

Repertory Patents

And Questions at the bottom

Repurposed materials to make NEW products which are now Patents

Particle Board, all **from saw dust** particles and wood saw dust fragments. How many patents can be issued for one type of product? Evidently several. ***Is there a Patent for trees? No. But there is from the waste products.***

Google search links: https://www.google.com/?gws_rd=ssl#q=particle+board+Patent&spf=705

1. <https://www.google.com/Patents/US3440189>
 2. <http://www.google.com/Patents/US6596209>
 3. <https://www.google.com/Patents/US3309444>
 4. <https://www.google.com/Patents/US3463746>
-

Apple Sauce, all from grinding, chopping, dicing **Apples**. Go figure. ***Is there a Patent on and Apple Tree or the Apples? No, but there is on the waste products or new found process.***

Google search links: https://www.google.com/?gws_rd=ssl#q=apple+sauce+patent&spf=878

1. <http://www.google.com/Patents/US5244685>
 2. <https://www.google.com/Patents/US3535127>
-

Wafer Board from wood chips from the lumber mills. More ways that are not obvious to repurpose waste. Just like broken glass, reinvent the use as we did. ***Is there a Patent for trees? No. But there is from the waste products.***

Google search links: https://www.google.com/?gws_rd=ssl#q=wafer+board+patent&spf=1049

1. <http://www.google.com/Patents/US4610913>
 2. <http://www.google.com/Patents/US4610913>
 3. <http://www.google.ms/Patents/US4751131>
-

Peanut Butter simply making paste from Peanuts. Maybe even the PBJ sandwich! ***Is there a Patent on Peanuts? NO! But you can bet there is a Patent on Mushed peanuts.***

Google Search Links: https://www.google.com/?gws_rd=ssl#q=peanut+butter+Patent&spf=1405

1. <https://www.google.com/Patents/US1445174>
2. <https://www.google.com/Patents/US3129102>
3. <https://www.wsj.com/articles/SB111266108673297874>
4. <http://patft.uspto.gov/netacgi/nph-Parser?Sect1=PTO1&Sect2=HITOFF&d=PALL&p=1&u=%2Fnetacgi%2FPTO%2Fsrchnum.htm&r=1&f=G&l=50&s1=6004596.PN.&OS=PN/6004596&RS=PN/6004596>

Jell-O horses, pigs and cows aren't too keen on this one. But I guess they had to do something with the hoof (toe nails). *Is there a Patent on animals? NO! The collagen in gelatin does come from boiling the bones and hides of animals processed for their meat (usually cows and pigs). But hooves consist of a different protein, keratin, which can't produce gelatin. To make Jell-O, you need to heat the gelatin in water.* Dec 19, 2013. *But there is on the processed bones.*

Google Links: 1. https://www.google.com/?gws_rd=ssl#q=jello+patent&spf=1590

1. <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jell-O>
2. <https://whatscookingamerica.net/History/Jell-O-history.htm>
3. <http://www.todayifoundout.com/index.php/2014/01/jiggly-history-jell-o/>

Shrapnel Patent Ground up metal and basically **JUNK**. You can bet these were **not** tumbled. Repurposed waste/ junk.

Google Links: https://www.google.com/?gws_rd=ssl#q=shrapnel+patent&spf=1942

1. <http://www.google.com/patents/US631703>
2. <https://www.google.com/patents/US1006875>
3. <https://www.google.com/patents/US1240217>
4. <http://www.google.ch/patents/US4524696>
5. <http://www.google.ch/patents/US932004>

Chicken Feed, by mixing up different materials, sea shells and such you now have a Patented product, interesting. How much **Chicken Feed** can you Invent? Evidently a lot.

Google Links: https://www.google.com/?gws_rd=ssl#q=chicken+feed+patent&spf=2113

1. <https://www.google.com/patents/US3257210>
2. <http://www.google.com/patents/US20090226558>

3. <http://www.google.com/patents/US6682762>
 4. <https://www.google.com/patents/US2813793>
 5. <https://www.google.com/patents/US2878123>
 6. <https://www.google.com/patents/US2899308>
-

Salt, Dry/ evaporate the water and you have Patented product. I did not know you could obtain a Patent from the residue from ocean water. ***There is no Patent on the ocean, but there is on the salt!***

Google Links: https://www.google.com/?gws_rd=ssl#q=salt+patent&spf=2284

1. <https://www.google.com/patents/US3269845>
 2. <https://www.google.com/patents/US1273208>
-

Ink, Octopus' were not thrilled about this one. Squeeze the sucker for his **INK**,

Google Links: https://www.google.com/?gws_rd=ssl#q=ink+patent&spf=2455

1. <http://www.google.com/patents/US6207258>
 2. <http://www.google.com/patents/WO2009034394A1?cl=en>
 3. <https://www.google.com/patents/US2427921>
 4. <http://www.google.com/patents/US6013122>
 5. <http://www.google.com/patents/US6869986>
-

Quill Pen, The birds thought this was a stupid idea. Pluck it and Patent it! ***The birds were quoted on squawking "PLUCK THIS"***

Google Links: https://www.google.com/?gws_rd=ssl#q=quill+pen+patent&spf=2797

1. <https://www.google.com/patents/US885317>
 2. <https://www.google.com/patents/US293545>
 3. <https://www.jetpens.com/blog/5-fascinating-pen-patents/pt/432>
-

Candle, How many ways can you Patent *wax and a string*?

Google Links: https://www.google.com/?gws_rd=ssl#q=candle+patent&spf=2968

1. http://www.google.com/patents/sitemap/en/Sitemap/C11/C11C/C11C_5_7.html

2. <https://www.google.com/patents/US1954659>
 3. <https://www.google.com/patents/US3925029>
 4. <https://www.google.com/patents/US3175876>
 5. <http://www.google.com/patents/WO2003022979A1?cl=en>
 6. <https://www.google.com/patents/US3266272>
 7. <http://www.google.com/patents/WO2013122833A1?cl=en>
 8. <http://patents.justia.com/patents-by-us-classification/44/275>
-

Powdered Eggs, Who would of ever thought to dehydrate an egg?

Google Links: https://www.google.com/?gws_rd=ssl#q=powdered+eggs+patent&spf=3139

1. <https://www.google.com/patents/US1203983>
 2. <https://www.google.com/patents/US2445299>
 3. <https://www.google.com/patents/US3082098>
-

Glue, Horses really did not like this idea, Horse Glue, Bah Humbug!

Google Links: https://www.google.com/?gws_rd=ssl#q=glue+patent&spf=389

1. <https://www.google.com/patents/US1394654>
 2. <https://www.google.com/patents/US3011985>
 3. <https://www.google.com/patents/US1020656>
 4. <http://money.cnn.com/2016/05/19/technology/google-flypaper-car/> **this one is just crazy “Google”**
- Go figure**
-

Ironically, there is only **one company** who holds all the Patents and Patents Pending for **FireGlass**

“Tumbled Tempered Glass”

Google Links: https://www.google.com/?gws_rd=ssl#q=tumbled+tempered+glass+patent&spf=3481

<http://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=11&ved=0ahUKEwiBstX-rM TAhVK94MKHeQEB6A4ChAWCDEwAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fpatentimages.storage.googleapis.com%2Fpdfs%2FUS20140141957.pdf&usg=AFQjCNF98kXZvXnxED64EWtCY1julOZYlgOMG>, that’s us

<http://www.google.dj/patents/US20050126225> Our Patent in French, interesting!

Everything is made from something, unless it is from the MOON!

From Cotton to Cloth

From Cloth to Clothing

From Sawdust to Sheets of Wood

From a Piece Wire to a Nail

From Animal Bones to Jello

From Apples to Sauce

From Sheets of Glass to Fragments of Glass

From Fragments of Glass to Beads/ Bead Like Shapes

From Peanuts to Crème

From Wax to Candles

From a Feather to a Pen

From an Octopus to ink in a Pen

From Ocean Water to Salt

Questions to be asked and answered, my thoughts

-
1. Can we ask for an injunction to stop any sales and production of the infringed product? (against American Fireglass and its dealers?) After the claim construction? (if successful)
-

2. Can we file for a frivolous case, because I believe initiating a Declaratory Judgment when they admittedly do not tumble/ infringe? The only reason I see that a Declaratory Judgment was filed is to allow American to claim "TUMBLED" without causing any harm to any other company or Patent. This is a legal request to continue to deceive (lying) the public, unfair business practices.

3. Does the Cyber Squatting and copywrite infringement cast a bad light on American Fireglass? Should/ can this be mentioned?

4. 1,500 dealers, most of which sell their glass as TUMBLED TEMPERED GLASS (by advertisement from American Fireglass' request) Safe to the touch/ safe to handle, is this issue going to be raised or mentioned to the judge? It was American Fireglass who has advertised the entire time they tumble their tempered glass so that it is "safe to the touch".

5. Will the presentation of the claim construction presentation be forwarded to me for final review for accuracy? There were a few inaccuracies in Texas. We had practice, now it needs to be perfect, agreed?

6. Can we bring up in the trial about the deceptive business practices that are now apparent? (false, misleading and fraudulent advertising on a national level through its dealer network of 1,500 dealers, plus (claimed). Misleading the public and *its* dealers through false advertising and false claims is fraud.

7. Regarding the Doctrine of Equivalent, can this be applied for and towards infringement? If it walks and talks like a duck, it is a duck. Claiming tumbled and it is not, claiming the safe benefits, is this fraudulent through deception?

8. Claiming a reasonable person in the art (in England, the concrete Patent) would have used tempered glass is not at all true. If this were the fact, they would have used tempered glass as they would have not had to process it (the bottles) to make smaller pieces as tempered glass breaks this way on its own (phenomenon, dicing). They actually broke bottles in a crusher to the proper size (and kept crushing) then tumbled. Not only can you not use raw glass in a fireplace, it would pop and or explode into the adjacent area, dangerous (this is sea glass/ raw glass). It was mentioned the bottles were very inexpensive to use as cullet in the concrete. This particular Patent is irrelevant to the Patent at issue (the '505") (stay focused).

9. We were told by our Patent Examiner (on or about) 04 15 2017 (actually now 05 09 2017) that he will issue a notice of allowance on our **Third Patent**, should this be a part of the court proceedings? I believe this would be a good shock factor to the plaintiff and their attorneys. **We were issued on 05 09 2017 Notice of Allowance on applications "13/863,373"** (notice of allowance issued 05 09 2017, possibly) **and "14/821,725"** (waiting on the notice of allowance) **the 3rd and 4th Patents!**

10. Either American is tumbling or they are not, which is it? If they are tumbling, I understand the Declaratory Judgment. If they are not tumbling, why or what is the real reason for the Declaratory Judgment? If they are not tumbling, why then claim "tumbling/ tumbled"?
