

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: 11/23/20 1:04 PM Received: November 19, 2020 Status: Posted Posted: November 20, 2020 Tracking No. 1k4-9k6k-ftol 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-2020-0055-0488

Comment from Applied BioKinetics LLC

Submitter Information

Name: Donald BUSHBY

Address:

23331

Triple Spur Lane

Spring, TX, 77373

Email: eedon@hotmail.com

Phone: 17132997263

Submitter's Representative: Donald Bushby

Organization: Applied BioKinetics LLC

General Comment

Hello Dear Sirs,

I am an engineer and an independent inventor. I am the founder of Applied BioKinetics LLC located in Spring Texas. I have developed and patented my invention for helping individuals to recover from the severe pain of Plantar Fasciitis. Our product has been / is sold under as a licensed product in well over 10,000 stores. This invention provides meaningful relief to those suffering heel pain. The product is covered by many hard earned very diligently examined US Patents (e.g. 8814818, 8216162, 8414511, 8834397, 8834398, 10212987 and 10299953). Some of these patents have gone up to the PTAB during prosecution.

The current USPTO system which favors deep pocketed Companies to unfairly out spend and leverage a flawed review / invalidation system must end, as it is biased and it discourages innovation and independent inventors.

Please consider taking steps to bring back fairness and balance to the system. Patents which have been reviewed and allowed after PTAB review during the prosecution should retain a very high bar to allowing them to be challenged again post issuance.

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.