

Subject: Tickets for next discussion
From: Carl Oppedahl <carl@oppedahl.com>
Date: 7/11/2023, 2:09 PM
To: "Vidovich, Greg" <Greg.Vidovich@USPTO.GOV>

Hello Greg. Let's resume our periodic videoconferences about patentcenter trouble tickets. I suggest that in our first videoconference we could discuss these seven tickets.

Carl

[CP28](#). January 2019. Patentcenter saves up any real or imagined defect in an uploaded file on the “upload documents” page, and only three screens later, on the “submit” page, only when the user clicks “submit”, does Patentcenter for the first time gripe about the real or imagined defect. See [blog article](#). USPTO considers this to be a feature rather than a bug. It was agreed in our July 1, 2020 meeting that USPTO would add a warning on the document upload page so that the user will realize they are only postponing the inevitable and will eventually have to return to this page to provide a document description.

[CP31](#). June 23, 2020. The default “outgoing correspondence” filter is three days since imaging, but quite often the USPTO clerks take four days after imaging a document to mail it. This means that users will very predictably not be told about some eleven percent of their outgoing correspondence. See [blog article](#). This is [Ideascale idea number 523](#). We raised this in our July 1, 2020 meeting.

[CP49](#). May 27, 2021. This ticket relates to 35-series applications (US designation from a Hague application). When the user tries to pay an Issue Fee using the web-based tool for paying Issue Fees, the system refuses to do so, saying that the tool is not available for this kind of patent application. The error message is “The application type entered does not allow for use of the Web-Based Issue Fee Transmittal.”

[CP51](#). May 27, 2021. This ticket relates to 35-series applications (US designation from a Hague application). When the user tries to carry out any SFD (subsequently filed document) or follow-on submission, a wholly inappropriate warning appears that scolds the filer for thinking that the e-filed document might go to the International Bureau. Patentcenter says:

The entered application has been transmitted to the International Bureau. The USPTO will not forward, to the International Bureau, follow-on submissions that are received after an international design application has been transmitted to the International Bureau. Thus, for example, where the International Bureau has sent an invitation requiring compliance with a requirement under the Hague Agreement, the applicant must file any reply to that invitation directly with the International Bureau to avoid abandonment or other loss of rights under the treaty.

The warning message should be scrapped since any filing in a 35-series case is by definition directed to the USPTO, not to the IB.

CP96. February 8, 2023. In any case in the “35 series” (meaning a designation to the US from a Hague application), Patentcenter refuses to permit the filer to select a document description of “Request for corrected filing receipt”. This is EBC ticket number 1-823950508.

CP99. February 20, 2023. Patentcenter fails to check for two attempted entries into US national phase from a single PCT application. See for example Patentcenter number 60947671 e-filed on September 8, 2022 and Patentcenter number 61618254 e-filed on February 19, 2023.

CP117. August 9, 2020. In EFS-Web each ack receipt gets a file name that is unique. Patentcenter always tries to give the same name (N417) to every ack receipt. What Patentcenter should do, as part of bringing forward features from EFS-Web, is give a unique name to each ack receipt. The source of uniqueness in the file name for the ack receipt could be the application number or the docket number or even the patentcenter submission number. This is Ideascale [idea number 595](#). (Formerly FR40.) We raised this in the July 1, 2020 meeting.