

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Group Art Unit: 1616  
Examiner: PAK, JOHN D

In re PATENT APPLICATION of:

Applicant(s) : Lin ZHEN-MAN	) About the
Application No. : 10/469,063	) 37 CFR 1.121
Filed : Aug. 13, 2003	) <b>AMENDMENT</b> &
For : <b>Surface Treatment of SARS-Infected Lungs</b>	) Respond for
	) examination report

Commissioner of Patents  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
Examiner,  
PAK, JOHN D

By Fax: 001 1 (571 ) 273-8300

Dear,

As a result of former Bush's bribe-taking from the Chinese Communism for assistance in concealing this application of medicine invention, this application has been abandoned and the petition is GRANT ED on 6/21/2007, such the long-term on the table which show the independent character of USA patent office was to call in question.

When Sweden's prosecutor announced a fact pointed out China Government many times to bribe appraisal meeting of Nobel since 2006 on December 18, 2008. In the same way, *Obama's inauguration address* warning to China Gov.  [...To those who cling to power through corruption and deceit and the silencing of dissent, know that you are on the wrong side of history; but that we will extend a hand if you are willing to unclench your fist], the more detailed contents it could be to link <http://www.ycec.net/lzm/090331-us.pdf>

In the same way, Obama's inauguration addresses that China turns to negative history.

Today, I am very glad to receive the second examination report which has been delayed for 2 years in Singapore on 18 April 2009. Thanks to President Obama for his assumed office to change America and change human destiny.

I have received the second Examination Report of Office action by post on April. 20, 2009.

But, the attitude of examiner was still very to play a practical joke:

- I. The examiner censures inventor's amendment of specification which joins new matter and cancel all its claims, but the Examination Report does not point out what the new matter join in where?
- II. The Examiner quotes a report to verify WHO unable to cure the SARS on March 24, 2003 for a Non-Patent Document and to find an excuse to ridicule inventor who is not an infectious disease specialist M.D. or Ph.D.;
- III. The examiner knows perfectly well this application of invention that uses Ozone really not to directly [indirectly] pour into the lung, and it was through the combine reaction of mixing with PFC liquid to decompose for Oxygen and atom of oxygen to shown a difference of not alike matter already, but the Examiner quotes four reports to verify that the Ozone could be harmful to lung and an attempt to prove that this application of invention was undependable;

From the above three Paragraphs, the Examination Report is nonsensical and not worth refuting, the examiner has every inch of ulterior motives to beyond the demarcation line of disguise-unknown of examines means, therefore, the applicant has the power to doubt that China Government is to increase the amount of money and the temptation of woman of bribe?

The opposed excerpt of the Examination Report are below :

1. The claims amendment of 1/10/2006 is again non-compliant with respect to 37 CFR 1.121:
  - a. The amendment filed on 1/10/2006 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. (page 4.)
  - b. Applicant has also added new Figure 4 in the response of 1/10/2006. This figure was never before disclosed. This constitutes new matter. (page 7.)
  - c. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph; (page 7.)
  - d. Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, (page 8.)
  - e. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, (page 9.)
2. A March 24, 2003 statement from the World Health Organization establishes the state of the prior art knowledge regarding treatment for SARS; ..... At the time of the effective filing date of this application, there was no known medicine or drug to effectively treat SARS patients. (page 9.)
3. Four Non-patent Documents to verify the ozone is known to have adverse effects on the lung...and the Applicant provides this assurance of efficacy without any experimental data; (page 10.)
4. Applicant did not perform the animal tests; (page 11.)
5. Applicant's claims are extremely broad, and one of the key components, ozone, would have been recognized by one skilled in the art as potentially having an adverse and injurious effect on the SARS-infected lung.; ...For these reasons, all claims must be rejected. No claim is allowed. (page 12.)

#### Respond I.

With regards to the claims amendment of 1/10/2006, which is again non-compliant with respect to 37 CFR 1.121, applicant was to point out that the objections of Examination Report did not list any substance below:

1. On page 4 of the Examination Report there is a footnote that states “The amendment filed on 1/10/2006 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure.” and to show all applicant’s added the all new paragraphs to the specification which constitutes new matter at page 4-5 of the Examination Report and underline;
2. The last paragraph of page 6 of the Examination Report has a wrong portrayal of that: “Therefore, such new details are deemed new matter, which were not conveyed by the originally filed disclosure.” With reference to the underlined, the examiner was public to lawless to prejudice for this application, that is to say, the examiner does not allow my this application to have any amendment of specification under the Article 19/34 of PCT law and 37 CFR 1.121.
3. In fact, this amendment of specification already obtained permission from the office and was published on 12/16/2004 and again to explain on 1/10/2006. Now again to state that all the amendment which does not affect the novel of invention and that it CONTAINS NO any NEW MATTER. Why did the examiner still want to become entangled in? It is obvious that was inevitable to relations with the bribe of China Government.

4. The first paragraph of page 7 of the Examination Report was used unsuitable a reason to opposed the added of new Figure 4 that already to obtain allow by office and to publish on 12/16/2004 and again to explain on 1/10/2006. Now again to explain, the addition of Figure 4 that was amendment from the writing of original specification and does not affect the novel of invention and that it CONTAINS NO any NEW MATTER. Therefore, thus this illegal and prejudice behavior of the examiner it does not to accept.
5. The PFC (Per fluorine chemical compound) can be found in the original specification easily so why did the seventh paragraph of page 7 of the Examination Report stated that the **fluonine element does** not belong to the Per fluorine chemical compound and out of the original specification? Therefore, the insane behavior of the examiner expressed opposition to claim 5 is not right! Because the **fluonine element** is a min specialty of PFC compound and contains subject matter in the specification under the regulations of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. Besides, if the Fluoro Chemicals (PFCs) of claim 2 does not extent to include all the **fluonine element**, the defend for this intellectual property of invention would lose the efficacy.
6. The first paragraph of page 8 of the Examination Report still used a unsuitable reason to purposely misrepresent the regulations of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, The second paragraph is below:
 

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.
7. It was clearly stated at the above paragraph that inventor has pointed out the subject matter of specification shall conclude all the claims. What the subject matter of specification then? The titles of specification are below:

**I. Background of the invention**

**II. PREFACE**

**III. Five lung “surface treatment” methods**

1. Antibiotic gasification and absorption;
2. Massage and sternutation;
3. Taking out and sterilizing lung lobes;
4. Local quick freezing for sterilizing of lung lobes;
5. Injecting sterilizer into lung lobes.

**IV. O1 Therapy for “surface treatment” of the lungs**

1. Selection of PFE solvent;
2. Properties of ozone sterilizer;
3. Mixing of PFC and ozone;
4. Lung “surface treatment” design flow;
5. Test with animal lung;
6. Special of operating table.

**V. Conclusion**

8. Above the III 5. Injecting sterilizer into lung lobes of small title that was shown a subject matter in specification as claim 1.& 3.
9. Above the IV. 1. Selection of PFE solvent of small title that was shown a subject matter in specification as claim 2. 5. & 6.

10. Above the IV. 2. Properties of ozone sterilizer of small title that was shown a subject matter in specification as claim 2. 4.5.
11. Above the IV. 3. Mixing of PFC and ozone of small title that was shown a subject matter in specification as claim 2. 5.
12. Above the IV. 3-6. Mixing of PFC and ozone of small title that was shown are subject matters in specification as claim 1-6.
13. The above III. 4. the “Local quick freezing for sterilizing of lung lobes” of small title that was shown are subject matters in specification as claim 7-8. In the III. 4. of specification, inventor had to bring up a concrete claim that as the state of “...The clinic freezing device must work in contact mode and is capable of lowering the temperature of an organ of about 1 kg to -30-50 within 5 ~ 10 seconds...”, so the merits of invent is clear in existence, on the contrary, because the Examination Report was no any oppose meat of essence to shown, therefore, the opposed of page 8. (2) of Examination Report that was no effect.
14. It derive from 7-12 of above verify of fact, the merits and subject matter of invent are clears existence in specification, on the contrary, because the Examination Report was no any oppose meat of essence to shown, therefore, the opposed of page 8. (3) of Examination Report that was no effect.
15. It derived from 9-12 above verify of fact, the merits and subject matter of invent are clears existence in specification, on the contrary, because the Examination Report was no any oppose meat of essence to shown, therefore, the opposed of page 8. (5) of Examination Report that was no effect.
16. It was derived from III.5., and IV. 2. of specification that verify of fact, the lung “surface treatment” method which could to cure the germ numerous more than the SARS, and for instance, in the V. **Conclusion** of specification was a state that: “...This invention will save many lives and change medical-history for lung Infection-Disease.”, therefore, the opposed of page 8. (7) of Examination Report that was no effect.
17. The examiner must understand that the restrictions on any a substitute protect any intellectual property of invent which was need too, therefore, the opposed of page 8. (8) and 910)of Examination Report that was no effect.
18. The page 8(1), (4), (6), (9) and (11) of the Examination Report which refer to the written words with grammar, so a new amendment claims, the square brackets to show the deleted and under line to show the amendment, attach 1. is a substitute Claim, along with a marked-up copy (attach 2.) of the amendment which was to substitute the claims B of publish on 12/16/2004. Applicant thinks, these rewrite the claims 1-8 were every inch to base on Article 19/34 of PCT law and the guides of 37CFR 1,121.
19. The ninth paragraph of page 9 of the Examination Report has a question that “the claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification.” . **This is wrong.** The injecting sterilizer into lung lobes is main matter of one skilled in the art and the originality medicine was constituents by the PFC liquid mixing with ozone both only which to shown the IV. of specification and the PFC liquid may be referral to the Remark of Paper behind the specification. However, the Ozone as a germicide is a proverb only and the properties could be to see the IV. 2.of specification. Here must specially to point out that then the Ozone was mixing in PFC liquid after, the Ozone was to decompose for Oxygen and single oxygen-atom, therefore, the sterilizer is single oxygen-atom not the Ozone, so the title of specification IV.2.was to emphasize the “ **O<sub>1</sub>**

## Therapy”.

On the other hand, the PFC liquid mixing with ozone used in the field of Ophthalmic Diseases that the Russian patent RU2187984 was an example of success application. **Therefore,** the misgivings of Examination Report from the quotes of four Non-Patent Documents to verify that the Ozone could be harmful to lung which could be withdrawn now.

## Respond II.

1. The seventh paragraph of page 9 of the Examination Report quoted a report to verify WHO unable to cure the SARS on March 24, 2003 for a Non-Patent Document and to find an excuse to ridicule inventor who is not an infectious disease specialist M.D. or Ph.D.;
2. The above report of WHO was a very reliable eyewitness to witness this application of invent was without precedent in history, in the case of the ridicule of Examination Report which shown the infantilism of examiner, the inventor was not to take it seriously. But, the examiner must understand what the logic-invent of this application it could be to overcome this ignorant, below:

As there is a need to define air as an interface, so SARS infection is a kind of surface ulcerous infection. This is a new medical definition, which is likely to revolutionize lung treatment!

The above new medical definition was shown at the tenth paragraph of the specification II. That “surface ulcerous infection” was to stand for suit to any one bacterial infection in lung, such the bird flu, phthisis, all manner of pernicious flu that include today pig flu in American or Mexico, therefore, the opposed of page 8. (7) of Examination Report that was no effect.

The examiner must understand this invention was situated at the angle of pathology, why so that more many infectious disease specialists M.D. or Ph.D. not understand? Above the ignorant of examiner which whether on behalf of a morale of envy? Its significant is that a scotoma of medical science of since the dawn of history was to bring to light, this value of invent application matter-of-course.

## Respond III.

The fourth paragraph of page 10 of the Examination Report quoted four Non-Patent Documents, which verify that the Ozone could be harmful to the lung. The above-mentioned of 19 paragraph of Respond II which respond perfectly. It was very clear, in this application’s PFC liquid, the Ozone was to decompose for Oxygen and single oxygen-atom and that to be totally different is the Ozone oxidant gas of four Non-Patent Documents it was to direct into the lung:

1. The abstract of HCAPLUS 2005:1339341 that “Ozone is an oxidant gas that can directly induce lung injury.” It was shown the injure of Ozone (oxidant gas) from the gas was to direct into the lung.
2. The abstract of HCAPLUS 1962:41562 that injure of Ozone (oxidant gas) after “Mice exposed to 4 p.p.m, of ozone for 3 hrs.” .

Thus, it can be seen that **the** misgivings of Examination Report from the quotes of four Non-Patent Documents to verify that the Ozone could be harmful to lung which could be to withdraw now. On the other hand, in the IV.6.of specification that has a suggestion to lift the security performance of application to adopt a step to take turns

washing the lung of left and right sides.

#### Respond IV.

The first paragraph of page 11 of the Examination Report questioned the originally filed disclosure provides direction to combine ozone and PFCs to treat SARS-infected lungs and there is no data or working example, this is wrong. Because the IV. 2 of specification has a content form of internationally recognized to verify the Density and Time how kill not alike germ after in liquid additive Ozone, because the SARS is one of in the flu germ, so the Examination Report's requests is to make things difficult for inventor.

#### Respond V.

The fifth paragraph of page 11 of the Examination Report questioned the applicants who did not perform the animal tests? As the inventor has completed all the invention theory and reasoning logicity, the IV. 2 of specification has a content form of internationally recognized to verify the Density and Time how kill not alike germ after in liquid additive Ozone, the animal tests was very easy that should be perform by not alike country that doctor, infectious disease specialist M.D. or Ph.D.

#### Respond VI.

In the first paragraph of the page 12 of the Examination Report, it questioned that the applicant's claims are extremely broad, and one of the key components, ozone, would have been recognized by one skilled in the art as potentially having an adverse and injurious effect on the SARS-infected lung, the reason was to repeat question which four Non-Patent Documents to verify that the Ozone could be harmful the lung.

The Examination Report was further to deem the four Non-Patent Documents are ripe art, so they not to welcome this claims of application, therefore the examiner was a conclusion that: "For these reasons, all claims must be rejected. No claim is allowed."

Above the examiner was to talk through one's hat again, applicant was respond at above the Respond I. 19 and Respond III.

#### Peroration

1. Applicant hereby solemnly declare and inform the Examiner, this invent of treatment, "washing-lung" is the last medical means invention for mankind society to cure all lung bacterial infection! But the examiner was to overstep the routines of examination for this application of invention.
2. At present, the swine flu is spreading in American now but CDC had not announced any effective medicine to meet an urgent need. Opposite, the "washing-lung" medical treatment in application is a specific remedy for any type of flu including the swine flu. However this is concealed by the bribery of China Government passes through the political circles of the world up to now six year already. Applicant hopes that Obama whom did not take bribes from China Government can uphold the justice for mankind society!
3. The attach 3. is a letter sent to president Obama by applicant on May. 01, 2009. It is regarding how to use the "washing-lung" medical treatment to cure the swine flu and is therefore worth examined by examiners.

4. The attach 4. is an open letter to International Court of Justice (ICJ) sent on 14 May 2009. This letter is to requests ICJ to order WHO Dr *Margaret Chan* to evaluation the medical value of the treatment of "washing-lung" and only can show that WHO have not concealed this medical invention. If not, ICJ must send out an arrest order for WHO Dr *Margaret Chan* for the crime of against-mankind like the Sudan Case. America should bear the civilized leading powers to admit this application because this is a war between right and evil of civilization history of mankind.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 14, 2009



applicant: Lin Zhen-man

Telephone: 65-63533647  
 Telefax: 65-62585636  
 Email: [lzmyc@singnet.com.sg](mailto:lzmyc@singnet.com.sg)

United States Patent and Trademark Office  
 Alexandria. VA 22313-1450  
 Attn: Office of Petitions  
 By facsimile: 001 1 (571 ) 273-8300  
 And by below receipt for Post Item

邮连1000

交寄邮件收据  
 Receipt for POST Item

NO. 0591906

邮件号码	重量	克
NO. of Item	Weight	g
RR316977812CN	88	
寄达国名及地名		
Country and City of Destination	USA Patent office 美国	
邮件类别	特快专递EMS: <input type="checkbox"/> 文件型 Document <input type="checkbox"/> 物品型 Parcel	
Category of Item	包裹 Parcel: <input type="checkbox"/> 国内 Domestic <input type="checkbox"/> 国际 International	
价值	函件 Correspondence: <input type="checkbox"/> 国内 Domestic <input type="checkbox"/> 国际 International	
国际函件	投保金额	
Value	Insurance amount	
	0.00	

资费 Charge(Yuan)	18.60	保价费 Insurance fee(Yuan)	0.00
附加服务费 additional service fee(Yuan)			
材料费 material fee (Yuan)			
保险费 commercial Insurance fee (Yuan)	0.00		
验关费 customs examination fee (Yuan)			
其他费用 Other fee (Yuan)	0.00		
合计(大写)Total (Yuan)	2009.05.14 18.60		小写: 26.60

收寄人员签章及日期  
 Signature and Stamp  
 of Postal Office

邓素珍 2009.05.14 11:17

航空

本收据仅作为用户交付邮费的凭证。

HKBN EsendFax Service  
SUCCESSFUL Transmission Confirmation

( Ref. No.: 090515.df01\_710093 )

=====

To : [lzmyc@singnet.com.sg](mailto:lzmyc@singnet.com.sg)

Subject :

HK Send-In Date : Fri May 15 00:56:47 2009

HK Report Date : Fri May 15 01:02:47 2009

Status Phone No Send-In Send-Out Page Fax Duration

-----  
OK 15712738300 00:56:47 00:56:51(Fri) 12 page(s) 356 sec

No virus found in this incoming message.

Checked by AVG - [www.avg.com](http://www.avg.com)

Version: 8.0.238 / Virus Database: 270.12.28/2113 - Release Date: 05/13/09 18:04:00