

REMARKS

Claims 1-54 are pending in the application.

I. Summary of the Office Action

The Examiner rejected claims 1-54 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 and 35 U.S.C. § 102.

II. Summary of Applicant's Reply

Applicant traverses the Examiner's rejections.

III. Applicant's Reply to the Rejections

The Examiner alleged that the claimed invention lacks patentable utility: Claimed invention(s) [sic] is determined to be 'not working' because of claims 19 and 28 are known to be superluminal, which violate the laws of Physics.

However, Examiner completely and totally fails to provide an explanation as to why the International Searching Authority's Written Opinion (PCT Rule 43bis.1), dated July 1, 2013 completely and totally disagreed with the Examiner citing that the invention has industrial applicability. Or is it the Examiner did not bother reading said opinion?

The Examiner used the phrase "laws of Physics", which is completely ambiguous and meaningless. If Examiner is too stupid, incompetent or incapable of specifying what the exact so-called laws of Physics that are being violated are then they must be removed from reviewing this and any other application.

Furthermore, there are no such thing as "laws of Physics". All of Physics is based upon theories. The use of the word laws is to force control and conformity over this branch of science by narcissists, ego maniacs, etc., desperate for fame, glory and notoriety. As good as Newton's so-called laws of motion were, they did not work 100% of the time. Einstein's theory of special and then general relativity solved problems such as the orbit of Mars around the sun that Newton's so-called law of motion could not. So, here again the Examiner is attempting to show some ridiculous form of absolute

authority by using “laws of Physics” in place of theories, which the Examiner still failed in the obligation to state precise theories. And if the Examiner does not understand the difference they must be removed from reviewing this and any other application.

The Examiner alleges that claims 19 and 28 involve superluminal (faster-than-light) action. Since Examiner demonstrated their complete and total lack of knowledge or understanding of Physics, there is no meaningful way this can be easily argued without knowing the “laws of Physics” the Examiner is referring to. It’s time the Examiner actually learned something about Physics.

Through the use of Einstein’s theory of general relativity, his theory of special relativity can be derived. However, general relativity merely deals with the warping of space/time due to mass. It does not describe what mass is, it does not describe what space is nor what space is made of either, nor the properties of space. It explains little when one starts digging into its details. For instance, Einstein’s theory of special relativity says that information or mass cannot be accelerated faster than the speed of light. One slight problem is that Einstein’s theory does not provide how it is prevented from happening. Thankfully, there is quantum mechanics because quantum mechanics lead to the Higgs field as the reason why sub-atomic particles cannot travel faster than light. As of the date of this writing, there is no way to derive the wave equations of quantum mechanics from Einstein’s theory of general relativity and the converse is also true. Therefore, until such time that the macro world of Einstein and the subatomic world of quantum mechanics can be united, a theory from one may not have any bearing on the other.

So, Einstein’s theory of general relativity cannot be used to explain how a the same particle can exist in two places at the same time, which David Wineland won the Nobel Prize for: This on its face pretty much destroys the laws of conservation of mass, conservation of energy, etc., etc., etc. and opens the door to superluminal action.

As far as this application is concerned, it is not up to the Applicant to resolve incompatibilities between Einstein’s limited theories and those of quantum mechanics, which none of the greatest minds in Physics have been able to do. It is not up to the Applicant to provide a quantum mechanical mechanism or theory by which this application works. It is the Examiner that must prove the application has no utility,

which the Examiner has failed miserably to do. Furthermore, if the Examiner continues to invalidate the utility of this application, then the Examiner better be able to provide, beyond a reasonable doubt, a mechanism that proves this application has no utility, instead of practicing mental masturbation with theories and so-called laws that do not apply and/or theorems' that use dubious assumptions such as circular logic.

Finally, nowhere in this application is it claimed that information is being accelerated faster than the speed of light. Before any information can be loaded into a transmitter, the specific information has to be generated and then fed into a transmitter. This would require somehow generating the information in a superluminal fashion, which this application does not claim, nor does it claim the ability superluminally transcribe information so it can be interpreted and read. No superluminal transmitter or receiver is suggested in this application, which is currently impossible to build. Only someone who failed to comprehend the application or someone that did not bother reading it would come to such a conclusion. Generating information let alone building an actual transmitter and getting it to somehow transmit information faster than the speed of light would not run afoul of Einstein's theory of special relativity; it would not work because the Higgs field would prevent it. The same is true of a receiver. (Theory versus reality.) Furthermore, since all of the components used in this application have mass, there is no way to send information faster than light because there is no way to generate the information faster than light, let alone receive a message faster than light with a receiver whose components all have mass.

IV. Grievances

You and your fucking, asshole boss cost me thousands of dollars in unnecessary legal costs due to your gross negligence, willful misconduct, failure to obey the law and failure to follow USPTO reviewer's guidelines, which lead to me having to end any legal support in fighting against your pieces of shit as well as putting me in a gigantic finance hole that has taken me two and one-half years to dig out from. I am hereby demanding the following be carried out immediately whether you fucking like it or not dip shits!

- a. You and your fucking, asshole boss are to recuse yourselves from the review of this application immediately.
- b. Given the above remarks, which show you and your fucking asshole boss to be incompetent, incapable, have zero character or integrity, and are fraudsters, you and your fucking asshole boss are to immediately issue a Notice of Allowance on patent application 13/835,937.
- c. You and your fucking asshole boss are to immediately provide me with those states you qualified for the bar, so I can move to have your law license law revoked and any other retribution I deem necessary!
- d. A grievance and complaint will be filed with the USPTO Commissioner's Office demanding you and your fucking asshole boss be terminated, forfeit any and all pensions and benefits as well as claw back 5 years of your salary.
- e. Under no circumstances should you or your fucking asshole boss contact me, I will considerate it a threat against my person and an act of harassment, which will result in the notification of appropriate authorities.
- f. I will not address the remaining claim rejections until you and your fucking asshole boss are removed from reviewing or having anything to do, in any way, shape or form with this application.

V. Conclusion

Applicant submits that for at least the foregoing reasons the rejection of claims 1-54 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be removed.

Unrespect fully
Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a stylized, cursive letter 'M' followed by a horizontal line.

Marc S.Paller, Inventor
PO Box 173
New York, NY 10159

Date: 9/19, 2016 m 11