

-----Original Message-----

From: ghtelf@aol.com

Sent: Wednesday, August 16, 2006 2:54 PM

To: AB95 Comments

Cc: ghtelf@aol.com

Subject: Proposed Changes to IDS Requirements

I submit these comments as an AIPLA member and attorney with over 45 yrs. of practice with extensive experience meeting requirements to cite art as a soliciting attorney and also as one trying to understand and evaluate the records of patents of other parties.

We're all for improved quality and efficiency. But we must make sure any changes do not unduly burden applicants with added expense or create substantial uncertainty whether a rule requirement has been satisfied.

In that context, I approve of much of the proposed changes with the principal exception of 1.98 a, 3, iv, v, and vi as to additional disclosure requirements. These need to be substantially redrafted to allow just reasonable justification of a citation [otherwise excessive in size, etc.] including how it is or may be material. I find the specified Explanation, Identification, Correlation, etc. requirements to be confusing, unduly burdensome, and likely to be traps that could skew post-issue claim construction to an unfair extent. As such requirements are merely intended to discourage citation, I don't favor it but would rather have you do it by requiring added fees, perhaps with escalation.

Thank you for your consideration....Respectfully, Gordon H. Telfer,
19,850