

Conclusion

The purpose of a language like English is to allow people to communicate with each other. Communications is already difficult enough because the meanings that people give to words depends on their life experiences as well as their education (formal or not). Communications also requires that people act in good faith, that they actually want to communicate. It is clear from the record that the Examiner and his Supervisor are not acting in good faith, that they have no intention of having meaningful communications.

The word *home* is a very good word. It is also a very old word whose roots stretch back through Middle English to Old English (also called Anglo-Saxon because it was the Germanic dialect spoken by the Angles and Saxons when they invaded Britain in the Fifth Century), and all the way back to Indo-European. Everybody knows what a home is (even people who don't have one) with the exception of the Examiner and his Supervisor.

The Examiner has misquoted Appellant's Appeal Brief on an issue of merit, deliberately used a less-common definition of *server* in order to serve his purposes, and misused *In re Van Geuns*. In their determination to deny Appellant the patent rights to his invention the Examiner and his Supervisor have failed to see that they are setting a precedent that threatens the patent system itself by requiring that an Applicant define every commonly-used word. Words must be defined by using other words, so there is no end to this. Eventually they will be arguing what the meaning of "is" is.

For these and other good reasons Appellant respectfully demands that this case be forwarded to BPAI without further delay.

Respectfully submitted,



Jed Margolin
pro se inventor
March 16, 2006
(775) 847-7845