

Gaspare J. Bono

Partner



Partner

Washington, DC
D +1 202 496 7211

gap.bono@dentons.com

Overview

Gaspare J. "Gap" Bono is a seasoned trial lawyer, with particular experience in competition and antitrust and litigating patent infringement cases. His practice includes jury and bench trials from New York to California and appellate advocacy before several federal courts of appeals, including the Federal Circuit.

Gap graduated from Georgetown University Law School and clerked for The Honorable John T. Elfvin, United States District Court, Western District of New York. He writes frequently on legal issues. Gap has continually been rated AV Preeminent by his peers for both his legal ability and ethical standards.

Experience

Antitrust and Competition Practice

Gap represents clients from around the world with regard to civil class actions and criminal cartel investigations, as well as mergers and joint ventures. He counsels clients on a broad range of antitrust and competitive issues, with the objective of providing practical solutions on transactions, agreements and competitive concerns. He frequently helps clients anticipate and avoid antitrust problems with competitor collaborations; product and service pricing; and relationships with customers, competitors and employees.

Gap provides advice to corporations in connection with mergers, acquisitions, joint ventures and other strategic transactions. For instance, he advised a UK-based company on its US\$265 million sale of a US-based subsidiary to a competitor in the United States. He worked closely with the company on all facets of this transaction, starting with the disclosure of information to potential bidders and continuing through antitrust approval.

Gap represents companies in criminal antitrust proceedings and in complex civil antitrust litigation. For instance, on behalf of one client, he filed an action in federal court in California alleging monopolization and conspiracy to restrain trade with respect to electronic control systems. The case settled favorably prior to trial.

In another antitrust case, he defended an association, its officers and directors, and their affiliate corporations in a complex antitrust conspiracy case filed in Florida. As lead trial counsel, he completely defeated the US\$47 million damages claim while prevailing on an internet defamation counterclaim.

His antitrust practice includes the following:

- **Antitrust Audits:** Examining client operations to identify specific business activities for antitrust exposure and provide recommendations to reduce those risks. For instance, Gap assessed the potential antitrust risks arising from collaboration with competitor on behalf of international manufacturer.
- **Brand Protection:** Protecting brand equity by implementing efficient enforcement strategies for trademarks, trade dress and broader issues of unfair competition. For instance, Gap is currently representing a global luxury brand in its fight against the “gray market” by using trademark law to stop unauthorized sales across the United States.
- **Business Counseling:** Counseling with clients on day-to-day operations to understand the levels of antitrust risks ranging from dealings with competitors to the antitrust risks associated with a large market share. For instance, Gap has handled responses and investigations of global brands into alleged antitrust violations.
- **Compliance Programs:** Partnering with general counsels to develop antitrust guidelines and training tailored to address the specific risks faced by their companies. For instance, Gap provided comprehensive antitrust training sessions to senior executives, in-house counsel and sales personnel for multinational companies.
- **Dealings in the Supply Chain:** Counseling companies at all levels of the distribution chain on their relationships with suppliers and customers, including dual distribution, exclusive distribution, authorized resellers, territorial restrictions, buyer cooperatives and requirements contracts. For instance, Gap analyzed proposed subcontractor restrictions by a high-tech manufacturing corporation.
- **Dealings with Competitors:** Assisting with the formation and activities of competitor collaborations (such as joint ventures) to achieve business goals of expanding into new markets and lowering production costs. For instance, Gap represented a global construction company in its negotiations to create a strategic alliance with an international competitor.
- **Government Contracting:** Providing antitrust advice to government contractors which face heightened antitrust scrutiny and risks, and helping them navigate the competitive issues arising from teaming agreements, joint bidding, and public-private partnerships (P3s). For instance, Gap counseled a global engineering company on a contractor teaming arrangement in response to a solicitation by the US Department of Defense for a multiple-award contract.
- **Intellectual Property/Licensing:** Assisting clients anticipate and avoid antitrust problems with IP acquisitions and licensing, in particular providing advice to participants to patent pools and standards setting organizations. For instance, Gap counseled an international technology brand on the antitrust implications of its worldwide license agreements and participation in patent pools.
- **Investigations/International Cartels:** Representing companies and executives in multi-jurisdictional cartel investigations. Currently, Gap is representing a multinational company in parallel cartel investigations by the DOJ, the European Commission and authorities in other countries.
- **Litigation/Class Actions:** Providing cost-effective representation for plaintiffs and defendants on wide range of private antitrust and unfair competition claims in court and tribunals across the US. Past litigation successes included a complete verdict for client defeating a US\$47-million antitrust damages claim at trial and a favorable settlement of monopolization allegations of the spa controls market prior to trial. Also, Gap defended a multinational company against industry-wide allegations of price fixing in two nationwide class action cases.
- **Marketplace Protection:** Assessing the competitive impact of potential mergers and acquisitions for third parties in the relevant industry. For instance, Gap analyzed potential antitrust issues arising from a series of mergers among important suppliers on behalf of a major retailer.
- **Mergers & Acquisitions:** Guiding clients through the process for securing antitrust approval of mergers, acquisitions and other significant transactions. For instance, Gap acted as antitrust counsel for a London-based company in its sale of an important subsidiary to a competitor in the US, advising client on all aspects of the transaction through approval by the federal antitrust agencies.

- **Pricing Practices:** Advising clients on pricing strategies for their goods and services, including resale price maintenance, loyalty discounts and bundled discounts. Also counseling on price discrimination under the Robinson-Patman Act, including discounts, rebates and promotional allowances. For instance, Gap designed a minimum advertised price (MAP) policy that permits our client to exercise appropriate supervision over the resale prices of its goods.
- **Trade Associations:** Association activities require careful management and oversight because they involve groups of competitors acting collectively. As outside antitrust counsel, assist industry trade groups navigate issues such as membership criteria, information exchanges and certification programs. For instance, Gap provided antitrust training to the leadership of a trade association and assisted with revisions to its antitrust guidelines.
- **Unfair Competition:** Counsel and defend clients with regard to related claims asserted along with core antitrust claims. Gap is highly experienced with patent infringement, copyright infringement, trademark and trade dress infringement, and claims of unfair competition under federal and state law. For instance, Gap defended several companies and their executives against claims of copyright infringement by the world's largest record labels.

Representative Antitrust Cases

- ***Olean Wholesale Grocery Cooperative, et al. v. Agri Stats et al.***
Represent Farbest Foods, a major turkey producer, in a class action brought by direct purchasers of turkey products alleging unlawful exchanges of information among competitors to decrease production and raise prices in violation of Sherman Antitrust Act.
- ***Sandee's Catering v. Agri Stats et al.***
Represent Farbest Foods in a price fixing class action brought by commercial indirect purchasers of turkey products alleging that competitors have exchanged industry information to curtail production and inflate prices in violation of multiple state antitrust acts.
- ***In re Capacitors Antitrust Litigation***
Represent defendants Shinyei Technology Co. Ltd., and Shinyei Capacitor Co., Ltd., in antitrust class action brought by indirect purchasers of finished products alleging international price fixing conspiracy to fix the prices of film capacitors used as components in electronic products. After six years of litigation and extensive discovery, successfully defeated plaintiffs' class certification motion and negotiated favorable settlement dismissing case against client.
- ***Dependable Component Supply Corp., et al. v. Panasonic Corporation, et. al.***
Represent defendants Shinyei Kaisha, Shinyei Capacitor Co. Ltd., and Shinyei Corporation of America, Inc., in antitrust class action brought by direct purchasers of film capacitors alleging an international conspiracy to fix the prices of film capacitors. After five years of litigation with extensive fact and expert discovery, successfully negotiated favorable settlement for client on eve of trial.
- ***In re Capacitors Grand Jury Investigation***
Represent Shinyei Kaisha, Shinyei Technology Co., Ltd., and Shinyei Corporation of America in criminal investigation by the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice relating to an alleged international cartel to fix prices in the capacitors industry. After cooperating with DOJ in its investigation and responding to its subpoena with extensive document production, successfully negotiated and obtained termination of DOJ's investigation with no further action taken by DOJ against client.
- ***In re Capacitors Inquiry by European Commission***
Represent Shinyei Kaisha and Shinyei Technology Co., Ltd., in investigation by the European Commission, DG Competition, regarding alleged anti-competitive behavior relating to capacitors supplied to the European Union/European Economic Area.
- ***Mountain Pass, et al. v. Siriusware, et al.***
Represented Siriusware and its parent accesso Technology Group in a major antitrust action brought by a competitor that sought more than \$54 million in damages. After obtaining dismissal of the complaint with prejudice for our clients in the district court, we successfully secured affirmance of the dismissal by the

Second Circuit Court of Appeal. The plaintiffs had alleged that Siriusware, a premier provider of ticketing technology solutions for leisure, entertainment and cultural venues, monopolized the ski resort software market, conspired to freeze plaintiffs out of the ski lift gate market, and engaged in unlawful tying arrangements. The appellate court adopted our arguments in its unanimous opinion, holding that the plaintiffs failed to prove Siriusware violated the Sherman Antitrust Act and finding that Siriusware's "conduct was reasonable as a matter of law."

- ***U-Can-It v. Pro Net Global***

Represented Pro Net Global Association, its officers and directors, and their affiliate corporations (a total of 18 clients and all named defendants) in a complex antitrust conspiracy case in which we defeated a US\$47-million damages claim. The plaintiff's 100-page complaint listed 16 causes of action including claims for price fixing, customer allocation, and unfair trade practices. The Panel issued a decision after a two-week evidentiary hearing, ruling in favor of our clients on all 16 claims.

- ***Jefferson Memorial Hospital v. Inova Health Systems***

Represented community hospital in suit brought against the largest health care and hospital system in Northern Virginia alleging monopolization and attempted monopoly in the acute care hospital market. During the trial of a related case, this antitrust suit was settled as part of a US\$35 million global settlement.

- ***Sea-Roy Corporation v. Rammax Maschinenbau GmbH, et al.***

Represented foreign manufacturer in suit by former US distributor alleging conspiracy to restrain trade, concerted refusal to deal, vertical restraints, price discrimination and monopoly. Counterclaims were filed alleging trademark infringement, trade dress infringement, and unfair competition. Summary judgment granted dismissing all antitrust claims. Trial on counterclaims resulted in jury verdict awarding US\$4 million for trademark infringement.

- ***Morris Electronics, Inc. v. Mattel, Inc.***

Represented large toy manufacturer in suit alleging tying arrangements, price discrimination, full line forcing, and exclusive dealing. Discovery took over two years to complete which disproved much of plaintiff's case. As a result, a very favorable settlement was obtained for client.

- ***Fred Weber, Inc. v. Shell Oil Company***

Represented major oil company in suit brought by largest asphalt paving company in state alleging price fixing and monopolization in the sale of asphalt oil and claiming US\$10 million in damages. After a six week jury trial, the jury returned a verdict in favor of client.

- ***Metropolitan Life Insurance Company v. Liberty Life Insurance Company***

Represented life insurance company in suit brought by largest competitor in industry alleging conspiracy to restrain trade, monopolization, and attempted monopoly. On the eve of trial, extremely favorable settlement obtained involving the payment of zero dollars and injunctive relief having no effect on client's future business plans.

- ***Inter-City Tire & Auto Center, Inc. v. Uniroyal, Inc.***

Represented tire manufacturer in suit alleging vertical restraints, market allocation, exclusive dealing and territorial restraints. After extensive discovery, obtained summary judgment for client, which was affirmed by Third Circuit.

- ***Gates Rubber Company v. Bando American, Inc.***

Represented domestic manufacturer of industrial rubber belts and hoses against antitrust counterclaim brought by large foreign competitor sued for theft of trade secrets. Counterclaims were filed alleging exclusive dealing, full line forcing and tying arrangements. The case was favorably settled.

- ***Newport Controls, LLC v. Balboa Instruments, Inc. and Balboa Water Group, Inc.***

Represented plaintiff Newport Controls against Balboa Instruments and Balboa Water Group in antitrust action alleging monopolization, attempted monopoly and conspiracy to restrain trade relating to electronic control systems in the spa controls market. The case was settled favorably for Newport Controls prior to trial.

Patent and Intellectual Property Practice

Gap litigates patent infringement cases in federal district courts throughout the country, and before the International

Gap was lead trial counsel in a patent infringement action in which he obtained a US\$52.5 million jury verdict for his client in addition to a jury finding of willful infringement. According to Bloomberg, this award was one of the ten largest patent verdicts of the year.

As lead counsel for a French government entity, Gap litigated a patent infringement case against six of the largest LCD manufacturers in the world. Prior to trial, every defendant settled on favorable terms. As part of this case, Gap obtained a significant decision by the Federal Circuit addressing the extent to which foreign companies may be subject to jurisdiction in the United States.

In a patent infringement case on the defense side, as lead counsel Gap won dismissal of the entire action on summary judgment based on license and laches defenses in a competitor suit seeking more than US\$43 million in damages. Then, he obtained reversal in the Federal Circuit of the district court's initial denial of attorney's fees and expenses. The district court subsequently issued a substantial fee award in excess of \$3 million to his client.

In addition to patents, Gap is highly experienced in litigating other intellectual property rights including trademarks, trade dress, copyrights and trade secrets. For instance, he has represented a global brand in "gray goods" trademark matters to prevent the illegal importation and sale, both in retail stores and over the Internet, of goods produced abroad and not intended for sale in the United States.

Representative Patent Infringement Cases

- ***LG.Philips LCD Co., Ltd. (LPL) v. Chunghwa Picture Tubes, Ltd., et al.***

Represented plaintiff LPL as lead trial counsel regarding technology related to manufacturing TFT-LCD products to improve yield and reduce electrostatic discharge. The jury awarded US\$52.5 million, the entire amount that was requested at trial. The jury also concluded that infringement was willful.

- ***Commissariat a l'Energie Atomique (CEA) v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., et al.***

Represented plaintiff CEA as lead trial counsel regarding its patented design of LCD technology against the six largest vertical alignment LCD manufacturers in the world, including Sharp Corporation, Tottori Sanyo Electric Co., Ltd., Fujitsu Display Technology Corporation, AU Optronics Corporation, Chi Mei Optoelectronics Corporation and Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., and negotiated license agreements for substantial royalties with all defendants prior to trial. As part of this case, successfully appealed to the Federal Circuit a decision of the district court on the issue of personal jurisdiction against CMO.

- ***LG.Philips LCD Co. Ltd (LPL) v. Tatung Company, et al.***

Acted as co-counsel for plaintiff LPL regarding technology related to improving performance and reliability of TFT-LCD products. The jury found willful infringement and awarded LPL damages in the amount of \$53.5 million.

- ***Eidos Display, LLC v. Innolux Corporation , et al.***

Represented plaintiff Eidos Display against Innolux as lead trial counsel regarding technology to reduce mask steps in TFT-LCD manufacturing. The jury found infringement, validity and willfulness, and awarded \$4.1 million for direct infringement. On post-verdict motions, the Court enhanced the damages, doubling them to \$8.2 million, and awarded pre-judgment interest and costs of \$1.8 million, and entered final judgment for nearly \$10 million.

- ***Buckhorn, Inc., et al. v. Orbis Corporation***

Represented defendant Orbis in a multiple patent infringement action brought by competitors Buckhorn and Schoeller Arca Systems relating to technology for collapsible bulk container products. After the completion of discovery and just prior to trial, summary judgment was granted in favor of Orbis on a license defense and the case dismissed with prejudice for lack of standing. Court then awarded attorney's fees and costs in excess of \$3 million to Orbis.

- ***Habasit Belting, Inc. v. Rexnord Industries, Inc., et al.***

Represented plaintiff Habasit in its enforcement of its patents pertaining to radial conveyor belting technology against its largest competitor. Based on fact and expert discovery, the defendant agreed to cease offering its accused product in the United States. After a very successful claim construction decision, the Court granted

Habasit's motion for summary judgment of non-infringement on defendant's patents.

- ***LG.Philips LCD Co., Ltd. (LPL) v. Viewsonic Corp., et al.***

Represented plaintiff LPL regarding mechanical technology related to assembly of flat panel display devices and products. This case settled favorably for LPL.

- ***Nidec Corporation v. LG Innotek Co., Ltd., et al.***

Represented the LG Innotek defendants in a multi-patent infringement suit brought by competitor Nidec regarding spindle motor technology. After obtaining the grant of reexamination on the asserted patents, the case was settled favorably for LG Innotek prior to trial.

- ***LG.Philips LCD Co., Ltd. (LPL) v. Chi Mei Optoelectronics Corp.***

Represented LPL as lead trial counsel regarding a number of patents directed to various aspects of TFT-LCD products, and also represented LPL as lead counsel in the related suits filed by AUO Optronics, *AU Optronics Corp. v. LPL et al.*, C.A. No. 07-137 (W.D. Wis.) (transferred and consolidated with (D. Del.) and by Chi Mei, *Chi Mei Optoelectronics Corp. v. LPL et al.*, C.A. No. 07-1 76 (E.D. Tex.) (transferred and consolidated (D. Del.)). Following a non-jury trial, the case was settled favorably for LPL with regard to both AUO and CMO.

- ***Eidos Communications, LLC, et al., v. Skype Technologies, SA, et al.***

Represent plaintiff Eidos Communications against Skype Technologies as lead trial counsel in multiple patent infringement action relating to technology for the transmission and control of digitized voice data and message data in communication applications such as messaging and telephony. The case was settled favorably for Eidos prior to trial.

- ***Newport Controls, LLC v. Balboa Instruments, Inc., et al.***

Represent plaintiff Newport Controls against Balboa Instruments in multiple patent infringement and trade secret action relating to technology for electronic control systems used in spas and hot tubs. The case was settled favorably for Newport Controls prior to trial.

- ***IP Forensics v. Ropak Corporation***

Represent defendant Ropak Corporation in case alleging false patent marking on bulk container products in materials handling industry. The case was dismissed with prejudice.

- ***Apeldyn Corporation v. AU Optronics Corporation, et al.***

Represent plaintiff Apeldyn in patent infringement action relating to overdrive technology improving the response time of liquid crystal material brought against the largest vertical alignment LCD television manufacturers in the world. A favorable settlement was obtained prior to trial.

- ***Certain Projectors With Controlled-Angle Optical Retarders, Components Thereof, and Products Containing Same, Before the US International Trade Commission (ITC).***

Represented Complainants Compound Photonics Ltd. and Compound Photonics US Corporation against Respondents Sony Corporation, Sony Electronics, Inc., and Sony Corporation of America in an ITC investigation concerning the unlawful importation and sale of projectors with controlled-angled retarders that infringe several claims of a US patent for fabricating a liquid crystal display device with a controlled-angle retarder. The investigation was concluded and the related district court patent infringement action was settled favorably prior to trial.

- ***Compound Photonics, Ltd. v. Sony Corporation and Sony Electronics, Inc.***

Represent plaintiff Compound Photonics Ltd. against defendants Sony Corporation and Sony Electronics, Inc. in a patent infringement action relating to technology involving methods for fabricating a liquid crystal display (LCD) device with a controlled-angle retarder to achieve the desired optical properties of the LCD device. The case was settled favorably prior to trial.

Representative Reported Opinions

- *In re Capacitors Antitrust Litigation*, No. 17-md-02801-JD, 2020 WL 6462393 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 3, 2020)
- *Eidos Display, LLC, et al. v. AU Optronics Corp, et al.*, 779 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2015)

- *Buckhorn, Inc., et al v. Orbis Corporation, et al.*, 547 Fed Appx. 967, 2013 WL 5273119 (Fed. Cir. 2013)
- *Commissariat a l'Energie Atomique v. Chi Mei Optoelectronics Corp.*, 395 F.3d 1315 (Fed. Cir. 2005)
- *Frehling Enterprises, Inc. v. International Select Group, Inc.*, 192 F.3d 1330 (11th Cir. 1999)

Insights

- **"New competition cooperation framework likely to increase and intensify coordination between authorities in Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the United Kingdom and the United States,"** Dentons client alert, September 10, 2020
- "First E-Commerce Antitrust Prosecution," Dentons Client Alert, April 13, 2015
- "Exceptional Case Standard For Awarding Attorney's Fees The Same In Both Lanham and Patent Acts," Dentons Client Alert, September 11, 2014
- "AUO's Conviction for Criminal Price Fixing of US Imports Sets the Stage for Future Prosecutions of Foreign Manufacturers," Dentons Client Alert, July 22, 2014
- "Supreme Court Tells Federal Circuit: No Induced Infringement Without Direct Infringement," Dentons Client Alert, June 4, 2014
- "Help Me Help You: Best Practices for Facilitating Merger Reviews Before the US and Canadian Antitrust Agencies," Dentons Client Alert, April 11, 2014
- "Pleading Direct Patent Infringement: The Evolution From Simplicity To Plausibility," Dentons Client Alert, March 24, 2014
- "Trade Associations: "Antitrust Powder Kegs"," Dentons Client Alert, February 20, 2014
- "Gray Market Cases: Brand Victories in 2013," Dentons Client Alert, February 6, 2014
- "Antitrust Premerger Notification: Revised HSR Filing Thresholds and "Rules of Thumb"," Dentons Client Alert, January 31, 2014
- "College Athletics and Antitrust: The New Year Begins," Dentons Client Alert, January 17, 2014
- "Predictive Coding: A Cost-Effective Approach to Antitrust Compliance," Dentons Client Alert, December 19, 2013
- "Athletics and Antitrust: Recreation or Big Business?," Dentons Client Alert, December 2, 2013
- "New Antitrust Rules for Drug Patent Licenses," Dentons Client Alert, November 13, 2013
- "Patent Infringement May Be Anticompetitive Under Sherman Act," Dentons Client Alert, September 12, 2013
- "Section 12 of the Clayton Act: Integrated or Independent?," Dentons Client Alert, August 9, 2013
- "Pay-for-Delay" Patent Settlements: No Longer A Free Antitrust Ride," Dentons Client Alert, June 20, 2013
- "New FTC Guidance on Competitor Information Exchanges," Dentons Client Alert, June 6, 2013
- "Form Over Substance: Notice Pleading For Patent Infringement," Dentons Client Alert, May 1, 2013
- "To Cross Appeal or not to Cross Appeal? - That is the Question," Dentons Client Alert, April 23, 2013
- "New Policy for Antitrust Plea Deals," Dentons Client Alert, April 17, 2013
- "US Joins Global Antitrust Probe of Car Shipping Companies," Dentons Client Alert, September 11, 2012
- "Highlights of the Antitrust Division's Annual Newsletter," Dentons Client Alert, May 17, 2012

- "Takeaways from the AUO Price-Fixing Trial," Dentons Client Alert, April 10, 2012
- "Recent Brand Victories in Gray Market Cases," Dentons Client Alert, February 29, 2012
- **"Unlike Fine Wine: The JV Guidelines a Decade Later,"** *Competition Law360*, January 5, 2012
- "Caveat Competitor: Joint Ventures and the Federal Antitrust Guidelines," Dentons Client Alert, December 5, 2011
- "New Antitrust Policy for Health Care Organizations," Dentons Client Alert, October 27, 2011
- "A \$35 Copyright Can Prevent Millions in Unauthorized Imports," *Executive Counsel*, August/September 2011
- "The False Patent Marking Statute: Constitutional or Not?," Dentons Client Alert, June 24, 2011
- "Supreme Court Rules that "Willful Blindness" Is Sufficient To Knowingly Induce Patent Infringement," Dentons Client Alert June 10, 2011
- "Antitrust Compliance Managers Need Direct Board Access to Satisfy New US Sentencing Guidelines," Dentons Client Alert, June 8, 2011
- "Will the Supreme Court Relax the Burden of Proof for Patent Invalidity?," Dentons Client Alert, May 5, 2011
- "Reversal of Fortune: Patent Verdict Overturned Against Apple," Dentons Client Alert, April 25, 2011
- "Particularity Required For Pleading False Marking," Dentons Client Alert, March 24, 2011
- "Divided Supreme Court Affirms Copyright Law as a Weapon Against Gray Market Activity," Dentons Client Alert, March 14, 2011
- "The FTC-Intel Settlement," Dentons Client Alert, September 9, 2010
- **"Avoiding Antitrust Violations Under Obama,"** *Competition Law360*, August 2, 2010

Activities and Affiliations

Presentations

- "Antitrust: Compliance and Exemptions In The Agricultural Industry," California Dairies, Inc. and DairyAmerica, Inc. Presentation, Fresno, California, February 25, 2021
- "What You Need To Know About Antitrust," Habasit America National Sales Meeting Presentation, Atlanta, GA, February 25, 2015
- "Overview of the US Antitrust Laws," Serco, Inc. Legal Department Presentation, Reston, VA, July 24, 2014
- "The Attorney-Client Privilege and Document Discovery in US Patent Litigation," LG Chem Seminar, Daejeon, South Korea, March 4, 2010
- "US Patent Litigation: Overview of Motions Practice," Hynix Semiconductor Seminar, Seoul, South Korea, March 3, 2010
- "Understanding US Antitrust Law to Avoid Violations," LGE and LGD Seminar, Seoul, South Korea, August 21, 2009
- "Proving Your Patent Infringement Case," IP Seminar, Key Biscayne, Florida, April 25, 2008

Memberships

- American Bar Association

- The District of Columbia Bar
- New York State Bar

Areas of focus

Practices

- **Competition and Antitrust Litigation**
- **Patent Litigation**
- **Trademark and Copyright Litigation**
- **Trade Secrets Litigation**
- **Litigation and Dispute Resolution**
- **Intellectual Property and Technology**
- **Appellate Advocacy**
- **Merger Control**

Education

- Georgetown University Law Center, 1976, JD
- University of Pennsylvania, The Wharton School, 1972, BS

Admissions and qualifications

- District of Columbia
- New York
- Supreme Court of the United States
- US Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit
- US Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit
- US Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit
- US Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit
- US Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
- US Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit
- US Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit
- US Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit
- US District Court for the District of Columbia
- US District Court for the District of Maryland
- US District Court for the Eastern District of Texas

- US District Court for the Western District of New York