

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: 11/19/20 3:50 PM
Received: November 16, 2020
Status: Posted
Posted: November 17, 2020
Tracking No. 1k4-9k4g-ogs2
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-2020-0055-0342

Comment from Brian Aumiller.

Submitter Information

Name: Brian Aumiller

Address:

2931 Shannon Cir
Palm Harbor, FL, 34684

Email: brian13b@hotmail.com

Phone: 7853416587

Organization: Under the Nail, LLC

General Comment

Hello,

My name is Brian and Ive been working on bringing an Invention to market, for the last 3 years. Along the way Ive learned that a Patent isn't as valuable as I thought.

When I first heard the story of Josh Malone and his fight with a large Direct Response Company(Telebrands) and how they willfully stole/copied his Invention. I cant tell you how scary that is to know that my Wife and I put our money into something that we think will protect us, but the cost to protect it is unfathomable. I believe Josh and his team spent upwards of 25 million to PROTECT his PATENT, but with repeated attacks(PTAB) the cost and stress adds up. I dont how this system is fair or ethical.

I went and spoke at a Success Act hearing help by the USPTO in DC around May of 2018. The Report that came out, was a let down because it didn't directly talk about the issues facing the Underrepresented on obtaining Patents. The lack of Inventors bring their Ideas were not there. But they did recommend a Coin. It seems like a waste helping us get a Patent, then on the other

hand tells we need millions more to defend it... I do believe we can fix this.

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.