SZSN Expansion To Increase Production By 60 Million KG

Shandong Zhouyuan Seed and Nursery Co., Ltd (SZSN)
$0.28 UP 16.6%

SZSN’s 45,000 square foot expansion and new advanced production line will increase annual production by 60 Million KG’s of seed. This one is on the move again! Watch for news and get on SZSN first thing Monday!

Is the plan to turn around someday and use patents to crush Linux vendors and en d users who don’t pay the Microsoft patent tax?
Daubert is about experts, not just about whether certain testimony will be allow ed but even if a certain expert really is one.
Roughly translated, it says that the January letter was intended as support for open formats generally and specifically for ODF, not OOXML.
Pop quizzes as Microsoft deems it "a necessity".
InformationWeek didn’t write about that.
That is logical, since a pivotal point is who is the owner of the Unix copyright s.
The page on the Linspire executives lists only one founder, Michael Robertson.
Whatever standard is chosen, it should be one that makes it possible for everyo ne to equally use the standard and get equal results.
More resources here, particularly this one, Dual Standards: More Choice or Less?

party through advertising or massive exposure .
Open Source isn’t dead either.
What are the odds that the SCO v.
They do Daubert hearings in advance, usually, so the jury doesn’t have to sit tw iddling its thumbs in a soundproof area while it gets sorted out.
It is true therefore that their purposes are different.
Here’s the address to write to: standards at state.
By that I mean that the whole purpose is to let people know if some product or s ervice really is what it claims it is.
Yoo hoo, Massachusetts.
However, owning a federal trademark registration on the Principal Register provi des several advantages, e.
I don’t want to have to use Microsoft products or be dependent on them for anyth ing.
Doesn’t see any problem with co-existence.
Groklaw is here, if you can.
Who will let us interoperate with the "proprietary extensions"?
Still think OSI can have no trademark rights because it didn’t register the mark

?
IBM and there won’t be one until after SCO v.
There is no free lunch.
And observe the questions about openness that were raised at the meeting withou
t satisfying answers being provided.
I see no arrangement for resolving disputes.
This is unacceptable since, implementing this standard mandates the need for pr
ivate understandings.
Is this how standards are normally approved?
Peter Korn has some interesting material on that very point here and a followup
here.
Linspire said it was absorbing the initial fees, but I don’t know about upgrades
.
To my thinking, it’s more like the Open Group, which owns the UNIX trademark.
They have lawyers to darken your skies.
By that I mean that the whole purpose is to let people know if some product or s
ervice really is what it claims it is.
Judges have heard it all, and they know the law, so they can hear anything and i
f it’s not relevant, they know it.
Federal registration, a system created by federal statute, is not required to es
tablish common law rights in a mark, nor is it required to begin use of a mark.
We knows from "Get the Facts" days how that might work, but Massachusetts might
not.
Here’s a letter someone else sent, Andy Updegrove, for some ideas.
But if I do hear anything, I’ll add it to the article.
is privately held and not publicly traded.
We leave it to those implementing these technologies to understand the legal env
ironments in which they operate.
That’s what Groklaw is for, though, to make it simpler, but it’s still complicat
ed, so try to pay attention.
I’d disagree about morality and laws not being related, though.
Such goals do not belong in a standards process.
Doesn’t see any problem with co-existence.
pdf But it isn’t just companies.
Trial Preparation in SCO v.
But now, let’s look at the overview to see how they all interrelate, and I’ll a
lso try to give you a picture of what trial preparation in Novell is probably li
ke right about now.
When you want to know more but don’t know where to look.
Feel free to make use of it.
I don’t mind if I choose to use them, but I don’t like to be forced.
" Can’t you imagine a plausible court argument that Open Source has now achieved
  secondary meaning, that the public associates it with OSI approval?
By that I mean that the whole purpose is to let people know if some product or s
ervice really is what it claims it is.
And IBM isn’t the only major company in opposition by any means.
Judges have heard it all, and they know the law, so they can hear anything and i
f it’s not relevant, they know it.
Yoo hoo, Massachusetts.
Attached were some letters, which Microsoft characterized as supporting a yes vo
te on OOXML.
What that mark means is that no one else can use that complete phrase in the are
as that OSI does, and frankly, that would seem to add weight to the secondary me
aning argument.
They are free to do that, if they wish, but can you call that a standard?
Motions in limine are motions to exclude evidence, or more precisely to exclude
the mention of same without first getting court approval.
Nagarjuna: Availability of the specification of binary formats does not solve
the problem of another vendor’s ability to implement.
IBM is a licensee, not a copyright holder or even a copyright claimant.

Inquiring minds want to know.
If so, can we fix it?
It’s worse than Tivo, in my book.
Whatever standard is chosen, it should be one that makes it possible for everyone to equally use the standard and get equal results.
Of course, I know there are more now, because I’ve received some and you’ve posted others here.
I’ll explain it as best I can, but ask your lawyer if it matters to you in a real-world sense.
Considering OSI’s long association with OSI-approved lisencing, I doubt any lawyer would tell its client that OSI has no conceivable rights.
That might be Novell’s happy lot, but not IBM’s.
They have lawyers to darken your skies.
And what about the patents on future versions?
It is true therefore that their purposes are different.
But now, let’s look at the overview to see how they all interrelate, and I’ll also try to give you a picture of what trial preparation in Novell is probably like right about now.
There can be immoral laws.
Roughly translated, it says that the January letter was intended as support for open formats generally and specifically for ODF, not OOXML.
There are more resources on accessibility on Groklaw’s ODF page.
SCO’s tactics are as obvious as they are unlawful.
These counterclaims arise from SCO’s efforts wrongly to assert proprietary rights over important, widely-used technology and to impede the use of that technology by the open-source community.
That is actually the whole point of laws.
Unlike Updegrove, none of those respondents have made their comments public.
But I know you have your own thoughts.
We knows from "Get the Facts" days how that might work, but Massachusetts might not.
And in fact, McGibbon is quoted as saying this:Since ODF is underspecified, Microsoft would need to make proprietary extensions.
Daubert is about experts, not just about whether certain testimony will be allowed but even if a certain expert really is one.
I may swing back by to highlight that in another context someday.
All the links are there.
Here’s the USPTO’s "Basic Facts about trademarks, and here’s what it says about registering one:Is registration of my mark required?
I also haven’t forgotten this worrying language in Microsoft’s Open Specification Promise:Q: Is this OSP sub-licensable?
They have vays of making you talk, you know.
This is the desirable way.
To make such a claim now .
But I think it’s clear there is afoot an attempt to create the impression of some schism in the FOSS world.
Groklaw - PreTrial Preparations in Novell - What’s a Daubert Hearing?
FOSS folks talk out in public about things that corporations talk about behind closed doors.
registration with the U.
But the issue is: providing a way of preserving a vendor’s old documents is the service that a vendor is expected to do.
They say they don’t even care if the court wishes to set them after the Novell trial.
Although I do make good cookies, and you wouldn’t be disappointed, you surely would be confused as to who prepared and sold those cookies to you.
I don’t want to have to use Microsoft products or be dependent on them for anything.
Motions in limine are motions to exclude evidence, or more precisely to exclude the mention of same without first getting court approval.

This promise is directly applicable to you and everyone else who wants to use it .
I see no arrangement for resolving disputes.
Accordingly, SCO recently has changed the focus of its campaign against LINUX.
Accordingly, SCO recently has changed the focus of its campaign against LINUX.
Each set of goals is valuable; sacrificing either at the expense of the other ma y not be in the best interest of users.
Roughly translated, it says that the January letter was intended as support for open formats generally and specifically for ODF, not OOXML.
There can be immoral laws.
To my thinking, it’s more like the Open Group, which owns the UNIX trademark.
It is misleading to say so.
It’s Novell and SCO that are in the dispute about who owns the copyrights to Uni x.
The comment on SugarCRM’s forum relates not so much to issues of control of dist ribution and modification or whether it’s OSI-
"Only religious fanatics and totalitarian states equate ’morality’ with ’legalit y,’ " Torvalds wrote.
If you wish to review, you can read about Portugal here and about Italy here.
They can’t know how you feel unless you tell them, and they can’t understand the tech unless it’s presented with proofs of statements made.
Therefore, there is no stock symbol for the company.
The plaintiff, Red Hat, Inc.
This clearly shows that one of them is trying to preserve the existing data crea ted by a single vendor, while the other is to provide a generic encoding standar d for office documents.
And what if you and Microsoft don’t agree?
An open standard, to boot?
Roughly translated, it says that the January letter was intended as support for open formats generally and specifically for ODF, not OOXML.
What legal worries might we all have then?
Why would a business want software they can’t personalize?
There was an auditorium available they chose not to use.
By that I mean that the whole purpose is to let people know if some product or s ervice really is what it claims it is.
Considering OSI’s long association with OSI-approved lisencing, I doubt any law yer would tell its client that OSI has no conceivable rights.
It doesn’t cover anything running on a server.
I’d disagree about morality and laws not being related, though.
Accordingly, your distributees, customers and vendors can directly take advantag e of this same promise, and have the exact same protection that you have.
It’s a lot more than that.
So, Linus said it’s a fine choice.
Multiple parties may use the same mark only where the goods of the parties are n ot so similar as to cause confusion among consumers.
IBM is a licensee, not a copyright holder or even a copyright claimant.
Attached were some letters, which Microsoft characterized as supporting a yes vo te on OOXML.
Multiple parties may use the same mark only where the goods of the parties are n ot so similar as to cause confusion among consumers.
IBM Over and IBM Won.
I also haven’t forgotten this worrying language in Microsoft’s Open Specificatio n Promise:Q: Is this OSP sub-licensable?
Don’t do "unauthorized" things.
Attached were some letters, which Microsoft characterized as supporting a yes vo te on OOXML.
" Can’t you imagine a plausible court argument that Open Source has now achieved secondary meaning, that the public associates it with OSI approval?
SCO apparently recognized that the supposed "secrets" that SCO itself was making publicly available through its own LINUX distribution do not qualify as trade s

ecrets.
OOXML can’t offer us that, in that it appears to favor Microsoft, which is retai ning certain proprietary information or only making it available under NDA.
When you hate something, of course it’s harder to get your facts right, but whe re are the fact checkers to help journalists when they rant right off the rails ?
Groklaw is here, if you can.
You could easily have checked that right here on Groklaw, if you didn’t want to call IBM or SCO.
That trial should last several weeks, and then after that you could have a trial begin in SCO v.
Although I do make good cookies, and you wouldn’t be disappointed, you surely wo uld be confused as to who prepared and sold those cookies to you.
The comment on SugarCRM’s forum relates not so much to issues of control of dist ribution and modification or whether it’s OSI-
Note that his version is a wiki, with a request for input from others there, so for the most up-to-date version, you will want to check his page.
Back in January, that wasn’t on the table yet.
This isn’t between Microsoft and IBM.
Federal registration, a system created by federal statute, is not required to es tablish common law rights in a mark, nor is it required to begin use of a mark.
Although I do make good cookies, and you wouldn’t be disappointed, you surely wo uld be confused as to who prepared and sold those cookies to you.
There is no free lunch.
All the members of the committee received a letter from Microsoft.
Each set of goals is valuable; sacrificing either at the expense of the other ma y not be in the best interest of users.
You can’t share the software with others, pass it on with the patent promise, modify your own copy, or even use it for an "unauthorized" purpose, whatever t hat means in a software context.
It means exactly what Open Source means: that the product has met specific requi rements set by an entity recognized as having the authority to decide who does a nd who doesn’t meet them.
Motions in limine are motions to exclude evidence, or more precisely to exclude the mention of same without first getting court approval.
You certainly have the technical knowledge to explain technical matters well, sh ould you wish to.
Where a mark is protected only under common law trademark rights, the same marks can be used where there is no geographic overlap in the use of the marks.
For our purposes here, let’s just have fun with the worst deal I’ve seen yet in this category.
Linspire said it was absorbing the initial fees, but I don’t know about upgrades .
Here is the covenant, then, with some translation into plain English from legale se and some analysis by me interspersed.
I can just see the jury.
And what about the patents on future versions?
Once such elements are identified, Ecma can propose a model of extending ODF so that the possible problems are sorted out.
Roughly translated, it says that the January letter was intended as support for open formats generally and specifically for ODF, not OOXML.
Here’s Bitlaw’s page on common law trademarks:Trademark rights arise in the Unit ed States from the actual use of the mark.
So you can’t even fix something, if what Linspire sent you isn’t quite what you need.