



Joseph V. Colaianni

Principal
Washington, D.C.
202 626 6434
colaianni@fr.com

Overview

Joseph V. Colaianni focuses on litigating Section 337 investigations before the U.S. International Trade Commission.

Joe is exceptionally experienced in virtually every aspect of Section 337 investigations, including due diligence and filing, discovery, hearings, and enforcement proceedings. He has served as lead counsel and has handled the day-to-day oversight of numerous Section 337 investigations. Joe has conducted more than ten evidentiary hearings (trials) at the ITC since 1996. He also has litigated patent infringement cases in U.S. district courts throughout the country, including jury and bench trials.

Before joining Fish & Richardson, Joe served as a patent examiner at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, reviewing patent applications relating to electronic imaging devices, including charge coupled devices and digital camera technology.

Chambers USA has recognized Joe as a notable practitioner in the nationwide International Trade: Intellectual Property (Section 337) category. Joe was also selected for inclusion as a "leading patent practitioner" by *IAM Patent 1000* for national patent prosecution and litigation practices and recognized as a leading attorney at the ITC. *The Best Lawyers in America* has included Joe in its "Best Lawyers in America" lists.

Experience

International Trade Commission, Section 337 Investigations

In the Matter of Certain Video-Capable Laptop, Desktop Computers, Handheld Computers, Tablets, Televisions, Projectors, and Components and Modules Thereof, 337-TA-1448 – Served as lead counsel for ASUSTeK Computer Inc. in patent infringement action adverse to Nokia relating to video codec standard essential patents.

Case Name Confidential – Served as lead counsel for a China-based manufacturer of electronic cigarettes, achieved finding of no violation in patent infringement matter adverse to RJ Reynolds relating to electronic nicotine delivery systems.

In the matter of Certain High-Strength Aluminum or Aluminum Alloy-Coated Steel, and Automotive Products and Automobiles Containing Same, 337-TA-1402 – Achieved an initial determination in favor of an electric car manufacturer in an ITC investigation related to two patents for aluminum-coated steel products. The ALJ ruled no violation, invalidating all patent claims asserted by the plaintiff.

Certain Video Processing Devices and Products Containing the Same, 337-TA-1323 – Served as lead counsel for respondents ASUSTeK Computer Inc. and ASUS Computer International in a patent infringement action brought by VideoLabs, Inc. relating to video coding/encoding technology. One asserted patent was found invalid as indefinite at the claim construction stage,

and the Commission affirmed the ALJ's grant of summary determination of invalidity of the remaining patents based on obviousness-type double patenting. The Commission's determination was no violation of Section 337 by the ASUS respondents.

Certain Adalimumab, Processes for Manufacturing or Relating to Same, and Products Containing Same, 337-TA-1296 – Represented Respondents Alvotech hf., Alvotech Germany GmbH, Alvotech Swiss AG, Alvotech USA Inc. in a trade secret misappropriation action brought by AbbVie Inc., AbbVie Biotechnology Ltd., and AbbVie Operations Singapore Pte. Ltd. relating to Alvotech's pre-commercial adalimumab biosimilar AVT02. Case resolved via favorable settlement.

Certain Capacitive Touch Sensing Systems, Capacitive Touch Sensing Controllers, Microcontrollers with Touch Sensing Functionality, and Components Thereof, 337-TA-1268 – Represented Respondent Cypress Semiconductor Corp. in a patent infringement action relating to capacitive touch sensing technology. Case resolved via favorable settlement.

Certain Digital Video-Capable Devices and Components Thereof, 337-TA-1224 – Represented Respondents MediaTek Inc. and MediaTek USA, Inc. in a patent infringement case brought by Koninklijke Philips N.V. and Philips North America LLC relating to digital copy protection technology. After trial, the ALJ found no violation of Section 337 because, *inter alia*, the products containing MediaTek's integrated circuits do not infringe Philips' patents.

Certain Vacuum Insulated Flasks and Components Thereof, 337-TA-1216 – Represented Respondent Everich and Tomic Houseware Co., Ltd. in a Section 337 action brought by Hydro Flask and Helen of Troy Limited alleging design patent infringement and trademark infringement. Case resolved via consent order.

Certain Photovoltaic Cells and Products Containing Same, 337-TA-1151 – Represented Respondent JinkoSolar Holding Co., Ltd. in a patent infringement action brought by competitor Hanwha Q CELLS involving solar cell technology. The ITC issued a final determination affirming the ALJ's summary determination ruling that JinkoSolar's products do not infringe Hanwha's patent. Affirmed on appeal by the Federal Circuit. In a related matter, represented JinkoSolar in an *inter partes* review challenge of Hanwha's patent at the PTAB. The PTAB found Hanwha's claims unpatentable in view of the prior art, and this finding was affirmed on appeal by the Federal Circuit.

Certain Multi-Domain Test and Measurement Instruments (Inv. No. 337-TA-1104) – Lead counsel for Respondents Rohde & Schwarz GmbH & Co. KG, Rohde & Schwarz Vertriebs GmbH, and Rohde & Schwarz USA, Inc. in a patent infringement action relating to test and measurement instruments.

Certain Semiconductor Devices and Consumer Audiovisual Products Containing Same (Inv. No. 337-TA-1047) – Represented Respondents MediaTek Inc., MediaTek USA Inc., and MStar Semiconductor Inc. in a patent infringement action involving video processing technology. Case resolved via favorable settlement.

Certain Graphics Processors, DDR Memory Controllers, and Products Containing the Same (Inv. No. 337-TA-1037) – Represented Respondents MediaTek Inc. and MediaTek USA Inc. in a patent infringement action involving graphics processors and DDR memory controllers. Case resolved via favorable settlement.

Certain Access Control Systems and Components Thereof (Inv. No. 337-TA-1016) – Represented Complainant The Chamberlain Group, Inc. in a patent infringement action involving garage door opener systems. Obtained a finding of violation of Section 337 and imposition of limited exclusion orders and cease and desist orders barring importation and sale of Respondents' infringing access control systems.

Certain Automated Teller Machines, ATM Modules, Components Thereof, and Products Containing the Same (USITC 337-TA-989) – Represented Complainant Hyosung against Diebold in patent litigation concerning a wide array of technologies associated with Automated Teller Machines. ALJ found a violation of Section 337 by Respondent Diebold.

Certain Devices Containing Non-Volatile Memory and Products Containing The Same – 337-TA-922 – Representing complainants Macronix International Co., Ltd. and Macronix America, Inc. in a patent infringement action relating to non-volatile memory technology.

Certain Non-Volatile Memory Chips and Products Containing the Same – 337-TA-916 – Representing respondents Macronix

International Co., Ltd. and Macronix America, Inc., Macronix Asia Ltd. of Japan, Macronix (Hong Kong) Co., Ltd. of Hong Kong, and Macronix's customers in a patent infringement action relating to non-volatile memory technology.

Certain Consumer Electronics, Including Mobile Phones and Tablets II – 337-TA-905 – Represented respondents Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. and Samsung's U.S. subsidiaries in a patent infringement action relating to wireless communications technology. Resolved successfully via settlement.

Certain Electronic Devices, Including Wireless Communication Devices, Tablet Computers, Media Players, and Televisions, and Components Thereof – 337-TA-862 – Represented respondents Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. and Samsung's U.S. subsidiaries in a patent infringement action relating to wireless communications technology. Resolved successfully via settlement.

Certain Sintered Rare Earth Magnets, Methods of Making Same and Products Containing Same – 337-TA-855 – Lead counsel for respondent Harman International in a patent infringement action relating to sintered rare earth magnets. Resolved successfully via settlement.

Case Name Confidential – Represented respondent Fortune 10 consumer electronics company in a patent infringement action relating to mobile electronic communications devices. Resolved successfully via settlement.

Certain Consumer Electronics, Including Mobile Phones and Tablets – Inv. No. 337-TA-839 – Represented respondents Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. and Samsung's U.S. subsidiaries in a patent infringement action relating to mobile communications technology. Resolved successfully via settlement.

Certain Electronic Devices Having a Retractable USB Connector – 337-TA-843 – Represented respondents Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. and Samsung's U.S. subsidiaries in a patent infringement action relating to electronic devices having USB connectors. Resolved successfully via settlement.

Certain Portable Communication Devices – 337-TA-827 – Represented respondents Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. and Samsung's U.S. subsidiaries in a patent infringement action relating to mobile electronic communications technology. Resolved successfully via settlement.

Certain Coenzyme Q10 Products and Methods of Making Same – 337-TA-790 – Represented respondent Mitsubishi Gas Chemical Co., Inc. in a patent infringement action relating to the coenzyme Q10. Obtained a finding of no infringement after trial.

Certain Lighting Control Devices Including Dimmer Switches and Parts Thereof – Inv. No. 337-TA-776 – Lead counsel for respondent Pass & Seymour in a patent infringement action relating to dimmer switches. Resolved via consent order.

Certain Flash Memory Chips and Products Containing Same – 337-TA-735 – Represented respondents Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., Samsung's U.S. subsidiaries, and Samsung customers in a patent infringement action relating to flash memory technology. Resolved successfully via settlement.

Certain Liquid Crystal Display Devices and Products Containing Same – 337-TA-699 – Representing complainant Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. in a patent infringement action relating to liquid crystal displays. Resolved successfully via settlement.

Certain Mobile Telephones and Wireless Communication Devices Featuring Digital Cameras, and Components Thereof – 337-TA-663 – Represented respondent LG Electronics in a patent infringement action relating to digital camera technology. Resolved successfully via settlement.

Certain Liquid Crystal Display Modules and Products Containing the Same, and Methods for Using the Same – 337-TA-634 – Representing Samsung respondents in a patent infringement action relating to liquid crystal displays. Resolved successfully via settlement.

Certain Liquid Crystal Display Devices and Products Containing the Same – 337-TA-631 – Represented complainant Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. in a patent infringement action relating to liquid crystal displays. Obtained a limited exclusion order and cease & desist order against respondent Sharp Corporation. Resolved successfully via settlement.

Certain Unified Communication Systems, Products Used With Such Systems, and Components Thereof– 337-TA-598 – Represented complainant Microsoft Corporation in a patent infringement action adverse to Alcatel-Lucent. Obtained a violation of section 337 by the Administrative Law Judge. Case resolved via settlement.

Certain Network Controllers and Products Containing Same– 337-TA-531 – Represented complainant Marvell Semiconductor in a patent infringement action relating to Ethernet network controllers. Resolved successfully via settlement.

Certain Recordable Compact Discs and Rewritable Compact Discs– 337-TA-474 – (CD-R and CD-RW discs) Successfully defended respondents Princo Corporation and Gigastorage Corporation against patent infringement allegations by Philips. The Administrative Law Judge and unanimous decision by the ITC Commission held that Philips committed patent misuse, thereby rendering all six asserted patents unenforceable. The patent misuse violation was based on Philips' patent pool license agreements and mandatory package licenses. This case was the first patent misuse finding by the ITC Commission. The ITC ruling was later modified on appeal.

Certain Abrasive Products Made Using A Process For Making Power Preforms, And Products Containing Same– 337-TA-449 – Obtained limited exclusion order and cease & desist order on behalf of complainant 3M against Kinik Co. in a patent infringement action relating to diamond abrasive tools.

Certain Synchronous Dynamic Random Access Memory Devices, Microprocessors and Products Containing Same– 337-TA-431 – Represented complainant Rambus against Hitachi in a patent infringement action relating to memory architecture. Case ended in favorable settlement for Rambus.

Certain Digital Satellite System (DSS) Receivers and Components Thereof– 337-TA-392 – Represented complainant Personalized Media Communications L.L.C. in a patent infringement action relating to digital satellite communications technology. Resolved after hearing via settlement.

U.S. District Court Cases

Moskowitz Family LLC v. Globus Medical, Inc. – (E.D. Pa.) – Counsel for Moskowitz Family LLC in a patent infringement action relating to surgical implants and tools for spinal fusion surgery.

DivX LLC v. MediaTek Inc. – (E.D. Tex.) – Represented defendant MediaTek in a case alleging trade secret misappropriation, trademark infringement, fraud, RICO violations, and breach of contract. Case settled via favorable settlement.

Pamarope Pty Limited v. Coloplast Corp. – (D. Del.) – Lead counsel for defendant Coloplast Corp. in a patent infringement action relating to female urinary incontinence devices. Case resolved via favorable settlement.

Wonderland Switzerland AG v. Dorel Juvenile Group, Inc. – (C.D. Cal.) – Represented Wonderland in a patent infringement action relating to child strollers and car seats. Case resolved via favorable settlement.

Defended a telecommunications equipment manufacturer in a series of patent infringement lawsuits relating to optical networking equipment. Won summary judgment of non-infringement. Case resolved via favorable settlement.

Progressive Semiconductor Solutions LLC v. Marvell Semiconductor, Inc.– (C.D. Cal.) Represented defendant Marvell in a patent infringement action involving semiconductor memory technology. Case resolved via favorable settlement.

Cambrian Science Corp. v. Cox Communications, Inc. et al.– (C.D. Cal.) Obtained summary judgment of non-infringement on behalf of defendants in a patent infringement action relating to optical networking technology. Also obtained a finding of exceptional case under 35 U.S.C. §285 and an award of attorneys' fees.

Lake Cherokee Hard Drive Technologies LLC v. Marvell Semiconductor, Inc. – (E.D. Tex.) – Obtained a jury verdict of non-infringement on behalf of defendant Marvell in a patent infringement action relating to hard drive controller technology.

FastVDO LLC v. Grass Valley USA, LLC – (D. Del.) – Defended Grass Valley in a patent infringement action relating to H.264 video compression technology. Case resolved via favorable settlement.

Reporting Technologies, Inc. v. Emma, Inc. – (E.D. Va.) – Represented Reporting Technologies in a patent infringement action relating to business intelligence software. Case resolved via favorable settlement.

Monec Holding AG v. Motorola Mobility, Inc. et al. – (D. Del.) – Defended Samsung in a patent infringement litigation relating to mobile communication devices. Case resolved via favorable settlement.

Broadcom Corp. v. Emulex Corp. – (C.D. Cal.) – Defended Emulex in a patent infringement matter relating to circuitry for telecommunications networks. Case resolved after jury trial via settlement.

Advanced Processor Technologies, LLC v. Analog Devices, Inc. et al. – (E.D. Tex.) – Defended Marvell Semiconductor Inc. in a patent infringement matter relating to cache memory technology. Case resolved via favorable settlement after claim construction.

Intravital, Inc. v. Fujitsu Microelectronics America, Inc. – (E.D. Tex.) – Defended Samsung in a patent infringement matter relating to H.264 video coding technology. Case resolved via favorable settlement.

Defended a multinational technology company in an E.D. Tex. patent infringement action relating to high-speed computer expansion card connections. The case resolved via the stipulated dismissal of our client.

Vigilos, LLC v. Cisco Systems, Inc., et al. – (E.D. Tex.) – Defended Intel Corp. in a patent infringement action relating to remote monitoring software. Won motion to transfer case to the Northern District of California, where it was dismissed.

Defended a telecommunications equipment manufacturer in a patent infringement action relating to decision-making software. Case resolved via stipulated dismissal of our client.

Maxim Integrated Products, Inc. v. Anpec Electronics Corp. – (N.D. Cal.) – Represented Maxim in a patent infringement action relating to audio hardware. Case resolved via favorable settlement.

Vizio, Inc. v. LG Electronics, Inc. – (D. Md.) – Defended LGE in a patent infringement matter relating to digital television technology. Case resolved via favorable settlement.

Fujitsu Hitachi Plasma Display, Ltd. v. LG Electronics, Inc. – (N.D. Cal.) – Defended LGE in a patent infringement matter relating to plasma television technology. Case resolved via favorable settlement.

Synopsys, Inc. v. Magma Design Automation, Inc. – (D. Del.) – Defended Magma in a patent infringement action relating to electronic design automation software. Case resolved via settlement.

Computer Cache Coherency Corporation v. Intel Corporation – (N.D. Cal.) – Defended Intel in patent infringement action relating to cache memory technology. Won summary judgment of non-infringement.

Sharp Corporation v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd. et al. – (E.D. Tex.) Defended Samsung in litigation involving liquid crystal display technology. Case resolved via settlement.

Represented two telecommunications companies in a patent infringement action involving optical networking technology. Case was resolved via a favorable settlement after claim construction.

Toshiba Corporation v. Juniper Networks, Inc et al. – (D.Del.) Successfully defended Juniper in litigation involving Internet router technology; judgment of non-infringement affirmed by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (2007).

D-Link Systems, Inc. adv. 3Com Corp. (N.D. Cal.) Defended D-Link in a patent infringement case brought by 3Com in the Northern District of California involving network interface controller products. Case settled favorably for D-Link.

Marvell Semiconductor, Inc. adv. Realtek Semiconductor Corp. – (N.D. Cal.) Defended Marvell Semiconductor in a patent infringement suit brought by Realtek Semiconductor in the Northern District of California relating to Ethernet networking devices. In a published decision, obtained a dismissal with prejudice and an award of more than \$500,000 in attorneys' fees for Marvell.

Summit Chemical Co. v. Bonide Products, Inc. (N.D. NY 2004) Represented Summit Chemical in a trademark infringement action

relating to Summit's "Mosquito Dunks" registered mark for biological insecticides for agricultural and domestic uses. Case resolved successfully via settlement.

CIENA Corp. v. Corvis, Inc. – (D.Del. 2003) Tried and won jury verdicts of infringement and validity in patent infringement case relating to dense wave division multiplexing optical communications systems. Case settled after injunction issued.

Intergraph v. Intel Corporation – (E.D.Tex. 2002) Defended patent infringement action relating to parallel processing microprocessors. Adverse decision at the trial court, case settled favorably after reversal of trial court on appeal.

MCI Corp. v. AT&T Am. Transtech, Inc. – (E.D. Pa. 1998) telecommunications case, defended patent infringement claims brought by MCI against AT&T, American Transtech, and Universal Card Services.

Intergraph Corp. v. Intel Corp. – (N.D. Ala. 1997) microprocessor case, defended patent infringement claims brought by Intergraph against Intel.

Recognitions & awards

Best Lawyers in America

Best Lawyers 2021-2023, 2026-2027

Ranked Lawyer

Chambers Global 2023-2026

IAM Patent 1000

IAM 2013-2014, 2016-2026

Ranked Lawyer

Chambers USA: Nationwide 2022-2025

Stand-out Lawyer

Thomson Reuters 2022-2024

Capital Pro Bono Honor Roll

District of Columbia Courts 2022-2023

Testimonials

"Joseph Colaianne is among the *crème de la crème* of ITC lawyers." — Market Commentator, 2023 *Chambers & Partners USA*

"Joe Colaianne always does an excellent job. He's very intelligent and good to deal with, whether you're adverse or aligned. He has a tremendous amount of ITC experience and puts together a very strong team, too. My experience is that he's a very good person to have on [your] side: he gets the information you need and can work something out with everyone involved in a case." — 2022 *Chambers and Partners USA*

"Joseph Colaianne is an excellent advocate, effective trial lawyer and trusted colleague." — 2019 *IAM Patent 1000*

Professional associations

American Bar Association

American Intellectual Property Law Association

ITC Trial Lawyers Association

Pro bono activities

In addition to his patent litigation practice, Joe dedicates time to pro bono matters including partnering with the Political Asylum/Immigration Representation Project and Capital Area Immigrants' Rights in representing asylum applicants and others in connection with immigration and custody matters.

Parker v. Reema Consulting Services, Inc. (D. Md.). – Successfully represented the plaintiff in an action for employment discrimination and wrongful termination. After a trial in federal court, a jury found for plaintiff and awarded monetary damages.

Provides pro bono representation to claimants before the U.S. Court of Appeals for Veterans Claims, as well as to refugees seeking asylum.

News

August 20, 2026

75 Fish Attorneys Recognized in 2027 Edition of *The Best Lawyers in America*

June 9, 2026

Fish & Richardson Secures Three "Band 1" Nationwide Rankings in *Chambers USA 2026* Guide

June 3, 2026

Fish & Richardson Receives Top Rankings in 2026 Edition of *IAM Patent 1000: The World's Leading Patent Professionals*

August 20, 2025

95 Fish Attorneys Included in the 2026 Edition of *The Best Lawyers in America*

June 6, 2025

Fish & Richardson Earns "Band 1" Nationwide Rankings for Intellectual Property and ITC Practices in *Chambers USA 2025*

May 30, 2025

Fish & Richardson Receives Top Rankings in 2025 Edition of *IAM Patent 1000: The World's Leading Patent Professionals*

February 13, 2025

Fish & Richardson Achieves "Band 1" Rankings in the U.S. for IP and ITC Practices in *Chambers Global 2025*

June 11, 2024

Fish & Richardson Receives Top Rankings in 2024 Edition of *IAM Patent 1000: The World's Leading Patent Professionals*

June 10, 2024

Fish & Richardson Earns "Band 1" Nationwide Rankings for Intellectual Property and ITC Practices in *Chambers USA 2024*

May 6, 2024

18 Fish & Richardson Attorneys Recognized by D.C. Courts in the 2023 Capital Pro Bono Honor Roll

July 31, 2023

Twenty-Eight Fish & Richardson Attorneys Recognized by D.C. Courts in the 2022 Capital Pro Bono Honor Roll

June 27, 2023

Fish & Richardson Receives Top Rankings in 2023 Edition of *IAM Patent 1000: The World's Leading Patent Professionals*

June 1, 2023

Fish & Richardson Earns "Band 1" Nationwide Rankings for Intellectual Property and ITC Practices in *Chambers USA 2023*

March 1, 2023

Fish & Richardson Earns "Band 1" Rankings in the U.S. for Intellectual Property and ITC Practices in *Chambers Global 2023*

September 8, 2022

Fish & Richardson Receives Top Rankings in 2022 Edition of *IAM Patent 1000: The World's Leading Patent Professionals*

August 22, 2022

96 Fish Attorneys Included in the 2023 Edition of *The Best Lawyers in America*

June 3, 2022

Fish & Richardson Earns "Band 1" Nationwide Rankings for Intellectual Property and ITC Practices in *Chambers USA 2022*

August 19, 2021

Fish Attorneys Recognized in 2022 Edition of *The Best Lawyers in America*

July 7, 2021

Fish & Richardson Receives Top Rankings in 2021 Edition of *IAM Patent 1000*. The World's Leading Patent Professionals

April 7, 2021

Thirty Fish Attorneys Named to 2020 Capital Pro Bono Honor Roll

March 2, 2021

Fish & Richardson Secures Denial of IPR Petitions on Behalf of Moskowitz Family LLC in Spinal Surgery Patent Dispute

August 12, 2020

Fish & Richardson Receives Top "Gold" Ranking from *IAM Patent 1000* for National Litigation Practice; National Rankings in the Plaintiff Firm and Prosecution...

June 23, 2020

Fish & Richardson Wins Major ITC Patent Case for JinkoSolar

June 20, 2019

Fish & Richardson Receives Top "Gold" Ranking from *IAM Patent 1000* for National Patent Litigation Practice

June 14, 2018

Fish Receives Top "Gold" Ranking from *IAM Patent 1000* for National Patent Litigation Practice

July 24, 2017

Fish & Richardson Receives Top "Gold" Ranking from *IAM Patent 1000* for National Patent Litigation Practice

June 15, 2016

Fish & Richardson Named to *IAMPatent 1000* for National Patent Litigation and Prosecution Practices

Events

October 26, 2023

What Companies Need to Know About Litigating in the ITC

FRONTEO

June 17, 2021

The Two Major Patent Venues That Korean Companies Must Know About: EDTX and WDTX

Yulchon

Additional insights

Speaking engagements

- "General Exclusion Orders at the ITC," *China U.S. Technical Training on Section 337 Investigations*, Xi'an, China (July 9, 2026)
 - "Parallel Proceedings in Motion: Tactical Strategies for Managing Concurrent ITC, PTAB, and District Court Actions," *American Conference Institute ITC Litigation & Enforcement Conference*, Washington, D.C. (May 5, 2026)
 - "Litigating trade secret misappropriation actions at the U.S. International Trade Commission," *Fish & Richardson & FRONTEO Joint Webinar* (May 25, 2022)
 - "Standard Essential Patents (SEPs) in Section 337 Investigations," *China Ministry of Commerce*, Beijing, China (June 2018)
 - "The 100-Day Proceedings at the ITC," *China Ministry of Commerce*, Beijing, China and Nanjing, China (June 2017)
-

Services

Litigation
ITC Litigation & Section 337
Patent Litigation

Industries

Electrical & Computer Technology
Software & Internet
Hardware
Semiconductors
Optics
Telecommunications

Admissions

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (1996)
District of Columbia (1997)
Virginia
U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit
U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Texas
U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia

Education

J.D. with honors, George Washington University Law School (1996) Member, *AIPPLA Law Journal*
B.S. *cum laude*, *Tau Beta Pi*, *Eta Kappa Nu*, Electrical Engineering, University of Maryland (1991)