

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: 11/19/20 2:55 PM
Received: November 15, 2020
Status: Posted
Posted: November 17, 2020
Tracking No. 1k4-9k41-4rgk
Comments Due: December 03, 2020
Submission Type: API

Docket: PTO-C-2020-0055

Request for Comments on Discretion to Institute Trials Before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board

Comment On: PTO-C-2020-0055-0001

Discretion to Institute Trials Before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board

Document: PTO-C-2020-0055-0316

Comment from Jeff Hitzler.

Submitter Information

Name: Jeff Hitzler

Address:

1749 Chateau Dr

Green Bay, WI, 54304

Email: inventorgb@sbcglobal.net

Phone: 920-619-2030

Organization: Inventors Network of Wisconsin

General Comment

I have been an independent inventor for many years and had several Patents. Two Design Patents, and two Utility Patents 7,178,191 and 10,003,936. I am proud of the work I've done and the work I've done to create these novel devices. I've gone through the challenges of professional searches and having professional Patent Attorneys prepare my applications, and having them reviewed and granted. Having them invalidated would be a travesty. instituted trial. e) These provisions should govern all petitions absent a showing of extraordinary circumstances approved by the Director, Commissioner, and Chief Judge.

III: PROCEEDINGS IN OTHER TRIBUNALS

a) The PTAB should not institute duplicative proceedings.

b) A petition should be denied when the challenged patent is concurrently asserted in a district court against the petitioner, real party in interest, or privy of the petitioner and the court has neither stayed the case nor issued any order that is contingent on institution of review.

c) A petition should be denied when the challenged patent is concurrently asserted in a district court against the petitioner, real party in interest, or privy of the petitioner with a trial is

scheduled to occur within 18 months of the filing date of the petition.

d) A petition should be denied when the challenged patent has been held not invalid in a final determination of the ITC involving the petitioner, real party in interest, or privy of the petitioner.

IV: PRIVY

a) An entity who benefits from invalidation of a patent and pays money to a petitioner challenging that patent should be considered a privy subject to the estoppel provisions of the AIA.

b) Privy should be interpreted to include a party to an agreement with the petitioner or real party of interest related to the validity or infringement of the patent where at least one of the parties to the agreement would benefit from a finding of unpatentability.

V: ECONOMIC IMPACT

Regulations should account for the proportionally greater harm to independent inventors and small businesses posed by institution of an AIA trial, to the extent it harms the economy and integrity of the patent system, including their financial resources and access to effective legal representation.

Another lesson learned for all inventors. Patents cant really protect you against the guys with more money than you.

Copy