

the chief engineer.

103

Q. And what did Diamond Turf Law Mower do; what sort of company is that?

A. It produced maintenance equipment for golf courses.

Q. Okay. And were you working also doing engineering for the company as well?

A. Yes.

Q. And that engineering capabilities that you have, was that something you garnered through your employment with IBM or is that something that you had specific knowledge of outside of your employment with IBM?

A. Both.

Q. This was not engineering of electrical components; this was engineering of mechanical systems; is that what this was?

A. Every, virtually every mechanical system has an electrical component.

Q. Okay.

A. And a hydraulic component in this particular case.

Q. And when did you -- when you ceased worked with Diamond Turf Lawn Mower, was that an amicable leaving or was there some problem or did

everything work out okay with that?

104

Contradicts resume
submitted by
Wheeler and Utley

CLICK HERE TO
SEE UTLEY
RESUME
REGARDING
DIAMOND TURF

A. Well, there was a, there was a
dispute over intellectual property. There was no
intellectual property agreement in my employment
agreement and there were certain inventions that
I made that we were unable to resolve ownership
of.

Q. Okay. So these were inventions that
you developed while you were employed by Diamond
Turf Lawn Mower?

A. Yes.

Q. Okay. Can you describe those
inventions to me.

A. They related to hydro-mechanical
equipment.

Q. Okay. What exactly with hydraulic
mechanical equipment?

A. How much detail you want me to go in
to?

Q. Well, were they related somehow to
the operations of the hydraulics of the equipment
or were they strictly mechanical?

A. They related to a hydro-mechanical
system, which means that it involves the
integration of hydraulics into a mechanically

we're talking about them because you said billing statements, which could be something totally different, I don't know.

MR. SELZ: That's the attached exhibits to the Amended Complaint in this matter that we're referring to.

MR. PRUSASKI: Okay. Thanks.

By MR. SELZ:

Q. Now, you had referenced Mr. Dick doing some patent work for yourself; is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And was that any patents arising from your employment with Diamond Turf?

A. It was arising from the technology and engineering work that I did, yes.

Q. So the hydro-mechanical work that you had done at Diamond Turf?

A. Yes.

Q. And was there ever a dispute between yourself and the owner of Diamond Turf with regard to the patents involved for that hydro-mechanical work?

MR. PRUSASKI: Objection, relevance and to the form.

THE WITNESS: There was a

disagreement as to ownership of the intellectual property.

By MR. SELZ:

Q. There was a dispute?


A. Yes.

Q. Did you ever advise the owner of Diamond Turf that you were going to patent these intellectual properties under your own name?

A. I did.


Q. Did you do that prior to patenting those or after?

A. They were never, they were not patented.

 Q. Okay. They were not patented. Was the application for patent made?

A. No.

Q. Since your employment with Iviewit.com or Iviewit, yeah, dotcom, LLC, what patents have you taken out in your name, sir?

 A. I have not taken out any patents in my name, other than what has been appended to patents filed by Iviewit and assigned to Iviewit.

Q. Okay. So they're all patents held by Iviewit and you're named as a co-inventor; is

Utley states here that no patent application was made but in William Dick's sworn statement to the Virginia Bar he claims he filed the patent application. Utley perjury.

CLICK HERE TO SEE WILLIAM DICK CONTRADICTORY STATEMENT TO THE VIRGINIA BAR

Utley again commits perjury as evidence shows patents in Utley's name only and NOT assigned to Iviewit.

CLICK HERE TO SEE PATENTS IN UTLEY'S NAME SOLELY OR SOULLESSLY

that what it is?

A. Yes.

Q. And Iviewit would be listed as a primary patent holder; is that how it would be?

A. They were assigned to Iviewit.

Q. They were assigned to Iviewit. Are you aware of any police report that was ever filed involving Mr. Mike Real and yourself?

MR. PRUSASKI: Objection, relevance.

By MR. SELZ:

Q. Go ahead and answer the question, if you can, sir.

A. There was a dispute over the nature of the equipment that I bought from Iviewit as --

Q. Well, that really wasn't my question. My question was are you aware of a police report? And it's really a yes or no type of answer.

MR. PRUSASKI: Objection, relevance.

THE WITNESS: I believe there was a report.

By MR. SELZ:

Q. Okay. Do you know who filed that report?

A. Iviewit filed that report as far as

PERJURY

