

To: Scott Sabatini
Political Reporter, Editor, Writer
Legalnewsline.com

Subject: Created in conjunction with the Southeast Texas Record

Sabatini:

February 19, 2009

1.) I read how Rep. Leahy is bringing back up the reform act. Reading your web site, you were very critical of this act. Explain how this act fails to protect inventors.

The proposed reform act has no mechanism to differentiate the method that the companies use to obtain the employee's signature (Gestapo Sign-Offs = Civil Rights Violations regarding Slavery, Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness, and Right to Participate in a Free Market Capitalist System).

This reform act may constitute and attempt to engage congress in a conspiracy to obstruct justice for inventors and enforce slavery and fraud through forced inventor sign-offs under threat of physical retaliation including and up to death, as they killed my relatives in the past, and to legitimize the theft of intellectual property by creating even more methods for corporations to steal inventions. Executives are free to hire as much security as they want while inventors have no security at all. The entire patent is skewed against inventors receiving awards for their patents or compensation. While we have 7 million trash patents on file, we have only 10 thousand that are valuable new product conception patents. We also have approximately another 10 thousand patents that have never been applied for, due to the refusal to grant patents on the items involved. Of these valuable marketable inventions, zero has been awarded into the correct inventor names and all of the valuable inventions are fought over and require court actions and are disputed inventorship. The act fails to establish a refusal to deal provision to stop the massive conspiracies to prevent inventors from being compensated and having the money to sue for their other inventions that were stolen. Presently companies will not hire individuals as independent intellectual property creators in partnership with them. They want to hire them for wages or say that they are going to hire them for wages and then pick their brain for ideas and refuse to pay or acknowledge their intellectual property creation or even continue their employment. The act should also require partnerships on a fair percentage of 33/66 on all intellectual properties created on company time. It accomplishes the following; it removes the guarantee from the patent system promising a patent in exchange for the sharing of the innovative ideas with the world. Gone is the guarantee of a new patent in the event that a patent is wrongfully awarded to another individual.

It literally fails to establish security for inventors against intimidation from inventorship dispute litigants. The act establishes improved methods for companies to steal intellectual properties from inventors both through the theft of properties of deceased inventors and enforcement of employment contracts regarding employer ownership of intellectual material rights instead of abolishing the legality of these agreements (slavery and repression of intellectual material creation incentive). Legal costs for inventorship or infringement disputes can exceed 1 million dollars and take up to eight to twelve years, effectively shutting out inventor s from obtaining

any form of justice from the patent system. The act does nothing to address this issue or improve the situation.

We must reform the present legislation in order to realize the precarious financial situation that small inventors and startup businesses are in. The patent system must shelter and nurture them instead of allowing big businesses to steal the inventions from them and reward them with multi-year lawsuits that they can't even afford to file.

2.) What are the biggest problems now with the patent system?

We have a situation where the largest producer of marketable significant invention can't even get a loan from the government, banks, or private sources. This means that our patent system is effectively shut down because there is no incentive to create and no method to finance new business startup. There's no potential to create exports that would create jobs. There's no potential for world wide headquartering in the United States. There's no method for generating consumer demand because no new products that aren't stolen are entering the market.

Unknown to most people is that all or nearly all of inventions that have occurred since 1790 have disputed inventorship conception issues through the use of every imaginable method. If you visit my website you will see the inventions of my grandfathers going back into time. The present system is totally defective of positive methods of proving inventorship. The patent office starts off with the incorrect theory that anyone is capable of creating a marketable significant invention and also that large conspiracies of individuals are the inventors instead of the reality that an idea forms in only one person's mind and that co-inventorship is rare and does not occur unless the main inventor begins the initial process. Then sub-invention or the full expansion of the possibilities occurs. Think tanks are not think tanks. They're theft tanks. They also allow inventions to be claimed as having been invented previously when actually they did not exist or they would have been available previously. The next problem is that they also consider inventions to be obvious and therefore anyone could have invented them.

Inventorship determination methods are the biggest problem facing our system. I proposed my patent reform act of 2008 shows many of the 30 or 40 different methods that inventors are cheated of their intellectual properties.

<http://inventingconsultantcreator.net/MRTPatentLegislationChanges.htm#2008reformation>

The first major problem is the slack of invention secrecy in the patent office itself. This problem, if it exists, essentially neutralizes any advantage gained through being the first to file at all, therefore, security must be improved. The second problem is leaks through ease dropping and EFS interceptions. This problem needs to be examined and corrected or it cannot be used as a reasonable method of evidencing at all. Ease dropping has been a problem since the 1870s and continues to be prevalent today in interfering with the correct inventorship determination. Also our present system has no mechanism in place regarding inventorship clusters with regards to using this as a court evidencing method of proving inventorship.

3.) From what I can tell you don't patent your own inventions, but patent those for others. Is this correct? Do you find yourself having to sue over patent rights in order to be compensated, or do you earn money with the proceeds from the patents themselves?

With regards to your statement of “From what I can tell you, don’t patent your own inventions, but patent those for others”, this is incorrect. For the last fifty years, persons have taken my intellectual materials from me and illegally claimed inventorship through inequitable conduct in order to defraud me of my legitimate legal interest in these intellectual materials. I have patented my own inventions, at least in the last seven months in order to establish myself as an inventor. Due to precarious nature of intellectual property conception, once verbalization occurs, a dispute instantly arises due valuable nature of the intellectual property. In some instances, further verbalization leads to more claims of inventions from other individuals leading a mentality that the largest pack of liars wins in court. Another set of methods of intellectual property theft are consummated through ease dropping and being overheard preparing documents, observations of internet usage, usage of the USPTO system, and potential security breaches at the USPTO. Previous to this seven month period dating back some four years, a small number of my patents, yearly, have been claimed by others through ease dropping. We patent no inventions for others. Although others may claim that we do as this is one method of intellectual property theft. Little known to the majority of the world is the fact that all intellectual property conception since 1790 has occurred to only four individuals, I being the last in a line of four. All of these individuals have been unprotected from intellectual property theft by the patent office and the lack of ability to afford reasonable security forces is due to the 100% theft of their intellectual materials. A conspiracy among businesses and possibly the patent office involves the judicial opinion that no one could have invented all invention.

With regards to your question “Do you find yourself having to sue over patent rights in order to be compensated?” No, I’m being shut out of the process by the inability to afford the court costs. This coupled with the average litigation time of 8 to 12 years and the ability of companies to shift funds out of the country, conceal funds, erode funds, and commit acts of violence against the inventor, add up to a no win situation for our inventors, let alone our new proposed system under Senator Berman’s bill. I have emailed Mr. Berman a copy my reformation of the patent act of 2007.

<http://worldonlyinventorofsignificancearguably.com/MRTPatentLegislationChanges.htm#2007reformation>

However, he has failed to make inventor beneficial changes to the act. He has only added more inventor negative provisions. So far we haven’t gotten that far with any of our patents. We imagine that the patents rights will be denied before issuance but in the unlikely invent that we are granted a patent, we expect that we will have to sue in order to be compensated. This is due to the fact that one person attempting to sue a large group of individuals with financial interests or claims of inventorship has a high probability of being defeated by intimidation, physically harmed, or becoming financially exhausted unless the inventor’s side has a large number of people and resources. This problem could be totally eliminated by changing the inventorship legislation to deal with inventorship and infringement issues thereby eliminating the need to even go to court.

With regards to your question “Do we earn money with the proceeds from the patents?” No, I’ve been skunked totally although I’ve produced all of the intellectual materials since 1953 and received no financial gain as in “not a nickel.”

No, presently we earn no money because we have no patents issued and there may be forces at work within the patent office and other locations to ensure we do not obtain them. This gets back to problem of 218 years of my family being shut out of intellectual property patent awarding.

<http://worldonlyinventorofsignificancearguably.com/MRTHistoricalInventions.htm>

We also have no individuals responding with interest in developing patent pending status applications that we have on file. I have had some individuals approach me on the street and comment that the quality and marketability of my patents look excellent but we are unaware of where they received their information from. We have also seen in the last few months the disgusting tendency of the intellectual materials claimed and developed by other companies. This points out the need for immediate conception determination at the time of filing because small inventors to not have the expertise or funding to battle large teams of corporate attorneys and groups of alleged co-inventors.

4.) You mentioned human advancement will stagnate, which makes sense if inventors can't get paid for their ideas. Can you give me some specific examples of how people you've worked with or perhaps you yourself have been harmed?

Some specific examples of persons who were injured by the theft of their intellectual materials are myself in particular and also all of the individuals who filed first in the patent office and then were subsequently denied a patent by patent office decision although, these individuals certainly would not have paid me either.

The so called economic stimulus plan recently approved by the house and senate demonstrates the slap in the face that our inventors are receiving by the country providing no money for economic stimulus at all to independent inventors. This demonstrates the lack of concern or even recognition that our entire economy is driven by new invention conceptions and without funding these new conceptions, expansion of the private sector cannot occur. Also, without a strong global patenting system, American business cannot realize profits to be spent in the United States. As far as specific example of how I have been harmed by the non-payment for my intellectual materials, I decided about four years to stop allowing my self to be literally robbed and intimidated by avoiding contact with the human race. Generally, since this contact forms the basis for the intellectual property difficulties. Since then, the marketable high quality of the patents entering the patent office have dropped drastically from 200-300 a year to 6 or 8 a year.

In the last seven and a half months, I and my office assistant have filed about ten provisional patents of which several have already been claimed by other individuals, demonstrating the uselessness of even attempting to use our patent system. Essentially, every valuable marketable invention conception since my birth in 1953 has been taken from me with zero compensation. I'm known as the Historical U.S. High Federal, although this position is generally unheard of. This lack of funds has resulted in lack of high genetic quality reproduction and therefore the end of the line for inventing high federals leading to the time of my death and the global invention stagnation and decline of life style qualities.

<http://inventingconsultantcreator.net/MRTHistoricalInventions.htm>

The lack of concern regarding high genetic inventor inbreeding and the financing of these conceptions will cause the collapse of the U.S. lead in intellectual property creation.

5.) Is the fast pace of litigation in East Texas helpful to you, from your side of the aisle?

Yes, the East Texas venue allows a better potential for contingent attorney activities. Also, my invention of paralegal lawsuit partnerships may bring more individuals into the legal arena to help in my pursuit of justice regarding the atrocities that have been done to me and my grandfathers.

Yes, the East Texas venue allows a potentially inventor justice friendly atmosphere as opposed to hostile local venues that have witness pools and judges that may be prejudice against having monetary awards against companies that have an impact on their local economy (mandamus type action). Also, the mismatch between top corporate lawyers and under employed underfinanced inventors could be neutralized by the Texas system (Underdogs have a fair chance). In many cases, these lawyers are successful at striking from the records many critical evidencing methods that should be included thereby denying justice to the underdogs. Recent decision have returned cases back to those local venues ruling that it was an unreasonable expense and burden to have the witnesses travel long distances. However in some cases, it is one inventor against a large group of individuals attempting to steal the invention from him, so this balances the situation. This of course fails to recognize the fact that in the vast majority of cases excluding certain chemical compounds, biological compounds, experiments, and gaming software, the odds are that I am the inventor anyways if it involves a significant invention.

6.) How would you respond to criticism from corporations that many people aren't advancing anything, just trolling for lawsuits from which to try to strike it rich?

The thing that people don't realize is that corporations have created the term "trolls" to put a negative face on this type of litigation. The reality is that corporations don't want anybody cutting in on their ability to steal intellectual properties from inventors or obtaining the inventions cheaply. These legal patrollers keep corporations fully legal although they too cheat inventors by paying them little or nothing for their intellectual materials. Although in the vast majority of the cases, these individuals are stealing my intellectual materials. At least the corporations are paying in these situations.

I think in many situations, this is true, especially where companies and individuals attempt to create patent thickets to attempt to deny the right of usage based on insignificant patents that have insignificant improvements on the existing and then attempting to enforce them on an entire product.

I think this is true in situations where patents are granted without any genuine advancement. As far as individuals buying the right to sue from the inventor, this usually evolves because the inventor is impoverished and can't possibly pursue the expensive litigation, therefore, the individual sells cheap to the funded second party who should have become a business partner of the first party instead of low balling the individual into a sale. Yes, the second individual is looking to strike it rich by cheating the inventor. However, corporate abuse of inventors is even worse. They use methods such as civil rights violations forcing inventorship rights sign-offs in an attempt to steal inventions from inventors by claiming previous conception in their experimental departments, or inter company memos, or refusal to deal by banding together and

refusing to purchase the invention at all from inventors for any figure, let alone the 15% minimum of profits after expenses that the inventors should have received. They also want to hire inventors as employees instead dealing with them as independent inventors refusing to partnership with them thereby attempting to strike it rich through the theft of intellectual materials from the inventors knowing that they are impoverished and therefore taking advantage of this to strike it rich.

7.) What do you see as the most critical step in the creation of a new, fair patent system?

- Inventorship Determination Methods Improvements
<http://worldonlyinventorofsignificancearguably.com/MRTPatentLegislationChanges.htm#thefthmethods>
- Refusal to Deal Legislation.
- Government Sponsored Problem Solving Grants and Projects
- Government Funded Loans for Select New Patent Related Startups
- Private Sector Invention Development Loan Guarantees Council for Select Inventions
- Re-appropriating the present economic stimulus package to actually stimulate the economy instead of creating unnecessary temporary jobs that cost \$275,000 each and that expire after the money is gone. We need long lasting private sector jobs created by new consumer demand of newly patented inventions.
- Continue Effort to develop a World Standardized Patent System for Correct Instant Inventorship Determination
- Eliminate the Present Proposals for "First to File"
- Eliminate 1 Year Advance Disclosure before Patent Filing
- Eliminate Invention Disclosures Previous to Filing (Absolute Novelty)
- Change to Multi-Determination Methods of Proving Inventorship including Ability to Advance Provisional Application over a Period of 1 Year through Additions to the Original Application. Use of Historic Invention Clusters in order to prove the Theory of Superior Genetic Inventor Heritage
- Draft a Master List of Inventions for Immediate Patent awarding at time of filing
- Invention Clusters should be used as an Evidencing Method
- Demonstrating the Ability to Shut Off the Flow of Significant Patents into the Patent Office through Non-Conception as Evidence of Master Inventorship
- Mass Filing or Locked Filing of Patents Immediately after the passing of a Deadline in a Particular Field of Invention.
- Reduce the Flow of insignificant Patents into the Office by Eliminating Wrongful Re-issuance of Patents when the Actual Inventor as Never Awarded a Patent in the First Place
- Limit Software to the Top Ten Thousand Received Each Year
- Eliminate Chemical Compound Issuances in Situations where there is No Marketable Use for the Product at the time
- Eliminate Pharmaceutical and Biotechnology Patents that are insignificantly Different from what has already been patented (Restrict to the Top Ten Thousand Received Each Year)

- Recognize Sub-Marine Efforts as Sub-Marine Efforts and Refuse to Patent

Thank you for your attention to this important matter. It renews our faith and hope that there is some potential of fairness and justice in our legislative congress and journalist professionals.

Sincerely,

Michael R. Thomas

Master Inventor

Email: inventmrt001@earthlink.net

Tel. (239) 731-9860

CC: Senator Patrick Leahy, Vermont, Tel. (202) 224-4242, FAX (202) 224-3479

CC: Senator Orrin G. Hatch, Utah, Tel. (202) 224-5251, FAX (202) 224-6331

CC: President Obama, FAX (202) 456-2461

CC: USPTO Director John Doll, FAX (571) 273-8300