NEWSLETTER

2023.04

QUARTERLY

PANAWELL INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

Cover: Interior of office block where Panawell locates

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Panawell Intellectual Property, consisting of Panawell & Partners, LLC and Panawell & Partners Law Firm, provide full spectrum of services in all fields of intellectual property rights, such as patent, trademark, copyright, computer software, anti-unfair competition, trade secrets, custom protection, domain name, license, assignment, enforcement, administrative and civil litigation, IP consulting and management.

Statistics of Patent Grants and Trademark Registrations in 2022 in China

In January 2023, the China National Intellectual Property Administration (CNIPA) released the statistical data on patents granted by and trademarks registered with the CNIPA in 2022.

Number of Chinese Patents Granted in 2022

	Invention	Utility Model	Design
Total	798,347	2,804,155	720,907
Chinese Applicants	695,591	2,796,049	709,563
Foreign Applicants	102,756	8,106	11,344

Number of Valid Patents till December 2022

	Invention	Utility Model	Design
Total	4,212,188	10,835,261	2,831,512
Chinese Applicants	3,551,453	10,781,169	2,708,070
Foreign Applicants	860,735	54,092	123,442

Number of PCT International Applications Received by CNIPA in 2022

Total	74,452
Chinese Applicants	69,115
Foreign Applicants	5,337

Number of Trademark Registration in 2022

	Registered Trademark	Valid Registered Trademarks till Dec. 2022
Total	6,177,170	42,671,911
Chinese Applicants	6,001,698	40,642,099
Foreign Applicants	175,472	2,029,812

(Source: official website of WIPO)

Interpretation of the Draft Amendments to China's Trademark Law

On January 13, 2023, the China National Intellectual Property Administration released the Draft Amendments to the Chinese Trademark Law (the Draft Amendments for Comments), and launched the process for the fifth amendment to the Trademark Law in China. Compared with the current Trademark Law consisting of 73 articles, the Draft Amendments for Comments have expanded it to that of 101 articles, of which 23 articles are completely new additions, 6 new ones created by separating from the original provisions, 54 substantially revised, and 27 unchanged or basically unchanged.

The new Trademark Law seeks to establish an order of trademark registration and use characterized by "application on demand, trademarks existing at an appropriate number, priority on trademark use, and elimination of idle

trademarks". To this end, the Draft Amendments have greatly adjusted the procedure for, and substantive provisions on, trademark grant and authorization, with the amendments made include, among other things, the adjusted restrictive requirements for trademark registration, changed relevant provisions on well-known trademarks, simplified and optimized procedures for trademark examination, trademark right determination, and dispute resolution, reinforced trademark agency supervision, strengthened trademark use obligations, and prohibited improper trademark enforcement.

Following is brief interpretation of the notable changes in the Draft Amendments.

Article 14 【Registration Requirements】

DRAFT AMENDMENT: A trademark applied for registration shall have distinctive features, be easy to identify, shall not violate the public order and good customs, and shall not conflict with the legitimate rights or interests previously acquired by others. Unless otherwise provided for, the same applicant shall register only one trademark in respect of the same goods or services.

INTERPRETATION: It restricts the requirements for registration, and emphasizes that after an applicant registers a trademark, the trademark shall not be repeatedly registered in principle.

This provision will have a significant impact on applicants who file new applications every three years in response to non-use revocation requests.

Article 16 【Distinctive Features】

DRAFT AMENDMENT: The following marks shall not be registered as trademarks: (1) only the general name, graphics, model or technical terms of the goods; (2) only directly indicating the quality, main raw materials, functions, uses, weight, quantity, or other characteristics of the goods; (3) other marks that lack distinctive features. If the marks listed in subparagraphs 2 and 3 of the preceding paragraph acquire distinctive features through use, and are easy to identify, it is possible for them to be registered as trademarks.

INTERPRETATION: It is clarified that for the general names, graphics, models and/or technical terms of the goods that would not acquire distinctiveness through use in trademark applications, registration thereof is absolutely prohibited. This provision requires applicants to be cautious when choosing trademarks, and some marks that are easy to spread, but lack distinctiveness should be abandoned.

Article 21 【Prohibition of Double Registration】

DRAFT AMENDMENT: The trademark applied for registration shall not be the same as the prior trademark that the applicant applied for, registered in respect of the same goods, or cancelled, revoked, or invalidated in publicized action within one year before the date of application, except under the following circumstances or where the applicant agrees to cancel the original registered trademark: (1) due to

the needs of production and operation, minor improvements have been made on the basis of the previous trademarks that have been actually used, and where the applicant can explain the differences; (2) where the previous trademark is not renewed for reasons that are not attributable to the applicant; (3) where the previously registered trademark has been cancelled due to failure to submit an explanation about the use of the trademark in time, but the previous trademark has been in actual use; (4) for reasons that are not attributable to the applicant, the prior trademark has been revoked due to failure to provide evidence of use for three consecutive years in the revocation procedure, but the prior trademark has already been in actual use; (5) where the prior trademark has been declared invalid due to conflict with the prior rights or interests of others, but the prior rights or interests have ceased to exist; and (6) there are other legitimate reasons for repeatedly applying or reapplying for trademark registration.

INTERPRETATION: It highlights the "one-mark-one-right" value of registered trademarks, and sets forth the exception of prohibiting repeated registration.

This provision will directly impact the two trademark protection strategies commonly used by applicants: filing relay application and replacement application, but it will also urge registrants to pay attention to the use and maintenance of their registered trademarks.

Article 22 【Applying for Trademark Registration in Bad Faith】

DRAFT AMENDMENT: The applicant shall not apply for trademark registration in bad faith, including the following circumstances : (1) applying for registration of trademarks in a large number not for the purpose of use, thereby disturbing the order of trademark registration; (2) applying for registration of trademarks by fraudulent or other unfair means; (3) applying for registration of trademarks that are harmful to the interests of the nation, and social or public interests, or trademarks with major adverse effects; (4) intentionally harming the legitimate rights or interests of others or seeking illegitimate interests in violation of the provisions of Articles 18, 19 and 23 of this Law; and (5) any other act of applying for trademark registration in bad faith.

INTERPRETATION: It clarifies the circumstances of trademark application in bad faith. The standards for determining "a large number" and "disturbing the order of trademark registration" in this provision will determine the legal boundary of the applicants' registration in defense in the future. The applicant should properly control the number of their applications, rank their trademarks applied for registration in terms of degree of importance, and classify trademarks applied for.

Article 45 【Relative Cause for Invalidation and Trademark Transfer】

DRAFT AMENDMENT: Where a registered trade-

mark violates the provisions of Article 18, Article 19, paragraph one of Article 20, Article 23, Article 24 and Article 25 of this Law, the prior right holder or interested party may, within five years from the date of trademark registration, request the intellectual property administrative department under the State Council (i.e. the CNIPA) to declare the registered trademark invalid. If anyone violates the provisions of Articles 18 or 19 of this Law or violates the provisions of Article 23 of this Law to register a trademark that has been used by others and has a certain influence by unfair means, the previous right holder may request that the registered trademark be transferred to his ownership. In case of registration in bad faith, the owner of a well-known trademark is not subject to the time limit of five years.

INTERPRETATION: For well-known trademarks that have been preemptively registered by others, unregistered trademarks that have been previously used, and trademarks preemptively registered by agents, representatives or specific related parties, the previous right holder now has one more option, namely "request for transfer" in addition to filing request for invalidation. This provision will help applicants reduce unnecessary repeated applications and obtain earlier filing dates for the same or very similar trademarks.

Article 49 【Revocation of Registered Trademarks】

DRAFT AMENDMENT: Any natural person, legal person or non-legal person organization, may apply to the CNIPA for revocation of the registered trademark under any of the following circumstances, provided that it shall not damage the legitimate rights and interests of the trademark registrant or disrupt the trademark registration order: (1) where a registered trademark becomes the general name of the goods approved for use; (2) where a registered trademark is not used for three consecutive years without justifiable reasons; (3) where the use of a registered trademark leads the relevant sector of the public to mis-identify the quality or origin of the goods; (4) where the registrant of a collective trademark or certification trademark violates the provisions of Article 63 of this Law and the circumstances are particularly serious; and (5) use of a registered trademark or exercise of the exclusive right to use a registered trademark seriously harms the public interest and causes major adverse effects. If a registered trademark falls under the circumstances listed in subparagraphs 4 and 5 of the preceding paragraph, the CNIPA may revoke the registered trademark ex officio. The CNIPA shall make a decision within nine months from the date of receiving the application for revocation. If an extension is required under special circumstances, it may be extended for three months upon approval.

INTERPRETATION: A cause for revocation of trademarks has been added. The circumstances of revocation in this Article are all circumstances of "improper use". This provision requires the registrants to use their registered trademarks as registered within the scope of the approved goods/services, and shall not expand the scope of

the rights to be exercised.

Article 61 【Explanation of Trademark Use】

DRAFT AMENDMENT: The trademark registrant shall, within 12 months after the expiry of every five years from the registration date of the trademark, explain to the CNIPA about the use of the trademark in respect of the approved goods, or the justifiable reasons for not using it. The trademark registrant may explain the use of a number of trademarks together within the aforesaid period. In case of failure to explain, the CNIPA shall notify the trademark registrant, and if the trademark registrant fails to do so within 6 months from the date of receipt of the notification, the registered trademark shall be deemed to have been abandoned, and be cancelled by the CNIPA. The CNIPA shall randomly check the authenticity of the explanation, and may, if necessary, require the trademark registrant to supplement relevant evidence or entrust the local intellectual property administrative department to verify. If it is proved to be untrue after a random check, the registered trademark shall be revoked by the CNIPA.

INTERPRETATION: This newly added provision on explaining use of trademarks will increase the trademark management cost of trademark owners to a certain extent, but it will also play a positive role in promoting use of registered trademarks.

Article 64 【Legal Liabilities for Changing Registered Trademarks on One's Own】

DRAFT AMENDMENT: Where a trademark owner changes the registered trademark, the name, address or other recorded matters of a registered trademark by himself in the process of using the registered trademark, the department in charge of trademark enforcement shall order him to make corrections within a time limit and may impose a fine of not more than 100,000 yuan; if he fails to make corrections at the expiry of the time limit, the CNIPA shall revoke the registered trademark.

INTERPRETATION: The penalties for non-standard use of registered trademarks have been added. This provision requires the registrants to use their trademarks as they are registered within the approved scope of goods/services.

Article 67 【Penalties for Application for Trademark Registration in Bad Faith】

DRAFT AMENDMENT: If an applicant applies, in bad faith, for trademark registration in violation of the provisions of Article 22 of this Law, the department in charge of trademark enforcement shall give him or it a warning or impose a fine of not more than 50, 000 yuan, and if the circumstances are serious, a fine of not less than 50, 000 yuan and no more than 250,000 yuan may be imposed. If there is any illegal income, it shall be confiscated.

INTERPRETATION: The administrative penalties for applicants for registration in bad faith have been revised, and the maximum fine has been raised to 250,000 yuan. This provision is expected to more effectively deter applicants from application for registration in bad faith.

Article 83 【Civil Damages for Preemptive Registration in Bad Faith】

DRAFT AMENDMENT: In case of application for trademark registration in bad faith in violation of the provisions of paragraph four of Article 22 of this Law, the other person may bring a lawsuit in the court and claim damages. The amount of damages shall at least include the reasonable expenses paid by that person to stop the application for trademark registration in bad faith. In case of violation of the provisions of paragraph three of Article 22 of this Law, an application for trademark registration in bad faith harms the interests of the nation, social and public interests, or causes major adverse effects, the procuratorial organ shall bring a suit in the court against the application for trademark registration in bad faith under the law.

INTERPRETATION: Civil liability for damages has been added to recover losses to others because of preemptive registration in bad faith. This provision gives trademark owners an important legal tool, and is expected to fundamentally contain and change the current situation of preemptive registration of trademarks in bad faith in China.

(Source: official websites of CNIPA)

CNIPA Released IP-Related Government Service Provision Guidelines

On March 3, the CNIPA issued the IP-Related Government Service Provision Guidelines for the purpose of implementing the State Council's work requirements on accelerating the standardization and facilitation of government services provision, promoting non-discriminatory acceptance and government services provision on the same standards, and delivering convenient, fast, fair, inclusive, high-quality and efficient government service provision.

(Source: official websites of CNIPA)

CNIPA Soliciting Comments on Patent Assignment Contract Template, Patent License Template, and Conclusion Guidelines

To deeply implement the work arrangement requirements on delivering the Nation's 14th Five-Year Plan for Intellectual Property Protection and Use, provide more standardized and convenient services, guide interested parties to prevent legal risks, protect their legitimate rights and interests, and better boost patent conversion and exploitation, the CNIPA, having revised the current patent right transfer contract template, the patent license template, and the corresponding conclusion guidelines, has developed and released the Patent Assignment Contract Template and Conclusion Guidelines (Draft) and Patent License Template and Conclusion Guidelines (Draft) for Comments. The Templates and Guidelines will be further revised, amplified, and publicly released for the reference and use of the interested parties.

(Source: official websites of CNIPA)

Skillfully Defending Inventive Step of Patent Applications in the Field of Chemical Materials Involving Crystalline Structures

Ms. Xiang LIU, Patent Attorney, Panawell & Partners

In the field of chemical materials, crystal form patents are receiving more and more attention. Especially in the field of medicine, the importance of crystal form patents is more prominent. This is because the research and development of new drugs often takes a lot of financial resources and time, and crystal form patents can extend the patent term and the market life of drugs. If the original compound patent expires and the crystal form patent possibly does not, then the generic drug company cannot imitate the same crystal form. In this way, it is possible for crystal form patents to seek more commercial benefits for original pharmaceutical companies.

In recent years, one of the great challenges encountered in the process of applying for patent for crystal form is the issue of inventive step. As this author's practical experience shows, the key to the success of defending inventive step for a crystal form patent application lies in the necessity to prove that the new crystal form of a known compound has achieved unexpected technical effects. The unpredictability of whether a compound has a crystal form, how many crystal forms exist, and what crystal form exists cannot be equated with non-obviousness in inventive-step examination. In addition to being clearly presented in the original application documents, the unexpected technical effects that can be considered in the inventive step evaluation should also be technical effects confirmed with corresponding experimental data.

This article will be discussing the techniques for defending matters of inventive step in the process of crystal form patent application based on the author's practice.

Case One

Chinese Patent Application No. 201711075793.3

Claim 1 of the present application claims an Iprafluazin magnesium salt crystal form A, wherein the Ipramirazin magnesium salt crystal form A uses Cu-Kα radiation, and X-ray powder diffraction pattern expressed at an angle of 2θ has characteristic absorption peaks at 4.795, 12.295, 12.710, 14.684, and 15.887.

In the first office action, the examiner commented that the reference document D1 (WO2011/071314A2) disclosed an ilaprazole magnesium salt tetrahydrate, and pointed out that since the TGA, DSC and XRD powder diffraction of the crystals of ilaprazole magnesium salt tetrahydrate was not determined in D1, therefore making it impossible for the present application to be compared with it, and therefore it could not be proved based on the available evidence that the crystal form A of the magnesium salt of iprazole in the present application was different from the ilaprazole magnesium salt tetrahydrate in D1. Thus,

claim 1 is presumably not novel. At the same time, the examiner also pointed out that since the mass-related properties of iprazole magnesium tetrahydrate were not disclosed in D1, there was no evidence that the present application had an unexpected technical effect over D1.

In the process of responding to the office actions and requesting reexamination, the applicant further limited the XRD full spectrum of ilaprazole magnesium salt crystal form A in claim 1 and the preparation method thereof, and supplemented the XRD diagram of the ilaprazole magnesium salt tetrahydrate in D1 to prove the difference in crystal structure between the crystalline form A of the present invention and the ilaprazole magnesium salt tetrahydrate in D1. Additionally, the applicant also elaborated the unexpected technical effect achieved in the present invention.

However, the examiner and the reexamination panel did not accept the above responses and amendments from the applicant. The examiner believed that: first of all, for drug crystals, the superior drug crystals are more reflected in stability or bioavailability, and the improvement in crystal purity is usually not an unexpected technical effect; secondly, XRD spectra is a method for characterizing the internal structure of crystals, which usually cannot be used to characterize crystal purity, so XRD alone does not indicate that the crystal purity or crystallinity in D1 is not good. The reexamination panel pointed out: (1) D1 did not give data on the chemical purity, heat resistance, high temperature stability, and fluidity effect of the crystal form of ilaprazole magnesium salt tetrahydrate in Example 14, and in the case as the applicant did not provide better technical effects in chemical purity, heat resistance, high temperature stability, and fluidity compared with D1, it could not be determined that the technical solution of claim 1 of the present application had prominent substantive features and made significant progress compared with D1; and (ii) in commenting on the product claims of claim 1, there is no evidence to show that the process features have a defining effect on the product itself, and the process features did not define the product claims. Therefore, differences in method features did not make the product claims themselves inventive.

For this reason, in responding to the reexamination notification, the applicant focused on supplementing the comparative experiments of the present invention in terms of fluidity, stability and purity of the ilaprazole magnesium salt crystal form A and the magnesium salt tetrahydrate in D1, to prove that the ilaprazole magnesium salt crystal form A of the present invention achieved unexpected technical effects compared with the ilaprazole magnesium salt tetrahydrate of D1. The above arguments were accepted by the panel. As a result, the panel revoked the decision of the CNIPA on rejecting the application, and this application was ultimately granted the patent.

From the above case, the following experience can be summarized for future practice in such cases:

(i) It is not enough to prove that the crystal structure of the material of the present invention is different from the crystal structure of the material disclosed in the prior art by supplementing the XRD diagram, and it is also necessary to further prove that the crystal structure of the material of the present invention has unexpected technical effect relative to the crystal structure of the material disclosed in the prior art; (ii) when proving the unexpected technical effects of the present invention relative to the closest prior art, it is necessary to prove from the aspects recognized in the art, such as the technical effects of drug crystal forms are more reflected in stability or bioavailability; of course, these technical effects must have been mentioned in the initial application documents; and (iii) at the stage of drafting, the application documents should correctly characterize and disclose in details the difference between the crystal features and the known crystals; and the applicant should avoid presenting only a single technical effect, and should describe multiple technical effects. For example, the technical effects may be solubility, dissolution, dissolution rate, hygroscopicity, stability, flowability, purity, and bioavailability. Presenting multiple technical effects would make it possible, in the later stage, to argue for the simultaneous improvement of multiple technical effects, and probable for the inventiveness higher than that of a single technical effect to be recognized. At the same time, presenting more technical effects may make it more possible to subsequently supplement data, and to prove the inventive step by supplementing experimental data from more dimensions.

Case Two

Chinese Patent Application No. 202011548589.0

The present application claims an all-organic pyroelectric material having the following chemical formula: $A_{1-x}A'_xB_{1-y}B'_y$, wherein A is protonated amantadine; B is formate ion; A' is selected from one or more of ... protonated methyl amantadine ... B' is selected from one or more of ... hypophosphite ions, acetate ions ... $0\leq x\leq 0.3$, $0\leq y\leq 0.3$.

In the office action, the examiner noted that the reference document D1 (CN103588648A) disclosed an amantadine formate that fell within the scope of $A_{1-x}A'_xB_{1-y}B'_y$ in claim 1, namely A is protonated amantadine, B is formate ion, and x=0, y=0. The two claim the same technical solution for the same technical field, solve the same technical problem, and achieve the same technical effect, so claim 1 of the present application does not possess novelty.

In the process of responding to the first and second office actions, the applicant further defined the space group and lattice constant of the all-organic pyroelectric material in claim 1 to further define the crystal structure of the material. To prove that the all-organic pyroelectric material of the present invention differed from the material disclosed in D1 in crystal structure, the applicant did not provide a crystal structure characterization

of the material in D1, but from the difference in the preparation method of the two materials (such as crystallization temperature) and the physical and chemical properties embodied in the material, it is proved that the amantadine formate of D1 lacked the crystal structure of the present invention. Specifically, the applicant additionally submitted experimental data to show the sublimation temperature of amantadine formate of the present invention. Example 1 of the present invention of amantadine formate sublimation temperature under normal pressure was 140℃, and did not have a melting point. That is, the amantadine formate of present invention was directly sublimated, without the process of melting. The melting point of amantadine formate in D1 was 238℃. It could be seen that the amantadine formate of present invention was completely different from that of D1 in physical properties. Thus, those skilled in the art have reason to infer that the amantadine formate compared to D1 has no crystalline structure of the present invention. To illustrate the technical effect of the all-organic pyroelectric material of present invention relative to the material of D1, the applicant stated: "It is well known in the art that the structure plays an important role in the performance, and the pyroelectric properties are dependent on the structural features of the material; so those skilled in the art have reason to believe that when the material structure of the reference differs from the present invention, its performance and the present invention are not comparable." These arguments were accepted by the examiner, and the application was ultimately granted the patent.

It can be seen from this case: (1) when it is not convenient for the applicant to supplement the characterization data of the crystal structure of D1, the physical and chemical properties of the materials of the present invention can be compared with those disclosed in D1 to prove that the crystal structure of present invention is different from that of the prior art; and (2) if, in the art, the performance of the material depends in particular on the crystal structure of the material (especially if the structure of the material is changed, it brings completely new properties), even if the applicant cannot provide experimental data to prove that the material of the reference does not have the performance of the material of the present invention, the material of present application has opportunity to be patented.

In conclusion, for a crystal structure in an application to be patented, in addition to ensuring that the crystal structure is different from the prior art, it is also necessary to ensure that the difference in the crystal structure brings unexpected technical effects.

Author:

Ms. Xiang LIU

Ms. Liu received her Bachelor degree from Shandong Normal University in 2011 and her Master degree from the Beijing University of Chemical Technology in 2014. She joined Panawell in 2018, and specializes in patent drafting and prosecution in chemical engineering, materials, and etc.

Are the Original Documents Required by CNIPA?

In respect of patent applications filed through the online system of China National Intellectual Property Administration (CNIPA), typically the applicant does not need to furnish the original formality documents (e.g. power of attorney, certified priority document, and the document to support any change of bibliographic information); instead, the scanned copies will be sufficient. However, in some special procedures, there is still possibility that the CNIPA requires the party concerned to submit original documents additionally. For example, where the party of patent invalidation procedure entrusts an agent to attend the hearing, the original power of attorney should be available on requested.

What calls for special attention is that the CNIPA does not accept electronic signature, although accepts the scanned copies of executed documents. If an individual or foreign entity executes a document to be submitted to CNIPA, he or its representative shall sign the document by hand. If a Chinese entity executes a document to be submitted to CNIPA, its official seal shall be affixed on the document. If a foreign entity with an official seal, such as a Japanese enterprise, executes a document, it can either affix its official seal on the document, or arrange its representative to sign the document by hand.

Nevertheless, if a foreign individual or entity records a patent license or pledge before the CNIPA, the original contract and the foreign individual/entity identification document or notarized copy thereof will be still required.

Meeting at INTA 2023 in Singapore

We are very pleased to inform you that PANAWELL & PARTNERS will send Partner William YANG, Partner Alex Bo WANG, and Attorney Victor Chunxi GUO, to attend the INTA Annual Meeting 2023 in Singapore.

To arrange a meeting with our representatives, please email us at mail@panawell.com or williamyang@panawell.com.

Looking forward to meeting you in Singapore!

Interview with Ms. Fenghua Wang Founder of Panawell

- First of the Exclusive Interview Series Marking Panawell 20th Anniversary

Over twenty years of hardship and perseverance, we Panawell stuff have been working diligently to deliver our dreams.

Though we cannot see time, we are all witness of its power.

On the occasion of Panawell's 20th anniversary, we have planned a series of interviews. Let's follow the steps of our predecessors and colleagues, looking back at our developments, refreshing our emotional memories, drawing strength, and standing strong.

Twenty-year perseverance has brought glory. Wisdom and aspiration are foundation of success.

Story from the first interview, we invited and interviewed Ms. Fenghua Wang, one of the founders of the Panawell.

Ms. Fenghua Wang and Ms. Cunxiu Gao, the founders of Panawell

Ms. Fenghua Wang and Ms. Cunxiu Gao jointly founded the Panawell in Beijing on July 25, 2003. Unfortunately, Ms. Gao passed away in 2011, and Ms. Wang was retired in 2014. The two founders, who had previously worked in the patent administrative department of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, had many years of patent prosecution practice and rich corporate management experience. In the very first year of incorporation, Panawell filed more than 300 patent applications, and in the early days, the Firm mainly filed and prosecuted patent applications for the nation's first-class scientific research institutions and scientific research projects of the Institutes of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, Peking University, and Tsinghua University.

We are very honored to have invited Ms. Wang to

review our entrepreneurial growth on the special occasion of Panawell's 20th anniversary. When talking about how Panawell was started, she talked about her love and great plan for the patent-related work when the Academy of Sciences was under restructuring, hoping to do something practical to keep on contributing to the Academy of Sciences. Faced with separation of all the corporate entities from the Chinese Academy of Sciences as a result of the restructuring and the need to re-organize the patent agencies out of the scientific research institutes of the Chinese Academy of Sciences, and universities, such as Tsinghua University and Peking University, Ms. Wang and Ms. Gao resolutely decided to establish Panawell, with great efforts made to put in place therein a full-chain execution support system for its high-quality IP service provision.

Ms. Wang, starting with interest from how Panawell got its name, recalled that the Firm had encountered many difficulties and challenges in the start-up days. For example, it came into existence in 2003, when SARS broke out. Faced with the sudden unprecedented epidemic, they found the Firm was in dire situation, and they couldn't give up their hope. What they had to do was stand together, support each other, and stick to their posts, managing to keep the entire patent prosecution procedure running uninterrupted for the sake of the clients. To this end, some employees even worked around clock, sleeping even on the office floor at night, so as to avoid any delay in the work. In order to improve work efficiency, they delivered and received letters of all sorts at the clients' doorsteps on the same day. This is how our working tradition had been shaped, a tradition of diligence and perseverance to face challenges together. To work with the determination to boost the industrialization of scientific research achievements and to help delivering high-value patents for the benefit of the country, is the most solid foundation of Panawell's drive for excellence.

We are pleased to provide quality and efficient services to our clients of all sizes. Panawell, starting from a small firm with only a humble office, has grown into a medium-sized one run by the second-generation team of brilliant partners, with the main Office domiciled in the central business district in Beijing and branches respectively in Chengdu, Ningbo, Hong Kong, and Tokyo.

Sharing with us her expectations and messages for the future of the Firm, Ms. Wang said, "I am proud of the achievements Panawell has made over the past 20 years and we still have great potential as Panawell is gaining momentum in its corporate operation! I have full confidence in our team and believe you will continue to provide outstanding IP services to our clients and continue to strive for excellence."

Ms. Wang, a role model for many of us, personally brought up a group of patent attorneys who have become backbone stuff in many patent agencies

and in the IP industry. Panawell will also continue to take the historical initiative and stand united for the great cause of endeavor on the solid foundation laid by the two founders. As an IP agency in the new era, Panawell will develop along with China's national strategic development and make its contribution by helping boost scientific and technological innovation and providing excellent IP serves to all innovators in China and overseas.

We will strive hard, and pass on the torch of fine tradition,

With gratitude to you for the twenty years of companionship and witness.

With aspirations reaching far and wide,

Panawell, keeping its original intention and purpose as solid as rock, is ready again to take on the road to even greater success in the future.

When the wind and tide is good, it is time to set sail and start a new journey with rough waves and bright sunshine.

Back Cover: Exterior of office block where Panawell locates

PANAWELL & PARTNERS LLC
Addr：1002-1005, 10th Floor, China Life Tower
16 Chao Yang Men Wai Street, Chaoyang District
Beijing 100020, China
Tel：(86 10)85253778
Fax：(86 10)85253671
Code：100020
E-mail：mail@panawell.com
Website: www.panawell.com

Editor: Jane Wang
Lan Wang
Shute XU
Translator: Jane Wang
Yujing Zhang
Yazhi Zhao
Dan Jin
Layout: Shunshun Dong