

Document ID: PTO-P-2005-0022-DRAFT-0004 Docket ID: PTO-P-2005-0022

Details Submitter Info Assignment File Set Permission Copy/Move Rendering Questions

Comment On [Learn more](#) *

Submitter Information

* denotes required field

First Name	<input type="text"/>
Middle Initial	<input type="text"/>
Last Name	<input type="text"/>
Mailing Address	<input type="text"/>
Mailing Address 2	<input type="text"/>
City	<input type="text"/>
Country	<input type="text" value="United States"/> Learn more
State or Province	<input type="text" value="- Select One -"/>
Postal Code	<input type="text"/>
Email Address	<input type="text"/>
Phone Number	<input type="text"/> Acceptable format is: ###-###-####
Fax Number	<input type="text"/>
Organization Name	<input type="text"/>
Submitter's Representative	<input type="text"/>

Number of Items Received

Submission Type	<input type="text" value="Web"/>
Number of Items	<input type="text" value="1"/>

Reset

Submit

Comment Info: =====

General Comment: The concept is right. Here are some thoughts:

1. Maximum claims for standard fee should be 10 (maximum independent claims: 3)

2. Claims 11-20: cost \$5000 for claim 11 and \$500 for each of claims 12-20; Claim 21 costs \$5000, etc. (Also, limit the # of cases an inventor/assignee can have open with extra claims at any given time since for some groups the \$ may not be a consideration)

3. New definition of applicant bearing the burden for additional claims: Patent

Examiner does a full search and examination on the additional claims instead of taking the patentability on its face based on a proper search by applicant (we don't

want a registration system). If the additional claims are not patentable there is a

\$25,000 fee for the applicant and a \$1000 bonus for the patent examiner. If a group has a second case happen like this in a calendar year the second fee is \$30,000 and a \$1000 bonus for that examiner, etc... This will help ensure the applicant who is sure he has such an important and valuable invention it requires

more than 10 claims to spend the money to do the leg-work up front.

4. Eliminate restriction practice. Make a rule that states only 1 statutory class

per application (this should reduce pendency by 2-3 months by itself).

5. New legislation reducing statutory period from 6 months to 3 months. Can only

reopen application after 3 months under extreme circumstance (significant reduction in pendency this way since many applicants take 6 months in response to everything and simply pay additional fees).

6. Assign on Quality review person to a SPE and have that person get to personally know and interact with the examiners of a particular art unit. The Quality review persons goals are aligned to improvements in quality...There is "us

vs them" thinking at times between Quality reviewers and examiners. This would go a long way to help it.

7. Extreme thought: Completely revamp the count system. Get a count for FAOM, one count for second office action and another for Final rejection/Allowance. If no second office action is needed in the case, get 2 counts

for rejection/allowance....Need some expertise in this, but essentially the count

system should promote reducing the backlog with the highest quality patent.

Getting 4 counts for an RCE where the same rejections are made over and over compared to an examiner who does 3 very strong FAOM...Question: Who did more valuable work vs who is a better performer on paper? The answer should be the same person, but it is not.

8. Another extreme thought: Eliminate individual production goals and form groups

of 6 examiners (2 primary, 2 "seasoned" junior examiners, 2 relatively new junior

examiners). This group divides the work amongst themselves to get valuable work

out the door as a group not as individuals. Take the expected production from that

group today working individually and increase the goal by 3%. Give a 5% raise for

those who volunteer for the new group setting. Set group goals for bonuses.

There would be 3 of these groups, typically, for an art unit. An art unit would have

1 SPE, 3 groups of 6 examiners, 1 LIE and 1 Quality Review/Training person who worked directly with the folks and for the SPE.

9. Require electronic filing of applications. This needs to happen faster and should

be easy to make user friendly for practitioners.

10. Require all prosecution to be done electronically
es,
and amendments all filed electronically. This and #9
s
over the life of a prosecution just in mailroom time.

I am a relatively new examiner with a considerable amount
environment experience. I understand that there are suggestions
and would be interested to see others develop them from
The goal is to process quality applications in a timely
patents.