

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

From: Ed Suominen [mailto:ed@eepatents.com]

Sent: Wednesday, May 03, 2006 2:52 PM

To: AB93Comments

Subject: Concerns about Proposed Continuation Application Rule Changes

Please see the attached letter for my comments expressing grave concerns about the continuation application rule changes (71 Fed. Reg. 48-61) being proposed by the Office.

Respectfully submitted,
Edwin A. Suominen

3355 E. Jump Off Joe Rd.
Valley, Washington 99181

Telephone: (509) 937-2627
Facsimile: (509) 937-2760

ed@eepatents.com

From the desk of
EDWIN A. SUOMINEN
Independent Inventor of
Electrical Engineering Technology

including

RF Receivers · Speech & Handwriting Recognition
Signal Processing · Cryptography · Digital
Authentication

U.S. Patents:
6,904,405; 6,631,256; 6,427,068;
6,052,748; 5,937,341

Published U.S. Applications:
2006/0019624; 2005/0171783;
2004/0038655

May 3, 2006

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL (ab93comments@uspto.gov)

Mail Stop Comments
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Re: Concerns about Proposed Continuation Application Rule Changes

Dear Sir:

As a fairly prolific inventor who has enjoyed some success from the exclusive rights vested in me under the U.S. Constitution, I am offended and saddened by the proposals recently advanced by the agency entrusted with granting those rights. The Office seeks to arbitrarily limit both my ability to address substantive issues during continued examinations and my opportunities to point out and distinctly claim all of the subject matter which I regard as my invention where time and resource limitations have precluded me from fully doing so in an original application. Implausibly, the "get it right the first time, or else" impact of these draconian proposals comes at the same time that pending "first to file" legislation threatens to make original application filings a wild rush to the nearest Express Mail window.

For the complex, multi-faceted inventions I have attempted to protect with my patent applications, the constrained examination envisioned by these proposed rules is hardly a "meaningful hearing appropriate to the nature of the case." I respectfully urge the Office to tread lightly on my rights of due process and refrain from imposing arbitrary limits on how extensively and thoroughly I am permitted to present my inventions to its examiners.

Respectfully submitted,



Edwin A. Suominen
Reg. No. 43,174