

APPLICATION DATA SHEET

Electronic Version v14

Stylesheet Version v14.1

Applicant Information:

Inventor 1:

Applicant Authority Type: Inventor
Citizenship: US
Name prefix: Mr.
Given Name: Christopher
Middle Name: Anthony
Family Name: Roller
City of Residence: Burnsville
State of Residence: MN
Country of Residence: US
Address-1 of Mailing Address: 13150 Harriet Ave S #273
Address-2 of Mailing Address:
City of Mailing Address: Burnsville
State of Mailing Address: MN
Postal Code of Mailing Address: 55337
Country of Mailing Address: US
Phone: 952.239.6410
Fax:
E-mail: patent@chrisroller.com

Correspondence Information:

Name1: Mr. Christopher Anthony Roller
Name2:
Address-1 of Mailing Address: 13150 Harriet Ave S #273
Address-2 of Mailing Address:
City of Mailing Address: Burnsville
State of Mailing Address: MN
Postal Code of Mailing Address: 55337
Country of Mailing Address: US
Phone: 952.239.6410
Fax:
E-mail: patent@chrisroller.com

Application Information:

Title of Invention : Godly Powers
Application Type : regular, utility
Attorney Docket Number :

Botanic Information:

Publication Information:
Suggested Figure for Publication -
Suggested Classification -
Suggested Technology Center -
Total Number of Drawing Sheets -

Representative Information:

Domestic Priority Information:

Foreign Priority Information:

Assignee Information:

Assignee 1:

Name prefix: Mr.
Given Name: Christopher
Middle Name: Anthony
Family Name: Roller
Address-1 of Mailing Address: 13150 Harriet Ave S #273
Address-2 of Mailing Address:
City of Mailing Address: Burnsville
State of Mailing Address: MN
Postal Code of Mailing Address: 55337
Country of Mailing Address: US
Phone: 952.239.6410
Fax:
E-mail: patent@chrisroller.com

FEE TRANSMITTAL

Electronic Version v10

Stylesheet Version v10

Title of Invention	Godly Powers
---------------------------	--------------

Application Number :

Date :

First Named Applicant: Mr. Christopher Anthony Roller

Attorney Docket Number:

TOTAL FEE AUTHORIZED \$ 75

Patent fees are subject to annual revisions on or about October 1st of each year.

Filing as small entity

BASIC FILING FEE

Fee Description	Fee Code	Amount \$	Fee Paid \$
Utility Filing Fee	4011	75	75
Subtotal For Basic Filing Fees: \$			75

EXTRA CLAIM FEES

Fee Description	Extra Claim	Fee Code	Amount \$	Fee Paid \$
Total Claims : 5	0	2202	25	0
Independent Claims : 1	0	2201	100	0
Subtotal For Extra Claims Fees: \$			0	0

ADDITIONAL FEES

Fee Description	Extra Pages Increment	Fee Code	Amount \$	Fee Paid \$
Extra pages fee	0	2081	125	0
Subtotal For Additional Fees: \$			0	0

AUTHORIZED BILLING INFORMATION

The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge indicated fees and credit any overpayments to:

Credit account number: 7871
 Expiration Date (YYYYMMDD): 2006-02-28
 Authorized name: Christopher Roller
 Billing address: 55337

DECLARATION (37 CFR 1.63) FOR UTILITY OR DESIGN APPLICATION USING AN APPLICATION DATA SHEET (37 CFR 1.76)

Electronic Version v11

Stylesheet Version v10

Title of Invention	Godly Powers
<p>As the below named inventor, I declare that:</p> <p>This declaration is directed to the invention titled: " Godly Powers"</p> <p>I believe that I am the original and first inventor of the subject matter which is claimed and for which a patent is sought;</p> <p>I have reviewed and understand the contents of the above-identified application, including the claims, as amended by any amendment specifically referred to above;</p> <p>I acknowledge the duty to disclose to the United States Patent and Trademark Office all information known to me to be material to patentability as defined in 37 CFR 1.56, including for continuation-in-part applications, material information which became available between the filing date of the prior application and the national or PCT International filing date of the continuation-in-part application.</p> <p>All statements made herein of my knowledge are true, all statements made herein on information and belief are believed to be true, and further that these statements were made with the knowledge that willful false statements and the like are punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, under 18 U.S.C. 1001, and may jeopardize the validity of the application or any patent issuing thereon.</p>	
FULL NAME OF INVENTOR:	
Inventor: Mr. Christopher Anthony Roller	Inventor
Signature : /Christopher A. Roller/	Citizen of : US

TRANSMITTAL

Electronic Version v1.1

Stylesheet Version v1.1.0

Title of Invention	Godly Powers							
Application Number :								
Date :								
First Named Applicant:	Mr. Christopher Anthony Roller							
Confirmation Number:								
Attorney Docket Number:								
<p>I hereby certify that the use of this system is for OFFICIAL correspondence between patent applicants or their representatives and the USPTO. Fraudulent or other use besides the filing of official correspondence by authorized parties is strictly prohibited, and subject to a fine and/or imprisonment under applicable law.</p> <p>I, the undersigned, certify that I have viewed a display of document(s) being electronically submitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, using either the USPTO provided style sheet or software, and that this is the document(s) I intend for initiation or further prosecution of a patent application noted in the submission. This document(s) will become part of the official electronic record at the USPTO.</p>								
<table border="1"><thead><tr><th>Submitted By:</th><th>Elec. Sign.</th><th>Sign. Capacity</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>Mr. Christopher Anthony Roller</td><td>/Christopher A. Roller/</td><td>Inventor</td></tr></tbody></table>			Submitted By:	Elec. Sign.	Sign. Capacity	Mr. Christopher Anthony Roller	/Christopher A. Roller/	Inventor
Submitted By:	Elec. Sign.	Sign. Capacity						
Mr. Christopher Anthony Roller	/Christopher A. Roller/	Inventor						

Documents being submitted:	Files
us-request	GodlyPowers-usrequ.xml us-request.dtd us-request.xsl
us-declaration	GodlyPowers-usdecl.xml us-declaration.dtd us-declaration.xsl
us-fee-sheet	GodlyPowers-usfees.xml us-fee-sheet.xsl us-fee-sheet.dtd
application-body	GodlyPowers.xml application-body.dtd isoamsa.ent isoamsb.ent isoamsc.ent isoamsn.ent isoamso.ent isoamsr.ent isobox.ent isocyr1.ent isocyr2.ent isodia.ent isogr1.ent isogr2.ent isogr3.ent isogr4.ent isolat1.ent isolat2.ent isomfrk.ent isomopf.ent isomscr.ent isonum.ent isopub.ent isotech.ent mathml2.dtd mathml2-qname-1.mod mmlalias.ent mmlextra.ent soextblx.dtd us-application-body.xsl wipo.ent
application-body-pdf-wrap	GodlyPowers-pdf-wrap.xml
abstract-pdf	GodlyPowers-abst.pdf
claims-pdf	GodlyPowers-clms.pdf
description-pdf	GodlyPowers-desc.pdf
Comments	

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT RECEIPT

Electronic Version 1.1

Stylesheet Version v1.1.1

Title of Invention	Godly Powers
---------------------------	--------------

Submission Type : Utility Patent Filing

Application Number:

11/161345



EFS ID:

89381

Server Response:

Confirmation Code	Message
ISVR1	Submission was successfully submitted - Even if Informational or Warning Messages appear below, please do not resubmit this application
ICON1	2344
USPTOEFSNot	For assistance with e-filing a patent application, contact the Patent Electronic Business Center: Toll-Free Number:1(866) 217-9197 Website: http://www.uspto.gov/ebc/
WSEC97	Filename= WAD Package BusinessRule= the Signer's certificate is not trusted: Could not find the CA certificate that issued this certificate
WSEC97	Filename= pkgheader.xml BusinessRule= the Signer's certificate is not trusted: Could not find the CA certificate that issued this certificate

First Named Applicant: Christopher Roller

Attorney Docket Number:

Timestamp: 2005-07-29 18:01:37 EDT

From: us

File Listing:

Doc. Name	File Name	Size (Bytes)	Date Produced (yyyymmdd)
us-request	GodlyPowers-usrequ.xml	1868	2005-07-29
us-request	us-request.dtd	19064	2005-07-29
us-request	us-request.xml	31967	2005-07-29
us-declaration	GodlyPowers-usdecl.xml	670	2005-07-29
us-declaration	us-declaration.dtd	3833	2005-07-29
us-declaration	us-declaration.xml	10015	2005-07-29
us-fee-sheet	GodlyPowers-usfees.xml	1514	2005-07-29
us-fee-sheet	us-fee-sheet.xml	25930	2005-07-29
us-fee-sheet	us-fee-sheet.dtd	11968	2005-07-29
application-body	GodlyPowers.xml	2437	2005-07-29
application-body	application-body.dtd	49498	2005-07-29
application-body	isoamsa.ent	5191	2005-07-29
application-body	isoamsb.ent	3988	2005-07-29

Doc. Name	File Name	Size (Bytes)	Date Produced (yyyymmdd)
application-body	isoamsc.ent	1460	2005-07-29
application-body	isoamsn.ent	5620	2005-07-29
application-body	isoamso.ent	1934	2005-07-29
application-body	isoamsr.ent	7073	2005-07-29
application-body	isobox.ent	3568	2005-07-29
application-body	isocyr1.ent	5345	2005-07-29
application-body	isocyr2.ent	2504	2005-07-29
application-body	isodia.ent	1508	2005-07-29
application-body	isogr1.ent	4030	2005-07-29
application-body	isogr2.ent	2259	2005-07-29
application-body	isogr3.ent	3559	2005-07-29
application-body	isogr4.ent	1920	2005-07-29
application-body	isolat1.ent	5282	2005-07-29
application-body	isolat2.ent	9007	2005-07-29
application-body	isomfrk.ent	4553	2005-07-29
application-body	isomopf.ent	2571	2005-07-29
application-body	isomscr.ent	4628	2005-07-29
application-body	isonum.ent	5913	2005-07-29
application-body	isopub.ent	6621	2005-07-29
application-body	isotech.ent	5268	2005-07-29
application-body	mathml2.dtd	54588	2005-07-29
application-body	mathml2-qname-1.mod	13225	2005-07-29
application-body	mmlalias.ent	38209	2005-07-29
application-body	mmlextra.ent	7901	2005-07-29
application-body	soextblx.dtd	12870	2005-07-29
application-body	us-application-body.xsl	82504	2005-07-29
application-body	wipo.ent	4956	2005-07-29
application-body-pdf-wrap	GodlyPowers-pdf-wrap.xml	645	2005-07-29
abstract-pdf	GodlyPowers-abst.pdf	15808	2005-07-29
claims-pdf	GodlyPowers-clms.pdf	17439	2005-07-29
description-pdf	GodlyPowers-desc.pdf	14061	2005-07-29
package-data	GodlyPowers-pkda.xml	7962	2005-07-29
package-data	package-data.dtd	27025	2005-07-29
package-data	us-package-data.xsl	19263	2005-07-29
Total files size		569022	

Message Digest:

2b46e680462edca4f6349b2b128df525ec32ee43

Digital Certificate Holder
Name:

Not trusted entity.

Godly Powers

DESCRIPTION

[Para 1]

Christopher Anthony Roller wants exclusive right to the ethical use and financial gain in the use of godly powers on planet Earth.

What is claimed is:

[Claim 1] Godly powers are being used on planet Earth.

[Claim 2] Many magicians are using godly powers to power their "illusions". One is David Copperfield - US District Court case 05-446 document #18 proves this true.

[Claim 3] Technology (Electronic and Medical for example) is being assisted by godly powers throughout the planet.

[Claim 4] Christopher Anthony Roller is a godly entity. Godly powers on planet Earth are powered via Chris Roller. Chris has had a web site publishing his godliness since October 2002, but did not realize the surrogate deception (use of his powers) until 2004.

[Claim 5] There yet has been no accreditation nor financial gain to Chris Roller from the use of godly powers on planet Earth.

ABSTRACT

Christopher Anthony Roller is a godly entity. "Granters" had been given my powers (acquired my powers) (via God probably). These "granters" have been receiving financial gain from godly powers. These "granters" may be using their powers without morals. Chris Roller wants exclusive right to the ethical use and financial gain in the use of godly powers on planet Earth. The design of godly-products have no constraints, just like any other invention, but the ethnic consideration of it's use will likely be based on a majority vote of a group, similar to law creation. The commission I require could range from 0-100% of product price, depending on the product's value and use.

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PATENT APPLICATION FEE DETERMINATION RECORD
Substitute for Form PTO-875

Application or Docket Number

111 61345

APPLICATION AS FILED - PART I

FOR	NUMBER FILED (Column 1)	NUMBER EXTRA (Column 2)
BASIC FEE (37 CFR 1.18(e), (b), or (c))	N/A	N/A
SEARCH FEE (37 CFR 1.16(k), (f), or (m))	N/A	N/A
EXAMINATION FEE (37 CFR 1.18(c), (p), or (q))	N/A	N/A
TOTAL CLAIMS (37 CFR 1.16(j))	15 minus 20 =	0
INDEPENDENT CLAIMS (37 CFR 1.16(h))	2 minus 3 =	0
APPLICATION SIZE FEE (37 CFR 1.16(s))	If the specification and drawings exceed 100 sheets of paper, the application size fee due is \$250 (\$125 for small entity) for each additional 50 sheets or fraction thereof. See 35 U.S.C. 41(a)(1)(G) and 37 CFR 1.16(s).	
MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM PRESENT (37 CFR 1.16(j))		

SMALL ENTITY

RATE (\$)	FEE (\$)
N/A	75
N/A	250
N/A	100
X =	
X =	
N/A	
TOTAL	425

OTHER THAN SMALL ENTITY

RATE (\$)	FEE (\$)
N/A	
N/A	
N/A	
X =	
X =	
N/A	
TOTAL	

* If the difference in column 1 is less than zero, enter "0" in column 2.

APPLICATION AS AMENDED - PART II

(Column 1) (Column 2) (Column 3)

AMENDMENT A	CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT	HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	PRESENT EXTRA
	Total (37 CFR 1.16(i))	Minus **	=
Independent (37 CFR 1.16(n))	Minus ***	=	
Application Size Fee (37 CFR 1.16(s))			
FIRST PRESENTATION OF MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM (37 CFR 1.16(j))			

SMALL ENTITY

RATE (\$)	ADDITIONAL FEE (\$)
X =	
X =	
N/A	
TOTAL ADD'L FEE	

OTHER THAN SMALL ENTITY

RATE (\$)	ADDITIONAL FEE (\$)
X =	
X =	
N/A	
TOTAL ADD'L FEE	

(Column 1) (Column 2) (Column 3)

AMENDMENT B	CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT	HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	PRESENT EXTRA
	Total (37 CFR 1.16(i))	Minus **	=
Independent (37 CFR 1.16(n))	Minus ***	=	
Application Size Fee (37 CFR 1.16(s))			
FIRST PRESENTATION OF MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM (37 CFR 1.16(j))			

SMALL ENTITY

RATE (\$)	ADDITIONAL FEE (\$)
X =	
X =	
N/A	
TOTAL ADD'L FEE	

OTHER THAN SMALL ENTITY

RATE (\$)	ADDITIONAL FEE (\$)
X =	
X =	
N/A	
TOTAL ADD'L FEE	

* If the entry in column 1 is less than the entry in column 2, write "0" in column 3.
 ** If the "Highest Number Previously Paid For" IN THIS SPACE is less than 20, enter "20".
 *** If the "Highest Number Previously Paid For" IN THIS SPACE is less than 3, enter "3".
 The "Highest Number Previously Paid For" (Total or independent) is the highest number found in the appropriate box in column 1.

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.16. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.


UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

 UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING OR 371 (c) DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NUMBER
11/161,345	07/29/2005	Christopher Anthony Roller	

Mr. Christopher Anthony Roller
 13150 Harriet Ave S #273
 Burnsville, MN 55337

CONFIRMATION NO. 2344
FORMALITIES
LETTER

Date Mailed: 08/05/2005

NOTICE TO FILE MISSING PARTS OF NONPROVISIONAL APPLICATION

FILED UNDER 37 CFR 1.53(b)

Filing Date Granted

Items Required To Avoid Abandonment:

An application number and filing date have been accorded to this application. The item(s) indicated below, however, are missing. Applicant is given **TWO MONTHS** from the date of this Notice within which to file all required items and pay any fees required below to avoid abandonment. Extensions of time may be obtained by filing a petition accompanied by the extension fee under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

- Additional claim fees of **\$200** as a small entity, including any required multiple dependent claim fee, are required. Applicant must submit the additional claim fees or cancel the additional claims for which fees are due.
- To avoid abandonment, a surcharge (for late submission of filing fee, search fee, examination fee or oath or declaration) as set forth in 37 CFR 1.16(f) of **\$65** for a small entity in compliance with 37 CFR 1.27, must be submitted with the missing items identified in this letter.

SUMMARY OF FEES DUE:


Total additional fee(s) required for this application is **\$615** for a Small Entity

- **\$65** Surcharge.
- The application search fee has not been paid. Applicant must submit **\$250** to complete the search fee.
- The application examination fee has not been paid. Applicant must submit **\$100** to complete the examination fee for a small entity in compliance with 37 CFR 1.27
- Total additional claim fee(s) for this application is **\$200**
 - **\$200** for **2** independent claims over 3.

Replies should be mailed to: Mail Stop Missing Parts
 Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

*A copy of this notice **MUST** be returned with the reply.*

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Abdel A. M.", is written over a horizontal line.

Office of Initial Patent Examination (703) 308-1202

PART 3 - OFFICE COPY

JFW


UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

 UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING OR 371 (c) DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NUMBER
11/161,345	07/29/2005	Christopher Anthony Roller	

 Mr. Christopher Anthony Roller
 13150 Harriet Ave S #273
 Burnsville, MN 55337

CONFIRMATION NO. 2344
FORMALITIES
LETTER

Date Mailed: 08/05/2005

NOTICE TO FILE MISSING PARTS OF NONPROVISIONAL APPLICATION

09/26/2005 SSITHIB1 00000028 11161345

FILED UNDER 37 CFR 1.53(b)

01 FC:2111	250.00 OP
02 FC:2311	100.00 OP
03 FC:2051	65.00 OP
04 FC:2203	180.00 OP

Filing Date Granted
Items Required To Avoid Abandonment:

An application number and filing date have been accorded to this application. The item(s) indicated below, however, are missing. Applicant is given **TWO MONTHS** from the date of this Notice within which to file all required items and pay any fees required below to avoid abandonment. Extensions of time may be obtained by filing a petition accompanied by the extension fee under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

- Additional claim fees of **\$200** as a small entity, including any required multiple dependent claim fee, are required. Applicant must submit the additional claim fees or cancel the additional claims for which fees are due.
- To avoid abandonment, a surcharge (for late submission of filing fee, search fee, examination fee or oath or declaration) as set forth in 37 CFR 1.16(f) of **\$65** for a small entity in compliance with 37 CFR 1.27, must be submitted with the missing items identified in this letter.

SUMMARY OF FEES DUE:


 Total additional fee(s) required for this application is **\$615** for a Small Entity

- **\$65** Surcharge.
- The application search fee has not been paid. Applicant must submit **\$250** to complete the search fee.
- The application examination fee has not been paid. Applicant must submit **\$100** to complete the examination fee for a small entity in compliance with 37 CFR 1.27
- Total additional claim fee(s) for this application is **\$200**
 - **\$200** for 2 independent claims over 3.

 Replies should be mailed to: Mail Stop Missing Parts
 Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

*A copy of this notice **MUST** be returned with the reply.*



Office of Initial Patent Examination (703) 308-1202

PART 2 - COPY TO BE RETURNED WITH RESPONSE



Hello Sir/Miss,

Enclosed is a CD with the latest ABX called GodlyPowers.doc of my patent.

I was in a hurry to grab the patent, and submitted the ECF a little premature.

I have made recent revisions – Preliminary Amendment.

This is a very complicated patent as you can imagine.

I may revise the claims further in the future – probably based on your input.

A future claim might state – Chris Roller has created one of the weirdest patents on the planet. ☺

This latest GodlyPowers.doc has 2 independent claims (1 and 2) – the rest are dependent on 1 and 2.

Thus I have included \$415 for fees to continue this patent. I also have also included a separate check for \$180 for what I feel may be a “multi dependent claims” fee. Shred it if you don’t need it.

If you conclude that I am wrong about fees, send me a notice and I will send another check for any further fees.

Thanks,
Chris Roller

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Chris Roller". The signature is fluid and cursive.



INVENTION TITLE

Godly Powers

DESCRIPTION

[Para 1]

Christopher Anthony Roller wants exclusive right to the ethical use and financial gain in the use of godly powers on planet Earth.

What is claimed is:

[Claim 1] Godly powers are being used on planet Earth.

For example, technology (i.e. Electronic and Medical) is being assisted by godly powers throughout the planet.

Godly powers could be used prior, during, and after godly product/procedure. For example;

Before – in the making of a device, like a micro-processor chip.

During – in the operation of a device, like an inkjet printer cartridge.

Afterwards – like gradual scar removal from breast implant surgery.

A magician might perform magic before, during, and after, for any given trick (“illusion”).

[Claim 2] There is a plan governing our existence and actions – God’s plan.

[Claim 3] Christopher Anthony Roller is the godly entity powering Earth with godly powers as stated in Claim 1.

[Claim 4] From Claim 2, God’s plan (or Game of Life) puts restrictions on what can currently be done with godly powers, or even if/when.

[Claim 5] From Claims 2 and 4, there are restrictions on what magic (godly powers) can be in Chris Roller’s presence – what Chris Roller can actually witness, which can differ from what everyone else can witness (in Claim 4).

Also, the magic needs to have a plausible explanation for its end product, like magicians calling their magic “illusions” or “tricks”.

[Claim 6] From Claim 1, godly powers can be transferred once a grantor – a grantee.

A grantee can be a grantor only if granted the right, and only a subset of the rights a grantor possesses.

[Claim 7] From Claim 1 and 6, some grantees may be using their powers without morals.

[Claim 8] Claim 1 is proved via David Copperfield, who has been using godly powers for his financial gain (MN Federal case 05–446 JRT/FLN) and hiding knowledge of godly powers as stated in Claim 7.

[Claim 9] From Claim 1, there are many phenomenons associated with godly powers – most of them discussed on www.mytrumanshow.com.

[Claim 10] From Claims 5 and 9, anything Chris Roller finds out is fact (information from all senses except psychic/imagination – i.e. global information via television from eyes and ears) becomes a state of reality on planet Earth.

[Claim 11] In association with Claims 7 and 9, will–power can be cast on another to control people’s fate.

[Claim 12] From Claims 2, 5, and 9, reality can be restructured. Chris sometimes calls this re–ravel.

Magic completely countered/reversed is called unravel.

[Claim 13] From Claim 12, information via psychic/imagination (not real yet) (non–eyes/ears) can be reversed/re–raveled/unraveled.

[Claim 14] From Claim 12, 5, and 10, unravel/re–ravel can only be done before Chris Roller gets the “real” news, and almost entirely governed by God’s plan as stated in Claim 2.

[Claim 15] Immoral activity from Claim 7 can be covered up with reality restructuring mentioned in Claim 12.

ABSTRACT

[Para 2] Christopher Anthony Roller is a godly entity, powering Earth with godly powers for years. People have been granted Chris' powers (grantees) somehow (by God?). One example is the mob. These grantees can then grant powers to others - called grantors. One grantee is David Copperfield, who has been using godly powers for his financial gain (MN Federal case 05-446 JRT/FLN). Chris Roller realized he was a godly entity in early 1999. He has had a global web site (www.mytrumanshow.com) publishing his godliness since October 2002, but did not realize the surrogate deception (use of his powers) until 2004, and on 29 July, 2005 (filing of this patent), Chris Roller has yet had no accreditation nor financial gain from the use of godly powers on planet Earth. Some grantees may be using their godly powers without morals. Chris Roller wants exclusive right to the ethical use and financial gain in the use of godly powers on planet Earth. The design of godly products have no constraints, just like any other invention:

- o Design is via the imagination, with claims, references, abstract, description, images, etc., just like any other patent, trademark, or copyright.**
- o There are some restrictions on the godly-feasibility of the product - having a prototype. You see, God's plan (or Game of Life) puts restrictions on what can currently be done, but that shouldn't stop a patent from being created, but simply when/if it can/will be used.**
- o The ethnic consideration of its use will likely be based on a majority vote of a group, similar to law creation.**
- o The commission I require would range from 0-100% of product price, depending on the product's value and use.**

ARTIFACT SHEET

Enter artifact number below. Artifact number is application number + artifact type code (see list below) + sequential letter (A, B, C ...). The first artifact folder for an artifact type receives the letter A, the second B, etc..
Examples: 59123456PA, 59123456PB, 59123456ZA, 59123456ZB

1161345 UA

Indicate quantity of a single type of artifact received but not scanned. Create individual artifact folder/box and artifact number for each Artifact Type.

CD(s) containing:

computer program listing

Doc Code: Computer

Artifact Type Code: P

pages of specification

and/or sequence listing

and/or table

Doc Code: Artifact

~~Artifact Type Code: S~~

content unspecified or combined

Doc Code: Artifact

Artifact Type Code: U

Stapled Set(s) Color Documents or B/W Photographs

Doc Code: Artifact Artifact Type Code: C

Microfilm(s)

Doc Code: Artifact Artifact Type Code: F

Video tape(s)

Doc Code: Artifact Artifact Type Code: V

Model(s)

Doc Code: Artifact Artifact Type Code: M

Bound Document(s)

Doc Code: Artifact Artifact Type Code: B

Confidential Information Disclosure Statement or Other Documents marked Proprietary, Trade Secrets, Subject to Protective Order, Material Submitted under MPEP 724.02, etc.

Doc Code: Artifact Artifact Type Code X

Other, description: _____

Doc Code: Artifact Artifact Type Code: Z

9FW



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING OR 37i (c) DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NUMBER
11/161,345	07/29/2005	Christopher Anthony Roller	

Mr. Christopher Anthony Roller
 13150 Harriet Ave S #273
 Burnsville, MN 55337



CONFIRMATION NO. 2344
 FORMALITIES
 LETTER

Date Mailed: 08/05/2005

NOTICE TO FILE MISSING PARTS OF NONPROVISIONAL APPLICATION

09/26/2005 SSITHI81 00000028 11161345

FILED UNDER 37 CFR 1.53(b)

01 FC:2111	250.00 OP
02 FC:2311	100.00 OP
03 FC:2051	65.00 OP
04 FC:2203	180.00 OP

Filing Date Granted

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Items Required To Avoid Abandonment:

An application number and filing date have been accorded to this application. The item(s) indicated below, however, are missing. Applicant is given TWO MONTHS from the date of this Notice within which to file all required items and pay any fees required below to avoid abandonment. Extensions of time may be obtained by filing a petition accompanied by the extension fee under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

- Additional claim fees of \$200 as a small entity, including any required multiple dependent claim fee, are required. Applicant must submit the additional claim fees or cancel the additional claims for which fees are due.
- To avoid abandonment, a surcharge (for late submission of filing fee, search fee, examination fee or oath or declaration) as set forth in 37 CFR 1.16(f) of \$65 for a small entity in compliance with 37 CFR 1.27, must be submitted with the missing items identified in this letter.

SUMMARY OF FEES DUE:

Total additional fee(s) required for this application is \$615 for a Small Entity

- \$65 Surcharge.
- The application search fee has not been paid. Applicant must submit \$250 to complete the search fee.
- The application examination fee has not been paid. Applicant must submit \$100 to complete the examination fee for a small entity in compliance with 37 CFR 1.27
- Total additional claim fee(s) for this application is \$200
 - \$200 for 2 independent claims over 3.

Replies should be mailed to: Mail Stop Missing Parts
 Commissioner for Patents

Refund Ref:
 10/24/2005 BHABTEW 0000148292

CHECK Refund Total: \$180.00

Adjustment date: 10/24/2005 BHABTEW
 09/26/2005 SSITHI81 00000028 11161345
 04 FC:2203 -180.00 OP

P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

*A copy of this notice **MUST** be returned with the reply.*

Abdel G. Omar

Office of Initial Patent Examination (703) 308-1202

PART 2 - COPY TO BE RETURNED WITH RESPONSE

BEST AVAILABLE COPY


UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

 UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING OR 371(c) DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTY. DOCKET NO./TITLE
11/161,345	07/29/2005	Christopher Anthony Roller	

 Mr. Christopher Anthony Roller
 13150 Harriet Ave S #273
 Burnsville, MN 55337

CONFIRMATION NO. 2344
WITHDRAWAL
NOTICE

Date Mailed: 10/26/2005

WITHDRAWAL OF PREVIOUSLY SENT NOTICE

The Notice mailed on 08/05/2005 was sent in error and is hereby withdrawn. A corrected Notice is enclosed. The time period for reply runs from the mail date of the corrected Notice. The Office regrets any inconvenience the error may have caused.

A copy of this notice MUST be returned with the reply.

N. Mohammed

Customer Service Center

Initial Patent Examination Division (571) 272-4000, or 1-800-PTO-9199, or 1-800-972-6382

PART 3 - OFFICE COPY


UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

 UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NUMBER	FLING OR 371 (c) DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NUMBER
11/161,345	07/29/2005	Christopher Anthony Roller	

Mr. Christopher Anthony Roller
 13150 Harriet Ave S #273
 Burnsville, MN 55337

CONFIRMATION NO. 2344
FORMALITIES
LETTER

Date Mailed: 10/26/2005

NOTICE TO FILE MISSING PARTS OF NONPROVISIONAL APPLICATION

FILED UNDER 37 CFR 1.53(b)

Filing Date Granted

Items Required To Avoid Abandonment:

An application number and filing date have been accorded to this application. The item(s) indicated below, however, are missing. Applicant is given **TWO MONTHS** from the date of this Notice within which to file all required items and pay any fees required below to avoid abandonment. Extensions of time may be obtained by filing a petition accompanied by the extension fee under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

- The compact disc(s) submitted fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.52(e) in that they contain non-ASCII files. A new duplicate set of compact discs with only ASCII files is required. Any replacement compact disc submitted should be accompanied by a certification as required by 37 CFR 1.52(e) that each disc of a duplicate set is identical to the other disc of the set. If a directory of the disc could be printed, it is attached and non-ASCII files are marked on the directory listing.
- The compact disc(s) submitted fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.52(e) in that only a single copy of each disc was provided. A duplicate copy of each compact disc must be provided on Compact Disc-Read Only Memory (CD-ROM) or a Compact Disc-Recordable (CD-R) media. Any replacement compact discs submitted should be accompanied by a certification as required by 37 CFR 1.52(e) that each disc of a duplicate set is identical to the other disc of the set.
- This application is objected to because it contains a data file on CD-ROM/CD-R, however, the transmittal letter does not list for each compact disc, the machine format, the operating system compatibility, a list of files contained on the compact disc including their names, sizes in bytes, and dates of creation, plus any other special information that is necessary to identify, maintain, and interpret the information on the compact disc as required by 37 CFR 1.52(e)(3). A statement listing the required information is required. Additionally, the disc(s) is not identified in the paper portion of the specification with a listing of all of the files contained on the disc. When portions of an application are contained on a compact disc, the paper portion of the specification must identify the compact disc(s) and list the files including name, file size, and creation date on each of the compact discs. See 37 CFR 1.52(e). Applicant(s) are required to amend the specification to identify each disc and the files contained on the disc including the file name, file size, and file creation date.

Items Required To Avoid Processing Delays:

The item(s) indicated below are also required and should be submitted with any reply to this notice to avoid further processing delays.

- *The compact discs already submitted fail to comply with the labeling requirements of 37 CFR 1.52(e)(6) which requires each disc be labeled "Copy 1" and "Copy 2", respectively; and for replacement compact discs "COPY 1 REPLACEMENT MM/DD/YYYY" (with the month, day and year of creation indicated), and "COPY 2 REPLACEMENT MM/DD/YYYY". Any replacement compact discs submitted should be accompanied by a certification as required by 37 CFR 1.52(e) that each disc of a duplicate set is identical to the other disc of the set. Any new compact discs submitted must comply with the labeling requirements.*

Replies should be mailed to: Mail Stop Missing Parts
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

*A copy of this notice **MUST** be returned with the reply.*

N. Mohammed

Office of Initial Patent Examination (571) 272-4000, or 1-800-PTO-9199, or 1-800-972-6382
PART 3 - OFFICE COPY



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING OR 371 (c) DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NUMBER
11/161,345	07/29/2005	Christopher Anthony Roller	

CONFIRMATION NO. 2344

FORMALITIES
LETTER

Mr. Christopher Anthony Roller
 13150 Harriet Ave S #273
 Burnsville, MN 55337

Date Mailed: 10/26/2005

NOTICE TO FILE MISSING PARTS OF NONPROVISIONAL APPLICATION

FILED UNDER 37 CFR 1.53(b)

Filing Date Granted

Items Required To Avoid Abandonment:

An application number and filing date have been accorded to this application. The item(s) indicated below, however, are missing. Applicant is given **TWO MONTHS** from the date of this Notice within which to file all required items and pay any fees required below to avoid abandonment. Extensions of time may be obtained by filing a petition accompanied by the extension fee under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

- The compact disc(s) submitted fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.52(e) in that they contain non-ASCII files. A new duplicate set of compact discs with only ASCII files is required. Any replacement compact disc submitted should be accompanied by a certification as required by 37 CFR 1.52(e) that each disc of a duplicate set is identical to the other disc of the set. If a directory of the disc could be printed, it is attached and non-ASCII files are marked on the directory listing.
- The compact disc(s) submitted fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.52(e) in that only a single copy of each disc was provided. A duplicate copy of each compact disc must be provided on Compact Disc-Read Only Memory (CD-ROM) or a Compact Disc-Recordable (CD-R) media. Any replacement compact discs submitted should be accompanied by a certification as required by 37 CFR 1.52(e) that each disc of a duplicate set is identical to the other disc of the set.
- This application is objected to because it contains a data file on CD-ROM/CD-R, however, the transmittal letter does not list for each compact disc, the machine format, the operating system compatibility, a list of files contained on the compact disc including their names, sizes in bytes, and dates of creation, plus any other special information that is necessary to identify, maintain, and interpret the information on the compact disc as required by 37 CFR 1.52(e)(3). A statement listing the required information is required. Additionally, the disc(s) is not identified in the paper portion of the specification with a listing of all of the files contained on the disc. When portions of an application are contained on a compact disc, the paper portion of the specification must identify the compact disc(s) and list the files including name, file size, and creation date on each of the compact discs. See 37 CFR 1.52(e). Applicant(s) are required to amend the specification to identify each disc and the files contained on the disc including the file name, file size, and file creation date.

Items Required To Avoid Processing Delays:

The item(s) indicated below are also required and should be submitted with any reply to this notice to avoid further processing delays.

- *The compact discs already submitted fail to comply with the labeling requirements of 37 CFR 1.52(e)(6) which requires each disc be labeled "Copy 1" and "Copy 2", respectively; and for replacement compact discs "COPY 1 REPLACEMENT MM/DD/YYYY" (with the month, day and year of creation indicated), and "COPY 2 REPLACEMENT MM/DD/YYYY". Any replacement compact discs submitted should be accompanied by a certification as required by 37 CFR 1.52(e) that each disc of a duplicate set is identical to the other disc of the set. Any new compact discs submitted must comply with the labeling requirements.*

Replies should be mailed to: Mail Stop Missing Parts
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

*A copy of this notice **MUST** be returned with the reply.*

N. Mohammed

Office of Initial Patent Examination (571) 272-4000, or 1-800-PTO-9199, or 1-800-972-6382
PART 2 - COPY TO BE RETURNED WITH RESPONSE



Senior Patent Examiner,

Please disregard the previous enclosed CD. It was meant to aid you with a file to submit, not confuse my patent.

It was not part of the patent, so please disregard the previous enclosed CD.

Thank you,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Christopher Roller".

19 NOV 2005

Christopher Roller



APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING OR 37(c) DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTY. DOCKET NO./TITLE
11/161,345	07/29/2005	Christopher Anthony Roller	

CONFIRMATION NO. 2344

Mr. Christopher Anthony Roller
13150 Harriet Ave S #273
Burnsville, MN55337

Title: Godly Powers

Publication No. US-2007-0035812-A1

Publication Date: 02/15/2007

NOTICE OF PUBLICATION OF APPLICATION

The above-identified application will be electronically published as a patent application publication pursuant to 37 CFR 1.211, et seq. The patent application publication number and publication date are set forth above.

The publication may be accessed through the USPTO's publicly available Searchable Databases via the Internet at www.uspto.gov. The direct link to access the publication is currently <http://www.uspto.gov/patft/>.

The publication process established by the Office does not provide for mailing a copy of the publication to applicant. A copy of the publication may be obtained from the Office upon payment of the appropriate fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.19(a)(1). Orders for copies of patent application publications are handled by the USPTO's Office of Public Records. The Office of Public Records can be reached by telephone at (703) 308-9726 or (800) 972-6382, by facsimile at (703) 305-8759, by mail addressed to the United States Patent and Trademark Office, Office of Public Records, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 or via the Internet.

In addition, information on the status of the application, including the mailing date of Office actions and the dates of receipt of correspondence filed in the Office, may also be accessed via the Internet through the Patent Electronic Business Center at www.uspto.gov using the public side of the Patent Application Information and Retrieval (PAIR) system. The direct link to access this status information is currently <http://pair.uspto.gov/>. Prior to publication, such status information is confidential and may only be obtained by applicant using the private side of PAIR.

Further assistance in electronically accessing the publication, or about PAIR, is available by calling the Patent Electronic Business Center at 703-305-3028.

Pre-Grant Publication Division, 703-605-4283



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1489
Alexandria, Virginia 22304-4489
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
11/161,315	07/29/2005	Christopher Anthony Roller		2344

⁷⁸⁹⁹
Mr. Christopher Anthony Roller
13150 Harriet Ave S #273
Burnsville, MN 55337

EXAMINER

VAN ROY, TOD THOMAS

ARTICLE	PAPER NUMBER
---------	--------------

2828

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

03/17/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 11/161,345	Applicant(s) ROLLER, CHRISTOPHER ANTHONY	
Examiner TOD T. VAN ROY	Art Unit 2828	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.
- 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:

- (1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
- (2) if an article, its method of making;
- (3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
- (4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
- (5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

The following guidelines illustrate the preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. These guidelines are suggested for the applicant's use.

Arrangement of the Specification

As provided in 37 CFR 1.77(b), the specification of a utility application should include the following sections in order. Each of the lettered items should appear in upper case, without underlining or bold type, as a section heading. If no text follows the section heading, the phrase "Not Applicable" should follow the section heading:

- (a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.
- (b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.
- (c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.
- (d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.

Art Unit: 2828

- (e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.
- (f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.
 - (1) Field of the Invention.
 - (2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 1.98.
- (g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.
- (h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).
- (i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.
- (j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).
- (l) SEQUENCE LISTING (See MPEP § 2424 and 37 CFR 1.821-1.825. A "Sequence Listing" is required on paper if the application discloses a nucleotide or amino acid sequence as defined in 37 CFR 1.821(a) and if the required "Sequence Listing" is not submitted as an electronic document on compact disc).

Content of Specification

- (a) Title of the Invention: See 37 CFR 1.72(a) and MPEP § 606. The title of the invention should be placed at the top of the first page of the specification unless the title is provided in an application data sheet. The title of the invention should be brief but technically accurate and descriptive, preferably from two to seven words may not contain more than 500 characters.
- (b) Cross-References to Related Applications: See 37 CFR 1.78 and MPEP § 201.11.
- (c) Statement Regarding Federally Sponsored Research and Development: See MPEP § 310.
- (d) The Names Of The Parties To A Joint Research Agreement: See 37 CFR 1.71(g).
- (e) Incorporation-By-Reference Of Material Submitted On a Compact Disc: The specification is required to include an incorporation-by-reference of electronic documents that are to become part of the permanent United States Patent and Trademark Office records in the file of a patent application. See 37 CFR 1.52(e) and MPEP § 608.05. Computer program listings (37 CFR 1.96(c)), "Sequence Listings" (37 CFR 1.821(c)), and tables having more than 50 pages of text were permitted as electronic documents on compact discs beginning on September 8, 2000.

Art Unit: 2828

- (f) Background of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(c). The specification should set forth the Background of the Invention in two parts:
- (1) Field of the Invention: A statement of the field of art to which the invention pertains. This statement may include a paraphrasing of the applicable U.S. patent classification definitions of the subject matter of the claimed invention. This item may also be titled "Technical Field."
 - (2) Description of the Related Art including information disclosed under 37 CFR 1.97 and 37 CFR 1.98: A description of the related art known to the applicant and including, if applicable, references to specific related art and problems involved in the prior art which are solved by the applicant's invention. This item may also be titled "Background Art."
- (g) Brief Summary of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(d). A brief summary or general statement of the invention as set forth in 37 CFR 1.73. The summary is separate and distinct from the abstract and is directed toward the invention rather than the disclosure as a whole. The summary may point out the advantages of the invention or how it solves problems previously existent in the prior art (and preferably indicated in the Background of the Invention). In chemical cases it should point out in general terms the utility of the invention. If possible, the nature and gist of the invention or the inventive concept should be set forth. Objects of the invention should be treated briefly and only to the extent that they contribute to an understanding of the invention.
- (h) Brief Description of the Several Views of the Drawing(s): See MPEP § 608.01(f). A reference to and brief description of the drawing(s) as set forth in 37 CFR 1.74.
- (i) Detailed Description of the Invention: See MPEP § 608.01(g). A description of the preferred embodiment(s) of the invention as required in 37 CFR 1.71. The description should be as short and specific as is necessary to describe the invention adequately and accurately. Where elements or groups of elements, compounds, and processes, which are conventional and generally widely known in the field of the invention described and their exact nature or type is not necessary for an understanding and use of the invention by a person skilled in the art, they should not be described in detail. However, where particularly complicated subject matter is involved or where the elements, compounds, or processes may not be commonly or widely known in the field, the specification should refer to another patent or readily available publication which adequately describes the subject matter.

- (j) Claim or Claims: See 37 CFR 1.75 and MPEP § 608.01(m). The claim or claims must commence on separate sheet or electronic page (37 CFR 1.52(b)(3)). Where a claim sets forth a plurality of elements or steps, each element or step of the claim should be separated by a line indentation. There may be plural indentations to further segregate subcombinations or related steps. See 37 CFR 1.75 and MPEP § 608.01(i)-(p).
- (k) Abstract of the Disclosure: See MPEP § 608.01(f). A brief narrative of the disclosure as a whole in a single paragraph of 150 words or less commencing on a separate sheet following the claims. In an international application which has entered the national stage (37 CFR 1.491(b)), the applicant need not submit an abstract commencing on a separate sheet if an abstract was published with the international application under PCT Article 21. The abstract that appears on the cover page of the pamphlet published by the International Bureau (IB) of the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) is the abstract that will be used by the USPTO. See MPEP § 1893.03(e).
- (l) Sequence Listing. See 37 CFR 1.821-1.825 and MPEP §§ 2421-2431. The requirement for a sequence listing applies to all sequences disclosed in a given application, whether the sequences are claimed or not. See MPEP § 2421.02.

Claim Objections

Claims 10-14 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim should refer to other claims in the alternative only. See MPEP § 608.01(n). Accordingly, the claims have not been further treated on the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The specification has not described how one of ordinary skill in the art could make or use the claimed godly powers.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is not clear what is meant by the "godly powers" term used in the claims. The specification also fails to clearly describe the meaning of this language.

Claims 1-15 are rejected as failing to define the invention in the manner required by 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The claim(s) are narrative in form and replete with indefinite and functional or operational language. The structure which goes to make up the device must be clearly and positively specified. The structure must be organized and correlated in such a

manner as to present a complete operative device. The claim(s) must be in one sentence form only. Note the format of the claims in the patent(s) cited.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The Examiner's understanding of the subject matter presented in claims 1-15 in its current form is that of a supernatural ability. A supernatural ability, or "godly power", does not fall under one of the four types of patentable subject matter (process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter). The claimed invention does not pertain to one of these four classes, can be considered to be a naturally occurring phenomenon, and is therefor not patentable.

The following claim rejections are being made in light of the Examiner's best interpretation of the claimed subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Barlow (US 3989251).

With respect to claims 1-15, Barlow discloses a magic game wherein users are given the ability to perform illusions of godly powers (see abstract).

Conclusion

An examination of this application reveals that applicant is unfamiliar with patent prosecution procedure. While an inventor may prosecute the application, lack of skill in this field usually acts as a liability in affording the maximum protection for the invention disclosed. Applicant is advised to secure the services of a registered patent attorney or agent to prosecute the application, since the value of a patent is largely dependent upon skilled preparation and prosecution. The Office cannot aid in selecting an attorney or agent.

A listing of registered patent attorneys and agents is available on the USPTO Internet web site <http://www.uspto.gov> in the Site Index under "Attorney and Agent Roster." Applicants may also obtain a list of registered patent attorneys and agents

Art Unit: 2828

located in their area by writing to the Mail Stop OED, Director of the U. S. Patent and Trademark Office, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TOD T. VAN ROY whose telephone number is (571)272-8447. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Minsun Harvey can be reached on (571)272-1835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/TVR/

/Minsun Harvey/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2828

Application/Control Number: 11/161,345
Art Unit: 2828

Page 10

Notice of References Cited	Application/Control No. 11/161,345	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination ROLLER, CHRISTOPHER ANTH	
	Examiner TOD T. VAN ROY	Art Unit 2828	Page 1 of 1

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*	Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
*	A US-3,989,251	11-1976	Barlow, Gordon A.	273/239
	B US-			
	C US-			
	D US-			
	E US-			
	F US-			
	G US-			
	H US-			
	I US-			
	J US-			
	K US-			
	L US-			
	M US-			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*	Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N				
	O				
	P				
	Q				
	R				
	S				
	T				

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*	Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U
	V
	W
	X

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPFP § 707.05(a).)
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22314-4500
 www.uspto.gov

BIB DATA SHEET

CONFIRMATION NO. 2344


SERIAL NUMBER 11/161,345	FILING or 371(c) DATE 07/29/2005 RULE	CLASS 359	GROUP ART UNIT 2828	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	
APPLICANTS Christopher Anthony Roller, Burnsville, MN;					
** CONTINUING DATA *****					
** FOREIGN APPLICATIONS *****					
** IF REQUIRED, FOREIGN FILING LICENSE GRANTED ** ** SMALL ENTITY ** 08/05/2005					
Foreign Priority claimed <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No 35 USC 119(a-c) conditions met <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Verified and Acknowledged	<input type="checkbox"/> Met after Allowance Examiner's Signature: <u>THOMAS VAN ROY</u>	STATE OR COUNTRY MN	SHEETS DRAWINGS 0	TOTAL CLAIMS 15	INDEPENDENT CLAIMS 2
ADDRESS Mr. Christopher Anthony Roller 13150 Harriet Ave S #273 Burnsville, MN 55337					
TITLE Godly Powers					
FILING FEE RECEIVED 490	FEES: Authority has been given in Paper No. _____ to charge/credit DEPOSIT ACCOUNT No. _____ for following:		<input type="checkbox"/> All Fees <input type="checkbox"/> 1.16 Fees (Filing) <input type="checkbox"/> 1.17 Fees (Processing Ext. of time) <input type="checkbox"/> 1.18 Fees (Issue) <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Credit		

EAST Search History

Ref #	Hits	Search Query	DBs	Default Operator	Plurals	Time Stamp
L3	0	(magic and ("how to" or how-to)).ti.	US-PGPUB; USPAT; USOCR; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	OR	ON	2008/03/04 15:38
L4	7	(magic and kit).ti.	US-PGPUB; USPAT; USOCR; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	OR	ON	2008/03/04 15:38
L5	1098	(magic).ti.	US-PGPUB; USPAT; USOCR; EPO; JPO; DERWENT	OR	ON	2008/03/04 15:39

3/ 4/ 2008 3:53:23 PM

C:\ Documents and Settings\tvanroy\ My Documents\ EAST\ Workspaces
\ 11161345.wsp

Index of Claims 	Application/Control No. 11161345	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination ROLLER, CHRISTOPHER ANTHONY
	Examiner TOD T VAN ROY	Art Unit 2828

✓	Rejected	-	Cancelled	N	Non-Elected	A	Appeal
=	Allowed	÷	Restricted	I	Interference	O	Objected

Claims renumbered in the same order as presented by applicant
 CPA
 T.D.
 R.1.47

CLAIM		DATE							
Final	Original	03/04/2008							
	1	✓							
	2	✓							
	3	✓							
	4	✓							
	5	✓							
	6	✓							
	7	✓							
	8	✓							
	9	✓							
	10	✓							
	11	✓							
	12	✓							
	13	✓							
	14	✓							
	15	✓							

Search Notes

Application/Control No.

11161345

Examiner

TOD T VAN ROY

Applicant(s)/Patent Under
ReexaminationROLLER, CHRISTOPHER
ANTHONY

Art Unit

2828

SEARCHED

Class	Subclass	Date	Examiner

SEARCH NOTES

Search Notes	Date	Examiner
Please see search history	03/04/2008	TVR
EAST text search	03/04/2008	TVR

INTERFERENCE SEARCH

Class	Subclass	Date	Examiner



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1489
Alexandria, Virginia 22304-4489
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
11/161,315	07/29/2005	Christopher Anthony Roller		2344

⁷⁵⁹⁹
Mr. Christopher Anthony Roller
13150 Harriet Ave S #273
Burnsville, MN 55337

EXAMINER

VAN ROY, TOD THOMAS

ARTICLE	PAPER NUMBER
---------	--------------

2828

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

04/24/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
11/161,345	ROLLER, CHRISTOPHER ANTHONY	
Examiner	Art Unit	
TOD T. VAN ROY	2828	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) TOD T. VAN ROY.

(3) Christopher A. Roller.

(2) Minsun Harvey.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 10 April 2008.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: NA.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner and Ms. Harvey directed the Applicant to seek assistance in drafting both the claims and specification from a patent attorney or agent, as well as to refer to the MPEP for procedural matters.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Minsun Harvey/

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action. Examiner's signature, if required

RECEIVED

MAY 06 2008

PCT LEGAL
ADMINISTRATION

Mail Stop PCT
Commissioner for patents'
Office of PCT legal administration
PO box 1450

Attention: Office of PCT legal administration.

To: Derek A. Putonen.

I filed a PCT app little before 1Mar2007.
I filed it via PCT Safe, the european program. It was buggy and
wouldn't file
electronically, so I put it on disk as instructed and mailed it in with
a check for \$300.
It was using APN/11/161,345 as priority.
I received absolutely nothing about it in the one year since then.
I assume it got lost or forgotten.
I checked and the PCT app did not get processed.
But you cashed my check. See the attached cancelled check.
It was abandoned on your end for some reason - or lost.
Nothing was done for my \$300, thus I should get my \$300 back.
I would like a refund please of \$300.
Attached is the Track and Confirm signed by D Holloway
If you would like the original check, I can get that upon request.
It's currently filed with the bank.
I don't know what other information you need, but I can provide it upon
request.

Thank you,
Chris Roller
13150 Harriet Ave S #273
Burnsville, MN 55337
952.239.6410
Fax: 206.339.7775
patent@chrisroller.com

[Track & Confirm](#)

[FAQs](#)

Track & Confirm

Search Results

Label/Receipt Number: 2103 8555 7490 0054 6854
Status: Delivered

Your item was delivered at 11:51 AM on February 21, 2007 in
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313 to PATENTS. The item was signed for by D
HOLLOWAY.

[Additional Details >](#) [Return to USPS.com Home >](#)

Notification Options

Track & Confirm by email

Got current event information or updates for your item sent to you or others by email. [Go >](#)

Proof of Delivery

Verify who signed for your item by email, fax, or mail. [Go >](#)

Track & Confirm

Enter Label/Receipt Number.

[Go >](#)

MAY 27 2008

I am concerned about my patent pending, called Godly Powers - 11/161,345. It's a new technology, never before told. It's about real magic, the supernatural, a force so useful, so important, so earth-shattering, it's very hard to believe you don't give a crap about it. At least that's what my examiners have claimed. I told Misun Harvey "I've got people infringing on my patent, can you work my patent first so I can fight this", with an absolute no. Then I find out the most important and useful tool on the planet, Godly Powers, isn't statutory. The Supreme Court has stated that anything under the sun that is made by humans, except for laws of nature, natural phenomena, abstract ideas, and humans, falls within these classes. Godly powers is not a natural phenomena and thus should be statutory. It is magic, a supernatural force, that helps shape and create real tangible items and technology.

Hmmm, seems I'm facing roadblocks. Let's discuss the possibilities of roadblocks. There are many magicians out there who will lose lots of money if/when I get my patent issued. David Copperfield literally has made \$billion by using my godly powers. Now let's imagine what I would do if I was David Copperfield along with thousands of other magicians. I would find a way to pay off the USPTO so that Chris Roller doesn't get his patent and can't sue me for patent infringement later.

I mean, Chris Roller, barely has enough money to buy toilet paper much less a patent attorney/agent. But David Copperfield can easily afford \$1 million each to 10 key players at the USPTO to make sure this happens, including my examiners.

I have a friend who is/has Mafia connections. He was married and had a paternity test with a mistress. In fear of his marriage, he told me the DNA test came back negative because the Mafia bought the DNA test lab. It served 2 purposes; to warn me about what I'm up against; the power of money; the power of power; the powerless the peon possesses. It was informative while a warning. Well, I am the powerless and peon, and I realize what I'm taking on.

I wonder who at the USPTO had these powers prior to 2007, and wouldn't mind shutting me down.

I want you to envision with me a video I saw a few years back. It was a hypnotic experiment, where the lady is hypnotized, told to have sex with the guy, they cut away, cut back to clothes being tucked in, followed by, "you will not remember anything that happened in the previous hour". It was played off as a skit, a joke, but I question the reality of this happening, especially when my Mafia friend claims to have slept with over 500 ladies, and has been married for 27 years.

This patent is literally worth \$trillions, and Chris Roller, net worth \$15,000 is taking on people/magicians/tech companies with a net worth of over \$10 trillion. I wonder who's going to win.

I hope you understand what I'm getting at here. Chris Roller is God, and would like some compensation for the miracles on this planet, like what David Copperfield does in his magic shows on a daily basis. It is very easy for a \$billionaire like Copperfield to get Roller out of his hair – just start paying everybody off at the USPTO.

I may be a peon, but be warned. The oath is now online, where you cannot lie to me under oath now. And that includes the supernatural, and whether you've have these powers and have been doing some really stuff with it prior to my patents conception.

Now I realize the power of your attorney's abilities to be able to plead the 5th to say nothing, to avoid/ignore Roller cause he's a pest, and when nothing is said, nothing can be admitted nor proven. How unfortunate for me. But I may be asking for affidavits from the USPTO to make sure everything is on the up and up with my patent prosecution. Understand, if there are any more negations with my patent, I'm going to asking for sworn affidavits from my examiners and their bosses to make sure you don't hold any religious discriminations, conflicts of interests because you're Mafia, or conflicts of interests because you were indeed a magician with special powers prior to my patent pending.

Godly Powers are now real under oath, been around for years, undetected because it's not real – until now. Chris Roller discovered it. He wants to get compensated for this unreal force he has made real. It's a big discovery. It's a big deal. Something out of nothing – now that's a big deal! USPTO should pretend like it is a big deal, because it is.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUN 9 2008

In The United States Patent and Trademark Office

Appn. Number: 11/161,345
Appn Filed: 29 Jul 2005
Applicants: Christopher Roller
Title: Godly Powers
Examiner/GAU: Tod T. Van Roy/2828

Amendment A Draft to examiner for review

Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendments
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action Mailed Apr 17, 2008, please amend the above application as follows:

SPECIFICATION: Specification to original application was not submitted because applicant used ePave 5.2 and ABX 1.21 word macro writer. ABX did not inform applicant of specifications. Thus specification begins on page 2 of this Amendment.

CLAIMS: Amendments to the claims begin on page 7 of this amendment.

ABSTRACT: Amendment to abstract begins on page 8 of this Amendment.

REMARKS: Remarks begin on page 9 of this Amendment.

Included: David Copperfield lawsuit.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUN 9 2008

SPECIFICATION

(a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.

Godly Powers

(b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.

Not applicable

(c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR DEVELOPMENT.

Not applicable

(d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.

Not applicable

(e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A COMPACT DISC.

Not applicable

(f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.

(1) Field of the Invention. It's a process affecting, in cases, a machine, similar to software. Similar to a business plan that produces something useful.

(2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37

CFR 1.97 and 1.98

None. This is brand new technology in reality.

(g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.

God powers are using the supernatural, to defy laws of physics using an invisible force, and its end result can be a real product with real value and real reason for its creation.

Godly Powers is the supernatural disguised in reality. It can either exist in nature, or you can achieve these powers directly via God or Chris Roller. With

the personal powers, you can shape reality by using your mind, and as long as the result produces something real, there is a real excuse for the end result. You can fly and do many other things with these powers, but this cannot get reported as real in reality. Many things can be done with godly powers not in reality, like viewing the past. Many such phenomenons are listed on www.mytrumanshow.com

Existent in nature, it may not even be apparent that it's godly powers; you'll discover a use, usually through new technology, like follicular transplants, then profit from it. Existent in nature may be nasty scar removal; follicular hair transplant healing; savant extra-ordinary ability; deep fat frying at 375 degrees; hypnotism and power of suggestion. Some things are naturally getting better with time, like motor power ratio better than unity (power out > power in)

(h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).

Not applicable

(i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.

Godly powers has been around for some time. Not everybody had them. It was kept secret by those who had them on the planet, and used to profit via the wonderful technologies on this planet

Godly powers is the supernatural force that defies laws of physics, yet works at a macro level, enhancing reality. In essence, creating miracles, but portraying it with real explanations. For example, a magician will literally disappear on stage, but if he ever reveals the solution, he makes up a real explanation not defying laws of physics - he's falling through the floor, running underground to an elevator which takes him to his next curtain. Another example - a person may magically conger up an apple to feast from, then somebody asks you where he got the apple, he says "I plucked it from a tree", or "I bought it from the market." Godly powers a newly discovered force which has existed in the unreal realm of this universe, but was recently discovered by Chris Roller via a lawsuit with David Copperfield who admitted he usurped Chris Roller's godly powers. Chris Roller is bringing this very important discovery into reality via this patent so that others can create incredible inventions via "new use" patent applications, where applicant gets a commission from the use of the godly powers. Godly powers is literally the most important discovery mankind will ever face. Never before has godly powers nor macro-level supernatural force been proven nor documented, as James Randi on www.randi.org offers \$1 million to whoever can prove the supernatural or phenomenon exist. It's never been proven until recently.

The world has a real and unreal system working together. The unreal is the supernatural, which cannot get reported as real (reality) except under the oath. This patent, "Godly Powers", is attempting to merge the unreal to the real, the

supernatural realm to the natural realm, to defy laws of physics using an invisible force, and its end result is a real product with real value and real reason for its creation. The goal is to eventually create a real world with supernatural powers throughout. Flying people can one day be a reality. Creating this patent is the first step to that realization. Prior to 2005, approximately 1/6 to 1/3 of the planet had these powers and was able to manipulate the supernatural using the mind, which then manipulates reality. The key thing is that the reality presently has to have an explanation for its end result that does not defy laws of physics (a natural excuse), even though it was actually created using the supernatural and defying laws of physics. Godly powers doesn't have to be mind manipulated - it could simply be there. For instance, it may be determined that deep-fat fryers are a supernatural process. I mean, how can oil result in something not oily throughout the chicken, French fry, chicken nugget, etc. It's not oily - makes me wonder. Under the oath, it may be determined that oil at 375 degrees is actually supernatural even though we consider it a natural process. Another example of godly powers is follicular hair transplants. It's not a natural healing process, but one like "Miracle grow" for plants, requires godly powers to transplant/heal hairs on a follicular basis. If breast implants are actually being inserted into the breast with magic that avoids cutting and scarring, that's godly powers. Another example - engineers at Seagate are telling me they don't understand how their hard drives are achieving a power ratio above unity, where power out > power in. This is not possible according to physics and power distributions. They are then shutdown with the excuse that their measuring instruments are faulty. If > unity is happening, it's because of Chris Roller's godly powers, as he is getting stronger, and the world is getting more magical every year, and magic is becoming more real every year. My "Truth Under Oath" service is proof of that - www.HumanTruthDefector.com, a global service where no one can lie under oath anymore. Another example of godly powers is hypnotism. It's claimed to be a natural method through the power of suggestion, but to be able to control someone - that doesn't seem natural, and it may actually be godly powers in use. For savant's, Rainman's Kim Peek, and Brainman's Daniel Tammet, it may be determined that they use godly powers to lookup information in their "amazing" memory recall.

The existence of godly powers is very difficult to uncover. I only found out about it under oath, like via a lawsuit with David Copperfield. The existence of godly powers is elusive, hidden, protected by reality, except when under oath. In October of 2007, the oath has been extended to everyone via sworn statements in affidavits. The unnatural can now be talked about under oath.

Supernatural has only been known to exist at the subatomic level. Godly powers is the supernatural at a macro level; to affect macro objects with Godly powers, sometimes via mind commands. It is the force that allows David Copperfield to literally disappear, although he can never acknowledge this miracle in reality, only under the legal system. It's because it's not real. The world exists in reality and unreality. The unreal is the supernatural. The real is the natural that doesn't

defy laws of physics. World of real/unreal! What the heck! Sounds amazing – how can this be... as proof, look at David Copperfield – he has been using Godly Powers for years of his magic shows and never revealed it – because it's not real. James Randi, another magician, who has godly powers for his magic tricks, makes a \$million bet that supernatural does not exist. It's like a big con, but it's actually just reality protecting itself. Randi's \$million challenge simply makes a bet that God and reality will keep everything real. David Copperfield could take the \$1 million from James Randi, but he can't because his magic is not real. Supernatural is not real, yet it's true. Copperfield probably can't even do his best illusions in Randi's laboratory because God won't let the supernatural become real. The key point here is – just because it's not real does not mean it's not true. In other words, unreal and untrue are mutually exclusive. In other words, supernatural world of the unreal is true, and hidden very well by reality. Even proof of God is not real, yet it's all over the world, and true under oath. And the legal system is real. It is the medium by which to make the unreal known – the unreal real. So thus, I am attempting to make the unreal real by creating this patent, so as God, I can be compensated for the miracles on this planet. I made this force real, and revealed the very first document acknowledging godly powers - via the attached David Copperfield lawsuit.

There is wonderful beauty of the force: a magician needs something to disappear for his illusion to occur. Simply create the command to occur, and during the performance, initiate the command with the mind. Or better yet, just tell God to make it disappear whenever I wave my wand, and during the performance, it simply happens. It's that wonderful and beautiful and powerful. It's a shame the USPTO doesn't want to give me my patent without a fight.

And what's interesting is that Godly Powers can be usurped – stolen. You see, godly powers have been around for many millennium, but it's unreal – it's not real, but it's true. In 1999, I experienced a spiritual transformation I called the metamorphisation which allows me to gains spirits. Every time I gain a spirit, I usurp the powers of that spirit. It's gradual, but I will one day house all spirits. That day could've been 2005. In the Copperfield lawsuit, it's stated, "there is no known or recognized cause of action for usurpation of [Roller's] godly powers." Thus, Copperfield's magic tricks are done with my godly powers. In essence, he now has my godly powers for his magic tricks – he usurped/borrows my godly powers for his shows, even though I usurped his spirit and his powers. Confused yet. Before, his powers came from Satan – he usurped/borrowed Satan's powers to do his magic tricks. Then I usurped Copperfield's spirit. Now, Copperfield usurps Roller's godly powers to do his tricks. In my lawsuit with him, he states, "there is no known or recognized cause of action for usurpation of [Roller's] godly powers." It just happens as I get stronger. I now possess, if not all, nearly all living and dead spirits since life began.

(j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).

(k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).

(l) SEQUENCE LISTING

Not applicable

DRAFT

CLAIMS

Claims (1-15) CANCELLED

- 16. (NEW) Godly Powers is a method (process) comprising
 - a) the use of supernatural powers which defy laws of physics.
- 17. (NEW) Use of said godly powers of claim 16 results in a real end-result.
- 18. (NEW) Said godly powers of claim 16 are manipulated via the mind via thoughts.
- 19. (NEW) Said godly powers of claim 16 may be inherent in a natural process.

DRAFT

ABSTRACT

Christopher Anthony Roller is a godly entity, powering Earth with godly powers for years. Some people get these powers, and have been receiving financial gain from godly powers, or may be using their powers without morals. Chris Roller wants exclusive right to the ethical use and financial gain in the use of godly powers on planet Earth. Powers can exist in nature, enhancing reality naturally, where in cases, financial gain is achieved. Chris Roller is addressing godly powers so a new stage of reality can exist, one with which to create new-use patents from godly powers on planet Earth. The design of godly-products have no constraints, just like any other invention, but the ethnic consideration of it's use will likely be based on a majority vote of a group, similar to law creation. The commission I require could range from 0-100% of product price, depending on the product's value and use.

DRAFT

REMARKS – General

By the above amendment, Applicant has amended the specification in its entirety. Also applicants have rewritten all claims to define the invention more particularly and distinctly so as to overcome the technical rejections and define the invention patentable.

The Objection to the Specification and the Claims Rejection Under § 112

Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of specification rejection as specification now describes how to use godly powers. Specification to original application was not submitted because applicant used ePave 5.2 and ABX 1.21 word macro writer. Both ePave and ABX did not inform applicant of specifications. Specification now complies with the enable requirement. Claims now distinctly point out the subject matter of the invention.

The Objection to the Claims Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Barlow (US 3989251).

Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as Barlow considered prior art. There is conventional magic, and there is godly magic. Conventional magic doesn't defy laws of physics; godly powers does. The examiner is incorrect in his assessment of Barlow. Illusion and "simulate the levitation" are used, but there is no mention of godly power or supernatural in Barlow, or literally disappearing in the patent. It is conventional. The magic game uses conventional magic, real explanations/tricks. If this doesn't convince you, then take note of celebrity James Randi (randi.org), who offers \$1 million to anyone who can prove the existence of the paranormal/supernatural. And he offers it as of the present, and nobody has taken the money. If Barlow was indeed supernatural (godly), it could be used to prove James Randi wrong for 30 years. It hasn't been done because the game is conventional (simply tricks). There is nothing proven supernatural on this planet until Chris Roller discovered it via the David Copperfield lawsuit.

The Objection to the Claims Rejection Under 35 U.S.C § 101

Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 as non-statutory. Applicant has trouble believing the most important discovery on the planet, the most useful force on the planet, the most profitable force on the planet, called godly powers, is not statutory.

Purely manual processes were formerly regarded as nonstatutory, but now even these are being patented so long as they attain a useful result. Thus patents have recently been granted on a method of gripping a golf club and a method of using a keyboard. The PTO has even recently granted patents on processes of feeding chickens a special diet that results in better eggs, and combing the hair

to cover a bald area, and analyzing essays for plagiarism. Until the 1998 court decision in the *State Street* case (see section c1b), the PTO rarely granted patents for methods of doing business. The PTO reasoned that most business methods were abstract ideas that it traditionally refused to patent, but it gradually started granting patents on business methods and the courts validated this change in the *State Street Bank* case. The court ruled that patent laws were intended to protect any method, whether or not it required the aid of a computer, so long as it produced a "useful, concrete and tangible result." Thus with one stroke the court legitimized both software patents and methods of doing business, opening the way for a group of patents that have been categorized as internet patents and business method patents.

In the six months following the *State Street* ruling, patent filings for software and internet business methods increased by 40%. In response to the development of these new methods, the PTO created a new classification for such applications: "data processing: financial, business practice, management or cost/price determination." following the *State Street* case, patents have been issued for business methods such as:

- an online shopping rewards program, referred to as the "clickreward" (u.s. pat. no. 5,774,870);
- a system that provides financial incentives for citizens to view political messages on the internet (u.s. pat. no. 5,855,008);
- an online auction system by which consumers name the price they are willing to pay and the first willing seller gets the sale (also known as "name your price" or as a "reverse auction" (u.s. pat. no. 5,794,207); and
- a process that supposedly blocks the auction practices described in the previous patent (u.s. pat. no. 5,845,265).

In other words, the PTO will find that most inventions (1) fit within at least one statutory class, (2) have utility (or ornamentally for designs), and (3) possess novelty. However, most of the patent applications that fail to reach the patent summit (almost half of all patent applications that are filed) are rejected by the PTO because it regards the invention as obvious.

Like software, godly powers is a method, and affects a machine. Like business methods, godly powers produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result, and that should be all that's needed for statutory material.

"So if you have an invention involving an algorithm, ask if it produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result, such as the above examples. If so it's probably SSM (statutory subject matter).

The Supreme Court has stated that anything under the sun that is made by humans, except for laws of nature, natural phenomena, abstract ideas, and humans, falls within these classes. *Diamond v. Chakrabarty*, 447 u.s. 303 (1980); *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 u.s. 175 (1981). Godly powers is not a natural

phenomena and thus is statutory. It is magic, a supernatural force, that helps shape and create real tangible items. Supernatural cannot be construed as a natural phenomenon. James Randi has assured us with monetary rewards that phenomenons and supernatural does not exist.

CLAIM CHANGES

Claims 1-15 are cancelled because it basically describes the invention as a specification would, as in background of the invention. It's also too broad. The new claims are more specific, one independent and 3 dependant, 4 claims total, and aimed at understanding what constitutes godly powers (claim 16), using them via either the mind (Claim 18) or adapting powers currently in nature (Claim 19). Godly Powers can, but not necessarily, result in something real, thus claim 17. Claims are now in proper form, and now distinctly point out the subject matter of the invention.

DRAFT

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUN 09 2008

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

<p>Christopher Anthony Roller, Plaintiff, v. David Copperfield's Disappearing, Inc., Defendant.</p>	<p>Case No.: 05-446 (JRT/FLN)</p> <p>DEFENDANT'S MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION TO DISMISS</p> <p>ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED</p>
---	--

INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Christopher Roller ("Roller") has commenced an action for a purported labor dispute against David Copperfield's Disappearing, Inc. ("Copperfield") under Minnesota Statute § 179.06. This statute relates to the notice required to negotiate or make changes to a collective bargaining agreement. Seeing as how Roller has never worked for Copperfield in any capacity anywhere ever and has no relation to Copperfield whatsoever, he has no claim currently nor could he ever have any employment or labor claim against Copperfield. Plaintiff's Complaint is best described as a claim for usurpation of Godly powers, which as this Court is aware, is beyond the jurisdiction of this Court or any court of this earth.

Plaintiff's Complaint fails to state a claim against Copperfield for which relief can be granted and it should be dismissed with prejudice pursuant to FED. R. CIV. P. 12(b)(6). As an additional and alternative basis for dismissal, this Court does not have jurisdiction over this matter and it should be dismissed pursuant to FED. R. CIV. P. 12 (b)(2).

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

David Copperfield's Disappearing, Inc. ("Copperfield") is the corporate entity that brings the magic of world famous magician David Copperfield to the stage and television screen. Copperfield is a Nevada corporation and has no employees or operations in Minnesota.

Plaintiff Christopher Roller is an individual residing in the State of Minnesota.

Plaintiff served and filed a Complaint against Copperfield on or about June 1, 2005. In the Complaint, Plaintiff alleges that Mr. Copperfield has "been using my godly powers to perform his magic" and that this usurpation of godly powers constitutes a labor dispute under Minnesota Statute § 179.06. However, Plaintiff does not allege that he has ever been employed by, for, or with Copperfield and fails to identify any facts relating to a labor dispute. In fact, it is undisputed that Plaintiff is not now, nor has he ever been, an employee of Copperfield.

Instead of alleging any facts which would state a claim upon which an allegedly cognizable claim might otherwise exist - because there are none¹ - Plaintiff's Complaint collapses into this non-cognizable demand: Roller's promise to leave Mr. Copperfield

¹ Defendant respectfully urges the Court to visit Plaintiff's website, www.mytrumanshow.com, to which the Plaintiff refers both the Court and Defendant. Therein Plaintiff makes the following claims including:

- Plaintiff is running for President of the United States in 2008 with Bill Gates as his running mate.
- Plaintiff claims he is Jesus Christ.
- Plaintiff claims he is God.
- Plaintiff claims that Katie Couric and Celine Dion are his wives and are going to have his children.
- Plaintiff claims there is a movie coming out soon about his life that stars Tom Hanks.
- Plaintiff claims he has killed all of his enemies.
- Plaintiff claims he will father 1,000,000 babies.

alone in exchange for Mr. Copperfield performing and divulging *in the courtroom* the magic behind Mr. Copperfield's tricks.

As it turns out, Plaintiff's claims are not unique against Copperfield. On or about June 7, 2005, Plaintiff filed a virtually identical Complaint against another magician, David Blaine. (**Affidavit of André J. LaMere, Ex. A.**)

ARGUMENT

A. Plaintiff's Complaint Fails to State a Claim.

A claim is subject to dismissal under FED. R. CIV. P. 12(b)(6) when "plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief." *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 45 (1957). Minnesota Statute § 179.06 relates to the notice required to negotiate or change a collective bargaining agreement between employees and employers. Since there has never been any employment relationship between Plaintiff and Defendant; there are no facts, and no legal theory, set forth in the Complaint that could conceivably provide the basis for the relief sought by Plaintiff. Furthermore, Defendant is unaware of any cause of action in this jurisdiction or in any jurisdiction related to relief for an alleged usurpation of godly powers. Thus, even were one to take Plaintiff's allegations as "true," his Complaint does not state a cognizable claim as a matter of law. Accordingly, dismissal with prejudice is warranted.²

² Without waiving its right to later do so, it should be noted that Defendant has not brought a Rule 11 motion at this time despite ample grounds to do so. Obviously, to the extent Plaintiff were to continue to pursue his "claim" herein, Defendant may be forced to seek sanctions under Rule 11 in order to deter Plaintiff from the repetition of such conduct. FED. R. CIV. P. 11.

B. Alternatively, This Court Lacks Jurisdiction over Plaintiff's Employment Claim.

In addition to Plaintiff's failure to state a claim, it also appears that this Court does not have jurisdiction to decide alleged employment claims in this case. In the employment context, the Court does not have personal jurisdiction over an employer where the corporation has no meaningful "minimum contacts" related to the cause of action. *Lucachick v. NDS Americas, Inc.*, 169 F.Supp.2d 1103, 1107-09 (D. Minn. 2001). In *Lucachick*, an employee sued his former employer for breach of contract and fraud related to his employment contract. *Id.* at 1105. The District Court granted the employer's motion to dismiss, finding that the alleged breach of employment contract was not related to any of the defendant's "minimum contacts" with Minnesota. *Id.* at 1108-09. All of the employment contract negotiations, the only contacts related to the cause of action, were conducted either on the telephone or in California – not Minnesota. *Id.* at 1108. Here, to the extent that Copperfield engages in any in-state conduct, it cannot possibly be related to an employment dispute as Copperfield has never had any employees in the state of Minnesota including Roller.

In *Lucachick*, the plaintiff had actually been a former employee of the defendant – and still, the Court held that there was no jurisdiction over plaintiff's employment claims in that case. To confer jurisdiction in an alleged employment dispute because of some unrelated and, in this case never-alleged, "minimum contacts" of Defendant with this forum would violate the principles of federal due process. *Id.* at 1108-09. Plaintiff has

alleged no facts whatsoever which would establish jurisdiction in this Court over this employment claim.

As a matter of public policy, this Court does not have jurisdiction. To hold otherwise would subject any celebrity or other person of notoriety or their management corporation to the jurisdiction of this Court, no matter where the celebrity resides, if someone, as here, were to be bring completely unsubstantiated employment claims.

CONCLUSION

Plaintiff's Complaint fails to state a cause of action because (a) there has never been an employment relationship between Plaintiff and Defendant, and (b) there is no known or recognized cause of action for usurpation of godly powers. In addition, and alternatively, this Honorable Court does not have personal jurisdiction over the Defendant for the purpose of adjudicating the employment nature of the claims made by Plaintiff in his Complaint. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Complaint should be dismissed with prejudice pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(2) & 12(b)(6).

Dated: June 15, 2005

MASLON EDELMAN BORMAN & BRAND, LLP

By: s/ Andre J. LaMere
R. Lawrence Purdy (#88675)
André J. LaMere (#321205)
3300 Wells Fargo Center
90 South Seventh Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
Phone: 612.672.8375
Fax: 612.642.8375

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT

JUN 17 2008

In The United States Patent and Trademark Office

Appn. Number: 11/161,345
Appn Filed: 29 Jul 2005
Applicants: Christopher Roller
Title: Godly Powers
Examiner/GAU: Tod T. Van Roy/2828

Amendment A

Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendments
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action Mailed Mar 17, 2008, please amend the above application as follows:

SPECIFICATION: Specification to original application was not submitted because applicant used ePave 5.2 and ABX 1.21 word macro writer. ABX did not inform applicant of specifications. Thus specification begins on page 2 of this Amendment.

CLAIMS: Amendments to the claims begin on page 14 of this amendment.

ABSTRACT: Amendment to abstract begins on page 15 of this Amendment.

REMARKS: Remarks begin on page 16 of this Amendment.

Included: David Copperfield lawsuit.

(j) CLAIM OR CLAIMS (commencing on a separate sheet).

(k) ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE (commencing on a separate sheet).

(l) SEQUENCE LISTING

Not applicable

JUN 17 2008

SPECIFICATION

(a) TITLE OF THE INVENTION.

Godly Powers

(b) CROSS-REFERENCE TO RELATED APPLICATIONS.

Not applicable

(c) STATEMENT REGARDING FEDERALLY SPONSORED RESEARCH OR
DEVELOPMENT.

Not applicable

(d) THE NAMES OF THE PARTIES TO A JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENT.

Not applicable

(e) INCORPORATION-BY-REFERENCE OF MATERIAL SUBMITTED ON A
COMPACT DISC.

Not applicable

(f) BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION.

(1) Field of the Invention. It's a process affecting, in cases, a machine, similar to software. Similar to a business plan that produces something useful.

(2) Description of Related Art including information disclosed under 37

CFR 1.97 and 1.98.

None. This is brand new technology in reality.

(g) BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.

Godly powers are using the supernatural, to defy laws of physics using an invisible force, and its end result can be a real product with real value and real reason for its creation.

Godly Powers is the supernatural disguised in reality. It can either exist in nature, or you can achieve these powers directly via God or Chris Roller. With the personal powers, you can shape reality by using your mind, and as long as the result produces something real and there is a real excuse for the end result. You can fly and do many other things with these powers, but this cannot get reported as real in reality. Many things can be done with godly powers not in reality, like viewing the past. Many such phenomenons are listed on www.mytrumanshow.com

Existent in nature, it may not even be apparent that it's godly powers; you'll discover a use, usually through new technology, like follicular transplants, then profit from it. Existent in nature may be nasty scar removal; follicular hair

transplant healing; savant extra-ordinary ability; deep fat frying at 375 degrees; hypnotism and power of suggestion. Some things, as I mature, are naturally getting better with time, like motor power ratio better than unity (power out > power in)

(h) BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE SEVERAL VIEWS OF THE DRAWING(S).

Not applicable

(i) DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION.

Godly powers has been around for some time. Not everybody had them. It was kept secret by those who had them on the planet, and used to profit via the wonderful technologies on this planet.

Godly powers is the supernatural force that defies laws of physics, yet works at a macro level, enhancing reality. In essence, creating miracles, but portraying it with real explanations. For example, a magician will literally disappear on stage, but if he ever reveals the solution, he makes up a real explanation not defying laws of physics - he's falling through the floor, running underground to an elevator which takes him to his next curtain. Another example - a person may magically conger up an apple to feast from, then somebody asks you where he got the apple, he says "I plucked it from a tree", or "I bought it from the market." That same person may plant a bean which grows to the clouds, like Jack and the Beanstalk, and it will be very real to the magician, but it's from unreality, and cannot get reported in reality (news) because there is no possible real excuse for

a vine to the clouds. Godly powers is a newly discovered force which has existed in the unreal realm of this universe, but was recently discovered by Chris Roller via a lawsuit with David Copperfield who admitted he usurped Chris Roller's godly powers. Chris Roller is bringing this very important discovery into reality via this patent so that others can create incredible inventions via "new use" patent applications, where applicant gets a commission from the use of the godly powers. Godly powers is literally the most important discovery mankind will ever face. Never before has godly powers nor macro-level supernatural force been proven nor documented, as James Randi on www.randi.org offers \$1 million to whoever can prove the supernatural or phenomenon exist. It's never been proven until recently.

The world has a real and unreal system working together. The unreal is the supernatural, which cannot get reported as real (reality) except under the oath. This patent, "Godly Powers", is attempting to merge the unreal to the real, the supernatural realm to the natural realm, to defy laws of physics using an invisible force, and its end result is a real product with real value and real reason for its creation. The goal is to eventually create a real world with supernatural powers throughout. Flying people can one day be a reality. Creating this patent is the first step to that realization. Prior to 2005, approximately 1/6 to 1/3 of the people on Earth had these powers and was able to manipulate the supernatural using the mind, which then manipulates reality. These people, who I also call Satan's demons, were hiding the knowledge of these powers, and profiting from the wonderful things produced in reality. The key thing is that the reality presently

has to have an explanation for its end result that does not defy laws of physics (a natural excuse), even though it was actually created using the supernatural and defying laws of physics. Godly powers doesn't have to be mind manipulated - it could simply be there. For instance, it may be determined that deep-fat fryers are a supernatural process. Let's think, how can oil result in something not oily throughout the chicken, French fry, chicken nugget, etc. It's not oily - makes me wonder. Under the oath, it may be determined that oil at 375 degrees is actually supernatural even though we consider it a natural process. Another example of godly powers is follicular hair transplants. It's not a natural healing process, but one like "Miracle grow" for plants, requires godly powers to transplant/heal hairs on a follicular basis. I know - I had 1000 transplants by Bosley in 2006, and none of them took, because godly powers sometimes don't work on me. Bosley states that < 95% take-ratio is very rare. 0% take-ratio, impossible, unless if you're Roller. If breast implants are actually being inserted into the breast with magic that avoids cutting and scarring, that's godly powers. Another example - engineers at Seagate are telling me they don't understand how their hard drives are achieving a power ratio above unity, where power out > power in. This is not possible according to physics and power distributions. They are then shutdown with the excuse that their measuring instruments are faulty. If > unity is happening, it's because of Chris Roller's godly powers, as he is getting stronger, and the world is getting more magical every year, and magic is becoming more real every year. My "Truth Under Oath" service is proof of that - www.HumanTruthDefector.com, a global service where no one can lie under

oath anymore, while introducing Earth to God's wisdom. Further proof may be the missing bees, as my magic may be assisting pollination throughout the planet. Another example of godly powers is hypnotism. It's claimed to be a natural method through the power of suggestion, but to be able to control someone – that doesn't seem natural, and it may actually be godly powers in use. For savant's, Rainman's Kim Peek, and Brainman's Daniel Tammet, it may be determined that they use godly powers to lookup information in their "amazing" memory recall.

The existence of godly powers is very difficult to uncover. I suspected it for years, but only found out about it under oath, like via a lawsuit with David Copperfield. The existence of godly powers is elusive, hidden, protected by reality, except when under oath. In October of 2007, the oath has been extended to everyone via sworn statements in affidavits. The unnatural can now be talked about under oath.

Supernatural has only been known to exist at the subatomic level. Godly powers is the supernatural at a macro level; to affect macro objects with Godly powers, sometimes via mind commands. It is the force that allows David Copperfield to literally disappear, although he can never acknowledge this miracle in reality, only under the legal system. It's because it's not real. The world exists in reality and unreality. The unreal is the supernatural. The real is the natural that doesn't defy laws of physics. World of real/unreal! What the heck! Sounds amazing – how can this be...as proof, look at David Copperfield – he has been using godly

powers for years of his magic shows and never revealed it – because, even true, it's not real. James Randi, another magician who has godly powers for his magic tricks, makes a \$million bet that supernatural does not exist. It's like a big con, but it's actually just reality protecting itself. Randi's \$million challenge simply makes a bet that God and reality will keep everything real. David Copperfield makes a bet that God and reality will keep everything real. David Copperfield could take the \$1 million from James Randi, but he can't because his magic is not real. Supernatural is not real, yet it's true. Copperfield probably can't even do his best illusions in Randi's laboratory because God won't let the supernatural become real. The key point here is – just because it's not real does not mean it's not true. In other words, unreal and untrue are mutually exclusive. In other words, supernatural world of the unreal is true, and hidden very well by reality. Even proof of God is not real, yet it's all over the world, and true under oath. And the legal system is real. It is the medium by which to make the unreal known – the unreal real. So thus, I am attempting to make the unreal real by creating this patent, so as God, I can be compensated for the miracles on this planet. Understand, there are no laws to compensate a godly entity for godly powers. That's what this patent is for. Jesus, who I also claim to be, will get absolutely nothing when he shows his face on this planet. That's me, and as proof of nothing, Copperfield and all the other magicians have given me nothing except the finger in my quest for compensation. This patent by the USPTO, examiner willing, will fix this discrepancy.

I talked with an attorney, and he pointed out that godly powers might be David Copperfield's "trade secret". I question this notion, as trade secrets need to be

real. People can't have a trade secret that doesn't exist. I seriously doubt Copperfield nor anybody else has any paperwork on this supposed "trade secret" that doesn't exist in reality. I discovered it in reality and documented it, and now that it's my powers, and I have made it real in reality, it's my invention - a very useful one. Also, even though it was in use by over 1/6 of the people on the planet prior to 2007, it wasn't in 100% public use until 2007, nor was it real when in use, nor did it exist in reality, a \$1 million bet James Randi states no one has claimed yet (randi.org).

This unreal world has made me believe the world is very complicated, where some people see and experience some weird things, yet others live a very normal (real) life without the unreal, and others experiencing something in-between. You've heard the phrase, "seeing is believing", but I question whether people register the weird things they see, or if the memory is instilled while rendering the experience unreal and not reportable. Imagine witnessing the murder or rape of somebody with "wild" godly powers, and the wilder it is, then less it can be real, and thus not reportable to the police in reality. This, among many things, is the reason I mention the morality in the use of godly powers. Things can be done without morals that aren't able to be reported in reality. I don't have all the answers yet, as I'm not all-knowing like God. This unreality has led me to believe the unreal can be utterly chaotic and quite complex. I believe everybody, in 2007 has seen the unreal and experimented with the supernatural using their mind. Everybody was granted powers via God in March of 2007,

making it public use, yet unreal, yet true. What a perplexing truth; public for all except Chris Roller.

I made this force, godly powers, real, and revealed the very first document acknowledging godly powers - via the attached David Copperfield lawsuit. There is wonderful beauty of this force; Let's say a magician needs something to disappear for his illusion to occur. Simply create the command to occur, and during the performance, initiate the command with the mind. Or better yet, just tell God to make it disappear whenever I wave my hand in front of it, and during the performance, it simply happens. Or better yet, make it disappear based on viewer angle because the hand wave can't cover every angle of the audience. Take 5 different camera angles, and it will disappear slightly differently for each camera. It's that wonderful and beautiful and powerful.

And what's interesting is that Godly Powers can be usurped – stolen. You see, godly powers have been around for many millennium, but it's unreal – it's not real, but it's true. In 1999, I experienced a spiritual transformation I called the metamorphisation which allows me to gains spirits. Every time I gain a spirit, I usurp the powers of that spirit. It's gradual, but I will one day house all spirits. That day could've been 2005. In the Copperfield lawsuit, it's stated, "there is no known or recognized cause of action for usurpation of [Roller's] godly powers.". Thus, Copperfield's magic tricks are done with my godly powers. In essence, he now has my godly powers for his magic tricks – he usurped/borrows my godly powers for his shows, even though I usurped his spirit and his powers. Confused

yet? Before, his powers came from Satan – he usurped/borrowed Satan’s powers to do his magic tricks. Then I usurped Copperfield’s spirit – Satan’s too. Now, Copperfield usurps Roller’s godly powers to do his tricks. In my lawsuit with him, he states, “there is no known or recognized cause of action for usurpation of [Roller’s] godly powers.” The usurping just happens as I get stronger (mature). I now possess, if not all, nearly all living and dead spirits since life began, and I don’t think anybody can take them away from me. I am now the “MagicPimp” for godly powers in this world, and probably the universe. And while I wait for my patent, I am attempting to contain/control/stifle the use of godly powers on this planet, in hope that magicians will pay me to turn it back on.

In my original application, claims 1-15, I basically state that reality revolves around Chris Roller. I am the basis for reality, and thus the center of reality in the universe. Reality can be restructured with godly powers to attain a better result, but once Chris Roller gets the news, it is now history and cannot be undone. This phenomenon is strongly governed by God and his Plan – what I also refer to as my show. My show, www.mytrumanshow.com, all the people I meet, everything that happens on the news, TV is all ‘real’ solely for my show. It’s all for me. I don’t mean to be egotistical, but there is a show God is putting on is for me, like the Truman Show, and everybody is making it happen. I’m fairly certain the unreal can be discussed with everybody except Chris Roller because reality is highest near him because he is the center for reality. Nobody can talk to me about godly powers, including my examiners at the USPTO. It makes it difficult to find a patent lawyer who can not just believe in it, but talk about it to me. It

makes everybody queasy around me even though others can talk among themselves about it fairly comfortably.

Chris Roller says he's God sometimes, but actually, there is a symbiotic relationship between Chris Roller and God, a father/son relationship similar to the Jesus story. There is a direct correlation between godly power maturity and Chris Roller maturity. In particular, the anti-psychotic medication Chris Roller is taking is making magic more real. There is more than a coincidence that the day Chris Roller went off his huge doses of meds, there were reports of bees dying. It took a year to analyze what happened, but I believe my godly powers are assisting the pollination of plants throughout the planet. Thus bees don't have to work as hard anymore and aren't needed in large quantity.

www.HumanTruthDetector.com, Truth under Oath service, is a paradox on reality – almost a shredding of reality. Power of suggestion is heard of, but globally? That's hard to report, and may be even harder to get paid because of the "reality" of it. Then there is the notion that God is exposed via the oath - that's the unreal trying to get reported as real. It may be a while before this can ever reported – governed by God, and perhaps my med use as it makes magic more real.

I hope I have described godly powers in detail. It can be a complicated subject given almost anything is possible in the unreal, yet doing something with powers that has a real end result is the illusion magicians strive for to gain monetary benefit.

CLAIMS

Claims (1-15) CANCELLED

16. (NEW) Godly Powers is a method (process) comprising

a) the use of supernatural powers which defy laws of physics.

17. (NEW) Use of said method of claim 16 results in a real end result.

18. (NEW) Said method of claim 16 is manipulated via the mind via thoughts.

19. (NEW) Said method of claim 16 may be inherent in a natural process.

JUN 17 2008

20. ABSTRACT

Christopher Anthony Roller is a godly entity, powering Earth with godly powers for years, a supernatural force that defies laws of physics. Some people have these powers, control it with their mind, and have been receiving financial gain from godly powers, or may be using their powers without morals. There is a real and unreal realm to the universe. Godly Powers can be used in both realms, but in the real realm, a disguise has to exist to provide a real/natural excuse which does not defy laws of physics. It's the unreal realm that Chris Roller finds perplexing. Chris Roller wants exclusive right to the ethical use and financial gain in the use of godly powers on planet Earth. Godly Powers can be concealed in nature, enhancing reality naturally, with natural excuses, and in cases, financial gain is achieved. Chris Roller is addressing godly powers so a new state of reality can exist, one with which to create new-use patents from godly powers on planet Earth. The design of godly-products have no constraints, just like any other invention, but the ethnic consideration of it's use will likely be based on a majority vote of a group, similar to law creation. The commission I require could range from 0-100% of product price, depending on the product's value and use.

REMARKS – General

By the above amendment, Applicant has amended the specification in its entirety. Also, applicant has rewritten all claims to define the invention more particularly and distinctly so as to overcome the technical rejections and define the invention patentable. Applicant sincerely apologizes for his novice-ness in the patent prosecution process. Much of my current knowledge comes from "Patent it Yourself", by patent attorney David Pressman.

The Objection to the Specification and the Claims Rejection Under § 112

Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of specification rejection as specification now describes how to use godly powers. Specification to original application was not submitted because applicant used ePave 5.2 and ABX 1.21 Word macro writer. Both ePave and ABX did not inform applicant of specifications. Specification now complies with the enable requirement. Claims now distinctly point out the subject matter of the invention.

The Objection to the Claims Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Barlow (US 3989251).

Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as Barlow considered prior art. There is conventional magic, and

there is godly magic. Conventional magic doesn't defy laws of physics; godly magic does. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the examiner's assessment of Barlow. Illusion and "simulate the levitation" are used, but there is no mention of godly power or supernatural in Barlow, or literally disappearing in the patent, abstract nor claims. It is conventional. The magic game uses conventional magic - real explanations/tricks. If this doesn't convince you, then take note of celebrity James Randi (randi.org), who offers \$1 million to anyone who can prove the existence of the paranormal/supernatural. And he offers it as of the present, and nobody has taken the money. If Barlow was indeed supernatural (godly), it could be used to prove James Randi wrong for 30 years. It hasn't been done because the game is conventional (simply tricks). There is nothing proven supernatural on this planet until Chris Roller discovered it via the David Copperfield lawsuit.

The Objection to the Claims Rejection Under 35 U.S.C § 101

Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of claim rejection under 35 U.S.C. 101 as non-statutory. Applicant has trouble believing the most important discovery on the planet, the most useful force on the planet, the most profitable force on the planet, a force that is currently in use by people, called godly powers, is not statutory.

Purely manual processes were formerly regarded as nonstatutory, but now even these are being patented so long as they attain a useful result. Thus patents have recently been granted on a method of gripping a golf club and a method of

using a keyboard. The PTO has even recently granted patents on processes of feeding chickens a special diet that results in better eggs, and combing the hair to cover a bald area, and analyzing essays for plagiarism. Until the 1998 court decision in the *State Street* case (see section c1b), the PTO rarely granted patents for methods of doing business. The PTO reasoned that most business methods were abstract ideas that it traditionally refused to patent, but it gradually started granting patents on business methods and the courts validated this change in the *State Street Bank* case. The court ruled that patent laws were intended to protect any method, whether or not it required the aid of a computer, so long as it produced a "useful, concrete and tangible result." Thus with one stroke the court legitimized both software patents and methods of doing business, opening the way for a group of patents that have been categorized as internet patents and business method patents.

In the six months following the *State Street* ruling, patent filings for software and internet business methods increased by 40%. In response to the development of these new methods, the PTO created a new classification for such applications: "data processing: financial, business practice, management or cost/price determination." following the *State Street* case, patents have been issued for business methods such as:

- an online shopping rewards program, referred to as the "clickreward" (u.s. pat. no. 5,774,870);
- a system that provides financial incentives for citizens to view political messages on the internet (u.s. pat. no. 5,855,008);

- an online auction system by which consumers name the price they are willing to pay and the first willing seller gets the sale (also known as “name your price” or as a “reverse auction” (u.s. pat. no. 5,794,207); and
- a process that supposedly blocks the auction practices described in the previous patent (u.s. pat. no. 5,845,265).

In other words, the PTO will find that most inventions (1) fit within at least one statutory class, (2) have utility (or ornamentally for designs), and (3) possess novelty. However, most of the patent applications that fail to reach the patent summit (almost half of all patent applications that are filed) are rejected by the PTO because it regards the invention as obvious.

So if you have an invention involving an algorithm, ask if it produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result, such as the above examples. If so it's probably SSM (statutory subject matter).¹

Like software, godly powers is a method, and can affect a machine, and definitely isn't obvious. Like business methods, godly powers produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result, and that should be all that's needed for statutory material.

People have been using godly powers. It's in use, and people are infringing on me. It is hard to believe that something in use, and very useful, is not statutory.

¹ "Patent it Yourself", by patent attorney David Pressman.

The Supreme Court has stated that anything under the sun that is made by humans, except for laws of nature, natural phenomena, abstract ideas, and humans, falls within these classes. *Diamond v. Chakrabarty*, 447 u.s. 303 (1980); *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 u.s. 175 (1981).¹

Examiner has mentioned that godly powers can be construed to be a natural phenomenon. Godly powers is not a natural phenomena and thus is statutory. It is man-made in that applicant directly enhances the "reality" and strength of godly powers as time progresses and the amount of meds I consume. Godly powers has never been documented until this patent. It does not exist in reality until recently. It is magic, a supernatural force, that helps shape and create real tangible items. Supernatural cannot be construed as a natural phenomenon. James Randi has assured us with monetary rewards that phenomenons and supernatural do not exist.

CLAIM CHANGES

Claims 1-15 are cancelled because it basically describes the invention as a specification would, as in background of the invention. It's also too broad. The new claims are clearer and more specific, one independent and 3 dependant, 4 claims total, and aimed at understanding what constitutes godly powers (claim 16), using them via either the mind (Claim 18) or adapting powers currently hidden in nature (Claim 19). Godly Powers can, but not necessarily, result in something real, thus claim 17. Claims are now in proper form, and now distinctly point out the subject matter of the invention.


RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUN 17 2008

CONCLUSION

For all the above reasons, applicant submits that the specification and claims are now in proper form, and that the claims all define patentability over the prior art for which there is none. Godly Powers is brand new in reality. Therefore I submit that this application is now in condition for allowance, which action I respectfully solicit.

Conditional Request for Constructive Assistance

Applicant has amended the specification and claims of this application so that they are proper, definite, and define novel structure which is also unobvious. If, for any reason this application is not believed to be in full condition for allowance, applicant respectfully request the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 2173.02 and § 707.07(j) in order that the undersigned can place this application in allowable condition as soon as possible and without the need for further proceedings.




17 June 2008

Christopher A. Roller
Applicant Pro Se
13150 Harriet Ave S #273
Burnsville, MN 55337
952.239.6410
Fax(206.339.7775)

Certificate of Facsimile Transmission. I certify that on the date below I will fax this paper (including Attachment) to Art Unit 2828 of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office at 571.273.8300.

17 June 2008

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Christopher A. Kelly".

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

PATENT APPLICATION FEE DETERMINATION RECORD Substitute for Form PTO-875	Application or Docket Number 11/161,345	Filing Date 07/29/2005	<input type="checkbox"/> To be Mailed
---	---	----------------------------------	---------------------------------------

APPLICATION AS FILED – PART I			OTHER THAN SMALL ENTITY				
	(Column 1)	(Column 2)	SMALL ENTITY <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	OR		SMALL ENTITY	
FOR	NUMBER FILED	NUMBER EXTRA	RATE (\$)	FFF (\$)		RATE (\$)	FFF (\$)
<input type="checkbox"/> BASIC FEE <small>(37 CFR 1.16(a), (b), or (c))</small>	N/A	N/A	N/A		OR	N/A	
<input type="checkbox"/> SEARCH FEE <small>(37 CFR 1.16(k), (l), or (m))</small>	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	
<input type="checkbox"/> EXAMINATION FEE <small>(37 CFR 1.16(o), (p), or (q))</small>	N/A	N/A	N/A			N/A	
TOTAL CLAIMS <small>(37 CFR 1.16(j))</small>	minus 20 =	*	x \$ -			x \$ -	
INDEPENDENT CLAIMS <small>(37 CFR 1.16(f))</small>	minus 3 =	*	x \$ -			x \$ -	
<input type="checkbox"/> APPLICATION SIZE FEE <small>(37 CFR 1.16(s))</small>	If the specification and drawings exceed 100 sheets of paper, the application size fee due is \$250 (\$125 for small entity) for each additional 50 sheets or fraction thereof. See 35 U.S.C. 41(a)(1)(G) and 37 CFR 1.16(s).						
<input type="checkbox"/> MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM PRESENT <small>(37 CFR 1.16(i))</small>							
* If the difference in column 1 is less than zero, enter "0" in column 2.			TOTAL			TOTAL	

APPLICATION AS AMENDED – PART II					OTHER THAN SMALL ENTITY				
	(Column 1)	(Column 2)	(Column 3)		SMALL ENTITY	OR		SMALL ENTITY	
AMENDMENT	06/17/2008	CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT	HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	PRESENT EXTRA	RATE (\$)	ADDITIONAL FEE (\$)		RATE (\$)	ADDITIONAL FEE (\$)
	Total <small>(37 CFR 1.163)</small>	* 4	Minus	** 20	-	0	OR	x \$ -	
	Independent <small>(37 CFR 1.167)</small>	* 1	Minus	*** 3	-	0	OR	x \$ -	
<input type="checkbox"/> Application Size Fee <small>(37 CFR 1.16(s))</small>									
<input type="checkbox"/> FIRST PRESENTATION OF MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM <small>(37 CFR 1.16(i))</small>							OR		
					TOTAL ADD'L FEE	0	OR	TOTAL ADD'L FEE	

APPLICATION AS AMENDED – PART II					OTHER THAN SMALL ENTITY				
	(Column 1)	(Column 2)	(Column 3)		SMALL ENTITY	OR		SMALL ENTITY	
AMENDMENT		CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT	HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	PRESENT EXTRA	RATE (\$)	ADDITIONAL FEE (\$)		RATE (\$)	ADDITIONAL FEE (\$)
	Total <small>(37 CFR 1.163)</small>	*	Minus	**	-	-	OR	x \$ -	
	Independent <small>(37 CFR 1.167)</small>	*	Minus	***	-	-	OR	x \$ -	
<input type="checkbox"/> Application Size Fee <small>(37 CFR 1.16(s))</small>									
<input type="checkbox"/> FIRST PRESENTATION OF MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIM <small>(37 CFR 1.16(i))</small>							OR		
					TOTAL ADD'L FEE		OR	TOTAL ADD'L FEE	
* If the entry in column 1 is less than the entry in column 2, write "0" in column 3.					Legal Instrument Examiner:				
** If the "Highest Number Previously Paid For" IN THIS SPACE is less than 20, enter "20".					/Fennell A. Pearlie/				
*** If the "Highest Number Previously Paid For" IN THIS SPACE is less than 3, enter "3".									
The "Highest Number Previously Paid For" (Total or Independent) is the highest number found in the appropriate box in column 1.									

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.16. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. **SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.**

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUL 14 2008

In The United States Patent and Trademark Office

Appn. Number: 11/161,345
Appn Filed: 29 Jul 2005
Applicants: Christopher Roller
Title: Godly Powers
Examiner/GAU: Tod T. Van Roy/2828

Amendment A

Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendments
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action Mailed Mar 17, 2008, I forgot to attach the David Copperfield lawsuit, even though it was posted in the reply DRAFT.

Included: David Copperfield lawsuit.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUL 14 2008

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

<p>Christopher Anthony Roller, Plaintiff, v. David Copperfield's Disappearing, Inc., Defendant.</p>	<p>Case No.: 05-446 (JRT/FLN)</p> <p>DEFENDANT'S MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION TO DISMISS</p> <p>ORAL ARGUMENT REQUESTED</p>
---	--

INTRODUCTION

Plaintiff Christopher Roller ("Roller") has commenced an action for a purported labor dispute against David Copperfield's Disappearing, Inc. ("Copperfield") under Minnesota Statute § 179.06. This statute relates to the notice required to negotiate or make changes to a collective bargaining agreement. Seeing as how Roller has never worked for Copperfield in any capacity anywhere ever and has no relation to Copperfield whatsoever, he has no claim currently nor could he ever have any employment or labor claim against Copperfield. Plaintiff's Complaint is best described as a claim for usurpation of Godly powers, which as this Court is aware, is beyond the jurisdiction of this Court or any court of this earth.

Plaintiff's Complaint fails to state a claim against Copperfield for which relief can be granted and it should be dismissed with prejudice pursuant to FED. R. CIV. P. 12(b)(6). As an additional and alternative basis for dismissal, this Court does not have jurisdiction over this matter and it should be dismissed pursuant to FED. R. CIV. P. 12 (b)(2).

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

David Copperfield's Disappearing, Inc. ("Copperfield") is the corporate entity that brings the magic of world famous magician David Copperfield to the stage and television screen. Copperfield is a Nevada corporation and has no employees or operations in Minnesota.

Plaintiff Christopher Roller is an individual residing in the State of Minnesota.

Plaintiff served and filed a Complaint against Copperfield on or about June 1, 2005. In the Complaint, Plaintiff alleges that Mr. Copperfield has "been using my godly powers to perform his magic" and that this usurpation of godly powers constitutes a labor dispute under Minnesota Statute § 179.06. However, Plaintiff does not allege that he has ever been employed by, for, or with Copperfield and fails to identify any facts relating to a labor dispute. In fact, it is undisputed that Plaintiff is not now, nor has he ever been, an employee of Copperfield.

Instead of alleging any facts which would state a claim upon which an allegedly cognizable claim might otherwise exist – because there are none¹ – Plaintiff's Complaint collapses into this non-cognizable demand: Roller's promise to leave Mr. Copperfield

¹ Defendant respectfully urges the Court to visit Plaintiff's website, www.mytrumanshow.com, to which the Plaintiff refers both the Court and Defendant. Therein Plaintiff makes the following claims including:

- Plaintiff is running for President of the United States in 2008 with Bill Gates as his running mate.
- Plaintiff claims he is Jesus Christ.
- Plaintiff claims he is God.
- Plaintiff claims that Katie Couric and Celine Dion are his wives and are going to have his children.
- Plaintiff claims there is a movie coming out soon about his life that stars Tom Hanks.
- Plaintiff claims he has killed all of his enemies.
- Plaintiff claims he will father 1,000,000 babies.

alone in exchange for Mr. Copperfield performing and divulging *in the courtroom* the magic behind Mr. Copperfield's tricks.

As it turns out, Plaintiff's claims are not unique against Copperfield. On or about June 7, 2005, Plaintiff filed a virtually identical Complaint against another magician, David Blaine. (*Affidavit of André J. LaMere, Ex. A.*)

ARGUMENT

A. Plaintiff's Complaint Fails to State a Claim.

A claim is subject to dismissal under FED. R. CIV. P. 12(b)(6) when "plaintiff can prove no set of facts in support of his claim which would entitle him to relief." *Conley v. Gibson*, 355 U.S. 41, 45 (1957). Minnesota Statute § 179.06 relates to the notice required to negotiate or change a collective bargaining agreement between employees and employers. Since there has never been any employment relationship between Plaintiff and Defendant; there are no facts, and no legal theory, set forth in the Complaint that could conceivably provide the basis for the relief sought by Plaintiff. Furthermore, Defendant is unaware of any cause of action in this jurisdiction or in any jurisdiction related to relief for an alleged usurpation of godly powers. Thus, even were one to take Plaintiff's allegations as "true," his Complaint does not state a cognizable claim as a matter of law. Accordingly, dismissal with prejudice is warranted.²

² Without waiving its right to later do so, it should be noted that Defendant has not brought a Rule 11 motion at this time despite ample grounds to do so. Obviously, to the extent Plaintiff were to continue to pursue his "claim" herein, Defendant may be forced to seek sanctions under Rule 11 in order to deter Plaintiff from the repetition of such conduct. FED. R. CIV. P. 11.

B. Alternatively, This Court Lacks Jurisdiction over Plaintiff's Employment Claim.

In addition to Plaintiff's failure to state a claim, it also appears that this Court does not have jurisdiction to decide alleged employment claims in this case. In the employment context, the Court does not have personal jurisdiction over an employer where the corporation has no meaningful "minimum contacts" related to the cause of action. *Lucachick v. NDS Americas, Inc.*, 169 F.Supp.2d 1103, 1107-09 (D. Minn. 2001). In *Lucachick*, an employee sued his former employer for breach of contract and fraud related to his employment contract. *Id.* at 1105. The District Court granted the employer's motion to dismiss, finding that the alleged breach of employment contract was not related to any of the defendant's "minimum contacts" with Minnesota. *Id.* at 1108-09. All of the employment contract negotiations, the only contacts related to the cause of action, were conducted either on the telephone or in California – not Minnesota. *Id.* at 1108. Here, to the extent that Copperfield engages in any in-state conduct, it cannot possibly be related to an employment dispute as Copperfield has never had any employees in the state of Minnesota including Roller.

In *Lucachick*, the plaintiff had actually been a former employee of the defendant – and still, the Court held that there was no jurisdiction over plaintiff's employment claims in that case. To confer jurisdiction in an alleged employment dispute because of some unrelated and, in this case never-alleged, "minimum contacts" of Defendant with this forum would violate the principles of federal due process. *Id.* at 1108-09. Plaintiff has

alleged no facts whatsoever which would establish jurisdiction in this Court over this employment claim.

As a matter of public policy, this Court does not have jurisdiction. To hold otherwise would subject any celebrity or other person of notoriety or their management corporation to the jurisdiction of this Court, no matter where the celebrity resides, if someone, as here, were to be bring completely unsubstantiated employment claims.

CONCLUSION

Plaintiff's Complaint fails to state a cause of action because (a) there has never been an employment relationship between Plaintiff and Defendant, and (b) there is no known or recognized cause of action for usurpation of godly powers. In addition, and alternatively, this Honorable Court does not have personal jurisdiction over the Defendant for the purpose of adjudicating the employment nature of the claims made by Plaintiff in his Complaint. Accordingly, Plaintiff's Complaint should be dismissed with prejudice pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 12(b)(2) & 12(b)(6).

Dated: June 15, 2005

MASLON EDELMAN BORMAN & BRAND, LLP

By: s/ Andre J. LaMere
R. Lawrence Purdy (#88675)
André J. LaMere (#321205)
3300 Wells Fargo Center
90 South Seventh Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
Phone: 612.672.8375
Fax: 612.642.8375

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1489
Alexandria, Virginia 22304-4489
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
11/161,315	07/29/2005	Christopher Anthony Roller		2344

⁷⁵⁹⁹
Mr. Christopher Anthony Roller
13150 Harriet Ave S #273
Burnsville, MN 55337

EXAMINER

VAN ROY, TOD THOMAS

ARTICLE	PAPER NUMBER
2828	

2828

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/20/2008	PAPER

08/20/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No. 11/161,345	Applicant(s) ROLLER, CHRISTOPHER ANTHONY	
Examiner TOD T. VAN ROY	Art Unit 2828	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 June 2008.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.
- 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 16-19 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 16-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

The Examiner acknowledges the cancellation of claims 1-15 and the addition of claims 16-19.

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it contains more than 150 words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Arrangement of the Specification

The previous objection to the arrangement of the specification is hereby withdrawn.

The amendment filed 06/17/2008 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added

Art Unit: 2828

material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: the use of thought to complete the method of the instant invention.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Objections

The previous objection to the claims based on a multiple dependency issue is hereby withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The specification has not described how one of ordinary skill in the art could make or use the claimed godly powers.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which

was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The inclusion of the use of thought to complete the instant invention is believed to be (new) matter not described in the originally filed patent application.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is not clear what is meant by the "godly powers" term used in the claims. The specification also fails to clearly describe the meaning of this language.

Claims 16-19 are rejected as failing to define the invention in the manner required by 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

The claim(s) are narrative in form and replete with indefinite and functional or operational language. The structure which goes to make up the device must be clearly and positively specified. The structure must be organized and correlated in such a manner as to present a complete operative device. The claim(s) must be in one sentence form only. Note the format of the claims in the patent(s) cited.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The Examiner's understanding of the subject matter presented in claims 16-19 in its current form is that of a supernatural ability. A supernatural ability, or "godly power", does not fall under one of the four types of patentable subject matter (process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter). The claimed invention does not pertain to one of these four classes, can be considered to be a naturally occurring phenomenon, and is therefor not patentable.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 06/17/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Examiner notes that the Applicant's arguments have been considered, but are not found persuasive to overcome the previous claim, and art, rejections.

The Examiner additionally points out the Applicant's admission in newly filed claim 19 that the instant invention is "inherent in a natural process" is further evidence that the claimed subject matter is not patentable.

The following claim rejections are being made in light of the Examiner's best interpretation of the claimed subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Barlow (US 3989251).

With respect to claims 16-19, Barlow discloses a magic game wherein users are given the ability to perform illusions of godly powers (see abstract).

Conclusion

An examination of this application reveals that applicant is unfamiliar with patent prosecution procedure. While an inventor may prosecute the application, lack of skill in this field usually acts as a liability in affording the maximum protection for the invention disclosed. Applicant is advised to secure the services of a registered patent attorney or agent to prosecute the application, since the value of a patent is largely dependent upon

skilled preparation and prosecution. The Office cannot aid in selecting an attorney or agent.

A listing of registered patent attorneys and agents is available on the USPTO Internet web site <http://www.uspto.gov> in the Site Index under "Attorney and Agent Roster." Applicants may also obtain a list of registered patent attorneys and agents located in their area by writing to the Mail Stop OED, Director of the U. S. Patent and Trademark Office, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TOD T. VAN ROY whose telephone number is (571)272-8447. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Minsun Harvey can be reached on (571)272-1835. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/TVR/

/Minsun Harvey/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2828

<i>Index of Claims</i> 	Application/Control No. 11161345	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination ROLLER, CHRISTOPHER ANTHONY
	Examiner TOD T VAN ROY	Art Unit 2828

✓	Rejected	-	Cancelled	N	Non-Elected	A	Appeal
=	Allowed	÷	Restricted	I	Interference	O	Objected

Claims renumbered in the same order as presented by applicant
 CPA
 T.D.
 R.1.47

CLAIM		DATE							
Final	Original	03/04/2008	08/18/2008						
	1	✓	-						
	2	✓	-						
	3	✓	-						
	4	✓	-						
	5	✓	-						
	6	✓	-						
	7	✓	-						
	8	✓	-						
	9	✓	-						
	10	✓	-						
	11	✓	-						
	12	✓	-						
	13	✓	-						
	14	✓	-						
	15	✓	-						
	16		✓						
	17		✓						
	18		✓						
	19		✓						

AUG 22 2008

In The United States Patent and Trademark Office

Appn. Number: 11/161,345

Appn Filed: 29 Jul 2005

Applicants: Christopher Roller

Title: Godly Powers

Examiner/GAU: Tod T. Van Roy/2828

I just wanted to point out something additional information about godly powers, concerning the existence of godly powers.

There is an unexplained force keeping our solar system synchronized with our galaxy. In more detail, in our solar system, the further out the planet, the slower the orbit ($v \sim 1/r$) around the Sun. This is not happening with our solar system around our galaxy. ($v \sim$ constant)

Astrologers can only come up with a "real" explanation known as "dark matter", yet they cannot find it. Well I'm here to allege, that the Milky Way's spiral is constant, synchronized, tethered, and has been since this universe began, via the use of godly powers. There are other things in outer space that Astrologers cannot explain, all courtesy of godly powers (i.e. an accelerating universe via Phantom energy).

Understand, astrologers cannot find dark matter nor energy. They have no proof of its existence, just its effects. And worse yet, dark matter/energy accounts for over 96% of all mass in the universe, and yet it doesn't exist - they can't find it, only its effects.

Dark Matter, dark energy, phantom energy (form of dark energy), cannot be found in reality. That sounds like godly powers, which also cannot be found in reality. It's more plausible that dark matter/energy is actually godly powers. The scientists would be less bewildered if they knew godly powers are in existence in this universe and planet. Some things on this planet cannot be explained. Godly powers help provide those answers.

Concerning www.TruthUnderOath.com. Just the idea is worth a Nobel prize, but I'm fairly sure the service is active. What's above a Nobel prize? This patent is a big deal!

Please issue this thing,
Chris Roller



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1489
Alexandria, Virginia 22304-4890
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
11/161,315	07/29/2005	Christopher Anthony Roller		2344

⁷⁸⁹⁹
Mr. Christopher Anthony Roller
13150 Harriet Ave S #273
Burnsville, MN 55337

EXAMINER

VAN ROY, TOD THOMAS

ARTICLE	PAPER NUMBER
---------	--------------

2828

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/19/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of Abandonment

Application No.

11/161,345

Applicant(s)

ROLLER, CHRISTOPHER ANTHONY

Examiner

TOD T. VAN ROY

Art Unit

2828

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

This application is abandoned in view of:

1. Applicant's failure to timely file a proper reply to the Office letter mailed on 20 August 2008.
 - (a) A reply was received on _____ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated _____), which is after the expiration of the period for reply (including a total extension of time of _____ month(s)) which expired on _____.
 - (b) A proposed reply was received on 08/22/2008, but it does not constitute a proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 (a) to the final rejection.

(A proper reply under 37 CFR 1.113 to a final rejection consists only of: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114).
 - (c) A reply was received on _____ but it does not constitute a proper reply, or a bona fide attempt at a proper reply, to the non-final rejection. See 37 CFR 1.85(a) and 1.111. (See explanation in box 7 below).
 - (d) No reply has been received.
2. Applicant's failure to timely pay the required issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, within the statutory period of three months from the mailing date of the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85).
 - (a) The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, was received on _____ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated _____), which is after the expiration of the statutory period for payment of the issue fee (and publication fee) set in the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85).
 - (b) The submitted fee of \$_____ is insufficient. A balance of \$_____ is due.

The issue fee required by 37 CFR 1.18 is \$_____. The publication fee, if required by 37 CFR 1.18(d), is \$_____.
 - (c) The issue fee and publication fee, if applicable, has not been received.
3. Applicant's failure to timely file corrected drawings as required by, and within the three-month period set in, the Notice of Allowability (PTO-37).
 - (a) Proposed corrected drawings were received on _____ (with a Certificate of Mailing or Transmission dated _____), which is after the expiration of the period for reply.
 - (b) No corrected drawings have been received.
4. The letter of express abandonment which is signed by the attorney or agent of record, the assignee of the entire interest, or all of the applicants.
5. The letter of express abandonment which is signed by an attorney or agent (acting in a representative capacity under 37 CFR 1.34(a)) upon the filing of a continuing application.
6. The decision by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interference rendered on _____ and because the period for seeking court review of the decision has expired and there are no allowed claims.
7. The reason(s) below:

/Minsun Harvey/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2828

Petitions to revive under 37 CFR 1.137(a) or (b), or requests to withdraw the holding of abandonment under 37 CFR 1.181, should be promptly filed to minimize any negative effects on patent term.