of patent practices, the formation of regional patent systems, and a universal network of mechanized information storage and retrieval systems.

The application and maintenance costs of a patent are particularly burdensome for individual inventors and small businesses around

the world, often precluding them from obtaining rights beyond the borders of their own countries. The duplication of effort involved in granting patents can be particularly harmful to developing and least developed countries where scientists and engineers can have more effect on economic growth working in their areas of expertise, not examining patent applications.

A little more than 45 percent of the 364,000 patent applications the USPTO expects to receive this year come from abroad. We would enjoy a significant reduction in our workload if, rather than doing our own search and examination of the applications we receive from abroad, we could rely on the searches and examinations already done by other patent offices as the basis for granting a U.S. patent.

The United States is committed to working with WIPO members to reconcile search and examination standards in which patent applicants from around the world could have confidence. I fully intend, during my tenure as Under Secretary, to make this issue a priority and assume a leadership role in its promotion and ultimate resolution.

The World Intellectual Property Organization's Conference on the International Patent System

by Tod Preston, Office of Legislative and International Affairs

On March 25-27, 2002, in Geneva, Switzerland, the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) convened a "Conference on the International Patent System." The purpose of the conference was to discuss the issues and challenges confronting the international patent system, including the increasing demands of global users and the need to make the system more user-friendly and accessible. Under Secretary for Intellectual Property James Rogan and Deputy Under Secretary Jon Dudas led the United States delegation to the conference.

Improving the international patent system – through simplification, streamlining and cost reduction — has long been a priority of the United States. The cost to U.S. companies and inventors in obtaining and preserving their patent rights abroad is often prohibitive. As economies around the world become increasingly interconnected, nationally- and regionally-based patent structures are often cumbersome and inefficient.

The United States, through the USPTO, has been active on a number of fronts to achieve the uniform treatment of patent applications and patent grants worldwide. Our ultimate goal is a system that would allow a patent applicant to draft a single application, preferably in electronic form, that would be accepted throughout the world. The U.S. is working to achieve this convergence of national/international formal and substantive standards through the Patent Cooperation Treaty, the Patent Law Treaty, and WIPO's Standing Committee on the Law of Patents.

The Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT), which entered into force in 1978, is one of the major accomplishments in international patent law. It has provided a harmonized “international stage” of patent prosecution that allows applicants to preserve their patent rights in the member states of WIPO while obtaining an expert opinion on the patentability of the subject matter of the application.

The USPTO has been at the forefront of the effort to encourage greater participation in the PCT by making it more user-friendly. In August 2000, the United States submitted a proposal for comprehensive reform. In response to the U.S. proposal, the PCT Assembly at WIPO set up a “Committee to Reform the PCT,” which in turn created a working group to consider technical issues and draft language for changes to both the regulations under the PCT as well as the treaty articles themselves. The working group is currently considering the major elements of the “first stage” of the U.S. proposal. These elements include the combination of search and examination procedures.

The United States is hopeful that the first stage of reform can be accomplished quickly. At least one of these measures, extending the deadline for entry into national stage from 20 to 30 months, has already been adopted by the PCT Assembly. The second stage of PCT reforms, however, will be a longer-term undertaking.

At the same time movement was getting underway on PCT reform, WIPO's Standing Committee on the Law of Patents (SCP) was working to finalize the Patent Law Treaty (PLT) of 2000. A major achievement in norm setting, the PLT harmonizes the formal re-

quirements of patent applications around the globe. It will help cut procedural red tape by establishing the maximum formal or procedural requirements that contracting parties may impose upon patent applicants and patentees.

The USPTO is currently drafting the ratification and implementation packages for the PLT. Its entry into force will allow U.S. applicants to benefit from reduced costs and easier access when seeking patent protection internationally.

With the adoption of the PLT, the SCP has turned its attention to arguably its most vexing challenge: “deep harmonization” of the substantive requirements of patent laws. Essentially, this entails an analysis of “best practices” in the drafting, filing and examination of patent applications in individual patent offices. Among the best practices being analyzed is the issue of patentable subject matter. As it has in the past, the USPTO advocates broad subject matter eligibility, without a requirement for “technical contribution, advantage or effect.” Such a requirement would go beyond the fundamental requirements for patentability, namely that it be new, useful, and non-obvious.

Previous discussions on harmonization in the mid-1990’s became mired in controversy and yielded little progress. While controversy still exists, most notably the issues involving the differences between a first-to-file system (used in the rest of the world) and the first-to-invent system (used here in the U.S.), some progress has been made at the SCP. This is particularly true with respect to creating a truly international grace period for inventor disclosures. In fact, the last two meetings of the SCP have revealed an international trend toward the inclusion of a grace period in patent systems worldwide, including systems using a first-to-file priority system.

The USPTO has solicited input from interested parties on the discussions that are underway in the SCP. On March 19, 2001, the USPTO published a *Federal Register* notice asking the public to submit comments on a variety of issues being addressed in the discussions. The responses received, which indicate divergent opinions on a number of controversial issues, are posted on the USPTO Web site at <http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/comments/index.html>.

Although a consensus on best practices has not yet been achieved, the USPTO is committed to the harmonization process due to the benefits that will result for U.S. applicants. Even if agreement is not reached on all outstanding issues, important progress can be made. If the talks are ultimately successful, it will lead to uniform

standards of patentability around the world and – hopefully — mutual recognition of patent rights. This would have enormous benefits for American patent owners.

At this month’s WIPO conference, Under Secretary Rogan urged delegates to continue to press forward on international patent reform. At the same time, he made clear that the United States believes that the energies and resources of WIPO should continue to focus on existing efforts within the Standing Committee on the Law of Patents and the PCT Union. These efforts offer U.S. intellectual property owners the most promising means for more affordable, streamlined patent protection abroad.

States Sovereign Immunity Subject of Senate Judiciary Hearing

by Jennifer Ness, Office of Legislative and International Affairs

On February 27, 2002, the Senate Judiciary Committee held a hearing entitled, “Sovereign Immunity and the Protection of Intellectual Property.” James Rogan, under secretary of commerce for intellectual property and director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), testified that “the Supreme Court’s decisions in 1999 on state sovereign immunity pose a critically important issue for intellectual property policy.”

Under the 11th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, state governments have immunity from some types of suits in federal courts. Historically, the U.S. Supreme Court has recognized only two circumstances under which an individual may sue a state: First, Congress, as an exercise of its power to enforce the 14th Amendment, may enact legislation that abrogates state sovereign immunity and allows an individual to sue a state. Second, a state may voluntarily waive its sovereign immunity. The court has held that the power to regulate commerce under Article I of the U.S. Constitution does not give Congress the authority to abrogate state sovereign immunity.

In 1999, the U.S. Supreme Court issued two decisions concerning the right of a state to assert sovereign immunity to shield itself from an intellectual property infringement suit brought under federal intellectual property laws. Congress had enacted statutes that permitted individuals to sue states for infringement of the patent and plant variety acts and for state violations of the Lanham Act.

In *Florida Prepaid Postsecondary Education Expense Board v. College Savings Bank*, 527 U.S. 627 (1999), the Court held that the U.S. Congress failed to justify the statute that abrogated state sovereign immunity in patent and plant variety infringement suits. In a companion case, the Court again held that Congress was not acting under its power to enforce the 14th Amendment when it abrogated state sovereign immunity for Lanham Act violations. *College Savings Bank v. Florida Prepaid Postsecondary Education Expense Board*, 527 U.S. 666 (1999). In a subsequent case, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals applied the Supreme Court's reasoning to hold that a state also enjoys sovereign immunity against suit in federal court for copyright infringement. *Chavez v. Arte Publico Press*, 204 F.3d 601 (5th Cir. 2000).

According to Under Secretary Rogan, "Intellectual property owners view the current situation as inequitable. In their view, state institutions profit from federally protected intellectual property and are permitted to bring suit to protect their own intellectual property, but are shielded from monetary damages as defendants. This inequity skews our system of intellectual property protection, because the penalties in place to discourage infringement do not apply to state entities."

Rogan added that, "The Commerce Department supports the objective of ensuring that owners of intellectual property rights have a proper remedy when a state infringes upon those intellectual property rights. As such, we believe that a legislative answer to the questions raised by the Florida Prepaid cases is appropriate." The committee's chairman, Senator Patrick Leahy (D-VT), introduced Senate Bill 1611, the Intellectual Property Protection Restoration Act of 2001, on November 1, 2001. The bill states that one of its purposes is to "help eliminate the unfair commercial advantage that states and their instrumentalities now hold in the federal intellectual property system because of their ability to obtain protection under the United States patent, copyright, and trademark laws while remaining exempt from liability for infringing the rights of others." While the administration appreciated the introduction of Senator Leahy's bill, Rogan said, it doesn't yet know what the "perfect fix" is to the problem.

Patent System Important to Homeland Security

Commerce Department Hosts Homeland Security Inventors Expo

by Ruth Nyblod, Office of Public Affairs

On March 18, 2002, the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) sponsored a mini exposition at the U.S. Department of Commerce to showcase inventions that help law enforcement, the military and the private sector meet homeland security needs.

Deputy Commerce Secretary Sam Bodman and Under Secretary James Rogan joined the inventors of the patented technology, representatives of private firms and government agencies using the technology and USPTO examiners who granted patents on the technology to open the day-long event.

“The nine inventions on display today made it to the marketplace and to the front lines of the war on terrorism because America’s historically strong patent system has always encouraged our innovators and entrepreneurs,” Bodman said. “But, these inventions are also viable because of the work of the department’s patent examiners. They are the facilitators of American technology. When they examine patents expeditiously and produce a quality product, America benefits at many levels and, in the case of the inventions we see today, we are all more secure.”

Economic and homeland security are major priorities of the Bush administration. President Bush proposed a 21 percent increase in the USPTO budget for 2003--the largest increase in the agency’s history--to ensure it has the resources to hire the skilled scientists and engineers needed to examine the increasingly sophisticated inventions, especially in computing and biotechnology. These two rapidly advancing technologies have a great impact in ensuring homeland security.

“America’s patent system plays a vital role in the development of technological advances on exhibit today,” noted Rogan. “Most of these products are already in use here at home and abroad. They provide us with greater protection at our airports, borders, defense facilities and places of work. They will help the United States win the war on terrorism.”

The U.S. Army had three inventions on display. The first, a chemical, biological, explosive containment system was invented by William J. Drumgoole, James A. Genovese, and Willem Frederik VanBasten. Ngoclan Mai examined the patent application for the apparatus that is a portable, inflatable device used to contain or mitigate the effects of explosively disseminated chemical and/or biological device.



The U.S. Army showcased three patents at the Expo, including an apparatus and method for the automatic recognition of concealed objects. The inventor, Paul Willson, is second from the left in this picture.

The second displayed invention assigned to the U.S. Army was an apparatus and method for automatic recognition of concealed objects using multiple energy computed tomography. Invented by Paul Willson and examined by David Porta, this invention is used to detect concealed objects, such as contraband in baggage. It is an improvement from traditional x-ray detection devices used at airports, because the traditional x-ray systems provide a gray scale image that does not identify the object, and the image is difficult to interpret. This invention uses one-tenth the x-ray flux of other systems and has autonomous decision-making and learning ability. 3-D volume projects are created for viewing identified objects.

The third Army invention was a method of diagnosing exposure to toxic agents by measuring distinct patterns in the levels of expression of specific genes. This technique, invented by Rina Das, Marti Jett, and Chanaka Mendis, is based on relative ratios, that is the amounts or changes in the levels of genes/proteins in the tissue or fluids from the normal levels. Karen Lacourciere examined the patent application.

A chemical trace detection portal -- based on the natural airflow and heat transfer of the human body -- was invented by Gary Settles and the patent assigned to Penn State Research Foundation. The invention that detects concealed explosives, weapons and narcotics works by sampling the air around a human being when the human being passes through a walk-through portal. Robert Racvis examined the patent application.

Roderick Swift and Andrew Tybinkowski invented a mobile x-ray inspection system for large objects. This system scans a stationary

object using a detector mounted on a boom so that a beam is scanned across the object by x-ray radiation to detect the contents of the object, such as drugs, explosives, or other contraband. The application was examined by Craig Church, and the patent was assigned to American Science & Engineering, Inc.



Under Secretary Rogan participates in a demonstration of Iridian Technologies' handheld iris imaging system used to capture high quality images for identifying people.

Iridian Technologies, Inc. demonstrated their hand-held iris imaging apparatus and method. This iris imaging system, invented by James McHugh, James Henry Lee, and Cletus Bonaventure Kuhla, is used to capture high-quality images for identification of a person. The template representative of the iris features is extracted and then compared to a database of previously stored templates to identify a person. Joseph Mancuso examined the patent application.

Michael Lee examined the patent application from Laser Data Command, Inc. for a system for matching passengers and their baggage. This system, invented by John Barclay, digitally records an airline passenger's identifying information including face and baggage photos as well as fingerprint data, all on a barcoded slip of paper. The barcode ID can be laminated and carried by the passenger and optionally attached to baggage. Thus, whenever passengers are screened in the airport, their luggage photo and photo ID are associated with positive fingerprint validation.

LAU Technologies displayed their real-time facial recognition and verification system. The invention scans an image of an individual and compares it with other stored images to determine if a match exists. This system has the ability to dilate the desired features such as face or eyes. The system was invented by Jay F. Bortolussi, Francis J. Cusack, Dennis Ehn, Thomas M. Kuzeja, and Michael Saulnier. Bhavesh Mehta examined the patent application.

A continuous video monitoring system for regulating access to computers was invented by Joseph Atick, Paul Griffin and Norman Redich of Visionics Corporation. The system has a set of stored images of users who have access to the computers. When an unauthorized user is detected, access is denied.

Intellectual Property Subcommittee Chair Applauds Patent and Trademark Depository Libraries

by Ruth Nyblod, Office of Public Affairs

Howard Coble (R-N.C.), Chairman of the House Judiciary Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet, and Intellectual Property, at a reception March 21, 2002, at the U.S. Botanical Gardens, addressed librarians and guests attending the United States Patent and Trademark Office's 25th annual Patent and Trademark Depository Library (PTDL) training seminar.

"The libraries serve as USPTO 'field offices' throughout the United States and Puerto Rico, helping to protect the technology that keeps America competitive in the global marketplace," said Congressman Coble. "In North Carolina, my home state, we have a wonderful patent and trademark library at North Carolina State University in Raleigh, and I want to thank my good friend, Jim Rogan, the director of USPTO, for the specialized services it offers to help support the exciting new technologies coming out of the research triangle and other parts of the state."

The 87 PTDLs are a nationwide network of public, state and academic libraries designated to disseminate patent and trademark information and to support inventors, intellectual property attorneys and agents, business people, researchers, entrepreneurs, students, historians and the general public who aren't able to come to USPTO's offices in Arlington, Virginia. Services to the public are free, and include assistance in accessing and using patent and trademark documents, training on USPTO databases, obtaining access to the USPTO Web site, and hosting public seminars.

The patent and trademark depository library program began in 1871 when federal law first provided for the distribution of printed patents to libraries for use by the public. All but a few of the first 22 libraries were located east of the Mississippi River. Since 1977, the PTDL network has grown to four times its original size, and



Congressman Howard Coble with Martha Sneed (left), manager of the USPTO's public search facilities, and Jean Porter, patent and trademark depository librarian, North Carolina State University, Raleigh.

libraries are located in all 50 states as well as the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico.

For the past 25 years, an annual training seminar has helped librarians keep pace with changes in patent and trademark law and information technology. Twenty-one librarians attended the first three-day meeting in 1977 which focused on patent classification training and the distribution of patents on microfilm -- a controversial replacement for paper copies at that time.

This year's training seminar was held March 17 - 22 at the Crystal City Marriott Hotel. Eighty-nine librarians representing 75 PTDLs and guests from the Patent Office of Finland, Canadian Intellectual Property Office, and State Intellectual Property Office of the People's Republic of China attended the six-day seminar. Training has evolved over the years to include Web-based classification tools, hands-on patent and trademark database searching, new classifications, trademark legislation, geographical indications and tribal insignia registrations, plus demonstrations of electronic trademark filing. Sessions also cover U.S. plant patents, published applications, foreign patent systems, and international patent classification.

While faces and topics of discussion may change as time goes by, one thing remains constant... that is the friendly, dedicated service of the PTDL librarians and PTDL program staff in bringing patent and trademark information to the people.

March/April History Facts

March 3, 1821 - Thomas Jennings received a patent for "dry scouring of cloths." Jennings may have been the first African-American inventor to receive a U.S. patent.

March 14, 1794 - Eli Whitney was granted a patent for the cotton gin in 1794.

April 10, 1790 - President George Washington signed into law the first patent act.

April 13, 1869 - George Westinghouse, Jr., received a patent for an "improvement in steam-power brake devices."

HELPFUL HINTS

for trademark applicants

Classification Changes

In addition to restructuring International Class (IC) 42 and adding three additional classes, the Eighth Edition of the Nice Agreement brought about reclassification of various goods. The following are a few examples of reclassifications:

- Eyewear for use in sports is now in IC 9 with all other optical instruments and apparatus.
- Snorkels have been moved from IC 28 to IC 9, because they are breathing and life saving apparatus.
- Non-motorized scooters are in IC 12, while ride-on toy scooters stay in IC 28, motorized scooters also remain in IC 12.
- Exterior blinds, embedded in window seals, are in either IC 6 or IC 19, depending on the composition of the blinds.
- Interior blinds, regardless of material composition, are in IC 20.
- Table Linens now are in IC 24, regardless of the composition of the item. The only exception is paper table linen, which remains in IC 16.
- Playing cards have been moved from IC 16 to IC 28.
- Snow globes are in IC 28.

Applicant's may obtain further information on the identification and classification of goods and services by visiting the USPTO Web site at [http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/tac/doc/gsmannual/](http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/tac/doc/gsmmanual/).

What People Are Saying About TEAS

by Joyce Ward, Office of Public Affairs

People are talking about the Trademark Electronic Application System (TEAS). Here is a sampling of what they are saying:

“I have not filed a paper trademark application since July 31, 2000. Over 200 applications later, I remain a true believer in TEAS. Ease of use, savings in application preparation time and expenses, accuracy of filing information, immediate notification of filing and receipt of serial number, are among the many reasons I will never go back! Both our clients and overseas associates have been quite happy with the results. As an author of the treatise Guide to Registering Trademarks, we have even shifted the direction of the publication since the initial release to focus on electronic filing in a belief that it is truly the future.”

-Jason Drangel, Partner, Bazerman & Drangel, New York, New York

“In the not too distant future, corporate America will not tolerate doing business ‘the old way.’ GE, for one, is insisting right now that its outside counsel file electronically. If our outside firms refuse to do this, they will lose GE’s business.”

- Kathryn Barrett Park, Trademark Counsel, General Electric

“To meet consumer needs, Procter & Gamble is always looking to be the best, most cost-effective producer in the marketplace. Efficient registration of our trademarks, which are essential to any successful marketing effort, is one of the innumerable elements that helps us meet our corporate mission. We have adopted TEAS because it has enabled us to increase noticeably the efficiency of our trademark operations, reducing costs by well over 50% on the activities covered by the program. We can now literally get things done in only a few minutes, which historically added up to hours. In turn, this has allowed us to move money that is

saved from filing to other activities. P&G completely supports the USPTO in its move to e-Government. When looking at law firms, I look for those with similar interests in efficiency and effectiveness.”

-David Moyer, Associate General Counsel
for Trademarks, Proctor & Gamble

About 25 percent of the USPTO’s trademark applicants currently use TEAS. The goal of the trademark operation is to have 50 percent electronic filing by the end of fiscal year 2002. In an effort to promote electronic filing, the USPTO is offering a series of e-government seminars to educate the public on the nuts and bolts of TEAS. Anne Chasser, commissioner for trademarks, and Craig Morris, TEAS project manager, conduct the seminars. The seminars entitled, “The Trademark Office Goes E-Government,” features panel discussions with local practitioners, like those whose comments appear above, who actually use TEAS.

For many attendees, the e-government seminars are their first exposure to the trademark e-filing system. One goal of the seminars is to debunk the myths surrounding electronic filing. According to TEAS project manager, Craig Morris, “By seeing a live demonstration of electronic filing, many customers are finding that TEAS is not as intimidating or difficult to use as previously thought. We have one clear goal— to do whatever we can to help our customers develop electronic filing expertise.”

During the seminars, Morris walks participants through the process of electronic filing. Attendees are able to ask questions about the process both of USPTO officials and of the private practitioners who currently use TEAS. The customer feedback from the seminars has been very positive and attendance at the seminars generally averages between 100 to 200 participants per session. Attendees include corporate counsel, attorneys at large, mid-sized and boutique firms, paralegal personnel, as well as solo practitioners and pro se applicants.

During fiscal year 2001, e-government seminars were held in Chicago, Boston, Houston and Atlanta. The early seminars were arranged through private law firms. The new wave of seminars, launched in February 2002, are offered in conjunction with the various Patent and Trademark Office Depository Libraries. At the time of this article, 2002 seminars had been held in Los Angeles, New York and Fort Lauderdale. Upcoming seminars are scheduled for April 3, 2002, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, and April 23, 2002, in Cleveland, Ohio. Future seminars are scheduled in Washington,

DC, Dallas and San Francisco. Plans are underway to schedule seminars in Seattle, Minneapolis and Denver.

The e-government seminars are free to the general public and registration is not required. For general information about the seminars, contact Craig Morris by phone at (703) 308-8910, ext. 136, or via e-mail at craig.morris@uspto.gov. For a complete listing of the dates and locations of future seminars, visit the USPTO Web site at <http://www.uspto.gov/web/trademarks/egov.htm>.

April Schedule of e-Government Seminars



Date: **April 3, 2002**

Location: **Montgomery Auditorium
The Free Library of Philadelphia
1901 Vine Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-1189**

Time: **9:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m.**

Contact: **Owen Sindler**, Head
Government Publications Dept.
(215) 686-5331 (voice) / (215) 563-3628 (fax)

Date: **April 23, 2002**

Location: **Louis Stokes Wing Auditorium
Cleveland Public Library
325 Superior Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114-1271**

Time: **9:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m.**

Contact: **Robin Gray**, Head
Government Documents Dept.
(216) 623-2870 (voice) / (216) 623-7030 (fax)
Robin.Gray@cpl.org

Coming Soon:

TRADEMARKS, THE FINGERPRINTS OF COMMERCE

A new exhibit at the U.S. Patent & Trademark Office Museum

May 17, 2002 to October 5, 2002

Arlington, Virginia

TRADEMARKS, THE FINGERPRINTS OF COMMERCE is an exhibit designed by the National Inventors Hall of Fame in conjunction with the International Trademark Association. The exhibit will focus on trademarks, including their colorful history, their functions, and their definitions. Also examined will be the tremendous manner in which trademarks impact public perceptions and decisions. The exhibit will include sensory and nontraditional trademarks, such as marks that incorporate sound, motion, smell and color. Included in the exhibit will be information on the impact of trademarks on the global economy and information on the United States Patent & Trademark Office's (USPTO) trademark electronic application filing system, TEAS. Throughout the exhibit, trademarks supplied by their respective companies, will illustrate the explanations.

The USPTO's museum attracts a diverse audience of tens of thousands of visitors a year: school age children, vacationing families, government employees, business people, and visiting dignitaries touring the USPTO. A main objective of the exhibit will be to raise public awareness of trademarks in a way that is easy to understand and accessible for general audiences.

#####