

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

<b>In the Matter of:</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Paul Granville Watson, IV,</b>	)	
	)	<b>Proceeding No. D2009-51</b>
<b>Respondent</b>	)	
	)	
	)	
<hr style="width:100%; border: 0.5px solid black;"/>	)	

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

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.24(d), the public reprimand of Paul Granville Watson, IV, (Respondent) is hereby ordered for violation of the ethical standard set out in 37 C.F.R. § 10.23(b)(6).

A “Notice and Order Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.24” mailed March 8, 2010, (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 Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO or Office) impose reciprocal discipline upon Respondent, namely: a public reprimand. The request for the public reprimand of the Respondent in the Complaint was based upon a March 23, 2009, Public Reprimand Without Terms issued by the Second District Subcommittee of the Virginia State Bar in VSB Docket No. 08-022-071777, a March 23, 2009, Public Reprimand Without Terms issued by the Second District Subcommittee of the Virginia State Bar in VSB Docket No. 08-022-073510, and a March 23, 2009, Public Reprimand Without Terms issued by the Second District Subcommittee of the Virginia State Bar in VSB Docket No. 09-022-075543. The Notice and Order directed

that if Respondent seeks to contest imposition of his public reprimand 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 Second District Subcommittee of the Virginia State Bar would be unwarranted based upon any of the grounds permissible under 37 C.F.R. § 11.24(d)(1).

Respondent has not filed a response to the Notice and 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) a public reprimand of Respondent is appropriate.

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

- (a) Respondent is publicly reprimanded;
- (b) the OED Director shall publish this Final Order;
- (c) the OED Director shall publish the following notice in the *Official Gazette*:

NOTICE OF REPRIMAND

Paul Granville Watson, IV, of Eastville, Virginia, an attorney licensed by the Commonwealth of Virginia. Mr. Watson has been publicly reprimanded by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (Office) for violating 37 C.F.R. § 10.23(b)(6) by having been publicly reprimanded by the Virginia State Bar for violating that jurisdiction's Rules of Professional Conduct 1.3, 1.4, and 8.1 in connection with his handling of one client divorce matter and two criminal defense matters for clients. Mr. Watson is authorized to practice trademark law before the Office, but he is not a registered patent practitioner and is not authorized to practice patent law before the Office.

With respect to the first criminal matter, Mr. Watson neglected his case by failing to promptly move for a bond hearing and by failing to communicate with his client; with respect to the second criminal matter, Mr. Watson failed to keep his client reasonably informed as to the status of the matter or comply with


reasonable requests for information; with respect to the divorce proceeding, Mr. Watson failed to act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing his client. In addition, Mr. Watson failed to reply to attempts by the Virginia State Bar to informally resolve the disputes between Mr. Watson and his respective clients, failed to reply to letters issued in association therewith, failed to reply to demands for written answers to formal complaints, and failed to reply to subsequent subpoenas duces tecum issued for the respective clients' files.

This action is taken pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 2(b)(2)(D) and 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.20, 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>.

(d) 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.

JUN - 3 2010

Date



BERNARD J. KNIGHT, JR.

General Counsel

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


**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that the foregoing Final Order Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.24 was mailed first class certified mail, return receipt requested, this day to the Respondent at the following address from which separate notice was last received by the OED Director:

Paul Granville Watson, IV  
Post Office Box 600  
Eastville, VA 23347

JUN - 3 2010

Date

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

NOTICE OF REPRIMAND


Paul Granville Watson, IV, of Eastville, Virginia, an attorney licensed by the Commonwealth of Virginia. Mr. Watson has been publicly reprimanded by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (Office) for violating 37 C.F.R. § 10.23(b)(6) by having been publicly reprimanded by the Virginia State Bar for violating that jurisdiction's Rules of Professional Conduct 1.3, 1.4, and 8.1 in connection with his handling of one client divorce matter and two criminal defense matters for clients. Mr. Watson is authorized to practice trademark law before the Office, but he is not a registered patent practitioner and is not authorized to practice patent law before the Office.

With respect to the first criminal matter, Mr. Watson neglected his case by failing to promptly move for a bond hearing and by failing to communicate with his client; with respect to the second criminal matter, Mr. Watson failed to keep his client reasonably informed as to the status of the matter or comply with reasonable requests for information; with respect to the divorce proceeding, Mr. Watson failed to act with reasonable diligence and promptness in representing his client. In addition, Mr. Watson failed to reply to attempts by the Virginia State Bar to informally resolve the disputes between Mr. Watson and his respective clients, failed to reply to letters issued in association therewith, failed to reply to demands for written answers to formal complaints, and failed to reply to subsequent subpoenas duces tecum issued for the respective clients' files.

This action is taken pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 2(b)(2)(D) and 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.20, 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>.

JUN - 3 2010

Date

  
BERNARD J. KNIGHT, JR.

General Counsel  
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