-----Original Message-----
From: Daniel Bestor [mailto:dbestor@trexlaw.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 04, 2006 12:09 PM
To: AB93Comments
Subject: changes in continuation practice

I disagree wholeheartedly on the proposed changes to the continuation practice. The process of prosecuting a patent in front of the PTO is a negotiation. The applicant wants to obtain protection for his innovative contributions in return for granting the public access to the invention. The PTO wants to make sure that the applicant receives protection ONLY for the new subject matter the applicant added to the public knowledge.

The continuation practice (continutaions and RCEs) are an integral part of this negotiation process and should NOT be changed. The founders of this country recognized the importance of investing in science and technology, and right now, one of the biggest industries and generators of wealth is technology (mechanical, electrical, biological, to name a few).

I also fear that any changes to the continuation practice will simply cause applicants to file multiple initial patent filings, which will cause even more confusion and problems with public notice. At least with the continuation practice, there is a connected chain of applications of which a member of the public and/or a competitor can obtain to determine the extent of patent protection in that area. With these changes, this logical mapping would be eliminated.

In summary, it is my opinion that the PTO would be doing a great disservice to the inventors, small and large, in this country but modifying the continuation practice as indicated.

Thanks,
Dan

Daniel Bestor
Technical Advisor
Trexler, Bushnell, Giangiorgi, Blackstone & Marr
105 West Adams Street
Suite 3600
Chicago, IL 60603-6299
Phone: (312) 704-1890 ext. 135
Fax: (312) 704-8023