-----Original Message-----
From: Vigil, Thomas [mailto:trvigil@welshkatz.com]
Sent: Thursday, March 02, 2006 8:19 PM
To: AB93Comments
Subject: comments and suggestions re continuing applications.

Gentlemen:

I have been practicing patent law since 1966.

I attended the presentation at Northwestern University in Chicago.

I believe the proposed restrictions on continuing applications are too drastic and a definite prejudice to applicants/inventors.

I do understand the need to un-jam the logjam of applications pending examination.

I also noted the Commissioners remarks that patentability reports would be very helpful in un-jamming the logjam.

So, I recommend that in every continuing application over 2, namely in a CON, DIV or CIP, that the applicant/inventor(s) be required to: 1. Indicate all relevant prior art known to him/her to be material or relevant to the claimed subject matter and 2. Indicate how the claims filed differ from prior presented and/or allowed claims.

I believe these restrictions will help un-jam the logjam and do not impose an unreasonable burden on the applicant/inventor(s).

While it is not quite a patentability brief, I do not believe it is unfair to require the applicant/inventor(s) to indicate how the newly presented claims differ from prior claims or to indicate prior art which the applicant/inventor(s) already has a duty to do.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Thomas R. Vigil Reg. 24,542