From: takeshi

Sent: Friday, August 20, 2010 4:03 AM

To: 3-tracks comments

Subject: Comments on Enhanced Examination Timing Control Initiative

Dear Sir or Madam,

Attached is our comments on Enhanced Examination Timing Control Initiative.

Best regards,

---

Takeshi Inoue Manager, Patent Attorney (Japan) Strategy and Policy Planning Office Intellectual Property Group, Hitachi, Ltd.

HITACHI Inspire the Next

August 20, 2010

Via E-mail to: 3trackscomments@uspto.gov

Re: Comments on "Enhanced Examination Timing Control Initiative"

Commissioner:

Hitachi, Ltd. (NYSE:HIT / TSE:6501) is one of heavy users of the US patent system. Around 1,000 US patents under Hitachi, Ltd. were issued in CY2009. We respectfully submit our comments on

Enhanced Examination Timing Control Initiative.

We agree generally to the three examination tracks proposed in the Initiative because we think patent system users have a need to control examination timing according to which stage of the

product life cycle the products pertinent to the filed inventions are in, or according to the length of

the product life cycle.

However, we strongly oppose the Initiative in that its benefits are limited to the applicants for

applications filed in the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) that are not based on

a prior foreign-filed application.

Under the Initiative, for applications filed in the USPTO that are based on a prior foreign-filed

application, no action would be taken by the USPTO until the USPTO receives a copy of the

search report, if any, and first office action from the foreign office and an appropriate reply to the

foreign office action as if the foreign office action was made in the application filed in the USPTO.

We strongly oppose the additional requirement to applications filed in the USPTO that are based

on a prior foreign-filed application. The Applicants for the applications filed in the USPTO that are

based on a prior foreign-filed application cannot fully control timing of first office action from the

foreign office. Accordingly, it is unfair to impose the requirement on only such applicants.

The notice does not explicitly state how the USPTO handles PCT applications in which the United States of America is a designated country. Those PCT applications must be treated the same as

applications filed in the USPTO that are not based on a prior foreign-filed application even if the

Mitachi, Ltd., Intellectual Property Group

USPTO is the not receiving office for the PCT applications.

We understand the necessity of reuse of search and examination work done by foreign offices. However, we would appreciate fairer initiative to promote the reuse.

Sincerely yours,

Kensuke Oka

Corporate Officer

**General Manger** 

Intellectual Property Group