From: Ron Rosenberger [mailto:redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, July 30, 2014 8:00 PM
To: alice_2014
Subject: Technical Effect

To the USPTO-

It is a sad day learning that the Supreme Court of the United States (SCOTUS) has aligned its interpretation of business method patents
with interpretations of the patent offices of other countries comprising China, Europe, Australia, Canada etc. Said other countries have
had for numerous years prohibitions on software-based patents that did not provide a "technical effect" of improving the performance of a
computer, or improving tangible devices or articles of manufacture in other technical fields.

It has cost me roughly $25,000 - $30,000 to learn the laws of foreign jurisdictions "the hard way". Currently I have spent maybe 4-5 times
that amount since 1999 procuring the six business method patents I have at the USPTO, which were the result of many failed applications
to achieve that result, not to mention the thousands of hours I have spent since 1999 on different USPTO matters.

I've recently learned that my six patents are most likely unenforceable, as the subject matter that did not pass the litmus test for patentability for said
countries listed above is basically the new litmus test for the USPTO per the recent SCOTUS Alice Corp. ruling. For the record, all of my activities
with the USPTO are self-funded, representing an enormous personal sacrifice.

It is agonizing and horrible that the SCOTUS took so long to realize what SINO (the Patent Office of China) ruled so long ago. Had the SCOTUS made similar
determinations at approximately the same time China did, I would have saved a fortune in money and time. I was looking at these six patents
(two of my best which were issued this year in March and May) as the start of a new phase in my life, which, thanks the the SCOTUS, appears to have
been obliterated.

I feel that this ruling at such a late point in time is a national disgrace, and is an exemplary foreboding of China's impending World Supremacy
(because China thought of it first).

In any event, the "part two" analysis as per the USPTO's June 25, 2014 Memorandum is as follows:

- Improvements to another technology or technical fields;

- Improvements to the functioning of the computer itself;
- Meaningful limitations beyond generally linking the use of an abstract idea to a particular technological environment.

I am well-versed with the first two points. That said, the VERY LEAST the USPTO could do is provide meaningful examples of
the third point. My guess is that an enforceable USPTO business method patent requires some improvement to a tangible physical device
or article of manufacture.

All of this said, new guidelines for Examiners NEED TO BE MADE PUBLIC, if nothing more than to preserve what little remaining sanity
I have that I am doing everything I possibly can for my sinking ship.

At least I'm not alone, as this ruling affects many many thousands (hundreds of thousands?) of USPTO business method patents,
wherein the loss of maintenance fees to the USPTO on now-unenforceable patents will likely be in the billions of dollars.

After all, misery loves company.

Ronald Rosenberger