

November 21, 2004

DOCUMENT REDACTED

Exemption 3, FOIA

5 USC 552(b)(3)

Explanation of Complaint:

On January 10, 2004, I met with District Manager Jeanne Strandberg of the Edina, Minnesota office of the Invention Submission Corporation. An appointment that was made from a previous phone conversation. We discussed the Invention Submission Corporations, hereinafter called ISC, services, then Jeanne signed a Statement of Confidentiality and Non-Use and we proceeded to discuss my invention (Pacifinder). I decided to accept ISC's proposed services Basic Information Package (BIP), for which I paid \$925.00 that day. Part of the Basic Information Package service was to have ISC's Research Staff review my invention information and conduct a search for the existence of similar concepts, as well as other information gathered in a organized manner.

I received a phone call from Jeanne the following month, and was informed that there was good news, and made an appointment to meet with her on March 2nd to discuss the BIP report. She also suggested that the \$4,000.00 fee be available if I were to choose to continue their services.

On March 2nd, Jeanne informed me in a more detailed manner, as we reviewed highlights of the BIP, and of the Preliminary Patentability Search and Opinion obtained by Patent Attorney Thomas Frost. Thomas Frost's recommendations were, "I am pleased to report that it is my professional opinion that design patent protection might be available for your invention". Jeanne was excited to inform me that the research done for a product would usually turn up an outcome of around 100 SIC hits, but that mine came back as having an outcome of 789 Manufacturers that would be appropriate candidates for the submission of [REDACTED]. I was so excited to hear such incredible news, that I proceeded to use ISC's services for which I then paid the \$4,000.00.

As a client, I entered an agreement with their recommendation of applying for a Design Patent. The \$4,000.00 was distributed in the manner of ISC receiving the first payment of \$2,850.00 to begin its services. The next \$1,150.00 was for the fee of patent services, and held in an account for the benefit of and for periodic payment for the patent attorney, agent, and services involved for a design application until action to patentability is received from the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office. Included in March 2nd's meeting with Jeanne, I was informed and entered an agreement with ISC's sister company Intromark Incorporated. Their services pertained the negotiations of any possible offers made from an interested buyer of [REDACTED].

Jeanne informed me not to discuss any part of my invention to anyone, because it could hinder the patentability of the product. She also informed me that all further services were to be conducted through ISC's Corporate Headquarters in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

On September 6th I received in the mail, a list of Companies that were matched to my invention using the governments SIC coding system. I was told that ISC sent out my Invention Summary to these non-databank potential Manufactures/Buyers. My wife and I were reviewing this list, excited to see what these companies were about. So, we decided to search them on the web. We noticed that the SIC code ISC had given our product didn't match the Manufactures code to produce such a product. My wife then called ISC in Pennsylvania and spoke to my new representative Sara Worthington. My wife explained that SIC code did not fit our product and would like for it to be adjusted. They agreed to change codes, but it would take a little longer to process. Meanwhile, I was told [REDACTED] Press Release and New Product Submission Brochure were sent out to ISC's data bank companies.

My wife and I were browsing ISC's website to see if my invention [REDACTED] was posted. To our surprise it was. But to our dismay and shock it was credited to another inventor. The same

DOCUMENT REDACTED

Exemption 3, FOIA

5 USC 552(b)(3)

product name and invention as mine. Worded almost exactly as my Press Release. Our first thought was that ISC had stolen my invention name and product. I furthered the search and found that a couple from Inwood, N.Y. was also clients of ISC and they already hold a patent on [REDACTED] as of February 25th, 2003. ISC encouraged me to hurry and continue their services and apply for a patent before someone else picked it up. Knowing they already had clients that had the same product and name already in existence. Furthering my search, I found many other inventions on their site that are the same. Not only did I find this on ISC's site, but also on other websites through different companies, including one already manufactured and available as of late 2003.

I have all of the documentation and correspondence I have received from ISC, Intromark, (Technosystems Consolidated Corporation), Universal Finance Company, to which I am paying a monthly installment of \$186.79. I have ceased payment for the month of November knowing this information, while your agency looks into the matter of this fraudulent, misrepresentation that this company has committed.

I thank you for your efforts in resolving this deception endured upon me from these unscrupulous firms.

Update: ISC has recently changed it's name to, "Invent Help."

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

John N. Burgraff

DOCUMENT REDACTED

Exemption 6, FOIA

5 USC 552(b)(6)

Home Phone: [REDACTED]

Work Phone: [REDACTED]

Email: [REDACTED]