

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

From: Rozenblat, David [mailto:drozenblat@sonnenschein.com]

Sent: Tuesday, January 03, 2006 5:35 PM

To: AB93Comments

Subject:

Hello,

I am a patent practitioner from Illinois, REG. No. 47,044 and have been in the patent field for over 8 years. I have to say that allowing the filing of continuation applications, along with RCE's, and C-I-P's, is in the vital interest of the USPTO and patentees as well. While the current restrictions may allow the USPTO to reduce its overflow, it would do so at the harm of patentees. I would suggest a better solution to the overflow problem is to hire more Examiners and not to limit the rights of the patentee.

Filing continuations serve many useful purposes, one which is to allow the patentee to more carefully tailor his claims to the product being sold. Sometimes, it takes many years to develop and sell a product, and the original claims do not always cover the final product. Therefore, it is often in the patentee's interest to file continuation applications to allow the patentee to modify his claims, even well after the time period for a reissue application.

Additionally, many times cases are transferred from one attorney to another, and while an argument "could have" been submitted it was not because the original attorney was not as talented as the latter attorney, and therefore missed certain arguments that he "could have" made. As a result, an RCE or a continuation would need to be filed in order to present a new argument that the previous attorney missed.

As it stands, for the above mentioned reasons, I currently object to the language proposed in RIN 0651-AB93.

-David Rozenblat

David Rozenblat

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

8000 Sears Tower - 233 South Wacker Dr.

Chicago, Illinois 60606

Direct 312-876-3427 FAX 312-876-7934