COMMENTS PROVIDED FOR SELECT MEMBERS OF US SENATE VIA USPTO

ON 35 USC 101 JURISPRUDENCE

Due by September 07, 2021

US Senate, via select US Senators has requested USPTO, an executive branch agency of Department of Commerce, to gather and collect information from the public about issues related to 35 USC 101 jurisprudence and specifically Alice and the confusion and uncertainty Alice has caused.

These comments are provided By

Tara Chand Esq., BSSE (IITD), MSSE, CISSP; Founder & CEO

Internet Promise Group LLC.; a boutique innovation enterprise

2390 Crenshaw Blvd. Ste 239, Torrance, CA 90501

310 787 1400 chand@InternetPromise.com

These comments here address major issues, or what is wrong at the USPTO, in not only in regards to 35 USC 101 and Alice jurisprudence, but also other areas as well, as what has surfaced regarding 35 USC 101 is merely a symptom of what has been going wrong with the USPTO for decades. Author believes merely a few regulatory changes would not fix these major problems and a major reform of USPTO is required taking into account the range of comments provided herein.

Abstract:

I am an independent inventor with over 100 US patents in a very large swath of human endeavors, with innovations across seven different market verticals, including cyber security defense of critical infrastructure, new innovative e-commerce platforms, cyber secure payment infrastructure, handheld and wearable devices, vehicle safety systems, human health and many more that benefit the US in many different ways.

In a nutshell, there is a fundamental abuse and disregard of the inventors and inventor rights and USPTO systematically cheats the inventors for the reasons as detailed herein.

There are numerous instances even when USPTO engages in egregious conduct, CAFC showing them great deference as another co-equal branch of conduct, does not hold USPTO accountable for its deeds thus harming inventors by condoning such conduct for it to be repeated.

Also addressed is how USPTO has impacted individual inventors like me and thereby has harmed the nation. It is high time that there exist a US Government codification and declaration Titled “Inventors Bill of Rights”, similar to Patient Bill of Rights or Veteran’s Bill of Rights.

Section 3.0 addresses 35 USC 101 Alice Jurisprudence and what is wrong with USPTO in general and specifically, including an example of a pending CAFC Appeal on 35 USC 101 highlighting USPTO conduct that is illustrative of the broader USPTO problem in this area.

Section 2.0 addresses what is characterized as “horror stories at the USPTO” to describe what is wrong with the USPTO.

Section 4.0 addresses how USPTO has impacted the ability of inventors like me to continue to invent technological solutions to the many problems that ails the nation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Topic	Page #
1.0	**INTRODUCTION**	5
1.1	Author's Background	5
1.2	35 USC 101 Alice is merely a symptom of what is wrong?	5
2.0	**Horror Stories at the USPTO**	**6**
2.1	Depriving inventors their due rights in seventeen year patent term	6
2.2	Problems of PHT	8
2.3	USPTO Abusing its own processes	8
2.3.1.	Abusing the fee setting authority granted by Congress	8
2.3.2	Bad faith conduct in gutting a patent of a small inventor	10
2.3.3.	Broken fee refund processes	10
2.3.4	Abuse of maintenance fees	11
2.4	Problems with The PTAB, Its' constitution and operation	11
2.4.1	PTAB as USPTO and examiner advocate	11
2.4.2.	PTAB exhibits gross abuse of seminal US patent laws	12
3.0	**USPTO abuse of 35 USC 101 and *Alice* Jurisprudence**	**13**
3.1	Overview	13
3.2	35 USC 101, Alice New subject matter Category, "Abstract"	17
3.3	Abstract Subject Matter	18
3.4	An example of Abuse of Alice by USPTO and CAFC	19
3.5	A real world example of Abuse of Alice by USPTO and CAFC	21
4.0	**Abuse of Inventors by USPTO and US Government**	**24**
	(With Six Examples)	

1.0 INTRODUCTION

Provided in here are comprehensive comments, covering the conduct of USPTO in many areas, including 35 USC 101 and Alice jurisprudence.

1.1 Author's Background

I am an independent inventor with over 100 US patents in a very large swath of human endeavors, and - with innovations across seven different market verticals, including cyber security defense of critical infrastructure, new e-commerce platforms, cyber secure payment infrastructure, handheld and wearable devices, vehicle safety systems, human health that benefit the US in many different ways.

I have degrees in Electrical Engineering, Systems Engineering, Software Engineering from world-famous institutions, and am a non-practicing attorney, as well as - a certified information system security professional (CISSP®), with decades of experience with large defense contractors. I also have an avid interest in humans and human psychology that enables my innovations, as the humans are at the core of utilizing an innovation that benefits society in multiple ways.

1.2 What has surfaced regarding 35 USC 101 is merely a symptom of what has been going wrong.

While I later herein address the specific issues regarding 35 USC 101 and Alice Jurisprudence, the US Senators are interested in, I would like to first address major issues at the USPTO, in terms of what has gone wrong and what is going wrong at the USPTO as what has surfaced regarding 35 USC 101 is merely a symptom of what has been going wrong with the USPTO for decades.

In a nutshell, there is a fundamental abuse and disregard of the inventors and inventor's rights and USPTO systematically cheats the inventors for the reasons as detailed below. Therefore, I saw it appropriate to have titled my comments below as "USPTO Horror Stories".

2.0 Horror Stories at the USPTO

2.1 Depriving inventors their due rights in seventeen year patent term

Congress granted inventors an exclusive use monopoly for 17 years for financially benefiting from their inventions. Congress made sure that under the Patent Harmonization Treaty (PHT), even if the patent term was changed to 20 years from filing; the inventor still had 17 years after issuance by extending the patent term via a patent term adjustment, if the patent prosecution time exceeds three years, thus granting inventors the exclusive rights for seventeen years.

An essential part of USPTO prosecution processes is to file Request for Continued Examinations (RCEs) as it earns both the Examiner an additional income and the USPTO additional substantial revenues. However, USPTO Management practice and Examiners systematically abuse the RCE process, while at the same time using filing of RCEs for reducing patent term from the seventeen years provided for, in the law.

Honorable Judge T S Ellis Jr. III of the Eastern District of Virginia rendered a decision in Exelixis Inc. v, Kappos, case No. 1:12v96 (ED. VA November 1, 2012), that is very compelling in that regard and had held that USPTO has been penalizing applicants for filing RCEs in their patent term adjustments (PTAs). A

second, CAFC decision in Exelixis says that USPTO view is not the right view in denying patent owners their PTAs based on them having filed RCEs.

None other than the eminent Judge T S Ellis Jr. III, of Eastern District of Virginia, in a decision Exelixis Inc. v, Kappos, case No. 1:12v96 (ED. VA November 1, 2012), on RCEs had said, RCEs being an essential part of prosecution process should never be the basis to reduce patent term; yet in spite of that USPTO routinely deprives inventors of their due of seventeen years; and for which Inventors are not at fault, as cited by Judge Ellis and documented by the USPTO in the enumerated faults for which patent term is reduced, RCE is not one of them.

The abuse of RCEs by USPTO to deprive patent terms is further detailed in an amicus brief the author had filed at the CAFC, Case 2013-1175 EXELIXIS, INC. Plaintiff-Appellee v. Teresa Stanek Rea, ACTING DIRECTOR in an issue addressing using RCEs to reduce patent terms; AMICUS CURIEA BRIEF OF Pro Se Tara Chand Singhal, 2390 Crenshaw Blvd., No. 239 Torrance, CA 90501 Telephone: (310) 787 1400.

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT No. 2013-1175 EXELIXIS, INC. Plaintiff-Appellee v. Teresa Stanek Rea, ACTING DIRECTOR, UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE Defendant-Appellant APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA IN CASE NO. 12-CV-0096, JUDGE T.S. ELLIS, III Jr. AMICUS CURIEA BRIEF OF Pro Se Tara Chand Singhal, 2390 Crenshaw Blvd., No. 239 Torrance, CA 90501 Telephone: (310) 787 1400

2.2 Problems With the of Patent Harmonization Treaty (PHT)

PHT is grossly ill-conceived and does not help USA-based inventors in any shape and form and on the contrary, harms US inventors in multiple ways. PHT is meaningless for US-based inventors as US-issued patents have no validity in any other country except the US.

2.3 USPTO Abusing its own Processes

2.3.1. USPTO Abusing the Fee setting authority granted by Congress and thus harassing the inventors:

As one example of that gross abuse of the fee setting authority is that RCE fees are 50% higher than the application filing fees for a new application.

Another example is petition fees which are exorbitant in relation to the service provided. Yet another example is the increase most recently in late filing fees for patent maintenance fees.

USPTO has demonstrated a clear abuse of their fee setting authority that was granted to them, as USPTO has shown an inability to judicially exercise that fee setting authority.

2.3.2 USPTO In bad faith gutting a patent being enforced by small inventor

It should be noted that a petition is currently pending before the USPTO, highlighting this bad faith gutting a patent that was being enforced by a small inventor, seeking a remedy as petitioned below.

PETITION UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.182, AFTER TWELVE YEARS OF REEXAMINATION OF U.S. PATENT 6,069,614 CONCLUDING IN FAVOR OF THE PATENT OWNER, FOR THE JUST ANSWER TO THE QUESTION OF WHEN U.S. PATENT 6,069,614 WILL ULTIMATELY EXPIRE

With regard to the PTO and reexamination proceedings, Congress expressly mandates that "all reexamination proceedings under [35 U.S.C. § 305] including any appeal to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board, will be conducted with special dispatch within the Office." 35 U.S.C. § 305. Congress' "will be" language is clear; no discretion is allowed. Speed in reexamination is mandatory, "including any appeal to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board." *Id. See* MPEP § 2261 ("In view of the requirement for 'special dispatch,' reexamination proceedings will be 'special' throughout their pendency in the Office.").

As the Supreme Court recently discussed, accountability for the Executive Branch requires that power assigned by Congress be supervised by a Presidential Appointee. *United States v. Arthrex, Inc.*, 594 U.S. ___, ___ (2021), slip op. at 6-9. The agency head must ensure that all mandates issued by Congress upon an administrative agency are strictly followed. Accountability within the Executive Branch is *a bedrock principle*.

The above facts, as in this petition pending before USPTO show that, in patent reexamination, an erroneous rejection by the PTO lasted from August 16, 2013 until October 29, 2020. More than seven years went by with claims 7, 9 and 17 of the '614 patent in the *erroneous* state of rejection. Because of the PTO's significant errors and delays, the patent owner was impelled to contest the rejection of these claims for *seven straight years during reexamination*.

Accountability for the Agency is critical, especially when it had to statutorily proceed "with special dispatch." *Arthrex*, 594 U.S. at ___, slip op. at 6-9. The delays and errors by the PTO described in this petition are both inexcusable and the antithesis of proceeding with "special dispatch."

The patent owner should now be made whole by an extension of patent term. Seven years and nine months should form the basis for the just extension of the term of the '614 patent.

2.3.3. Broken USPTO Refund Processes

When the patent prosecution fees that had been paid by an applicant has to be returned, as has been agreed by the USPTO and proper refund documents had been filed, no fees are or have been ever been refunded. This USPTO behavior has occurred with the author at least a half dozen times during the last couple of decades. This is clear evidence of not only a broken USPTO refund process but also indication of bad faith by the USPTO leadership.

2.3.4 Abuse of Maintenance Fees

An inventor is granted exclusive use of his/her invention for a fixed period of seventeen years. USPTO, by levying unnecessary, unwarranted, excessive and exorbitant maintenance fees is depriving inventors of their basic due rights granted to them for seventeen years.

2.4 Problems with the PTAB, Its'- Constitution, Operation and Abuse of Inventors

Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB) is routinely abusing the inventors in multiple ways as enumerated below.

2.4.1 PTAB acting in the role of, as the USPTO and the Examiner Advocate, instead of acting as an impartial, neutral and fair decision maker.

In that role of and acting as an advocate of the Examiner, and in rubber stamping the Examiner decision, PTAB panel members routinely disregard essential claimed subject matter claim elements, as well as the applicable law.

Based on Author's personal experience having filed a large number of appeals during the last couple of decades, I would venture an estimate that perhaps about 10% of the PTAB judges understand their true rule of being an impartial and fair and neutral judge and more than 90% of PTAB judges do not understand their true role and purpose as being PTAB judges.

This is a problem of the USPTO leadership. This is a major flaw as the PTAB is constituted, operates and functions. This is dereliction of basic duty and role of a judge to be impartial, fair and a neutral decision maker in the interest of the inventor.

In Author's view, to remedy this major problem with the PTAB by the USPTO leadership, it is proposed that a written oath by each PTAB panel judge before each PTAB decision, restating and reminding and affirming PTAB's purpose and role, in both their knowledge and obligation of their basic duty of fairness and

neutrality along with requirement of their knowledge of the law, would go a long way to address this USPTO injustice to inventors.

2.4.2. Abuse of Patent Laws

PTAB exhibits a gross misunderstanding and abuses seminal US Patent Laws of Graham, Alice, KSC, and various court-created legal doctrines, as detailed below.

2.4.2.1. USPTO Abuse of *Deere v. Graham* obviousness law

US Supreme Court in Graham v. Deere went to great lengths teaching on how to properly apply the 103 law of obviousness. The most important provision of this law is one of "a person of ordinary skill in the art" as a fundamental basis to judge obviousness of a claim.

This first and essential prong of four prong Graham analysis for obviousness determination is constantly being abused by the Examiners as well as PTAB judges due to a lack of understanding what a POSITA is capable of AND not capable of.

2.4.2.2. USPTO abuse of KSR obviousness law on Common Sense

US Supreme Court in KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc. provided a definition of POSITA by elaborating on POSITA common sense; however USPTO has a total disregard of how to apply KSR to the facts of the case, by ignoring three different sequential pre-conditions required before applying "common sense" of POSITA.

2.4.2.3. USPTO abuse of basic Anticipation Law

35 USC 102, Anticipation law is clear in its' Supreme Court created and eloborated application and yet examiners routinely issue 102 rejections without any legal basis, merely to harass inventors.

2.4.2.4. USPTO abuse of basic Hindsight doctrine

US Supreme Court created Hindsight Doctrine is clear as has been taught by the US Supreme Court in its many decisions over the years; yet examiners routinely issue 103 rejections without any legal basis disregarding that Hindsight Doctrine in both the Hindsight Search and Hindsight Analysis.

3.0 USPTO and CAFC abuse of 35 USC 101 and *Alice* Jurisprudence

3.1 Overview

Alice created a new category of patent ineligible subject matter called abstract subject matter.

For almost everyone Alice decision is extremely clear on what it teaches and yet Alice still has caused such extreme confusion at the USPTO and the CAFC. That is because, for them they have only read what the commentators have written about Alice and not the original full Alice decision as the Supreme Court has gone to great lengths to detail the Alice ruling and its creation of Abstract Subject Matter.

Therefore, no amount of congress legislation would be able to fix that confusion. Author believes and posits that a proper application of Alice requires an intelligent and an unbiased understanding of the basic terms and phrases that have been used in the Alice decision in the context they have been used therein.

The USPTO and CAFC routinely misunderstand and misapply the primary Alice terms of “fundamental economic practice”, “method of organizing human activity”, “something significantly more”, and secondary terms such as, “conventional use of computers”, to mean whatever these terms choose to mean to the USPTO and CAFC, out of context in how they have been used in the Alice, as detailed in the Alice ruling itself.

As an illustration, the term “conventional use of computers”, has no meaning without the context it has been used in the Alice. This term “conventional use of computers”, makes sense when used in the context of the terms, “fundamental economic practice”, “method of organizing human activity”, “something significantly more” to identify when these mental activities that predate computer era are performed making conventional use of computers.

However, USPTO and CAFC have a gross misunderstanding and have used that to create a new test of “conventional use of computers” in isolation and devoid of the context it was used in Alice.

Please note English language has a limited number of words that are used to express by us humans, an unlimited variety of human endeavors. Therefore, understanding or deriving proper meaning of the words without the context in which they have been used is a veritable jungle of meaningless ideas.

While Alice was clear to anyone who read it, it still created a lot of confusion for everyone. Whomsoever read someone else analysis of Alice, instead of reading the Alice decision itself, totally misunderstood and misconstrued Alice's seminal phrases and what they meant in the context of Alice and its unique facts and thus the underlying basis of US Supreme Court's Alice decision.

In each subsequent CAFC decision, based on conflicting arguments by both the Plaintiff and the Defendants in the case before them, the CAFC further confused and misconstrued these seminal phrases, in new fact cases that came before them since Alice.

USPTO legal staff then attempted to interpret these confusing CAFC decisions to create guidance for the examiners. Since these USPTO legal staff-provided guidelines are based on these equally confusing and ever changing CAFC decisions, USPTO has issued a large number of, as many as twenty, sequential guidelines, including the latest one, dated January 19, 2019.

Since, while the Alice stays same, the USPTO based on every new CAFC decision came out with revised USPTO MPEP guidelines for the examiner.

<u>However, it should be noted by the PTAB and the CAFC, the only controlling law is the Alice decision itself and they cannot enter a decision contrary to Alice itself in holding the subject matter Abstract, when it clearly under Alice is not.</u> Therefore, detailed herein is what Alice's Abstract Subject Matter law really is:

3.2 35 USC 101, Alice subject matter category, “Abstract”

In the Alice case before the S. Ct., facts were for a risk-based or a barter transaction that was a staple of commerce for hundreds of years and was done by parties to the transaction manually, using manual communication means. Alice Court characterized these types of transactions done mentally or using pen and paper as essentially a mental or as Alice characterized as abstract as being mental transaction.

The patent before the Alice court had taken that abstract or mental activity and had transformed that mental activity as a communication between computers using logic to facilitate that risk-based or the barter transaction.

The issue before the Alice court was, if that originally a risk-based barter transaction that was conducted as a mental activity for hundreds of years, when merely transferred and was being conducted by the use of computers, in the new current era of computers, by the patent before the Alice court, was that innovative or has innovation elements under 35 USC 102 and 35 USC 103 to deserve patent protection?

The Alice court held and ruled no, because Alice court characterized that subject matter as mental activity and thus abstract; and for that reason held that subject matter as abstract and thus excluded or held patent ineligible under a newly created “abstract subject matter” category or classification.

Then, the Alice court reasoned, maybe the subject matter of the invention, where the inventor was doing more than that mental element and that may be deserving of patent protection. That is then why Alice court created a doctrine of “something significantly more” in the Alice context.

And that is the true genesis of the Alice's two prong test for holding subject matter as patent eligible under the newly created category of Abstract Subject Matter.

It is essential to understand the basis and origin of the Abstract Subject Matter, as a newly created subject matter category, because that provides the context for the rest of the Alice decision to be properly understood and used.

Therefore, these historical contexts are important to remember as the historical and legal basis of the Alice's new coined terms "abstract" and "something significantly more".

Alice court in order to provide further guidance for what the Alice court referred to as abstract or mental activities, coined the new phrases of "fundamental economic practice" and "method of organizing human activity", thus referring to and elaborating the meaning of these two phrases, as directed to commercial activities under the broad categories of "fundamental economic practice", "method of organizing human activity" that were widely prevalent in our society as normal commerce activities that were being done mentally or using pen and paper before the era of computers.

All this context of these terms of Alice is lost on USPTO and CAFC and others who have only read an opinion by someone of Alice, and thus without knowing the context and thus the proper meaning of these Alice terms.

Please note English language has a limited number of words that are used to express by us humans, an unlimited variety of human endeavors. Therefore,

understanding or deriving proper meaning of the words without the context in which they have been used is a veritable jungle of meaningless ideas.

That is what has happened and is happening at the USPTO and the CAFC as well as the patent bar, to have caused this extreme confusion.

3.3 Abstract Subject Matter

There were human activities directed to commercial activities under the broad categories of “fundamental economic practice”, “method of organizing human activity that predate era of automation and automation characterized by using computers as well as communication networks between these computers.

These activities were all done mentally and supplemented using pen and paper but mental activity being the primary activity. Since they are mental activities Alice categorized them as abstract in nature.

A case with a specific fact came before Alice Court where the patent owner had taken a specific mental activity of hedging risk that predates era of automation and had implemented that using computer and computer network as tools for automation.

Alice court reasoned that this was not innovation worthy of a patent as the patent owner had merely taken an abstract activity that of hedging risk and had merely automated and implemented using computers with networks

Hence Alice court held, the claims were being directed to abstract subject matter and thus created a new 35 USC 101 patent ineligible category of Abstract Subject Matter

Alice court to provide further guidance defined abstract to include human activities that had predated the computer era by broad brush phrases of "methods of organizing human activity" and "fundamental economic practice"

Alice court soon realized that these broad phrase categories subsumed all human activities and then to include only those human activities that are mental and by definition predate computer era, created an exception by coining a phrase, "something significantly more".

And thus Alice court created a foundation for a two prong test for abstract subject matter analysis, the first prong being directed to the determination of abstract subject matter and if the analysis of the first prong does determine an abstract subject matter and then only a second prong directed to determination of “something significantly more”.

3.4 An example of Abuse of Alice by USPTO and CAFC

As an illustration payment transactions using barter and currency under the category of “fundamental economic practice” would fall in the mental category of abstract; however payment mechanisms using bankcards would not be abstract because they are more than mere payment transaction under the broad phrase

"fundamental economic practice" and thus bankcard payments cannot be purely mental or abstract activity making conventional use of computers.

These subtle distinctions as above are lost on the USPTO legal staff who formulated the MPEP related to 35 USC 101 and Alice abstract subject matter and they then merely wrongly interpreting these seminal Alice phrase of "fundamental economic practice" and "conventional use of computers".

Therefore characterizing any payment transaction as "fundamental economic practice" is a wrong decision and only those activities that predate computer era are abstract activities and thus fundamental economic practice under Alice.

Refer to currently pending CAFC Appeal No. 2020-2318 United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit In re: TARA CHAND SINGHAL Appellant, On Appeal from the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Patent Trial and Appeal Board in No. 12/928,710.

The invention of the Author, subject of this CAFC appeal, is directed to cyber security defense of the nation's critical infrastructure, in payment transactions in global e-commerce.

In this case at issue here since claimed subject matter was directed to a payment transaction the examiner and the board in affirming the examiner had

indulged in a knee jerk decision without examining the technical features of the claim directed to security of private data in payment transactions.

3.5 A real world example of abuse of Alice by USPTO and CAFC

The following illustrates how the pending patent, referred to above in section 3.4 above, is impacted by the conduct of USPTO and the CAFC. As the only issue, in this pending patent application, before the USPTO and CAFC is 35 USC 101 Alice's Abstract Subject Matter.

A real tangible application of the technology of this patent called, Card Secure Platform®, based on the above pending patent has been launched in the market place, as described on the website www.SalesTransactionSystem.com and summarized as follows:

Payment Transaction Space Issues that Affect Everyone

Bankcard payment transactions using electronic payment infrastructure have become both ubiquitous and fundamental to commerce the world over. It is important for everyone to know why, how and what serious security risks and vulnerabilities in the payment transaction space affect you in multiple ways.

For one, electronic payment infrastructure requires a customer to have a bankcard (either physical or digital) issued by a card-issuing bank, the customer's bankcard data is then transferred to the payee or merchant's POS either in-store or online each time a payment is made to the payee/merchant.

Thus the customer's private bankcard data is copied many times to a large number of payees/merchants and creates the perfect opportunity for cyber security hacks, which too have become ubiquitous, as countless recent news item attest.

Second, online payments require use of your own personal computer, which is subjected to multiple security risks due to malware such as BOT (automated hidden robot like malware to steal your personal data including your passwords).

To eliminate these security issues, What if there was a payment system where the customer didn't need to have their bankcard, nor required to transfer bankcard data from customers to merchants? That is, no card-intake mechanism in a merchant's POS or online sales, nor bankcard data stored in any database.

Yet make seamless payments to any payee/merchant using their existing POS electronic payment infrastructure, eliminating all privacy and security issues from the nations' electronic payment infrastructure.

That may seem impossible to achieve; however, Tara Chand made that possible. We have launched this new payment transaction system in the market place and are actively pursuing strategic business alliances. I believe you would very much like to be associated, with this life transforming innovation in the payment transaction space. Read more. . .

Introducing a New Innovative Mobile Payment Technology Platform

A new innovative mobile payment technology platform, branded Card Secure Platform® (CSP), has been launched in the payment transaction space and is signing up merchants and bankcard customers now.

We made sure a key part of this innovation is CSP's seamless deployment within the existing payments infrastructure industry, operating as a separate, parallel independent payment channel within the merchant's existing POS system without any disruption of their current POS methods or partnerships, in addition to providing extreme security and human-factor convenience for both merchants and their customers.

The invaluable features and benefits of this new innovative mobile payment technology platform, branded, Card Secure Platform® (CSP) will rapidly drive industry-wide adoption and further described on the landing page of our website www.salestransactionsystems.com.

The CSP platform provides key innovative features enabling seamless payment transactions using the existing payment infrastructure, online and in-store, without the customer ever needing to carry a bankcard, thus avoiding any transfer or transmission of sensitive data through the merchant's POS system, eliminating entirety all current and constantly evolving cyber security issues for both the merchant as well as their customers.

The landing page of our website www.salestransactionsystems.com allows you access to review three different PowerPoint slide decks for our upcoming IPO road show, created for our three different constituencies: merchants; investors; card issuing banks and their customers.

Each of these invite decks includes a video describing the key features of Card Secure Platform® (CSP) and how this innovative mobile payment technology platform benefits the entire payment card industry.

4.0 Abuse of Inventors by USPTO and US Government and how that has impacted individual inventors like me

How does this abuse of inventors affect my ability to innovate in important areas that nation has an acute and dire need of. I characterize this abuse by the USPTO and US Government as a culture of stealing and stupidity that harms inventors and their ability to innovate and provide the following as merely illustrative examples herein.

Example 1: I have invented a sophisticated, complete and effective forest fire fighting system, using many elements of technology from defense systems that would extinguish forest fires in one tenth of time for in tenth of cost and but would not file a patent application due to this culture of stealing and stupidity fostered by the USPTO and supported by the US Government, on the inventors.

Example 2: I would innovate a system to ever so slightly change the course of hurricanes by a fraction of degree so that they bypass populated land masses and thus save billions in devastation and misery caused by hurricanes, but would

not file a patent application due to this culture of stealing and stupidity fostered by the USPTO and supported by the US Government, on the inventors.

Example 3: I have invented a sophisticated, and complete and effective cyber security defense system against nation states but would not make it public via a pending patent withheld publication due to this culture of stealing and stupidity.

Example 4: I have invented a sophisticated COVID-19 diagnostic apparatus to be able to literally image COVID-19 virus being exhaled by a person in a matter of seconds, using my expertise that is in areas other than medical field. But I would not be making that public by filing a US patent, given the conduct of the USPTO as had been detailed earlier as well USPTO and US Government fostering a culture of stealing and stupidity.

Example 5: An examiner said in an interview to me that "if he grants me this patent, you would go and sue somebody for a billion dollars"; USPTO has been politicized by the large multi-nationals, where USPTO examiners on behalf of USPTO are watching multi-national interests and not applying the basic laws to grant a patent.

Example 6: I have been issued a seminal US patent that benefits the nation greatly in many ways in their telecom networks and mobile devices and due to this culture of stealing fostered by the USPTO and the US Government, I am hesitant to even approach the companies in these two industries.

This is a seminal patent benefiting the telecom industry in multiple ways as summarized below with reference to Author's marketing in China:

What is good for China, Chinese mobile wireless industry, Chinese government and wireless customers - all of them - new technology that was just granted a Chinese patent in wireless space

How it benefits the Chinese government?

<> Faster emergency response from emergency responders

<> Technical Advancement the world has yet to see and make China proud as the first country to roll out this important technological advance

How it benefit wireless industry?

<> Efficient use of spectrum

<> Efficient routing of calls

How it benefits Chinese wireless customers?

<> Having an ecological mobile phone that minimizes harmful radiation

<> Saves 80% battery life

<> Precise calibrated transmission signals

We call this technological advance - GPS Smart™; Smart because it has very small footprint but still so immensely beneficial to everyone.

We invite handset manufacturers and wireless carriers in China to engage with us to have this technology rolled out in China.

We request Chinese government to facilitate roll out of this technological advance in wireless space in China.

Please Contact: AFD China Intellectual Property Law Office
Tel.: 010-82730790:, Email: info@afdip.com
or email: chand@internetpromisegroup.com
From: Tara Chand, Esq., BSEE(IITD), MSSE, CISSP
Founder & CEO
Internet Promise Group® Inc., - *an innovation enterprise active across seven market verticals, including human health*