

**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE ADMINISTRATIVE LAW JUDGE**

In the Matter of:

**Rodney K. Worrel,**

Respondent.

Proceeding No. D2014-06

July 7, 2014

**INITIAL DECISION ON DEFAULT JUDGMENT**

The above-entitled matter is before this Court on a *Motion for Entry of Default Judgment and Imposition of Disciplinary Sanction* (“Default Motion”), filed on April 1, 2014, by the Director of the Office of Enrollment and Discipline (“OED Director”) for the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO” or “Office”). On November 26, 2013, the OED Director filed a *Complaint and Notice of Proceedings Under 35 U.S.C. § 32* (“Complaint”) in this matter against Rodney K. Worrel (“Respondent”). The *Complaint* seeks the exclusion or suspension of Respondent for committing violations of the USPTO Code of Professional Responsibility and the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct. This Court is authorized to hear this proceeding and to issue this *Initial Decision* pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 11.19, 11.39.<sup>1</sup>

Respondent failed to file a timely answer to the OED Director’s *Complaint*. USPTO regulations state that such a failure to respond constitutes an admission of allegations and “may result in entry of default judgment.” 37 C.F.R. § 11.36(e). As Respondent has not filed any response, the *Default Motion* is **GRANTED**.

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

On November 26, 2013, the OED Director filed a *Complaint* against Respondent. Copies of the *Complaint* were sent via U.S. first-class certified mail, return receipt requested, to Respondent’s provided address. The U.S. Postal Service returned the *Complaint* to the OED Director with the notation “Return to Sender, Unable to Forward.” Counsel for the OED Director also mailed, via certified mail return receipt requested, a copy of the *Complaint* to Respondent at an alternate address where the OED Director believed that Mr. Worrel receives mail. The *Complaint* mailed to that address was not returned, and the return receipt was similarly not returned.

Considering service of the *Complaint* was unable to be accomplished pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.35(a)(2)(i), the OED Director served Respondent by notice via publication pursuant

---

<sup>1</sup> Pursuant to an Interagency Agreement in effect beginning March 27, 2013, Administrative Law Judges of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development are authorized to hear cases for the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

to 37 C.F.R. § 11.35(b). As required, the OED Director caused an appropriate notice to be published in the Official Gazette for two consecutive weeks. Specifically, this publication occurred on January 28, 2014 and February 4, 2014. Notice via publication computes the time for filing an answer to be thirty days from the second publication of the notice. Therefore, Respondent's initial deadline to file an answer changed from December 26, 2013, to March 4, 2014. To date, Respondent has not filed an answer to the *Complaint*.

On March 21, 2014, the OED Director sent Respondent a letter attempting to confer with Respondent regarding the OED Director's intent to file the *Default Motion*. Respondent did not respond.

## **DEFAULT**

Section 11.36 of Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations states that "[f]ailure to timely file an answer will constitute an admission of the allegations in the complaint and may result in default judgment. 37 C.F.R. § 11.36(e). Respondent in this matter has failed to timely submit an answer after being properly served with the *Complaint*. Accordingly, Respondent is deemed to have admitted each of the factual allegations recounted below.

## **FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. Respondent has been registered as a patent attorney since December 12, 1974. Respondent's registration number is 27,475.<sup>2</sup>
2. Respondent is also a member of the California State Bar (Bar Number 51857).<sup>3</sup>
3. Respondent's acts and omissions leading to the violations of USPTO disciplinary rules set forth in this Complaint were willful.

### **Misconduct in Connection with the Representation of Morgan Murray**

4. In June 2009, Morgan Murray and his company, Califresh of California, LLC, hired Respondent to prepare, file, and prosecute a patent application on his invention.
5. Mr. Murray paid Respondent \$8,000.00 in advance for legal services, government filing fees, and expenses.
6. In or about April 2010, Mr. Murray reviewed and approved a copy of the patent application that Respondent had prepared for Mr. Murray's invention.
7. On May 5, 2010, Respondent sent an invoice to Mr. Murray for \$4,795.00 for additional patent legal services allegedly performed and additional filing fees

---

<sup>2</sup> Respondent is currently administratively suspended for failure to respond to a survey sent on July 31, 2012, inquiring whether Respondent wished to remain on the roster of registered patent practitioners. See 37 C.F.R. § 10.11 (2012).

<sup>3</sup> Respondent is inactive and not eligible to practice law in California by virtue of a June 21, 2013 order issued by the State Bar Court of California.

(\$545.00) allegedly remitted to the USPTO. By check dated May 21, 2010, Mr. Murray paid Respondent the \$4,795.00

8. Respondent never filed a patent application on Mr. Murray's invention and never remitted filing fees (\$545.00) to the USPTO on Mr. Murray's behalf.
9. Beginning in May 2010 through June 2012, Respondent, by way of a quarterly update, represented to Mr. Murray that the patent application on his invention had been filed with the USPTO.
10. Between July 2012 and September 2012, Respondent failed to respond to the repeated attempts made by Mr. Murray to contact him.
11. In September 2012, Mr. Murray reached Respondent at his home by telephone.
12. Mr. Murray requested a copy of the patent application that Respondent said he had filed.
13. Respondent stated that he would send a copy of the patent application to Mr. Murray, but he did not do so.
14. To date, Respondent has not provided Mr. Murray with a copy of his patent application documentation.
15. Respondent did not file or prosecute a patent application on behalf of Mr. Murray.
16. Mr. Murray is entitled to the return of at least the USPTO filing fees (\$545.00) paid in advance to Respondent and not remitted by Respondent to the USPTO.

Misconduct in Connection with the Representation of David K. Bradshaw and Terry L. Bradshaw

17. On or about June 18, 2012, David K. Bradshaw and Terry L. Bradshaw ("the Bradshaws") hired Respondent to prepare, file, and prosecute a patent application for their invention.
18. The Bradshaws paid Respondent \$6,000.00 in advance for legal services, government filing fees, and expenses.
19. The Bradshaws telephoned Respondent on or about September 12, 2012, September 25, 2012, and September 27, 2012, leaving messages asking that Respondent return their phone calls.
20. Respondent did not return the Bradshaws' telephone calls.

21. On October 1, 2012, the Bradshaws wrote to Respondent and requested a refund of their \$6,000.00.
22. Respondent did not respond to the Bradshaws.
23. Respondent did not prepare, file, or prosecute a patent application on behalf of the Bradshaws.
24. Respondent did not earn any patent legal fees, pay government filing fees, or incur any expenses in connection with his representation of the Bradshaws.
25. The Bradshaws are entitled to the return of the \$6,000.00 they paid to Respondent.
26. Respondent has not refunded any part of the unearned fees paid by the Bradshaws.

Misconduct in Connection with the Representation of William R. Damm and John R. Damm in U.S. Patent Application No. 12/387,212

27. On April 29, 2009, Respondent filed U.S. Patent Application No. 12/387,212 (“the ‘212 application”), titled “Receiving Apparatus,” on behalf of William R. Damm and John R. Damm (“the Damms”).
28. On October 11, 2011, the Office issued a Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment that required a response within one month.
29. The Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment was mailed to Respondent’s address of record in the ‘212 application.
30. The October 11, 2011 Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment was correspondence that could have a significant effect on the ‘212 application, was received by Respondent on behalf of the client, and was correspondence of which a reasonable practitioner would believe under the circumstances the client should be notified.
31. Respondent did not inform the Damms about the October 11, 2011 Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment.
32. Respondent failed to respond to the October 11, 2011 Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment.
33. Because no response was filed to the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment, the Office issued a Notice of Abandonment on April 26, 2012.
34. The Notice of Abandonment was mailed to Respondent at his address of record in the ‘212 application.

35. The April 26, 2012 Notice of Abandonment was correspondence that could have a significant effect on the '212 application, was received by Respondent on behalf of the client, and was correspondence of which a reasonable practitioner would believe under the circumstances the client should be notified.
36. Respondent did not inform the Damms of the April 26, 2012 Notice of Abandonment or tell them that the application became classified as abandoned.
37. As of the filing date of this Complaint, the '212 application remains abandoned.
38. Respondent has not refunded any unearned fees paid by the Damms.

Misconduct in Connection with the Representation of Juan H. Vargas in U.S. Patent Application No. 12/931,780

39. On February 9, 2011, Respondent filed U.S. Patent Application No. 12/931,780 ("the '780 application"), titled "Method and Apparatus for Fluid Control," on behalf of Juan H. Vargas.
40. On October 3, 2011, the Office issued a Non-final Office Action that required a response within three months.
41. The Non-final Office Action was mailed to Respondent's address of record in the '780 application.
42. The October 3, 2011 Non-final Office Action was correspondence that could have a significant effect on the '780 application, was received by Respondent on behalf of the client, and was correspondence of which a reasonable practitioner would believe under the circumstances the client should be notified.
43. Respondent did not inform Mr. Vargas of the October 3, 2011 Non-final Office Action.
44. Respondent failed to respond to the October 3, 2011 Non-final Office Action.
45. Because no response was filed to the Non-final Office Action, the Office issued a Notice of Abandonment on April 25, 2012.
46. The Notice of Abandonment was mailed to Respondent at his address of record in the '780 application.
47. The April 25, 2012 Notice of Abandonment was correspondence that could have a significant effect on the '780 application, was received by Respondent on behalf of the client, and was correspondence of which a reasonable practitioner would believe under the circumstances the client should be notified.

48. Respondent did not inform Mr. Vargas of the April 25, 2012 Notice of Abandonment or tell him that the application became classified abandoned.
49. After learning of Respondent's neglect of the '780 application, Mr. Vargas hired another attorney to represent his interests before the Office in the '780 application.
50. Mr. Vargas incurred attorney's fees in having his new attorney successfully revive the '780 application.
51. Respondent has not refunded any unearned fees paid by Mr. Vargas.

Misconduct in Connection with the Representation of Donald M. Serimian in U.S. Patent Application No. 12/456,159

52. On June 15, 2009, Respondent filed U.S. Patent Application No. 12/456,159 ("the '159 application"), titled "Nectarine Tree Denominated 'Summer Lion L'," on behalf of Donald M. Serimian.
53. On May 26, 2010, the Office issued a Non-final Office Action that required a response within three months.
54. The Non-final Office Action was mailed to Respondent's address of record in the '159 application.
55. On November 29, 2010, Respondent filed a response to the May 26, 2010 Non-final Office Action and included a \$555.00 check for a three-month extension of time.
56. On December 23, 2010, the Office issued a letter informing Respondent that the \$555.00 check was returned for insufficient funds.
57. Because the response to the Office Action was not timely filed and the extension fee was not paid, due to the return of the check for insufficient funds, the application was considered abandoned per the Decision on Petition noted below.
58. On January 31, 2011, Respondent filed a Petition to Revive the '159 application stating that the delay was unintentional due to the return of the check for insufficient funds.
59. By Decision on Petition mailed on April 11, 2011, the Office of Petitions dismissed the petition, due to Respondent's failure to pay the proper \$810.00 petition fee.
60. The April 11, 2011 Decision on Petition allowed for the filing of a request for reconsideration within two months of the mail date of the decision.
61. The April 11, 2011 Decision on Petition was mailed to Respondent's address of record in the '159 application.

62. The April 11, 2011 Decision on Petition was correspondence that could have a significant effect on the '159 application, was received by Respondent on behalf of the client, and was correspondence of which a reasonable practitioner would believe under the circumstances the client should be notified.
63. Respondent did not inform Mr. Serimian of the April 11, 2011 Decision on Petition.
64. Respondent failed to file a request for reconsideration.
65. On June 7, 2011, the Office issued a Notice of Abandonment.
66. The June 7, 2011 Notice of Abandonment was mailed to Respondent at his address of record in the '159 application.
67. The June 7, 2011 Notice of Abandonment was correspondence that could have a significant effect on the '159 application, was received by Respondent on behalf of the client, and was correspondence of which a reasonable practitioner would believe under the circumstances the client should be notified.
68. Respondent did not inform Mr. Serimian of the June 7, 2011 Notice of Abandonment or tell him that the application became classified as abandoned.
69. Although the Notice of Abandonment was mailed to Respondent on June 7, 2011, Respondent sent a cover letter and an invoice to Mr. Serimian on February 8, 2012, requesting payment for legal fees and expenses without informing Mr. Serimian of the abandonment of his application.
70. Respondent re-sent the February 8, 2012 cover letter and invoice on April 3, 2012, again without informing Mr. Serimian of the abandonment of his application.
71. Mr. Serimian paid the invoice on or about July 17, 2012.
72. As of the filing date of this Complaint, the '159 application remains abandoned.
73. Respondent has not refunded any unearned fees paid by Mr. Serimian.

Misconduct in Connection with the Representation of [REDACTED] in U.S. Patent Application No. [REDACTED]

74. On February 22, 2010, [REDACTED] paid Respondent \$6,000.00 to prepare, file, and prosecute a patent application on his behalf.
75. On [REDACTED], Respondent filed his U.S. Patent Application No. [REDACTED] ("the [REDACTED] application"), titled "[REDACTED]" on behalf of Mr. [REDACTED]

76. On [REDACTED], the Office mailed a Notice to File Corrected Application Papers in the [REDACTED] application that required a response within two months.
77. The [REDACTED] Notice to File Corrected Application Papers was mailed to Respondent's address of record in the [REDACTED] application.
78. The Notice to File Corrected Application Papers was correspondence that could have a significant effect on the [REDACTED] application, was received by Respondent on behalf of the client, and was correspondence of which a reasonable practitioner would believe under the circumstances the client should be notified.
79. Respondent did not inform [REDACTED] of the [REDACTED] Notice to File Corrected Application Papers.
80. Respondent did not respond to the [REDACTED] Notice to File Corrected Application Papers.
81. Because no response was filed to the Notice to File Corrected Application Papers, the Office issued a Notice of Abandonment on [REDACTED]
82. The [REDACTED] Notice of Abandonment was correspondence that could have a significant effect on the [REDACTED] application, was received by Respondent on behalf of the client, and was correspondence of which a reasonable practitioner would believe under the circumstances the client should be notified.
83. Respondent did not inform [REDACTED] of the [REDACTED] Notice of Abandonment or tell him that the application became classified as abandoned.
84. Respondent has not refunded any part of the unearned fees paid by [REDACTED]
85. As of the filing date of this Complaint, the [REDACTED] application remains abandoned.

#### Failure to Cooperate with OED

86. On February 6, 2013, OED sent an initial request for information ("RFI") via certified mail to Respondent's address on record with OED and requested a response by March 8, 2013.
87. On March 18, 2013, OED re-sent the initial RFI via certified mail to Respondent's same address on file with OED and requested a response by March 28, 2013.
88. The February 6, 2013 RFI was returned to OED by the U.S. Postal Service on March 21, 2013, and was marked "unable to forward."
89. The March 18, 2013 RFI was returned to OED by the U.S. Postal Service on April 15, 2013, and was marked "unable to forward."



90. Thereafter, OED located another address for Respondent, which is believed to be Respondent's current address, although Respondent did not report this address to OED.<sup>4</sup>
91. On July 23, 2013, OED sent all previously sent copies of the RFI via certified mail and regular mail to Respondent's new address and requested a response by August 12, 2013.
92. The RFIs sent on July 23, 2013, were not returned to OED.
93. Someone at Respondent's new address signed for the RFIs delivered to that address on July 26, 2013.
94. Respondent did not respond to the RFIs on or before August 12, 2013, or otherwise contact OED.
95. As of the date of the *Complaint* was filed, Respondent still had not replied to the RFIs or otherwise contacted OED.
96. By not responding to OED with the information requested in the RFIs, Respondent has failed to cooperate with the OED investigation.

### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

1. Regulation 37 C.F.R. § 10.112(c)(4) states that a practitioner shall "promptly pay or deliver to the client as requested by a client the funds, securities, or other properties in possession of the practitioner which the client is entitled to receive."
2. Respondent violated 37 C.F.R. §10.112(c)(4) by failing to return to Mr. Murray \$545.00 in government filing fees that he failed to remit to the USPTO on Mr. Murray's behalf.
3. Respondent violated 37 C.F.R. §10.112(c)(4) by failing to return Mr. Murray's patent application materials after being asked to do so.
4. Respondent violated 37 C.F.R. §10.112(c)(4) by failing to return to his client the \$6,000.00 in unearned legal fees and expenses paid in advance.
5. Respondent violated 37 C.F.R. §10.112(c)(4) by failing to return to additional clients' unearned legal fees, government filing fees, and expenses not incurred that were paid in advance to Respondent.

---

<sup>4</sup> Respondent has an ongoing obligation to update his address with OED within thirty days of any change. See 37 C.F.R. § 11.11(a).

6. Regulation 37 C.F.R. § 10.77(c) states that a practitioner shall not “[n]eglect a legal matter entrusted to the practitioner.”
7. Respondent violated 37 C.F.R. § 10.77(c) by not preparing, filing, or prosecuting patent applications on behalf of a client; by not preparing, filing, or prosecuting a patent application on behalf of a client; and by allowing four separate clients’ patent applications to go abandoned without their knowledge or consent.
8. Regulation 37 C.F.R. § 10.23(c)(3) states that a practitioner shall not “misappropriate or fail to properly or timely remit funds received by a practitioner or the practitioner’s firm from a client to pay a fee which the client is required by law to pay to the Office.”
9. Respondent violated 37 C.F.R. § 10.23(c)(3) by accepting \$545.00 in government filing fees from Mr. Murray, but never remitting those filing fees to the USPTO on Mr. Murray’s behalf.
10. Respondent violated 37 C.F.R. § 10.23(c)(3) by accepting \$6,000.00 from a client that included payment of filing fees and then failing to pay those filing fees to the Office.
11. Regulation 37 C.F.R. § 10.23(c)(8) states that a practitioner shall not “fail to inform a client or former client or fail to timely notify the office of an inability to notify a client or former client of correspondence received from the Office or the client’s or former client’s opponent in an *inter partes* proceeding before the Office when the correspondence (i) could have a significant effect on a matter pending before the Office, (ii) is received by the practitioner on behalf of a client or former client, and (iii) is correspondence of which a reasonable practitioner would believe under the circumstances the client or former client should be notified.”
12. Respondent violated 37 C.F.R. § 10.23(c)(8) by failing to inform his clients of the Notices of Non-Compliant Amendments, Non-Final Office Actions, Decision(s) on Petition, Notice(s) to File Corrected Application Papers, and/or Notices of Abandonment, along with other important Office correspondence that Respondent received in connection with his clients’ patent applications.
13. Regulation 37 C.F.R. § 10.84(a)(1) states that a practitioner shall not “fail to seek the lawful objectives of a client through reasonably available means permitted by law and the Disciplinary Rules, except as provided by paragraph (b) of this section.”
14. Respondent violated 37 C.F.R. § 10.84(a)(1) by neglecting his clients’ patent applications and allowing those applications to become abandoned without the clients’ knowledge or consent; by failing to prepare, file, and prosecute clients’ patent applications.

15. Regulation 37 C.F.R. § 10.23(b)(4) states that a practitioner shall not “engage in conduct involving dishonesty, fraud, deceit, and misrepresentation.”
16. Respondent violated 37 C.F.R. § 10.23(b)(4) by providing false or misleading information to his clients about the status of their patent applications that had been entrusted to Respondent; and by telling his client, Mr. Murray, that he would return Mr. Murray’s patent application materials and failing to return those materials.
17. Regulation 37 C.F.R. § 10.89(c)(6) proscribes intentionally or habitually violating the USPTO Code of Professional Responsibility.
18. Respondent violated 37 C.F.R. § 10.89(c)(6) by repeatedly allowing his clients’ patent applications to become abandoned without their knowledge or consent.
19. Regulation 37 C.F.R. § 11.804(a) states that a practitioner shall not “violate or attempt to violate the USPTO Rules of Professional Conduct, knowingly assist or induce another to do so, or do so through the acts of another.”
20. Regulation 37 C.F.R. § 11.801(b) states that a practitioner shall not “fail to disclose a fact necessary to correct a misapprehension known by the person to have arisen in the matter, fail to cooperate with the Office of Enrollment and Discipline in an investigation of any matter before it, or knowingly fail to respond to a lawful demand or request for information from an admissions or disciplinary authority . . . .”
21. After May 2, 2013, Respondent violated 37 C.F.R. § 11.804(a) via §11.801(b) by failing to respond to OED’s requests for information and failing to cooperate in the investigation of the grievance(s) filed against him.

## SANCTIONS

The OED Director requests that the Court sanction Respondent by excluding him from practice before the USPTO in patent, trademark, or other non-patent cases or matters. Before sanctioning a practitioner, the Court must consider the following four factors:

- (1) whether the practitioner has violated a duty owed to a Client, to the public, to the legal system, or to the profession;
- (2) whether the practitioner acted intentionally, knowingly, or negligently;
- (3) the amount of the actual or potential injury caused by the practitioner’s misconduct; and
- (4) the existence of any aggravating or mitigating factors.

37 C.F.R. § 11.54(b).

1. Respondent Violated his Duties to his Clients and the Profession.

Respondent accepted payment from his clients and was therefore obligated to perform the agreed-upon legal services on their behalf. Although Respondent prepared and filed some patent applications, they were ultimately abandoned due to his neglect. Moreover, Respondent ignored some of his clients' inquiries, misled his clients when responding to other inquiries, and did not return their payments. Additionally, by failing to honor his contractual agreements with his clients, Respondent has tarnished the image of patent practitioners and the legal profession as a whole. This factor supports a maximum sanction.

2. Respondent Acted Knowingly and Intentionally.

Respondent has offered no explanation for his actions, and has not participated in the instant proceeding in any way. He has therefore waived the opportunity to contest the USPTO's assertions as to his state of mind. This Court therefore concludes that Respondent's actions and inactions were deliberate. Respondent repeatedly prepared and filed patent applications, then failed to respond to notices of missing parts or office actions, ultimately resulting in the applications becoming abandoned. Respondent was deliberate in responding to client inquiries about the status of patents, reassuring clients that the patents would be approved, and requesting additional funds from the clients. Respondent also either knowingly or negligently withheld his current address from OED. This factor supports a maximum sanction.

3. Respondent's Misconduct Caused Actual Injury.

Respondent's clients have suffered monetary losses by paying Respondent for fees and services that were never incurred or earned. Additionally, their patent applications were abandoned, and thus their intellectual property rights in their inventions were never secured by Respondent. Accordingly, this factor also supports a maximum sanction.

4. Are there any aggravating or mitigating factors?

The Court often looks to the American Bar Association Standards for Imposing Lawyer Sanctions ("ABA Standards") when assessing attorney disciplinary sanctions. See In re Chae, D2013-01 (USPTO Oct. 21, 2013). A review of the record reveals that aggravating factors exist in this case.

First, an attorney's substantial experience in the area of practice constitutes an aggravating factor. Respondent has been practicing patent law for thirty-nine years, and thus is fully aware of his legal and ethical obligations to his clients and the possible adverse consequences for their intellectual property rights in their inventions. Nevertheless, he allowed his clients' patent applications to become abandoned, purposely misled them with regards to the status of their applications, and failed to return payments made to him for fees that were never incurred or earned.

A pattern of misconduct and multiple offenses is also considered an aggravating factor. For each of his clients, Respondent took accepted their money, and allowed their patents applications to become abandoned or, in some cases, simply failed to file the patent application at all. Respondent hid his misconduct from many of his clients by misleading them about the

status of their patent applications. On several occasions, Respondent charged his clients for fees that were either never incurred or unearned.

With respect to mitigating factors, the burden is on Respondent to raise any affirmative defenses or mitigating circumstances and specify their nexus to the misconduct, and any reason they may provide a defense or mitigation. 13 C.F.R. § 11.36(c) and 11.49. By failing to appear and defend this matter, Respondent failed to meet that burden. Additionally, the OED Director has stated that he is unaware of the existence of any mitigating factors. Accordingly, the existence of aggravating factors in the absence of mitigating factors supports a maximum sanction.

### ORDER

On the basis of Respondent's deemed admissions, and after an analysis of all four enumerated factors, this Court concludes that Respondent's misconduct warrants the penalty of exclusion. Accordingly, the *Default Motion* is **GRANTED**.

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Respondent Rodney K. Worrel, PTO Registration No. 27,475, be **EXCLUDED** from practice before the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office.

So ORDERED.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Alexander Fernández", is written over a horizontal line.

Alexander Fernández  
Administrative Law Judge

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of the foregoing INITIAL DECISION ON DEFAULT JUDGMENT, issued by Alexander Fernández, Administrative Law Judge, in D2014-06, were sent to the following parties on this 7<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2014, in the manner indicated:

  
Cinthia Matos, Docket Clerk

### VIA FIRST CLASS MAIL:

Rodney K. Worrel  
Worrel & Worrel  
2919 W. Bullard Avenue #121  
Fresno, CA 93711

Rodney K. Worrel  
2324 E. Fir Avenue  
Fresno, CA 93720

### VIA FIRST CLASS MAIL AND E-MAIL:

Elizabeth Ullmer Mendel  
Ronald K. Jaicks  
Melinda DeAtley  
Associate Solicitors  
Mail Stop 8  
Office of the Solicitor  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[Pto-hudcases@uspto.gov](mailto:Pto-hudcases@uspto.gov)