

Are Examiners using a 103 obviousness objection without prior art in the relevant subject matter? I have invented five different inventions which are truly innovative and groundbreaking ideas that no prior person has even thought up, let alone invented. The inventions are so brilliant that there is no prior art on them; yet the Examiners frequently imagine there are persons of ordinary knowledge of my previously unimagined inventions, and that those nonexistent persons would obviously think of my invention. The 103 language should be rewritten so that the Examiners must quote the exact words, found in previously-granted patents, that describe the new invention, in order to sustain an obviousness objection.

Are Examiners using a 103 obviousness objection even when there are no existing experts in the relevant art?

My inventions are so revolutionary and innovative that nobody has even conceptualized them before, so there is no relevant art for even an extraordinarily-knowledgeable person to look at and think the new invention would be obvious. *A fortiori*, an ordinarily-knowledgeable person would not consider my inventions to be obvious.

Are Examiners using a 103 obviousness objection when there are the only existing experts have only an ordinary knowledge of the relevant art at a time when extraordinary knowledge of the existing art is required to think of the new patent application invention? Each of my new inventions is so novel and innovative that the prior art and prior knowledge is of no use to any ordinary person to use think of my invention.

The purpose of the US Patent Office is to get brilliant innovators to share their brilliant inventions. If those brilliant innovators are defeated in getting a patent on their invention, they will stop disclosing their inventions with the US Patent Office.

David Stauffer 503-285-1100