

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

In the Matter of:	)	
	)	
Kara Jane Jensen Zitnick,	)	Proceeding No. D2016-24
	)	
Respondent	)	
_____	)	

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

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.24, the suspension of Kara Jane Jensen Zitnick (“Respondent”) is hereby ordered for violation of 37 C.F.R. § 11.804(h).

Background

On December 16, 2015, the Minnesota Supreme Court issued an order in *In re Kara Jane Jensen Zitnick*, Minnesota Supreme Court Case No. A15-0743, suspending Respondent for sixty (60) days from the practice of law in that jurisdiction based on ethical grounds, followed by probation for two (2) years upon reinstatement.

On October 11, 2016, a “Notice and Order Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.24” (“Notice and Order”) mailed by certified mail (receipt no. 70160910000045133662) notified Respondent that the Director of the Office of Enrollment and Discipline (“OED Director”) had filed a “Complaint for Reciprocal Discipline Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.24” (“Complaint”) requesting that the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO” or “Office”) impose reciprocal discipline upon Respondent identical to the discipline imposed by the Minnesota Supreme Court in *In re Kara Jane Jensen Zitnick*, Minnesota Supreme Court Case No. A15-0743. The Notice and Order was delivered to Respondent on October 17, 2016.

The Notice and Order provided Respondent an opportunity to file, within forty (40) days, a response opposing the imposition of reciprocal discipline identical to that imposed by the

Minnesota Supreme Court, based on one or more of the reasons provided in 37 C.F.R.

§ 11.24(d)(1). Respondent has not filed a response to the Notice and Order.

Analysis

In light of Respondent's failure to file a response, it is hereby determined that there is no genuine issue of material fact under 37 C.F.R. § 11.24(d), and suspension of Respondent from the practice of trademark and non-patent matters before the USPTO for sixty (60) days followed by probation for two (2) years upon reinstatement is the appropriate discipline.

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

1. Respondent is suspended from the practice of trademark and non-patent matters before the USPTO for sixty (60) days followed by probation for two (2) years upon reinstatement, effective the date of this Final Order;

2. The OED Director publish the following Notice in the *Official Gazette*:

NOTICE OF SUSPENSION

This notice concerns Kara Jane Jensen Zitnick of Bloomington, Minnesota, who is authorized to practice before the Office in trademark and non-patent matters. In a reciprocal disciplinary proceeding, the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") has ordered that Ms. Zitnick be suspended for sixty (60) days from practice before the USPTO in trademark and other non-patent matters and be placed on probation for two (2) years upon reinstatement for violating 37 C.F.R. § 11.804(h), predicated upon being suspended for sixty (60) days from the practice of law with two (2) years of probation upon reinstatement by a duly constituted authority of a State. Ms. Zitnick is not authorized to practice before the Office in patent matters.

On December 16, 2015, the Minnesota Supreme Court issued an order suspending Ms. Zitnick from the practice of law in Minnesota. The order was predicated on Ms. Zitnick failing to communicate with a client, failing to hold client funds in trust, failing to timely return client funds, failing to maintain the required trust account books and records, creating shortages in her trust account, and failing to cooperate with a disciplinary investigation. The Minnesota Supreme Court found that Ms. Zitnick unconditionally admitted to the allegations that she violated Minnesota

Rules of Professional Conduct 1.4(a)(3), 1.4(a)(4), 1.15(a), 1.15(c)(3), 1.15(h), 1.16(d), 8.1(b), 8.4(c), and Rule 25 of the Rules on Lawyers Professional Responsibility.

This action is taken pursuant to the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 32 and 37 C.F.R. § 11.24. Disciplinary decisions are available for public review at the Office of Enrollment and Discipline's FOIA Reading Room, available at: <http://e-foia.uspto.gov/Foia/OEDReadingRoom.jsp>.


3. The OED Director give notice pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 11.59 of the public discipline and the reasons for the discipline to disciplinary enforcement agencies in the state(s) where Respondent is admitted to practice, to courts where Respondent is known to be admitted, and to the public;

4. Respondent shall comply with the duties enumerated in 37 C.F.R. § 11.58;

5. The USPTO dissociate Respondent's name from any Customer Numbers and the public key infrastructure ("PKI") certificate associated with those Customer Numbers; and

6. Respondent shall not apply for a USPTO Customer Number, shall not obtain a USPTO Customer Number, nor shall she have her name added to a USPTO Customer Number, unless and until she is reinstated to practice before the USPTO.

7 Dec 2016
Date



David M. Shewchuk
Deputy General Counsel for General Law
United States Patent and Trademark Office

on behalf of

Michelle Lee
Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual
Property and Director of the United States Patent
and Trademark Office

cc:

OED Director

Ms. Kara Jane Jensen Zitnick
7800 Metro Parkway
Bloomington, MN 55425