

IN THE AU INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OFFICE

A/Supervising Examiner
Patent Examination B / B3 - Pharmaceuticals

In re PATENT APPLICATION of:

Applicant(s) : Zhen-man Lin)
Application No. : 2003248601) **Respond for Second**
PCT Filed Date : 12. 06, 2003) examination
For : **Surface Treatment of SARS-Infected Lungs**)

Patent Examination B
B3 – Pharmaceuticals

Fax: 61-2-6283-7999

Dear Madam/Sir

I had received the first examination report on 25 June 2008.

Regarding your comment 4.(1)of the Examination Report is below:

▣ Despite your submissions I am maintaining objection 2. This SUNNEN document is dated May 2003, prior to the filing date of the present application. ... ▣

I insisted my point of view that the invention specification delivered mail to WHO meeting on 20th May 2003 in my Respond II. Of **Respond for First** examination and humanitarianism are that below:

1. Under the Claiming Priority of PCT patent Article 8 (1), I have the rights to apply for UA office to use this date of 20th May 2003 for the date of priority use in my application, therefore, your comment 4.of the Examination Report was meaningless;
2. Second, my website- <http://www.ycec.com/Surface-Treatment-of-SARS-hk200503.htm> - contains the date of upload to have no way of doing something for textual criticism also. In general, the publish of website could be forged, therefore, for this reason to replace priority for cancel my patent application that behavior was absurd and same violate examine principles of AU office, Australia not should be a hoodlum and a rubbish country!
3. Concealing my medicine inventions of curing SARS, Bird flu were from the autarchy, evil-classic of Communism China, whether Australia Gov. also to fall low to be an evil-attendant and to conspire instruct AU Patent Office to look for an excuse and attempt cancel my this application?
4. The **Novelty** must face the public, but my website is a personal place which could not be any certainty factor;
5. Because the conceal that to lead to world all other country include the Ministry of Public Health of Australia, the public up to now that novel of my invention cannot be destroyed;
6. From the present situation of international provide help conceal, so the novelty objection not still stands, but the AU patent office must to forgive my notify on ahead of time by the PCT patent Article 8 (1) and humanitarianism of values, so the argument must stop in this time.

About your comment 5(2).of the Examination Report is below:

1. About the invent specification of the changes that was filed on 16 June 2005, so the changes of further that was not need.
2. About the scope of the claim 1 that subject was very clear to show is "...a liquid medicineis Per Fluoro Chemicals (PFC) mixing ozone." Therefore, the worry of claim for a method of treatment that was an illusion and the grammar which no any a problem.
3. About the claim 3 that "substitute liquid" it will change for "substitute for the liquid" and the "single oxygen" will to substitute for "atom of oxygen" now, please to see the attach 1 of A marked-up copy of the amend and attach 2 of substitute claims; I hope you can to agree.
4. About the claim 6 is clear and necessary, because the claim 1 is emphasize "In the lungs infected disease field, ...", so I hope you can to agree also.

Lastly, about the note of continuation fees, under the under PCT Article 22 or 39(1), which stated National fee is AU\$ 320 of the page 2 of "PCT Applicant's Guide" only and PCT Article 27(1), No national law shall require compliance with requirements relating to the form or contents of the international application different from or additional to those which are provided for in this Treaty and the Regulations. So this continuation fees is an extra charges. (Attach 3)

Further, under the PCT Article 24(1)(iii), if I did not fail to perform the acts referred to in Article 22 within the applicable time limit, under (1) that was show: "...any designated State with the same consequences as the withdrawal of any national application in that State:", further, under the PCT Article 25(2)(a), if I has to pay the national fee within the prescribed time limit, "...as far as effects in the State of the designated Office are concerned, treat the international application as if such error or omission had not occurred." Therefore, I hope you will nil any bias to examine my application and grant me the patent and I will then make the payment of continuation fees!

I believed that the Australia Government should recognize this invention that has influenced the advancement of mankind civilization.

Yours faithfully,



Applicant and inventor:

Lin Zhen Man

10 Ava Road, Ava Tower, # 19-07 Singapore 329949

27 September 2008 pm 9:10

Fax: 61-2-6283-7999

Australia Patent Office

Discovery House, Philip ACT 2606

IP Australia, PO Box 200, Woden ACT 2606

A marked-up copy of the amend claims on

26 Sep. 2008

Claims in AU patent office

1. In the lungs infected disease field, a liquid medicine of formulation for the Surface Treatment of SARS-Infected comprising is Per Fluoro Chemicals (PFC) mixing ozone.
2. A formulation as claimed in claim 1 wherein the same is in liquid form and includes all liquids of fluorine element.
3. A formulation as claimed in anyone of 1 or 2 comprising any substitute for the liquid to mixing ozone or the atom of oxygen is decomposed by other element.
4. A formulation as claimed in anyone of claims 1 to 3 comprising medicaments selected from anti bacterial agents, antibiotics and lung infection/inflammation curing agents.
5. The Liquid medicine/formulation for the Surface Treatment of SARS-Infected Lungs substantially as herein described and illustrated with reference to the accompanying examples and figures.
6. A formulation as claimed by anyone from claim 1 to 5 comprises any other lung diseases and SARS inflammation.

Substitute copy of the claims on

27 September 2008

Claims in AU patent office

1. In the lungs infected disease field, a liquid medicine of formulation for the Surface Treatment of SARS-Infected comprising is Per Fluoro Chemicals (PFC) mixing ozone.
2. A formulation as claimed in claim 1 wherein the same is in liquid form and includes all liquids of fluorine element.
3. A formulation as claimed in anyone of 1 or 2 comprising any substitute liquid to mixing ozone or the single oxygen is decomposed by other element.
4. A formulation as claimed in anyone of claims 1 to 3 comprising medicaments selected from anti bacterial agents, antibiotics and lung infection/inflammation curing agents.
5. The Liquid medicine/formulation for the Surface Treatment of SARS-Infected Lungs substantially as herein described and illustrated with reference to the accompanying examples and figures.
6. A formulation as claimed by anyone from claim 1 to 5 comprises any other lung diseases and SARS inflammation.

IN THE AU INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY OFFICE

A/Supervising Examiner
Patent Examination B / B3 - Pharmaceuticals

In re PATENT APPLICATION of:

Applicant(s) : Zhen-man Lin)
Application No. : 2003248601) **Respond for**
PCT Filed Date : 12. 06, 2003) Fees notify
For : **Surface Treatment of SARS-Infected Lungs**)

Electronic Records
Administration

Fax: 61-2-6283-7999

Dear Madam/Sir

I have received your letter of 27 Aug. 2008 on 11 Sep. 2008.

Under the under PCT Article 22 or 39(1), which as National fee is AU\$ 320 of the page 2 of "PCT Applicant's Guide" only and PCT Article 27(1), No national law shall require compliance with requirements relating to the form or contents of the international application different from or additional to those which are provided for in this Treaty and the Regulations. So your extra charges of PCT national fee from the web-pages was feigned.

Your letter interpret that AU.05 A continuation (renewal) fee must be paid to maintain the application is wrong, because the continuation (renewal) fee of "application" is after if I have to get the UA patent, therefore, it absolutely not at the "application" of national phase.

Under the PCT Article 24(1)(iii), if I was not fails to perform the acts referred to in Article 22 within the applicable time limit, under (1) that was show: "...any designated State with the same consequences as the withdrawal of any national application in that State:", further, under the PCT Article 25(2)(a), if I was to paid the national fee within the prescribed time limit, "...as far as effects in the State of the designated Office are concerned, treat the international application as if such error or omission had not occurred.", therefore, you must to remind my Examiner does not to be at a stick for me.

On the side, about the fee for filing a response to an examination report more than 12 months, you were wrong again, I had received the first examination report on 24 March 2007. It was regarding the post time, so the sign-date of report it shown 13 March 2007, so I was for filing a response to an examination report more than 1 month not the three month, under the PCT Article 48(2)(b), I think, AU office may as far as that State is concerned, excuse, for reasons other than those referred to in subparagraph (a), any delay in meeting any time limit for me!

Thank you.

Yours faithfully,



Applicant and inventor: Lin Zhen Man
10 Ava Road, Ava Tower, # 19-07 Singapore 329949 15 Sep. 2008
Fax: 852-8169-2860