

# PUBLIC SUBMISSION

<b>As of:</b> 11/30/20 11:40 AM
<b>Received:</b> November 20, 2020
<b>Status:</b> Posted
<b>Posted:</b> November 24, 2020
<b>Tracking No.</b> 1k4-9k7a-ut4x
<b>Comments Due:</b> December 03, 2020
<b>Submission Type:</b> Web

**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-2020-0055-0513

Comment from Casey Wimsatt

---

## Submitter Information

**Name:** Casey Wimsatt

**Address:**

882 Pine Ave

San Jose, CA, 95125

**Email:** cwimsatt@symbionica.com

**Phone:** 4082698240

---

## General Comment

Please keep and expand, not restrict, Inter Partes Review. From my personal experience, the Patent Granting process is highly prone to errors. My patent was finally granted, but not before the examiner made multiple false claims in an attempt to deny it. In the final denial, the examiner had the gall to cite as prior art a patent that did the very opposite of what mine did. It found a way to remove motion (in order to allow consistent drawing by an artist), while mine explicitly was about adding motion (to facial expressions to help autistic kids understand emotions). It was a shocking display of incompetence at best. Given such a flawed and error prone system, it would be adding insult to injury to limit reviews/disputes of granted patents. Therefore, I urge you to keep the existing Inter Partes Review and consider expanding other means for reviewing examiner decisions.