

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: 12/4/20 11:14 AM
Received: December 02, 2020
Status: Posted
Posted: December 04, 2020
Tracking No. 1k4-9kf9-cum5
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-2020-0055-0751

Comment from Allen Coggins

Submitter Information

Name: Allen Coggins

Address:

1710 HWY K

St. Clair, MO, 63077

Email: allenc@thermasi.com

Phone: 314-931-1004 xt 101

Organization: Thermasi LLC.

General Comment

Thank you for taking the time to read my concerns.

MY name is Allen Coggins I have been inventing energy products throughout my career. I have learned about the unfair practices to the American inventor by the PTAB. It is highly concerning to me after all the money and time I have in attaining my patent that a competing company can challenge our patent with no or very little premise. I am shocked and appalled after finding out all my hard work, time, and money spent to get my patent now seems it could only be as good as the paper it is on. Your patent review process was very thorough, taking me close to 5 years to get my patent. Your reviewers have the time to find if a new patent is infringing on existing ones or if it is truly inventive. Why is the PTAB even needed if your reviewers do their job right the first time. The way the PTAB is treating the "Little guy" will only lead to more corruption and stifle innovation by people who are the backbone of this country who has hopes to one day achieve the "American Dream". It is time all the American branches of government stand up for the American inventor by stopping foreign infringers of our products and allow a truly free market to all Americans and not just big business.

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.