PATENT ASSIGNMENT COVER SHEET

Electronic Version v1.1 Stylesheet Version v1.2

EPAS ID: PAT2622349

SUBMISSION TYPE:		NEV	VASSIGNMENT		
NATURE OF CONVEYANCE:			DECLARATORY JUDGMENT BY DEFAULT FROM CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA DISTRICT COURT		
CONVEYING PARTY	′ DATA				
Name				Execution Date	
MIPOD NUCLEAR INC.				10/29/2013	
RECEIVING PARTY	DATA				
Name:	FRANCIS Y	FRANCIS Y TSANG			
Street Address:	1850 WHITN	1850 WHITNEY MESA DRIVE, SUITE 100			
Internal Address:	C/O GLOBA		SOTOPE SYSTEMS LLC		
City:	LAS VEGAS	LAS VEGAS			
State/Country:	NEVADA	NEVADA			
Postal Code:	89014				
PROPERTY NUMBERS Total: 6 Property Type			Numbe	r	
Application Number:		12944694			
Application Number:		12944094			
Application Number: Application Number:		12944634			
Application Number		12944634			
Application Number		12944634 61260585			
Application Numbers Application Numbers Application Numbers		12944634 61260585 61265383			
Application Number: Application Number: Application Number: PCT Number:	:	12944634 61260585 61265383 US1056573			
Application Number: Application Number: Application Number: PCT Number: Application Number:	E DATA	12944634 61260585 61265383 US1056573 61405605			
Application Number: Application Number: Application Number: PCT Number: Application Number: CORRESPONDENC	E DATA (81:	12944634 61260585 61265383 US1056573			
Application Number: Application Number: Application Number: PCT Number: Application Number: CORRESPONDENC Fax Number: Phone: Email:	E DATA (81: 702 crm	12944634 61260585 61265383 US1056573 61405605 5)301-3832 7276717 asters@gmai			
Application Number: Application Number: Application Number: PCT Number: Application Number: CORRESPONDENC Fax Number: Phone: Email: <i>Correspondence will</i>	E DATA (81: 702 crm <i>be sent via US</i>	12944634 61260585 61265383 US1056573 61405605 5)301-3832 7276717 asters@gmai 5 <i>Mail when th</i>	e email attempt is unsucces		
Application Number: Application Number: Application Number: PCT Number: Application Number: CORRESPONDENC Fax Number: Phone: Email:	E DATA (81: 702 crm <i>be sent via US</i>	12944634 61260585 61265383 US1056573 61405605 5)301-3832 7276717 asters@gmai	<i>e email attempt is unsucces</i> . TERS		

HENDERSON, NEVADA 89052

 $\|$

Address Line 4:

ATTORNEY DOCKET NUMBER:	1136.0000			
NAME OF SUBMITTER:	CONNIE R. MASTERS			
Signature:	/Connie R. Masters/			
Date:	11/20/2013			
Total Attachments: 5 source=Certified copy of Declaratory Judgment by Default#page1.tif source=Certified copy of Declaratory Judgment by Default#page2.tif source=Certified copy of Declaratory Judgment by Default#page3.tif source=Certified copy of Declaratory Judgment by Default#page4.tif source=Certified copy of Declaratory Judgment by Default#page5.tif				

_	·					
Ì		Electronically Filed 10/29/2013 02:14:46 PM				
1	Frederic I. Berkley, Esq. Nevada Bar No.: 1798	CLERK OF THE COURT				
2	SKLAR WILLIAMS PLLC A Professional Limited Liability Company	CLERK OF THE COURT				
4	410 South Rampart Boulevard, Suite 350					
5	Las Vegas, Nevada 89145 Telephone: (702) 360-6000					
6	Facsimile: (702) 360-0000 fberkley@sklar-law.com					
7	Attorneys for Plaintiff					
8	DISTRIC	CT COURT				
9	CLARK COUNTY, NEVADA					
10						
11	FRANCIS Y. TSANG,	CASE NO. A-13-682490-C				
12	Plaintiff,	DEPT. NO. XXXI				
13						
14 15	VS.					
15	MIPOD NUCLEAR INC., a Nevada Corporation,	DECLARATORY JUDGMENT BY DEFAULT				
17	Defendant.					
18						
19	This matter having come on to be he	eard for a prove-up bearing on the 29 th day of				
20	This matter having come on to be heard for a prove-up hearing on the 29 th day of					
21	October, 2013 before the above-entitled Court; Plaintiff Francis Y. Tsang appearing with his					
22	counsel, Frederic I. Berkley of the law firm of Sklar Williams PLLC and it appearing to the					
23 24	Court that Defendant Mipod Nuclear Inc.'s Default was entered by the Clerk of the Court on					
24	August 28, 2013, and the Court having considered the Affidavit in Support of Default Judgment					
26	filed on September 12, 2013 and the Supplemental Affidavit of Francis Y. Tsang in Support of					
27						
28						
		1				
	l	I				

•

PATENT REEL: 031692 FRAME: 0495 Declaratory Judgment by Default filed on October 23, 2013 and having considered the testimony of Francis Y. Tsang and good cause appearing therefore;

THIS COURT FINDS that it has jurisdiction to grant the relief prayed for in Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint for Declaratory Judgment Under NRS 30.030 and this Court's Declaration shall have the force and effect of a final judgment or decree;

THIS COURT MAKES THE FOLLOWING FURTHER FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW:

1. Pursuant to a memorandum of understanding dated February 26, 2010 (the "MOU"), Plaintiff contributed two United States provisional patent applications, namely, U.S. Provisional Patent App No. 61/260,585 and U.S. Provisional Patent App. No. 61/265,383, embodying technology for the on-demand production of medical isotopes from low-enriched and non-enriched uranium (the "Technology"), to Defendant in exchange for promised consideration, among other things, of \$3 million upon issuance of "final patents" or "transfer of the said property in at least the amount of the total purchase price," with a down payment of \$930,000 upon Defendant's initial capitalization.

2. Also pursuant to the MOU, Defendant agreed to pay Plaintiff an annual salary of \$240,000 plus a benefits package equivalent to what Plaintiff had at his full-time position in 2010 with the U.S. Department of Energy.

3. From March 2010 through December 2011, Defendant's business managers, namely, Theodore L. King ("King") of TornadoCane Futures LLC of Cottonwood, Arizona and Robert B. Knight ("Knight") of Calgary, Alberta, mismanaged Defendant and wasted the money invested in Defendant, among other things, on personal expenses and/or defalcations, leaving Defendant unable to pay Plaintiff for the Technology as agreed in the MOU.

4. In December 2011, King and Knight unilaterally resigned their positions with Defendant without seeking to make restitution to Defendant or provision for its future management or viability.

5. From August 2010 through December 2011, Plaintiff worked full-time for the benefit of Defendant, performing the agreed-upon services to earn the salary Defendant agreed to pay Plaintiff in the MOU.

6. Any moneys received by Plaintiff from Defendant, from the inception of Defendant to date, amounting to approximately \$180,000, have only partly compensated Plaintiff for the salary Defendant agreed to pay Plaintiff for his services.

7. Defendant has paid nothing to Plaintiff for Plaintiff's contribution of the Technology to Defendant.

8. Defendant has also paid nothing to patent counsel to Defendant, namely, Kilpatrick Townsend & Stockton LLP of Menlo Park, California, for its services in the preparation and filing of patent applications around the world for the Technology.

9. The patent applications currently pending for the Technology, in Defendant's name, are now faced with Office actions in the ordinary course, and other proceedings and costs, such as annuities, that if not attended to and paid, will imminently result in the abandonment of the applications and forfeiture of the Technology to the public domain.

10. Defendant has not paid anything to Plaintiff for the Technology, is not in a position to pay Plaintiff anything for the Technology, and has no prospect of ever being in a position to pay Plaintiff for the Technology, due to its bad faith mismanagement giving rise to grounds for rescission by Plaintiff of his contribution of the Technology to Plaintiff, and restoration of the Technology from Defendant to Plaintiff.

11. The form of the Technology is not the same as when Plaintiff first contributed it to Defendant in February 2010, in that the provisional patent applications originally embodying it have matured and ripened into non-provisional and foreign country applications based on those original provisional patent applications. In the circumstances, the Court is empowered to and does make restoration of the Technology in its current form, namely, of all U.S. and foreign country patent applications for the Technology in Defendant's name. See, e.g., Mackintosh v. California Federal Savings & Loan Association, 113 Nev. 393, 407, 935 P.2d 1154, 1163

(1997). Such restoration shall take specific effect through the order of declaratory judgment provided hereinbelow.

THIS COURT HEREBY enters a Declaratory Judgment on behalf of Plaintiff, Francis Y. Tsang, and declares that each and every one of the following patent filings are his and his alone, and that Defendant Mipod Nuclear Inc., a Nevada corporation, and any one claiming under Mipod, shall have no interest in said patent filings or their subject matter:

- U.S. Provisional Patent App No. 61/260,585

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- U.S. Provisional Patent App. No. 61/265,383
- U.S. Provisional Patent App. No. 61/405,605
- U.S. Pat. App. No. 12/944,634 (published as Pub. No. US 2011/0280356 A1)
- U.S. Pat. App. No. 12/944,694 (published as Pub. No. US 2011/0286565 A1)

App. No. PCT/US2010/056573 (filed with the World Intellectual Property Organization and published as Pub. No. WO 2011/093938)

App. No. 201080061626.3 (filed with the Patent Office of the People's Republic • of China and published as Pub. No. CN 102893339 A)

App. No. 2784064 (filed with the Canadian Patent Office (publication pending))

App. No. 10844923.2 (filed with the European Patent Office and published as Pub. No. 2499645)

App. No. 2012-539025 (filed with the Japan Patent Office (publication pending)) THIS COURT FURTHER DECLARES that Plaintiff Francis Y. Tsang is authorized, acting in his own behalf and/or in the name of Mipod Nuclear Inc., a Nevada corporation, and that each and every officer, member of the Board of Directors, and/or employee or agent of Mipod, is authorized acting in the name of Mipod, to execute, deliver, attest to, record, and/or certify such assignments (including, without limitation, any document filed or recorded with the United States Patent and Trademark Office), and to do all things, as may be necessary or

PATENT REEL: 031692 FRAME: 0498

beneficial to, or are otherwise in furtherance of giving effect to, the provisions of the preceding 1 2 paragraph. 3 Dated this $\frac{2}{day}$ of October, 2013. 4 5 6 7 RICT COURT JUDGE 8 Prepared by: 9 10 By: Frederic I. Berkley, Esq. C 11 420 South Rampart Blvd., Suite 350 Las Vegas, Nevada 89145 12 Telephone: (702) 360-6000 13 Facsimile: (702) 360-0000 Attorney for Plaintiff 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 CERTIFIED COPY 28 DOCUMENT ATTACHED IS A TRUE AND CORRECT COPY OF THE ORIGINAL ON FILE 5 CLERK OF THE COURT OCT 3 D 2013

RECORDED: 11/20/2013

5

PATENT REEL: 031692 FRAME: 0499