PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: 11/19/20 12:17 PM
Received: November 13, 2020
Status: Posted
Posted: November 17, 2020
Tracking No. 1k4-9k2e-c33z
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-2020-0055-0201
Comment from Michael Schuster

Submitter Information

Name: Michael Schuster
Address:
718 W Westshore Drive
Shorewood, IL, 60404
Email: Michael.schuster2@me.com
Phone: 815-693-9453
Submitter's Representative: IL State Representative Bill Foster
Organization: MJSI, Inc

General Comment

To whom it may concern,

My name is Michael Schuster. I was a plumber for 15 years and had an idea for a product. I started my own company. Created original product along with several others and filed around 30 patents on my products. We had a nice business seeking products to Home Depot, Costco, Walmart, Ace Hardware and Menards. We had 20 employees here in Shorewood,IL. Our most successful product received nation awards winning the Chicago Innovations Award and the Home Depot Innovation Awards. Our success was short lived when the leading competitor that owned 80% of the market) infringed our product and stole our disruptive innovation.

We filed an infringement lawsuit against the competitor and they dragged out the process and drove up expenses to where we could not afford to continue. We fortunately survived the PTAB process but since this was not part of the contingency with the lawyers, and we had to pay a crazy amount of money to make it through the process. We didnt have enough to finish the

battle and were forced to settle out of court. We settled for an amount that was less than what the product generated in 2 months because the PTAB process drained our funds we could not have our day in court. We were forced to sell the company after revenue continued to plummet.

I urge adoption of regulations to govern the discretion to institute PTAB trials consistent with the following principles.

I: PREDICTABILITY

Regulations must provide predictability. Stakeholders must be able to know in advance whether a petition is to be permitted or denied for policy reasons. To this end regulations should favor objective analysis and eschew subjectivity, balancing, weighing, holistic viewing, and individual discretion. The decision-making should be procedural based on clear rules. Presence or absence of discrete factors should be determinative, at least in ordinary circumstances. If compounded or weighted factors are absolutely necessary, the number of possible combinations must be minimized and the rubric must be published in the Code of Federal Regulations.

II: MULTIPLE PETITIONS

a) A petitioner, real party in interest, and privy of the petitioner should be jointly limited to one petition per patent.

b) Each patent should be subject to no more than one instituted AIA trial.

c) A petitioner seeking to challenge a patent under the AIA should be required to file their petition within 90 days of an earlier petition against that patent (i.e., prior to a preliminary response). Petitions filed more than 90 days after an earlier petition should be denied.

d) Petitioners filing within 90 days of a first petition against the same patent should be permitted to join an 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.

Stop these erroneous patent challenges!