

From:
Sent: Tuesday, May 11, 2010 4:29 PM
To: extended_missing_parts
Subject: Comments on Proposed Change to Missing Parts Practice

**Before the
United States Patent and Trademark Office
United States Department of Commerce
Alexandria, VA 22313**

In the Matter of)	
)	
Request for Comments on Proposed Change To Missing Parts Practice)	Docket No.: PTO-P-2010-0029
)	
)	
)	

To the United States Patent and Trademark Office

Comments from Nickolaus E. Leggett

I am an individual independent and employed inventor holding three U.S. Patents. My latest patent is a wireless bus for computers and other digital devices (U.S. Patent # 6,771,935). I am also a certified electronics technician (ISCET and iNARTE) and an Extra Class amateur radio operator (call sign N3NL). I have a Master of Arts degree in Political Science from the Johns Hopkins University (June 1970). In addition, I am a professional technical writer.

I strongly support this USPTO proposal to use the missing parts practice to allow applicants with a provisional patent application more time to file a complete nonprovisional application. The proposed additional 12 months would be of great help to independent inventors and small organizations.

Inventors need this extra time because of the difficulty of fully developing their invention so that its market appeal can be tested and capital obtained. At the present

time, there is a significant shortage of available capital for new and often speculative inventions. The inventor can find it useful to present a working prototype to potential investors. This increases the investors' confidence in the functionality of the new invention. Yet, at the same time the inventor wants to file for patent protection as soon as his or her concepts are fully developed. Thus he or she is attracted to the idea of filing a provisional patent application while the physical prototype is still being built and perfected.

The proposed mechanism would allow the inventor to file a provisional application and retain its value during a two-year period when he was completing his physical prototype and interacting with potential investors. The more novel the invention, the more important the extra time would be. This is because a highly novel invention is likely to be greeted with caution and even skepticism until its merits can be directly demonstrated to the investing community. This was the case in the past with the development of the telegraph, telephone, wireless telegraph, and the airplane. All of these had to be demonstrated to become real to the business community. The same situation holds true today. Thus the extra time would tend to encourage the development of highly novel inventions that can be very significant in the economy. Potential examples could include neutrino-based communications apparatus, electronics components using the natural vacuum of space, and highway-compatible vehicles using the ground effect principle.

It is directly in the national interest to provide this assistance to inventors. Most inventors are currently struggling with a very rough economy that makes the already difficult process of bringing an invention to market even more difficult.

Respectfully submitted,

**Nickolaus E. Leggett
1432 Northgate Square, #2A
Reston, VA 20190-3748
(703) 709-0752**

May 11, 2010