

Document ID: PTO-P-2005-0022-DRAFT-0006 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

Middle Initial

Last Name

Mailing Address

Mailing Address 2

City

Country [Learn more](#)

State or Province

Postal Code

Email Address

Phone Number Acceptable
format is: ###-###-####

Fax Number

Organization Name

Submitter's Representative

Number of Items Received

Submission Type

Number of Items

Reset

Submit

Comment Info: =====

General Comment: I strongly oppose the proposed rule changes because they adversely affect applications submitted by independent inventors prosecuting their own applications. The ability of examiners to succinctly consider the claims is important. However, in many cases, a dependent claim can save a rejected independent claim by incorporating its limitations. If examiners were all to reject independent claims without noting for the applicant that a dependent claim is objected to yet would be allowable if written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim, or other dependent claims, it would severely impair the ability of independent inventors to obtain patents in cases where patentable subject matter should have been found in their disclosures. In cases where the proposed rule changes would readily cheat independent inventors prosecuting their own applications. However, if substantially modified to protect the rights of independent inventors, the proposed changes would not be objectionable in spirit. In effect, independent inventors should be made exempt from the requirement, and, additionally, examiners should be carefully directed to ensure that applicants are aware that dependent claims may merely be "objectionable" because they would be allowable if appropriately rewritten in independent form, despite rejection of the base claim when standing alone. However, even for applications prosecuted by skilled attorneys, problems would arise. For example, it may be difficult for the attorney to determine whether a dependent claim would have been allowable if written in independent form, or if the base claim needs to be amended to make the remaining dependent claims allowable as well. Because the next Office action will likely be made final, the proposed examination practice would cheat applicants, in certain cases, of the ability to make a response to the first Office action. For these reasons, I am strongly opposed to the proposed changes in their present form. As Albert Einstein once said, "The law should be as simple as possible, but not any simpler." The importance of claims in the patent examination process is too important to risk inadequate oversight based on too much simplification.