

First, I believe that the topic submitted by Mr. Kirk Williams is an excellent one: A primary or supervisor examiner should not sign off unless having read and understood the underlying paper(s)/arguments.

My submissions propose a study of examinations/examiners in which:

1) An overly broad claim interpretation which is divorced from the specification is used, as addressed by *Microsoft Corp. v. Proxyconn Inc.*, No. 2014-1542 (Fed. Cir. June 16, 2015).

J. Carl Cooper  
Reg. 34,568