

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of Jed Margolin

Serial No.: 11/736,356

Examiner: Ronnie M. Mancho

Filed: 4/17/2007

Art Unit: 3664

For: **System and Method For Safely Flying Unmanned Aerial Vehicles in Civilian Airspace**

Filed: 4/17/2007

First Office Action: 9/1/2010

Response: 11/29/2010

Second Office Action: 2/15/2011

The following is to comply with 37 CFR § 1.133 **Interviews** and MPEP Section 713.04
Substance of Interview Must Be Made of Record.

I called the Examiner on or about March 2, 2011. I identified myself and the patent application and asked the Examiner to withdraw making the Second Office Action Final.

He asked for my reason.

I said I wanted the opportunity to respond to the additional grounds for rejection he had made in the Second Office Action (which he had made Final).

He said that the First Office Action had been sent to me and I had had the opportunity to respond, and he believed I did.

I repeated that he had made additional grounds for rejection in the Second Office Action and I wanted the opportunity to respond.

He looked up the case and cited the 103 basis for rejection: Margolin (5,904,724) and Duggan (Published Application US 2005004723).

I told him that I am that Margolin.

I also told him that he had done a cut-and-paste of the rejection in the First Office Action but had added a few things.

He wanted to know where.

I pointed out First Office Action (page 3, third paragraph):

Margolin did not disclose that the vehicle is flown using an autonomous control system. However, Duggan teach of a system for safely flying an unmanned aerial vehicle in civilian airspace comprising:

In the Second Office Action it became (page 3, third paragraph):

Margolin did not disclose that the vehicle is flown using an autonomous control system (e.g. autopilot). However, Duggan teach of a system for safely flying an unmanned aerial vehicle in civilian airspace comprising:

I said that he had equated autonomous control system with an autopilot, but they are not the same.

He believed the rejection was still the same and offered a long explanation that did not make much sense. I did hear him say that he believed I did not understand the term “autopilot.”

We moved on to his statement in the Second Office Action about civilian airspace (page 10, last line), where he said:

Applicant further argues that the prior art do not disclose flying an unmanned aerial vehicle (i.e. an aircraft) in civilian airspace. The examiner does not acquiesce to applicant's remarks. The prior art clearly shows flying an unmanned aerial vehicle (i.e. an aircraft) in civilian airspace since the air space in which the vehicle is flown is not restricted. As further noted applicant fails to provide a particular meaning attached to "civilian airspace".

I told him that “civilian airspace” was term commonly used in the aerospace community and that FAA and the military use it. I referred him to my reference **Sensing Requirements for Unmanned Air Vehicles** which contains the passage:

Engineers from the Air Vehicles Directorate transferred unmanned air vehicle (UAV) sensing system requirements for airspace operations to civilian UAV users and developers. These requirements represent design goals on which to base future sensing subsystem designs, filling an omission in UAV technology planning. Directorate engineers are continuing to develop the technologies that will enable future UAVs to coexist with manned aircraft in both military and civilian airspace. Incorporating these

requirements will ensure that engineers design future UAVs to detect possible conflicts, such as midair collisions or runway incursions, and take action to avoid them.

He said that I had used the term but did not define it.

I said that, although I was entitled to be my own lexicographer, I was not required to be one, and I had the right to use the common meaning of terms.

He said that I still had to provide the meaning of the term, and I hadn't.

I said he could have made that rejection in the First Office Action, when I would have had the opportunity to respond to it. Instead, by introducing it in the Second Office Action he had denied me the opportunity to respond.

We moved on to his use of my own patent against me. I reminded him that I had protested his use of my own patent against me in my Response to the First Office Action.

Applicant argued that Margolin belongs to the inventor. It is noted that the prior art is a statutory bar since it was published more than 8 years before filing of the present application.

I asked him where the 8 years comes from because I had not found it in MPEP or the U.S. Code. He said 8 years was longer than 1 year and referred me to 102(b).

Then he asked if I was a patent attorney. Since I am not, I said no. Then he suggested I get a patent attorney.

To get back to the issue at hand I read 102(b) to him and told him that it does not apply because the present invention is not the same as the one described in '724. It is a new application for '724.

At that point the Examiner was confused as to whether I was Margolin or Duggan.

{The problem is not, as he implied, that I don't know anything about patent law. The problem is that I cannot read his mind or sometimes, understand his English.}

We moved on. I explained why I had discussed the Duggan application in such detail, starting with the fact that it had issued as a patent (U.S. Patent 7,343,232 **Vehicle control system including related methods and components**) on March 11, 2008, before the First Office

Action. I also explained why I had introduced the extensive exhibit concerning the financial problems experienced by the Duggan Examiner. I explained that when I stated in my Response to the First Office Action that “Perhaps the Duggan Examiner was preoccupied with financial problems” I was being diplomatic. In fact, the evidence shows that the Duggan Examiner was either incompetent or may have committed misconduct. I explained to the Examiner that my reason for bringing up the subject was to show that the USPTO Office discriminates against *pro se* inventors. Aerospace Companies with expensive Law Firms are given a free pass, while *pro se* inventors get kicked in the head. I was not asking for a free pass, only to be treated fairly.

The telephone interview between the Examiner and myself that is described above was cordial but the Examiner refused to withdraw making the Second Office Action Final. Indeed, the Examiner displayed the USPTO’s bias against *pro se* inventors.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jed Margolin/ Date: April 10, 2010

Jed Margolin

Jed Margolin
1981 Empire Rd.
Reno, NV 89521-7430
(775) 847-7845