

Hello,

I would like to suggest the following topics:

Rejection 102 and 103:

The Examiner needs to point only the references that are pertinent to the claim elements and not a shopping list like some Examiners do, and not showing where in the prior art resides the precise teaching of the claim element. Also, how the prior would be used perform the functionality of the claim.

I have had cases that I had to cancel claims and deal with just one because it is extremely difficult to respond to an office action where the Examiner is not clear and in a great deal of instances, the Examiner doesn't have a full grasp of the teachings of the prior art in relation to the claimed invention.

Means for rating the Examiner:

Means to rate the Examiner by the number patents examined based on the average of all the patents application examined by all the Examiners in the art unit. If the for instance, one Examiner averages 50 patents a year, but the art unit averages 50 patents per Examiner, then the Examiner will receive a lower grade than the average based on less examined patents. If on the other hand, the average is less, say: the average is 40 patents applications examined the Examiner will receive a higher grade. The same applying to the number of patents issued; the number of patent applications going to appeal; the number of patents applications overturned in appeal; number of RCEs filed; the average of time it takes from start of examination of an application to the final issuance into a patent or the abandonment of it, etc.

Also, a means for the patent applicant to rate the Examiner based on the Examiner's quality work, like: Knowledge of the prior art in relation to the examined application; knowledge of applying rejection according to the USPTO rules and laws; the quality of the work done by the Examiner in issuing a rejection, etc.

By allowing the Examiner to be rated based on the average and based on the quality of work for the patent applicant will enable the USPTO to know which Examiner is doing a good job or not, where retraining is need and being able to compensate the Examiner based on quality of work and not on the ability to dispose of an application ASAP or just moving it from one dock to another. The current point system can easily be manipulated and giving the impression that the Examiner is doing a good job while not.

Thanks,

John Almeida

Inventor - jalmeida2020@hotmail.com