

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND  
TRADEMARK OFFICE**

**In the Matter of:** )  
 )  
 )  
**Glenn C. Brown,** )  
 )  
 )  
**Respondent** )  
\_\_\_\_\_ )

**Proceeding No. D2009-32**

**FINAL ORDER PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 11.24**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.24(d), the exclusion of Glenn C. Brown (Respondent) from the practice of patent, trademark, and other non-patent law before the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO or Office) is hereby ordered for violation of the ethical standard set out in 37 C.F.R. § 10.23(b)(6) via 37 C.F.R. § 10.23(c)(5).

A “Notice and Order Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.24” mailed October 08, 2009, (Notice and Order) informed Respondent that the Director of the Office of Enrollment and Discipline (OED Director) had filed a “Complaint for Reciprocal Discipline Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.24” (Complaint) requesting that the USPTO Director impose reciprocal discipline upon Respondent, namely: exclusion from the practice of patent, trademark, and other non-patent law before the Office. The request for exclusion of the Respondent in the Complaint was based upon the December 24, 2008, Order of the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon in In the Matter of the Form B Resignation of Glenn C. Brown (Case No. S056743) accepting Respondent’s affidavit of resignation and ordering that Respondent’s name be stricken from the roll of attorneys and that he no longer be entitled to the rights or privileges of an attorney in that jurisdiction. The Notice and Order directed that if

Respondent seeks to contest imposition of his exclusion from practice pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.24(d), Respondent shall file, within 40 days, a response containing all information Respondent believes is sufficient to establish a genuine issue of material fact that the imposition of discipline identical to that imposed by the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon would be unwarranted based upon any of the grounds permissible under 37 C.F.R. § 11.24(d)(1). The Notice and Order was mailed by first-class certified mail, return receipt requested, to an address in Bend, Oregon, provided by Respondent to the Office of Enrollment and Discipline (OED) pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.11 and an address in Sisters, Oregon, where the OED Director reasonably believed Respondent received mail. The mailing to Bend, Oregon, was returned with the explanation that it was “not deliverable as addressed” and unable to be forwarded. The mailing to Sisters, Oregon, was returned with the explanation that it was “unclaimed.” A “Supplemental Order Pursuant 37 C.F.R. § 11.24” mailed February 4, 2010, (Supplemental Order) reset the time period for response set out in the Notice and Order. The Supplemental Order was mailed by first-class certified mail, return receipt requested, to the address in Bend, Oregon, and to the address in Sisters, Oregon. The mailing to Bend Oregon was returned with the explanation that it was “not deliverable as addressed” and unable to be forwarded. The mailing to Sisters, Oregon, was returned with the explanation that it was “unclaimed.” A service by publication notice pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.24(b) and 11.35(b) published in the *Official Gazette* on April 20, 2010, and April 27, 2010, notifying Respondent that he may obtain copies of, inter alia, the Notice and Order and Supplemental Order by sending a written request to the USPTO General Counsel.

Respondent has not filed a response to the Notice and Order or Supplemental Order.

37 C.F.R. § 11.24(d)(1). Accordingly, it is hereby determined that: 1) there is no genuine issue of material fact under 37 C.F.R. § 11.24(d) and 2) exclusion of Respondent from practice before the USPTO is appropriate.

ACCORDINGLY, it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

(a) Respondent is excluded from the practice of patent, trademark, and other non-patent law before the Office, beginning on the date of this Final Order indicated below;

(b) Respondent shall comply fully with 37 C.F.R. § 11.58 while excluded;

(c) Respondent is granted limited recognition to practice before the Office beginning on the date this Final Order is signed and expiring thirty (30) days after the date this Final Order is signed for the sole purpose of facilitating Respondent's compliance with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 11.58(b);

(d) The USPTO shall promptly dissociate Respondent's name from all USPTO customer numbers and public key infrastructure ("PKI") certificates;

(e) Respondent shall not use any USPTO customer number or PKI certificate unless and until he is reinstated to practice before the USPTO;

(f) Respondent shall not obtain a USPTO customer number or a PKI certificate unless and until he is reinstated to practice before the USPTO;

(g) The OED Director shall publish this Final Order;

(h) The OED Director shall publish the following notice in the *Official Gazette*:

## NOTICE OF EXCLUSION

Glenn C. Brown of Bend, Oregon, a registered patent attorney (Registration Number 34,555). Mr. Brown has been excluded from the practice of patent, trademark, and non-patent law before the United States Patent and Trademark Office for violating 37 C.F.R. § 10.23(b)(6) via 37 C.F.R. § 10.23(c)(5) by being disbarred by the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon. Mr. Brown consented to his name being stricken from the roll of attorneys in the State of Oregon while an attorney disciplinary proceeding was pending against him in that jurisdiction. Mr. Brown submitted his resignation acknowledging his inability to contest or defend against the State Bar of Oregon's charges of professional misconduct, which were comprised of numerous counts of neglecting legal matters entrusted to a lawyer; failing to keep clients reasonably informed and failing to promptly comply with reasonable requests for information; failing to explain matters to the extent reasonably necessary to permit clients to make informed decisions regarding the representation; failing to deposit and maintain client funds in trust; failing to account for client funds; failing to promptly deliver funds and other property clients are entitled to receive; failing to withdraw when continued representation will result in violation of the disciplinary rules; failing to comply with obligations on termination of representation; dishonesty-conversion of client funds; misrepresentation; and failing to respond to lawful requests of a disciplinary authority. This action is taken pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §§ 2(b)(2)(D) and 32, and 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.24 and 11.59. Disciplinary decisions involving practitioners are posted for public reading at the Office of Enrollment and Discipline's Reading Room located at:  
<http://des.uspto.gov/Foia/OEDReadingRoom.jsp>.

(i) The OED Director, in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 11.59, shall give notice of the public discipline and the reasons for the discipline to disciplinary enforcement agencies in the State where the practitioner is admitted to practice, to courts where the practitioner is known to be admitted, and the public;

(j) Respondent shall comply fully with 37 C.F.R. § 11.60 upon any request for reinstatement.

[signature page follows]

JUL 08 2010

Date



WILLIAM R. COVEY

Deputy General Counsel for General Law  
United States Patent and Trademark Office

on behalf of

David Kappos  
Under Secretary of Commerce For Intellectual  
Property and Director of the United States Patent  
and Trademark Office

## NOTICE OF EXCLUSION

Glenn C. Brown of Bend, Oregon, a registered patent attorney (Registration Number 34,555). Mr. Brown has been excluded from the practice of patent, trademark, and non-patent law before the United States Patent and Trademark Office for violating 37 C.F.R. § 10.23(b)(6) via 37 C.F.R. § 10.23(c)(5) by being disbarred by the Supreme Court of the State of Oregon. Mr. Brown consented to his name being stricken from the roll of attorneys in the State of Oregon while an attorney disciplinary proceeding was pending against him in that jurisdiction. Mr. Brown submitted his resignation acknowledging his inability to contest or defend against the State Bar of Oregon's charges of professional misconduct, which were comprised of numerous counts of neglecting legal matters entrusted to a lawyer; failing to keep clients reasonably informed and failing to promptly comply with reasonable requests for information; failing to explain matters to the extent reasonably necessary to permit clients to make informed decisions regarding the representation; failing to deposit and maintain client funds in trust; failing to account for client funds; failing to promptly deliver funds and other property clients are entitled to receive; failing to withdraw when continued representation will result in violation of the disciplinary rules; failing to comply with obligations on termination of representation; dishonesty-conversion of client funds; misrepresentation; and failing to respond to lawful requests of a disciplinary authority. This action is taken pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. §§ 2(b)(2)(D) and 32, and 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.24 and 11.59. Disciplinary decisions involving practitioners are posted for public reading at the Office of Enrollment and Discipline's Reading Room located at:  
<http://des.uspto.gov/Foia/OEDReadingRoom.jsp>.

JUL 08 2010

Date



WILLIAM R. COVEY

Deputy General Counsel for General Law  
United States Patent and Trademark Office

on behalf of

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