
Sent: Monday, November 19, 2012 7:19 AM
To: Trials
Subject: AIA-PTAB
Importance: High

Good morning,

Email states:
Subject: Comments on AIA Regulations

Date: Mon, 5 Nov 2012 18:41:32 -0800

Attention: Janet Gongozola, Regulations Review under the AIA. At the annual AIPLA meeting on October 25-27, 2012, Mr. William Covey, Director of OED, announced publically that the USPTO would not provide or enforce any CLE requirements on any USPTO registered patent practitioner, either active or voluntarily inactive, and the AIA (LeahySmith America Invents Act), expressly provides that the CAFC "shall" transfer jurisdiction of such matters to the Court of Appeals of the relevant District in which an action arises. That now includes matters not relating to or involving patent laws, which in view of Mr. Covey's comments and action relating to CLE by USPTO registered patent practitioners. Thus, the jurisdiction of CLE matters, including the inactivity of the thousands of voluntarily inactive PTO patent practitioners does not any longer involve or relate to any PTO related CLE requirements or patent laws, such that the matter is now in the exclusive jurisdiction of the States, not in the PTO under 35 U.S.C. or 37 C.F.R., or law, including Sperry v. Florida, 373 U.S. 379, 388 (1963) and 18 U.S.C. 1001.



+dan Search Images Maps Play YouTube News Gmail Drive Calendar More



Gmail

More

COMPOSE

Message Systems SMTP - www.MessageSystems.com/fts/serve - Learn about our SMTP server, intelligent gateway & policy engine

Inbox (7)

Starred

Important

Sent Mail

Drafts

Circles

More

Search people...

cornishj

dan2222

mscornish

uspto

uspto

proposed regulations under AIA

Inbox x

dan daniel dan2222co1@gmail.com
to uspto

Attention: Janet Gongozola, Regulations Review under the AIA. At the annual AIPLA meeting on October 25-27, 2012, Mr. William Covey, DI that the USPTO would not provide or enforce any CLE requirements on any USPTO registered patent practitioner, either active or voluntarily America Invents Act), expressly provides that the CAFC "shall" transfer jurisdiction of such matters to the Court of Appeals of the relevant That now includes matters not relating to or involving patent laws, which in view of Mr. Covey's comments and action relating to CLE by US Thus, the jurisdiction of CLE matters, including the inactivity of the thousands of voluntarily inactive PTO patent practitioners does not any related CLE requirements or patent laws, such that the matter is now in the exclusive jurisdiction of the States, not in the PTO under 35 U.S. Sperry v. Florida, 373 U.S. 379, 388 (1963) and 18 U.S.C. 1001. Respectfully submitted, Cornell D.M. Jr. Ige Cornish, cornishj@erols.com, dan2222@juno.com, dan2222co1@gmail.com (submitted with the which being on Sunday is extended to Monday 11/6/2012).

Mail Delivery Subsystem mailer-daemon@googlemail.com
to me

Delivery to the following recipient failed permanently:

uspto@uspto.gov

Technical details of permanent failure:

Google tried to deliver your message, but it was rejected by the recipient domain. We recommend contacting the other email provider for fu this error. The error that the other server returned was: 550 550 5.1.1 <uspto@uspto.gov>: Recipient address rejected: User unknown in rel

----- Original message -----

DKIM-Signature: v=1; a=rsa-sha256; c=relaxed/relaxed;
d=gmail.com; s=20120113;
h=mime-version:date:message-id:subject:from:to:content-type;
bh=03bYQdT68Gih9onQaGbcEogjdodwp2CVqo/TW8VOao=;
b=bpEysm+zFP7/hAk645YSkqSrgPSCXV.JpBxlls1eML/a4JETKb7n0BWhCX6kmW/ljd
goVXFHubM/OOt++RKT20qzDudRFX5CP2iyCGUqawLkSZXV9AREMWMvy6vTAJHFyHIBHK
RWSIFMs0ahnjLcGltzbjyAjSt21Sce9nIRNWfsgo2ETWA6p1tbAdG0E71/f+5nUbKv
+w8M6Ocu3FivMRoTVx0Hdne6m7boto8xnEkulY5uk43peEdc8M9W5zOrkS7U66IK2rf
Cldsv7fKswv+vRjj6YHKaVNRtRre5rvZPPOoa+0C3pZOpQ9QbXJgVNyFU0vrWJLE0uv
Y+XA==

MIME-Version: 1.0