## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



Commissioner for Patents United States Patent and Trademark Office P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

Klarquist Sparkman, LLP 121 SW Salmon St Suite 1600 Portland OR 97204

MAILED

APR 12 2011

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Patent No. 7,557,210

Issue Date: July 7, 2009

Application No. 10/355,543

Filed: January 31, 2003

Inventor: Rajinder Singh et al

: DECISION ON PETITION

This is a decision on the second renewed petition for expungement of information, filed March 18, 2011, which is being treated as petitions under 37 CFR 1.182 to invalidate an assignment previously recorded against the above-identified application.

The petition is <u>Denied</u>. This decision may be viewed as a final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 704 for purposes of seeking judicial review. See MPEP 1002.02.

Petitioner indicates an assignment recorded on August 15, 2005 was erroneously filed for the above identified application and requests this assignment record be expunged from the file. This second renewed petition basically repeats the same arguments presented in the previous renewed petition filed November 24, 2020. Reference is made to the petition decision mailed January 24, 2011 which dismissed that petition.

The instant petition still fails to show how expunging the assignment document recorded on August 15, 2005 would not affect the integrity of the assignment record. Petitioner is attempting to have a recorded assignment document **removed** from the assignment record. Clearly, removal of a document affects the integrity of the record. Petitioner argues that third parties would not be able to determine correct property rights in the issued patent. However, third parties would be able to review the assignment documents in their entirety and make their own determination of correct property rights. Petitioner's position is that the document recorded, a license agreement, correctly states the agreement but the Notice of Recordation is incorrect. Contrary to petitioner's statement, it would appear a corrective assignment document would provide the proper remedy by indicating exactly what the error was in the previously recorded Notice or Recordation.

For the reasons presented, the petition is denied.

Telephone inquiries concerning this communication should be directed to Carl Friedman at (571)272-6842.

Anthony Knight

Director,

Office of Petitions