

From: John Boyd

Sent: Monday, January 22, 2018 4:21 PM

To: RegulatoryReformGroup <RegulatoryReformGroup@USPTO.GOV>

Subject: Comments concerning ideas to improve, revise, and streamline other USPTO regulations

Dear Sir/Madam,

I would like to propose a change to one regulation (1.83(a)) that I believe is inconsistent with other drawing regulations.

35 U.S.C. 113 "Drawings" states "The applicant shall furnish a drawing **where necessary** for the understanding of the subject matter to be patented."

Moreover, 37 CFR 1.81 confirms "The applicant for a patent is required to furnish a drawing of the invention **where necessary for the understanding of the subject matter sought to be patented**".

However, I have seen patent examiners refer to 37 CFR 1.83(a) to require new drawings for "every feature of the invention specified in the claims" even if not required to understand the claimed invention.

Accordingly, I think 1.83(a) should be revised as follows (bold/underlined) to be consistent with 35 USC 113 and 37 CFR 1.81:

- (a) The drawing in a nonprovisional application must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims **when necessary for the understanding of the subject matter sought to be patented**. However, conventional features disclosed in the description and claims, where their detailed illustration is not essential for a proper understanding of the invention, should be illustrated in the drawing in the form of a graphical drawing symbol or a labeled representation (e.g., a labeled rectangular box). In addition, tables that are included in the specification and sequences that are included in sequence listings should not be duplicated in the drawings.

I think this would improve and streamline USPTO regulations relating to patent drawings and reduce costs for applications.

Please let me know if you have any questions or comments.

Best,

John Boyd