

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

As of: 11/9/20 12:22 PM
Received: November 09, 2020
Status: Posted
Posted: November 09, 2020
Tracking No. 1k4-9jzr-iiqi
Comments Due: November 19, 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-2020-0055-0025

Comment from FrontDoor Software.

Submitter Information

Name: Carrie Hafeman

Address:

33136 Timber Ridge Rd
Evergreen, CO, 80439

Email: carrie@frontdoorsoftware.com

Submitter's Representative: Josh Malone

Organization: Front Door Software

General Comment

Director Iancu:

I believe PTAB's intention was to create a fast track litigation and trial system that focusses on patents. PTAB needs to be abolished, or at the very least be run as a real trial, WITH A JURY, experts witnesses and testimony from the inventor allowed. Patents are property rights and thus require a real trial with a real jury.

If an inventor does have their patents taken away after they have already been awarded, the inventor should be compensated for the USPTO fees paid for those patents, patent attorney fees the inventor had paid, damages to shareholders, and additional financial damages to a company and/or inventor based on being awarded a patent, and all related damages resulting from having that patent taken away later by the very department that issued the patent in the first place.

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.

It is absurd that 85% of patents appealed to PTAB are declared to be invalid. Either the examiners should do a better job or the PTAB should be abolished.

Sincerely,
Carrie Hafeman