

From: ACUS Information nfo@acus.gov
Subject: FW: "Small Claims Patent Court Comments"
Date: August 29, 2022 at 9:35 AM
To: [REDACTED]

From: Amnon Michael Cohen [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, August 27, 2022 8:04 AM
To: ACUS Information <info@acus.gov>
Subject: "Small Claims Patent Court Comments"

The idea and concept of small claims court for disputed patents **is not the remedy** for the ongoing shift of the USAPTO away from its original granted mandate to harvest economic developments resulted from new discoveries based inventions and any other innovations of value to improve the quality and safety of life (Or impractical ones which may not give rise to any disputes)

I recognize the already strong political and professional acceptance of such remedy, but I ask for your wisdom that the remedy is not in resolving disputes but by focusing on eliminating potential future disputes on IP ownerships.

The remedy had been outlined in my published website related to improving the global patent and trading in yet new original Intellectual Properties and arts' system.

My short comment is submitted among many long and detailed proposals and support which does not see the importance and value of the original concept of patent protection as set in The Venetian Patent Statute.

As an inventor, my experience with the USAPTO has indicated its directors are self-serving political and economic interests and not the key clients "The Inventors", and in my experience there are parts which I can not disclose as to the poor conduct and disservice I had experienced including the long unreasonable standing delay in the USAPTO processing my last patent application without accountability to its shortcoming.

Before around 1984 the USAPTO was a better office for us inventors to work with, more accountable to its clients.

The need to avoid disputes starts with a proficient system and more

modern service as in my proposal for the pre-patent—pre-partnership registration option which is not the resulted provisional patent option resulted from my original proposal for the USAPTO. The safeguard is in the original 1st to invent, 1st to file and 1st not to publish strategy till the suitable commercial partnership is formed and the patent application is processed by its owners — because a patent is not of value without its market value — and all disputes as large as PTAB cases or as small as the proposed new **small claims court proposal** are and will be for cases where the market value of the invention has been recognized!

In my submission, I am just asking for your wisdom to actually realize that the need for modernization and mending the flaws already within the more and more complicated system is in the input of my original proposal for the Prepatent Registry option (Plus its Trading-Post and further Global Taxation Treaty options) where inventors and investors plus corporate partners are protected already from the original higher quality application that examiners can welcome, also employing more modern computerized tools/solutions.

I like to add the popular translation of the original Venetian Patent Statute document to be simply respected:

There are in this city, and also there come temporarily by reason of its greatness and goodness, men from different places and most clever minds, capable of devising and inventing all manner of ingenious contrivances. And should it be provided, that the works and contrivances invented by them, others having seen them could not make them and take their honor, men of such kind would exert their minds, invent and make things which would be of no small utility and benefit to our State. Therefore, decision will be passed that, by authority of this Council, each person who will make in this city any new ingenious contrivance, not made heretofore in our dominion, as soon as it is reduced to perfection, so that it can be used and exercised, shall give notice of the same to the office of our Provisioners of Common. It being forbidden to any other in any territory and place of ours to make any other contrivance in the form and resemblance thereof, without the consent and license of the author up to ten years. And, however, should anybody make it, the aforesaid author and inventor will have the liberty to cite him before any office of this city, by which office the aforesaid who shall infringe be forced to pay him the sum of one hundred ducates and the contrivance immediately destroyed. Being then in liberty of our Government at his will to take and use in his need any of the said contrivances and instruments, with this condition, however, that no others than the authors shall exercise them.

Amnon Michael Cohen
Owner “Superior Hulls Inc.”

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Israel

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Canada