

**From:** Robnathans@aol.com [mailto:Robnathans@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Saturday, December 26, 2009 10:48 AM  
**To:** patent\_quality\_comments  
**Subject:** SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT FROM MR. NATHANS

#1.:

If the following was put into practice, prosecution time would be shortened.

"Should the examiner still deem the application not in condition for allowance, the examiner is respectfully requested to make any suggestions in a telephonic interview or otherwise that may further advance prosecution in accordance with the mandate of MPEP 707.07 (j); page 700-101 8<sup>th</sup> Ed. : "When an application discloses patentable subject matter and it is apparent from the claims and applicant's arguments that the claims are intended to be directed to such patentable subject matter, ...the examiner should not stop with a bare objection or rejection of the claims. The examiner's action should be constructive in nature and where possible, should offer a definite suggestion for correction."

I have included this in numerous responses to office actions and it is almost always ignored. In the last several years I have found that perhaps half of the examiners have no interest in helping the inventors and many of the final rejections have been preposterous and require appeals. They often suggest RCEs...to improve their account at the expense of my garage inventors. Apparently many of them do not study the final rejections, or are simply incompetent.

#2. The MPEP is often also ignored when broad titles are permitted that convey no information as to what the final patent covers. This also makes the USPTO search less effective. Why click on "illumination device"? The examiners should suggest proper titles which is often not carried out.

Respectfully submitted,

Robert Nathans  
Reg. #19,558