



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
WWW.USPTO.GOV

Paper No. 6

HERBERT G. ZINSMEYER
5911 BULLARD DRIVE
AUSTIN TX 78757

COPY MAILED

OCT 0 2 2006

OFFICE OF PETITIONS

In re Application of :
HERBERT G. ZINSMEYER et al. :
Application No. 09/076,477 :
Patent No. 5,926,441 :
Filed: May 12, 1998 : DECISION ON RENEWED PETITION
Issue Date: July 20, 1999 : UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.378(E)
Title: SUN SYNCHRONIZED TIMER :
FOR AN ANIMAL FEEDER :

This is a decision on the renewed petition filed January 30, 2006, under 37 C.F.R. §1.378(e), requesting reconsideration of a prior decision pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.378(b)¹, which refused to accept the delayed payment of a maintenance fee for the above-referenced patent.

The Office regrets the period of delay in issuing this decision.

¹ Any petition to accept an unavoidably delayed payment of a maintenance fee filed under 37 C.F.R. §1.378(b) must include:

- (1) The required maintenance fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. §1.20 (e) through (g);
- (2) The surcharge set forth in 37 C.F.R. §1.20(i)(1), and;
- (3) A showing that the delay was unavoidable since reasonable care was taken to ensure that the maintenance fee would be paid timely and that the petition was filed promptly after the patentee was notified of, or otherwise became aware of, the expiration of the patent. The showing must enumerate the steps taken to ensure timely payment of the maintenance fee, the date and the manner in which patentee became aware of the expiration of the patent, and the steps taken to file the petition promptly.

The request to accept the delayed payment of the maintenance fee is DENIED².

A discussion follows.

Procedural history

The patent issued on July 20, 1999. The grace period for paying the 3½ year maintenance fee provided in 37 C.F.R 1.362(e) expired at midnight on July 20, 2003, with no payment received. Accordingly, the patent expired on July 20, 2003.

The original petition was submitted on November 21, 2005, and was dismissed via the mailing of a decision on January 19, 2006, for failure to establish that the entire period of delay was unavoidable.

With the present petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.378(e), Petitioner has submitted the fee associated with the filing of a petition under this section of the C.F.R. as well as a statement of facts.

The standard

35 U.S.C. §41(c)(1) states:

The Director may accept the payment of any maintenance fee... after the six-month grace period if the delay³ is shown to the satisfaction of the Director to have been unavoidable.

§1.378(b)(3) is at issue in this case. Acceptance of a late maintenance fee under the unavoidable delay standard is considered under a very stringent standard. Decisions on reviving abandoned applications on the basis of "unavoidable" delay have adopted the reasonably prudent person standard in determining if the delay was unavoidable:

The word 'unavoidable' ... is applicable to ordinary human affairs, and requires no more or greater care or diligence than is generally used and

² This decision may be regarded as a final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. §704 for the purposes of seeking judicial review. See MPEP 1002.02.

³ This delay includes the entire period between the due date for the fee and the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.378(b).

observed by prudent and careful men in relation to their most important business⁴.

In addition, decisions are made on a "case-by-case basis, taking all the facts and circumstances into account."⁵ Nonetheless, a petition cannot be granted where a petitioner has failed to meet his or her burden of establishing that the delay was "unavoidable."⁶

A delay caused by an applicant's lack of knowledge or improper application of the patent statute, rules of practice, or the MPEP is not rendered "unavoidable" due to either the applicant's reliance upon oral advice from USPTO employees or the USPTO's failure to advise the applicant to take corrective action⁷.

Presuming for the purposes of discussion that it was an act/omission of Counsel that contributed to any of the delay herein, the act(s) or omissions of the attorney/agent are imputed wholly to the applicant/client⁸ in the absence of evidence that the attorney/agent has acted to deceive the client.⁹

The Office must rely on the actions or inactions of duly authorized and voluntarily chosen representatives of the applicant, and the applicant is bound by the consequences

4 In re Mattullath, 38 App. D.C. 497, 514-15 (1912) (quoting Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 31, 32-33 (1887)); see also Winkler v. Ladd, 221 F. Supp. 550, 552, 138 U.S.P.Q. 666, 167-68 (D.D.C. 1963), aff'd, 143 U.S.P.Q. 172 (D.C. Cir. 1963); Ex parte Henrich, 1913 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 139, 141 (1913).

5 Smith v. Mossinghoff, 671 F.2d at 538, 213 U.S.P.Q. at 982.

6 Haines v. Quigg, 5 USPQ2d 1130 (N.D. Ind. 1987), 673 F. Supp. at 316-17, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1131-32.

7 See In re Sivertz, 227 USPQ 255, 256 (Comm'r Pat. 1985).

8 The actions or inactions of the attorney/agent must be imputed to the petitioners, who hired the attorney/agent to represent them. Link v. Wabash Railroad Co., 370 U.S. 626, 633-634, 82 S.Ct. 1386, 1390-91 (1962). The failure of a party's attorney to take a required action or to notify the party of its rights does not create an extraordinary situation. Moreover, the neglect of a party's attorney is imputed to that party and the party is bound by the consequences. See Huston v. Ladner, 973 F.2d 1564, 23 USPQ2d 1910 (Fed Cir. 1992); Herman Rosenberg and Parker Kalon Corp. v. Carr Fastener Co., 10 USPQ 106 (2d Cir. 1931).

9 When an attorney intentionally conceals a mistake he has made, thus depriving the client of a viable opportunity to cure the consequences of the attorney's error, the situation is not governed by the stated rule in Link for charging the attorney's mistake to his client. In re Lonardo, 17 USPQ2d 1455 (Comm'r. Pat. 1990).

of those actions or inactions¹⁰. Specifically, petitioner's delay caused by the mistakes of negligence of his voluntarily chosen representative does not constitute unavoidable delay within the meaning of 35 USC 133¹¹.

The actions of the attorney are imputed to the client, for when a petitioner voluntarily chooses an attorney to represent him, the petitioner cannot later avoid the repercussions of the actions or inactions of this selected representative, for clients are bound by the acts of their lawyers/agents, and constructively possess "notice of all facts, notice of which can be charged upon the attorney¹²."

Courts hesitate to punish a client for its lawyer's gross negligence, especially when the lawyer affirmatively misled the client," but "if the client freely chooses counsel, it should be bound to counsel's actions¹³."

The portions of the MPEP relevant to the facts as presented

2504 Patents Subject to Maintenance Fees

37 CFR 1.362. Time for payment of maintenance fees.

(a) Maintenance fees as set forth in §§ 1.20(e) through (g) are required to be paid in all patents based on applications filed on or after December 12, 1980, except as noted in paragraph (b) of this section, to maintain a patent in force beyond 4, 8 and 12 years after the date of grant.

(b) Maintenance fees are not required for any plant patents or for any design patents. Maintenance fees are not required for a reissue patent if the patent being reissued did not require maintenance fees.

(c) The application filing dates for purposes of payment of maintenance fees are as follows:

(1) For an application not claiming benefit of an earlier application, the actual United States filing date of the application.

(2) For an application claiming benefit of an earlier foreign application under 35 U.S.C. 119, the United States filing date of the application.

(3) For a continuing (continuation, division, continuation-in-part) application claiming the benefit of a prior patent application under 35 U.S.C. 120, the actual United States filing date of the continuing

¹⁰ Link v. Wabash, 370 U.S. 626, 633-634 (1962).

¹¹ Haines, 673 F.Supp. at 316-17, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d at 1131-32; Smith v. Diamond, 209 USPQ 1091 (D.D.C. 1981); Potter v. Dann, 201 USPQ 574 (D.D.C. 1978); Ex parte Murray, 1891 Dec. Comm'r Pat. 103, 131 (Comm'r Pat. 1891).

¹² Link at 633-634.

¹³ Inryco, Inc. v. Metropolitan Engineering Co., Inc., 708 F.2d 1225, 1233 (7th Cir. 1983). See also, Wei v. State of Hawaii, 763 F.2d 370, 372 (9th Cir. 1985); LeBlanc v. I.N.S., 715 F.2d 685, 694 (1st Cir. 1983).

application.

(4) For a reissue application, including a continuing reissue application claiming the benefit of a reissue application under 35 U.S.C. 120, the United States filing date of the original non-reissue application on which the patent reissued is based.

(5) For an international application which has entered the United States as a Designated Office under 35 U.S.C. 371, the international filing date granted under Article 11(1) of the Patent Cooperation Treaty which is considered to be the United States filing date under 35 U.S.C. 363.

(d) Maintenance fees may be paid in patents without surcharge during the periods extending respectively from:

(1) 3 years through 3 years and 6 months after grant for the first maintenance fee,

(2) 7 years through 7 years and 6 months after grant for the second maintenance fee, and

(3) 11 years through 11 years and 6 months after grant for the third maintenance fee.

(e) Maintenance fees may be paid with the surcharge set forth in § 1.20(h) during the respective grace periods after:

(1) 3 years and 6 months and through the day of the 4th anniversary of the grant for the first maintenance fee.

(2) 7 years and 6 months and through the day of the 8th anniversary of the grant for the second maintenance fee, and

(3) 11 years and 6 months and through the day of the 12th anniversary of the grant for the third maintenance fee.

(f) If the last day for paying a maintenance fee without surcharge set forth in paragraph (d) of this section, or the last day for paying a maintenance fee with surcharge set forth in paragraph (e) of this section, falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or a federal holiday within the District of Columbia, the maintenance fee and any necessary surcharge may be paid under paragraph (d) or paragraph (e) respectively on the next succeeding day which is not a Saturday, Sunday, or Federal holiday.

(g) Unless the maintenance fee and any applicable surcharge is paid within the time periods set forth in paragraphs (d), (e) or (f) of this section, the patent will expire as of the end of the grace period set forth in paragraph (e) of this section. A patent which expires for the failure to pay the maintenance fee will expire at the end of the same date (anniversary date) the patent was granted in the 4th, 8th, or 12th year after grant.

(h) The periods specified in §§ 1.362 (d) and (e) with respect to a reissue application, including a continuing reissue application thereof, are counted from the date of grant of the original non-reissue application on which the reissued patent is based.

Maintenance fees are required to be paid on all patents based on applications filed on or after December 12, 1980, except for plant patents and design patents. Furthermore, maintenance fees are not required for a reissue patent if the patent being reissued did not require maintenance fees. Application filing dates for purposes of determining whether a patent is subject to payment of maintenance fees are as follows:

(A) For an application not claiming benefit of an earlier application, the actual United States filing date of the application.

(B) For an application claiming benefit of an earlier foreign application under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), the actual United States filing date of the application.

(C) For a continuing (continuation, division, continuation-in-part) application claiming the benefit of a prior patent application under 35 U.S.C. 120, the actual United States filing date of the continuing application.

(D) For a reissue application, including a continuing reissue application claiming the benefit of a reissue application under 35 U.S.C. 120, the United States filing date of the original nonreissue application on which the patent reissued is based.

(E) For an international application that has entered the United States as a Designated Office under 35 U.S.C. 371, the international filing date granted under Article 11(1) of the Patent Cooperation Treaty which is considered to be the United States filing date under 35 U.S.C. 363.

2506 Times for Submitting Maintenance Fee Payments

37 CFR 1.362(d) sets forth the time periods when the maintenance fees for a utility patent can be paid without surcharge. Those periods, referred to generally as the "window period," are the 6-month periods preceding each due date. The "due dates" are defined in 35 U.S.C. 41(b). The window periods are (1) 3 years to 3 1/2 years after the date of issue for the first maintenance fee payment, (2) 7 years to 7 1/2 years after the date of issue for the second maintenance fee payment, and (3) 11 years to 11 1/2 years after the date of issue for the third and final maintenance fee payment. A maintenance fee paid on the last day of a window period can be paid without surcharge. The last day of a window period is the same day of the month the patent was granted 3 years and 6 months, 7 years and 6 months, or 11 years and 6 months after grant of the patent. 37 CFR 1.362(e) sets forth the time periods when the maintenance fees for a utility patent can be paid with surcharge. Those periods, referred to generally as the "grace period," are the 6-month periods immediately following each due date. The grace periods are (1) 3 1/2 years and through the day of the 4th anniversary of the grant of the patent, (2) 7 1/2 years and through the day of the 8th anniversary of the grant of the patent and, (3) 11 1/2 years and through the day of the 12th anniversary of the grant of the patent. A maintenance fee may be paid with the surcharge on the same date (anniversary date) the patent was granted in the 4th, 8th, or 12th year after grant to prevent the patent from expiring. Maintenance fees for a reissue patent are due based upon the schedule established for the original utility patent. The filing of a request for ex parte or inter partes reexamination and/or the publication of a reexamination certificate does not alter the schedule of maintenance fee payments of the original patent. If the day for paying a maintenance fee falls on a Saturday, Sunday, or a Federal holiday within the District of Columbia, the maintenance fee may be paid on the next succeeding day that is not a Saturday, Sunday, or Federal holiday. For example, if the window period for paying a maintenance fee without a surcharge ended on a Saturday, Sunday, or a Federal holiday within the District of Columbia, the maintenance fee can be paid without surcharge on the next succeeding day that is not a Saturday, Sunday, or a Federal holiday within the District of Columbia. Likewise, if the grace period for paying a maintenance fee with a surcharge ended on a Saturday, Sunday, or a Federal holiday within the District of Columbia, the maintenance fee can be paid with surcharge on the next succeeding day that is not a Saturday, Sunday, or a Federal holiday within the District of Columbia. In the latter

situation, the failure to pay the maintenance fee and surcharge on the next succeeding day that is not a Saturday, Sunday, or a Federal holiday within the District of Columbia will result in the patent expiring on a date (4, 8, or 12 years after the date of grant) earlier than the last date on which the maintenance fee and surcharge could be paid. This situation results from the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 21, but those provisions do not extend the expiration date of the patent if the maintenance fee and any required surcharge are not paid when required. For example, if the grace period for paying a maintenance fee with a surcharge ended on a Saturday, the maintenance fee and surcharge could be paid on the next succeeding business day, e.g., Monday, but the patent will have expired at midnight on Saturday if the maintenance fee and surcharge were not paid on the following Monday. Therefore, if the maintenance fee and any applicable surcharge are not paid, the patent will expire as of the end of the grace period as listed above. A patent that expires for failure of payment will expire on the anniversary date the patent was granted in the 4th, 8th, or 12th year after the grant.

2542 Change of Correspondence Address

Unless a fee address has been designated, all notices, receipts, refunds, and other communications relating to the patent will be directed to the correspondence address (37 CFR 1.33) used during the prosecution of the application. Practitioners of record when the patent issues who do not wish to receive correspondence relating to maintenance fees must change the correspondence address in the patented file or provide a fee address to which such correspondence should be sent. It is not required that a practitioner file a request for permission to withdraw pursuant to 37 CFR 1.36 solely for the purpose of changing the correspondence address in a patented file.

The correspondence address should be updated or changed as necessary to ensure that all communications are received in a timely manner. A change of correspondence address may be made as provided in 37 CFR 1.33(a). The correspondence address may be changed as provided in 37 CFR 1.33(a)(1) prior to the filing of an oath or declaration. After an oath or declaration has been executed and filed by at least one inventor, the correspondence address may be changed as provided in 37 CFR 1.33(a)(2). Requests for a change of the correspondence address may be sent to the Office of Public Records, Document Services Division, Special Handling Branch during the enforceable life of the patent. To ensure accuracy and to expedite requests for change to the correspondence address, it is suggested that the request include both the patent number and the application number. Form PTO/SB/122 may be used to request a change of correspondence address in a patent application. Form PTO/SB/123 may be used to request a change of correspondence address for an issued patent.

Application of the standard to the current facts and circumstances

Petitioner's explanation of the delay has been considered, and it has been determined that it fails to meet the standard for acceptance of a late payment of the maintenance fee and surcharge.

In the original petition under 37 C.F.R. §1.378(b), submitted November 21, 2005, Petitioner set forth that he relied on his attorney to remind him of the maintenance fee, and his attorney closed his practice. The petition was dismissed as Petitioner had failed to establish that steps were in place for ensuring the timely payment of this maintenance fee.

With this renewed petition, Petitioner has explained that he has since put into place steps for ensuring that future maintenance fee payments will not be missed, comprising of a combination of a paper calendar, a hand-held computer, and his personal computer.

It appears that Petitioner has mistaken the requirement. Rule §1.378(b)(3) requires:

A showing that the delay was unavoidable since reasonable care was taken to ensure (emphasis added) that the maintenance fee would be paid timely and that the petition was filed promptly after the patentee was notified of, or otherwise became aware of, the expiration of the patent. The showing must enumerate the steps taken (emphasis added) to ensure timely payment of the maintenance fee, the date and the manner in which patentee became aware of the expiration of the patent, and the steps taken to file the petition promptly.

The steps which this rule requires does not pertain to future maintenance fee payments, but rather previous maintenance fee payments, i.e. the missed payment which resulted in the expiration of this patent.

As such, an adequate showing that the delay in payment of the maintenance fee at issue was "unavoidable" within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 41(c) and 37 C.F.R 1.378(b)(3) requires a showing of the steps taken to ensure the timely payment of the maintenance fees for this patent. Where the record fails to disclose that the patentee took reasonable steps, or discloses that the patentee took no steps to ensure timely payment of the maintenance fee, 35 U.S.C. 41(c) and 37 C.F.R. §1.378(b)(3) preclude acceptance of the delayed payment of the maintenance fee under 37 C.F.R §§1.378(b) and/or (e).

It is clear that Petitioner relied on his attorney to track his maintenance fees for him, and it is noted that in the original petition, Petitioner asserted that the attorney retired shortly after the patent issued, and that the attorney might have informed the Patentee that he would thereafter be responsible

for keeping track of the maintenance fees himself. However, it does not appear that Petitioner enacted any steps for ensuring the timely payment of the 3-½ year maintenance fee. Consequently, Petitioner will not be able to establish that the entire period of delay was unavoidable.

CONCLUSION

The prior decision which refused to accept, under 37 C.F.R. §1.378(b), the delayed payment of a maintenance fee for the above-identified patent, has been reconsidered. For the above stated reasons, the delay in this case cannot be regarded as unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §41(c)(1) and 37 C.F.R. §1.378(b).

Since this patent will not be reinstated, the petitioner is entitled to a refund of the surcharge and the 3-½ year maintenance fee, but not the \$400 associated with the filing of this petition. A treasury check will be issued in due course.

As stated in 37 C.F.R. §1.378(e), no further reconsideration or review of this matter will be undertaken.

As a side note, on the second page of his petition, Petitioner comments "there apparently is no mechanism in place to change the recipient's address" for receiving maintenance fee reminders from the Office. This is not accurate. In order to update the fee address for his other patents, Petitioner would be well advised to use the form which may be downloaded at <http://www.uspto.gov/web/forms/sb0047.pdf>.

Telephone inquiries should be directed to Senior Attorney Paul Shanoski at (571) 272-3225.



Charles Pearson
Director
Office of Petitions
United States Patent and Trademark Office