

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA**

GILBERT P. HYATT,

Plaintiff,

v.

KATHERINE K. VIDAL, Under  
Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual  
Property and Director of the United  
States Patent and Trademark Office,

Defendant.

Civil Action No. 1:24-cv-02290

**COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff Gilbert P. Hyatt, by and through his attorneys Baker & Hostetler LLP, alleges as follows:

**Nature of the Action**

1. This is an action under the Patent Act, 35 U.S.C. § 145, to obtain a patent on patent application serial number 08/464,999 (Dkt. #741). For over two decades, Plaintiff Gilbert P. Hyatt has diligently prosecuted the '999 Application in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (“PTO”), as well as several hundred co-pending applications.

2. Congress has provided a cause of action for an aggrieved patent applicant to bring a civil action under 35 U.S.C. § 145 to obtain *de novo* consideration of his entitlement to a patent. Mr. Hyatt brings this action to obtain a patent in this application.

**Parties**

3. Plaintiff Gilbert P. Hyatt is an engineer, scientist, and inventor who has obtained more than 70 issued patents. Some of his patents and applications cover microcomputer structure, computer memory architecture, incremental processing, illumination devices, display devices, graphics systems, image processing, and sound and speech processing. He is 86 years of age and resides in Clark County, Nevada.

4. Defendant Katherine K. Vidal is the Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office. She has overall responsibility for the administration and operation of the PTO, including the patent examination process. She is named as a defendant in her official capacity only.

**Jurisdiction and Venue**

5. This action arises under the patent laws of the United States. This Court has subject-matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1338(a), and 35 U.S.C. § 145.

6. Venue is proper in this judicial district pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 145.

7. This Complaint is timely filed in accordance with 35 U.S.C. § 145 and 37 C.F.R. § 90.3(a)(3)(i).

8. This matter has not been appealed to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

**The '999 Application**

9. Mr. Hyatt is the owner and inventor of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 08/464,999 (Dkt. #741) (the “'999 Application”).

10. The '999 Application has the benefit of the filing date of U.S. Patent Application Serial No. 06/663,094 (Dkt. #303) filed on October 19, 1984.

11. The '999 Application includes the following 377 claims: 117–123, 125, 127, 129, 131, 133, 135, 137, 139, 141, 143, 145–151, 153–156, 160, 162, 164–178, 180–191, 193–200, 202, 204–240, 249, 250, 259, 260, 269, 270, 279, 280, 289, 290, 299, 300, 309, 310, 319, 320, 329, 330, 339–354, 374, 417, 418, 420–434, 437–446, 448–457, 459–482, 484–486, 488–491, 493–531, 533–548, 550, 552–565, 567–594, 596–598, 600–613, 615–629, 631–640, 642–650, 652–654, 656–660, 663, 664, and 666–677 (the “Subject Claims”).

12. Mr. Hyatt is seeking issuance of a patent on the Subject Claims, but not on any other claims in the '999 Application.

13. The Subject Claims in the '999 Application are generally directed to the following subject matter:

- a. taking various recited actions and outputting information to a communication link, both based on radial information generated by radial scanout or radial projection based on all of database information accessed from a memory, information from a communication link, and information from a video camera;
- b. taking various recited actions and outputting information to an output communication link, both based on shaded kernel filtered information generated based on all of information accessed from a memory, information from an input communication link, and information received from a video camera or a radar system located on a remote sensing platform, without recitation of any specific types of platform;
- c. generating map information and outputting information to an output communication link, both based on shaded kernel filtered information generated based on all of database information accessed from a charge storage memory, information from an input communication link, and sensor information received from a satellite;
- d. operating an airline and outputting information to an output communication link, both based on shaded kernel filtered information generated based on all of data decompressed database information accessed from a charge storage memory, information from an input communication link, and sensor information received from a satellite;
- e. taking various recited actions based on pattern recognition processing of rotating 3D perspective information that is generated based on both information from a memory and information received from a video camera,

an infrared system, a radar system, or a sensor located on a remote sensing platform, without recitation of any specific types of platform; or

- f. generating weather information or operating a real estate development based on pattern recognition processing of rotating 3D perspective information that is generated based on both information from a memory and sensor information from a satellite.

These lines of demarcation are further evidenced by the specific limitations of each Subject Claim. Each claim of the Subject Claims of the instant application has ascertainable differences in scope from the claims of Mr. Hyatt's co-pending applications.

14. Mr. Hyatt filed the '999 Application on June 2, 1995. As such, this application is governed by the Transitional Rules under the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, Public Law No. 103-465 (1994) ("URAA"), including a provision the PTO implemented in 37 C.F.R. § 1.129(a) ("Rule 129(a)", that limits to two the number of submissions that an applicant can file, to require limited further examination.

15. The '999 Application is deemed "special" under the PTO rules and must be "advanced out of turn." 37 C.F.R. § 1.102(a). It "continue[s] to be special throughout its entire course of prosecution in the [PTO], including appeal, if any, to the [Board]." MPEP § 708.01.

16. Mr. Hyatt has never made a dilatory filing in prosecuting the '999 Application. In contrast, the PTO suspended prosecution on at least seven occasions (10/24/2003, 4/24/2007, 3/17/2008, 12/30/2008, 9/24/2009, 4/19/2010, and 9/23/2011), and entered new grounds of rejections at least as late as February 2020.

17. The PTO subjected all of Mr. Hyatt's applications, including the instant application, to the Sensitive Application Warning System ("SAWS"), from at least the late 1990s through 2015. In accordance with the terms of the SAWS, examiners lacked authority to allow Mr. Hyatt's patent applications. Moreover, under the terms of the SAWS, examiners and other PTO officials were directed to consider factors that are irrelevant to the

statutory criteria for patentability in determining whether or not to permit Mr. Hyatt's applications to issue as patents. The inclusion of Mr. Hyatt's applications in the SAWS prejudiced the PTO in its consideration of Mr. Hyatt's applications, including the instant application.

18. In August 1995, Mr. Hyatt filed a preliminary amendment.

19. In September 1995, the PTO sent a non-final office action rejecting all claims.

20. In February 1996, Mr. Hyatt timely responded, and in March 1996, Mr. Hyatt filed a supplemental response.

21. In July 1996, the PTO sent a final office action rejecting all claims.

22. In December 1996, Mr. Hyatt filed a notice of appeal, and in February 1997, Mr. Hyatt filed a petition to withdraw the finality of the office action.

23. In April 1997, the PTO partially granted the petition, vacated the final office action, dismissed the appeal, and held the March 1996 supplemental response non-responsive but *bona fide*.

24. In May 1997 responded to the holding of non-responsiveness, and in December 1997, Mr. Hyatt filed a supplemental response.

25. For more than a year after Mr. Hyatt's May 1997 response, the PTO did not take any action on the merits. In September 1998, the PTO sent a non-final office action rejecting all claims.

26. In March 1999, Mr. Hyatt timely responded, and in June 1999, Mr. Hyatt filed a supplemental response.

27. In June 2000, the PTO sent a final office action rejecting all claims.

28. In December 2000, Mr. Hyatt filed a notice of appeal; in June 2001, Mr. Hyatt made a Rule 129(a) submission removing the finality of the office action; and in July 2001, Mr. Hyatt filed a supplemental amendment.

29. In April 2002, the PTO sent a non-final office action rejecting all claims.

30. In October 2002, Mr. Hyatt timely responded, and in April 2003, Mr. Hyatt filed a supplemental amendment.

31. For more than a year and a half from Mr. Hyatt's October 2002 response, the PTO did not take any action on the merits except for suspending examination once. In January 2004, the PTO sent a non-final office action rejecting all claims.

32. In July 2004, Mr. Hyatt timely responded.

33. In November 2004, the PTO sent a non-final office action rejecting all claims.

34. In May 2005, Mr. Hyatt timely responded.

35. The PTO did not take any action on the merits for more than eight and a half years. Instead, the PTO suspended examination on seven different occasions and did not decide Mr. Hyatt's repeated petitions for action.

36. In October 2013, the PTO sent a so-called "Requirement" action that, among other things, purported to require Mr. Hyatt to select 600 claims for examination in applications of the "700 Family" (each of which have the same disclosure as the disclosure in the '999 Application) and to identify any earlier embodiment that falls within the scope of any selected claim that Mr. Hyatt believed was entitled to a priority date earlier than December 22, 1988, or to provide a simple statement that the claim was described in the written description of parent application Serial No. 07/289,355 (Dkt. #321), filed on that date, excluding documents incorporated by reference.

37. In late 2013, the PTO sent similar Requirements in nearly all of Mr. Hyatt's applications.

38. In January 2014, Mr. Hyatt timely responded to the Requirement, and in March 2016, Mr. Hyatt filed a supplemental amendment.

39. For another four years, the PTO did not take any action on the merits. In April 2018, the PTO sent a non-final office action rejecting all claims. The PTO acknowledged that Mr. Hyatt's response was "bona fide" and "fully responsive."

40. In October 2018, Mr. Hyatt timely responded.

41. In July 2019, the PTO sent a final office action rejecting all claims.

42. December 2019, Mr. Hyatt made another Rule 129(a) submission removing the finality of the office action.

43. In February 2020, the PTO sent a final office action rejecting all claims.

44. In August 2020, Mr. Hyatt filed a notice of appeal with claim amendments, but PTO sent an advisory action in September 2020 refusing to enter the amendments; in March 2022, Mr. Hyatt filed his appeal brief.

45. In November 2022, the PTO sent an examiner's answer.

46. The PTO's failure to send an examiner's answer within six months violated the commitment it made to this Court in *Hyatt v. PTO*, No. 14-cv-01300-TSE-TCB, ECF 156 (E.D. Va.).

47. In April 2023, Mr. Hyatt timely filed a reply brief.

48. The PTO did not take any action on the merits for another period of more than one and a half years. On October 16, 2024, the Board sent its decision affirming the rejections of each of the Subject Claims on at least one ground of rejection.

49. *De novo* consideration of Mr. Hyatt's entitlement to a patent on the '999 Application is uniquely necessary due to the PTO's decades-long campaign to prevent Mr. Hyatt from obtaining further patents on his inventions. Beginning in the mid-1990s, when PTO pulled several of Hyatt's applications from issuance, PTO has engaged in concerted action to prevent any of Hyatt's applications from issuing as patents. PTO placed Hyatt's applications into the SAWS program to prevent the mailing of a notice of allowance even where an examiner wished to allow Hyatt's applications. Where Hyatt prevailed before the Patent Board, PTO "recycled" his applications by reopening prosecution after he prevailed before the Board. PTO then began to thwart Patent Board review altogether by placing Hyatt's applications in an administrative purgatory that one federal judge referred to as "never-never land." During this time, PTO misrepresented its intent to act on Mr. Hyatt's applications to at least one federal court. Aspects of that campaign have been attested to in

sworn testimony by officials who personally interfered with the examination, issuance, and appeal of Hyatt's applications.

50. Ultimately, after nearly two decades of prosecution, PTO threw out all prior activity and began prosecution anew with the goal of rejecting or forcing Hyatt's applications into abandonment. During this time, the very examiners who were supposed to be impartially examining his applications were creating disrespectful "memes" about him that mirrored the language in the PTO's office actions and were sending emails disparaging his personal character. Meanwhile, PTO management instructed examiners to reject submissions Hyatt had not even made and, within three years of resuming examination, informed a federal court that PTO intended to reject all of Mr. Hyatt's applications. And PTO did, rejecting every claim in every application that the Office had not forced into abandonment, irrespective of the actual merits of the applications.

51. For these reasons, among others, PTO acted in bad faith and prejudiced the proceedings underlying the '999 Application.

#### **The Written Description Rejections**

52. The PTO rejected Subject Claims 117, 172, 197, 230, 319, and 417 for alleged lack of written description within the meaning of pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph.

53. The disclosure of the '999 Application describes the claimed subject matter of Subject Claims 117, 172, 197, 230, 319, and 417 in such manner that a person of ordinary skill in the relevant field of art would understand that Mr. Hyatt had possession of the invention claimed in that Subject Claim as of the '999 Application's effective filing date.

54. The rejection of Subject Claims 117, 172, 197, 230, 319, and 417 under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. § 112, for alleged lack of written description under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is erroneous.

#### **The Prosecution Laches Rejection**

55. The PTO rejected the Subject Claims and held the '999 Application entirely forfeited under the equitable doctrine of prosecution laches.



56. The rejection for prosecution laches is erroneous.

57. The prosecution laches rejection is erroneous because prosecution laches is not a valid ground of rejection under the Patent Act, particularly for the '999 Application, which is subject to the two-submission limit of the URAA Transitional Rules.

58. The prosecution laches rejection is erroneous because Mr. Hyatt did not delay prosecution.

59. The prosecution laches rejection is erroneous because any delay in the prosecution is attributable to the actions or inaction of the PTO.

60. The prosecution laches rejection is erroneous because any delay in prosecution fairly attributed to Mr. Hyatt is not unreasonable and not unexplained.

61. The prosecution laches rejection is erroneous because Mr. Hyatt's prosecution actions did not constitute an egregious misuse of the statutory patent system.

62. The prosecution laches rejection is erroneous because the PTO failed to warn Mr. Hyatt in advance of any specific actions or inaction of the risk of forfeiture of his rights under the Patent Act in or as to the '999 Application and failed to warn Mr. Hyatt of what specific actions he should take or not take to avoid forfeiture.

63. The prosecution laches rejection is erroneous because the PTO failed to make a sufficient showing of intervening rights.

64. The prosecution laches rejection is erroneous because the PTO unreasonably delayed in asserting prosecution laches after decades of prosecution activity by Mr. Hyatt, prejudicing Mr. Hyatt, who has invested significant amounts of time and money in the prosecution of the '999 Application.

65. The prosecution laches rejection is erroneous because the PTO has unclean hands.

### **The Undue Multiplicity Rejections**

66. The PTO rejected all of the Subject Claims under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly failing to distinctly claim the subject matter that Mr. Hyatt regards as the invention under the doctrine of undue multiplicity.

67. Each of the Subject Claims informs with reasonable certainty about the scope of each claim.

68. Each of the Subject Claims distinctly claims the subject matter that Mr. Hyatt regards as the invention.

69. The Subject Claims are distinguished from all claims that Mr. Hyatt seeks to pursue in all of his other applications because each of the Subject Claims are generally directed to the subject matter identified in paragraph 13 above, whereas Mr. Hyatt does not seek to patent any claims that meet the same descriptions in any other of his applications. Each of the Subject Claims contains further specific limitations. Each of the Subject Claims has ascertainable differences in scope from the claims of Mr. Hyatt's co-pending applications. Each of the Subject Claims of the '999 Application has ascertainable differences in scope from each other.

70. The rejection of the Subject Claims as unduly multiplied under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, is erroneous.

### **The Obviousness Rejections**

71. The PTO rejected certain of the Subject Claims under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being obvious over certain references.

72. The PTO rejected Subject Claim 197 as obvious over Michael (U.S. Patent No. 4,163,249), Wu (U.S. Patent No. 4,471,357), and Collins (U.S. Patent No. 4,212,258).

73. The PTO rejected Subject Claim 230 as obvious over Zwirn (U.S. Patent No. 4,532,548), Wu, and Kimura (U.S. Patent No. 3,891,792).

74. The PTO rejected Subject Claim 417 as obvious over Chaikin (U.S. Patent No. 4,267,573), Bennett (U.S. Patent No. 4,463,372), and Kimura.

75. Subject Claims 197, 230, and 417 would not have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the relevant field of art as of the effective filing date of the '999 Application, from the above-identified references or their combinations.

76. The rejections under pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. § 103 are erroneous.

#### **The Provisional Double Patenting Rejections**

77. The PTO has provisionally rejected Subject Claim 117 for non-statutory obviousness-type double-patenting over allegedly conflicting reference claim 143 of U.S. Patent application Serial No. 08/471,123 (Dkt. #786).

78. The PTO has provisionally rejected Subject Claim 172 for non-statutory obviousness-type double-patenting over allegedly conflicting reference claim 151 of U.S. Patent application Serial No. 08/457,197 (Dkt. #719).

79. The provisional non-statutory double-patenting rejections of Subject Claims 117 and 172 are erroneous.

80. The provisional non-statutory double-patenting rejections are insufficient to preclude issuance of a patent on Subject Claims 117 and 172 of the '999 Application because the reference claims has not issued.

#### **Objections**

81. In addition to rejecting the Subject Claims, the PTO has suggested that there might be objections to the specification and drawings but has not articulated any such objections applicable to this patent application.

82. Any objections to the specification and drawings would be erroneous because the specification and drawings comply with the requirements of law.

#### **Count I: Issuance of a Patent**

83. The above paragraphs are hereby incorporated by reference as if set forth fully herein.

84. Patent Act Section 145 provides a cause of action for a patent applicant dissatisfied with a decision of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board to obtain a judgment that

the “applicant is entitled to receive a patent for his invention, as specified in any of his claims involved in the decision of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board.” 35 U.S.C. § 145.

85. Each of the Subject Claims of the '999 Application was involved in the October 16, 2024, decision of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board.

86. Each of the Subject Claims of the '999 Application is patentable.

87. Each of the Subject Claims of the '999 Application satisfies all applicable legal requirements for issuance of a patent.

88. Mr. Hyatt is entitled to receive a patent on the Subject Claims in the '999 Application.

**Prayer for Relief**

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully asks that this Court enter Judgment in his favor and that he be granted the following relief:

- A. A decree that Mr. Hyatt is entitled to receive a patent for the '999 Application on the Subject Claims;
- B. A decree that the rejections of the Subject Claims of the '999 Application are erroneous;
- C. A decree authorizing the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office to issue a patent for the subject matter claimed in the Subject Claims of the '999 Application;
- D. A decree that the specification and drawings of the '999 Application comply with the requirements of law; and
- E. Such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: December 16, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Mark W. DeLaquil

MARK W. DELAQUIL (VA Bar No. 68088)

ANDREW M. GROSSMAN\*

BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP

1050 Connecticut Ave., N.W., Suite 1100

Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 861-1527

agrossman@bakerlaw.com

mdelaquil@bakerlaw.com

*Attorneys for Gilbert P. Hyatt*

\* Application for admission *pro hac vice*  
forthcoming