TO: Borchardt, NRR
Cys: Travers
Paperiello

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
CORRESPONDENCE CONTROL TICKET

Date Printed: Aug 21, 2003 07:29

Kane
Norry
Collins
Dean
Thadani, RES

PAPER NUMBER:	LTR-03-0539	**LOGGING DATE:**	08/20/2003
ACTION OFFICE:	EDO		
AUTHOR:	Po Kee Wong		
AFFILIATION:	MD		
ADDRESSEE:	Nils Diaz		
SUBJECT:	Response to Judges RADER'S and LOURE'S orders about Case 03-1322		
ACTION:	Appropriate		
DISTRIBUTION:			
LETTER DATE:	08/10/2003		
ACKNOWLEDGED	No		
SPECIAL HANDLING:			
NOTES:			
FILE LOCATION:	Adams		
DATE DUE:		**DATE SIGNED:**	

TEMPLATE SECY-017

E-RIDS-01

pokwong

From: "pokwong" <pokwong@rcn.com>
To: <NJD@nrc.gov>; <GJD@nrc.gov>; <CMRmerrifield@nrc.gov>; <FXC@nrc.gov>; "C. E. (Gene) Carpenter" <CEC@nrc.gov>; <DCJ@nrc.gov>; "Richard Meserve" <rmeserve@pst.ciw.edu>; <coates@hq.nasa.gov>; <rcolwell@nsf.gov>; "R. Giacconi" <rgiaccon@aui.edu>; <rsas@kva.se>; "michael sohlman" <michael.sohlman@nobel.se>
Cc: <horbalyj@cafc.uscourts.gov>; <James.Hughes@uspto.gov>; "Vock, Curtis" <cvock@lathropgage.com>; <awong@admin.seu.edu>; "pokwong" <pokwong@rcn.com>
Sent: Sunday, August 10, 2003 2:28 PM
Subject: Response to Judges RADER'S and LOURE'S orders about Case 03-1322

Dear Invited Referee:

This is to inform you that the subject document of 19 pages that had been submitted to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit on August 5, 2003 is also being forwarded to you who represent for USNRC; NASA; NSF; AUI,CIW and Nobel Foundation to review and evaluate and to help the Court and the Merit Panel assigned to hear this case according to the ORDER issued by Judge RADER on July 30, 2003.

The document of 19 pages is being forwarded to you by U.S. Postal Mail.

Your time and effort spent on the subject matter is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Po Kee Wong

Po Kee Wong, Pro Se, Appellant for Case 03-1322
Tel. and Fax: 301-585-3453
pokwong@rcn.com

RECEIVED
2003 AUG -5 AM 9:04
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
FEDERAL CIRCUIT

RESPONSE TO:

THE ORDER issued on July 30, 2003 BY U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT JUDGE RANDALL R. RADER

SUBMITTED TO:

U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT
ON
AUGUST 5, 2003
FOR
CASE NUMBER: 03-1322
(SERIAL NUMBER: 08/980,657)
IN RE PO KEE WONG

The Appellant Po Kee Wong, Pro Se, respects the **ORDER** issued from **Judge RADER** and would like to point out and to confirm **the corresponding documents one by one as being stated in the ORDER by comparison of the page numbers with those in the " BRIEF AND SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX FOR APPLELLEE DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE." (That is The Red Book) in the followings:**

(1) The Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences's decision on appeal that is listed as pages SA0006 to SA0012 in the RED BOOK.
(2) The Board's decision on rehearing that is listed on page SA0001 to SA0005 in the RED BOOK.
(3) Wong's appeal brief is listed from page SA0019 to page 0032 in the RED BOOK.

(4) Wong's brief on rehearing HAS NOT BEEN LISTED in the RED BOOK is being submitted here with this RESPONSE to Judge RADER. This is the most important document of 5 pages that was submitted to Craig R. Feinberg on December 16, 2002 and that should be considered admissible and transmitted to the merit panel assigned to hear this case according to the ORDER issued by Judge RADER.

The Appellant would like also to point out that the IMECE2003-43540 Paper entitled " THE UNIQUELY –CORRCTED METHOD TO COMPUTE HIGH POWER FUNCTIONS." that has been accepted and To be presented at the IMECE2003 November 15-21,2003, Washington DC USA is exactly the same document listed from page SA0075 to SA0081 in the RED BOOK. Therefore, the IMECE2003-43540 paper That is also being submitted with this RESPONSE is also an admissible Document. Furthermore, the Problem No. (3) in the "SUMMARY OF FUNDAMENTAL CHALLENGING PROBLEMS FOR DEVELOPING NEW NUCLEAR SAFETY STANDARD COMPTER CODES." that was presented at the NRC RIC 2003 Conference W4 Session in front of more than 800 worldwide Nuclear Professionals 2:15-3:15 PM at the Capital Hilton Hotel, Washington DC is also a Problem listed in the document (4). Therefore, the NRC Summary should also be considered admissible.

Since the Patent Application 08/980,657 is a basic patent with great

impacts to the computation in computers and calculators having been extensively used in various fields of sciences, engineering, technologies and mathematics in education worldwide, therefore the 11 documents listed on page 3 of the USPTO Director's Motion should be stopped by the reasons of the APPLICABLE RULES being listed in the RESPONSE to the ORDER issued by Judge LOURE on June 30, 2003.

4 pages of the RESPONSE to Judge LOURE'S ORDER are also submitted to Judge RADER for consideration.

Respectfully submitted

Po Kee Wong

Po Kee Wong, Pro Se Appellant
2413 Spencer Road, Silver Spring, Maryland, 20910-2344
Tel. And Fax: 301-585-3453
E-MAIL: pokwong@rcn.com

CC.:

John M. Whealan, Solicitor
James R. Hughes, Associate Solicitor
Joseph G. Piccolo, Associate Solicitor

P.O. Box 15667
Arlington, Virginia 22215
Tel.: 703-305-9035 Fax: 703-305-9373

NOTE: Pursuant to Fed. Cir. R. 47.6, this order
is not citable as precedent. It is a public order.

United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

03-1322
(Serial No. 08/980,657)

IN RE PO KEE WONG

ON MOTION

Before RADER, Circuit Judge.

ORDER

The Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) moves to strike certain documents attached to Po Kee Wong's opening and reply briefs. Wong opposes.

Previously, Wong had "request[ed] permission to enter" various documents and copies of e-mail correspondence as evidence in his appeal, which the court treated as a motion to supplement the record on review. In our June 30, 2003 order, we explained that the record on review consists of documents that were before the Board of Patent and Trademark Appeals. See Fed. R. App. P. 16(a). The documents submitted by Wong were not submitted to the Board and, thus, we denied his motion to supplement the record with documents that were not part of the record on review.

Having reviewed the attachments to Wong's briefs, many of which were submitted in Wong's earlier motion to supplement the record, it appears that the only documents properly included in his appendices are: (1) the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences' decision on appeal, (2) the Board's decision on rehearing, (3)

Wong's appeal brief, and; (4) Wong's brief on rehearing. All other documents and correspondence (most of which is dated after the Board's January 2003 denial of rehearing) are stricken.*

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

(1) The PTO's motion to strike is granted to the extent that extra-record documents in the appendices will be disregarded.

(2) A copy of this order shall be transmitted to the merits panel assigned to hear this case.

7/30/03
Date

Randall R. Rader
Randall R. Rader
Circuit Judge

cc: Po Kee Wong
John M. Whealan, Esq.
s16

FILED
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR
THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT

JUL 30 2003

JAN HORBALY
CLERK

* If this order inadvertently strikes documents that were before the Board, the PTO should promptly so inform the court.

Wong V. USPTO Case No. 03-1322 Attachment II. 2

REQUEST FOR REHEARING

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCE

Submitted to:
Craig R. Feinberg
Tel: 703-308-9797
Craig.Feinberg@uspto.gov
Program and Resource Administrator
On December 16, 2002 by Fax to: 703-308-6199

Ex parte Po Kee Wong

Appeal No. 2001-0411

Application No. 08/980,657

ON BRIEF

Before Administrative Patent Judges: THOMAS, FLEMING, AND GROSS

According to **37 CFR 1.197 (b),**
Provides that any request for rehearing must specifically state the points believed to have been misapprehended or overlooked in the Board's decision, the Appellant Po Kee Wong respectfully submits the following arguments to the Judges in order to reverse the examiner's rejection of the claim:

Please note that, in my APPEAL BRIEF on page No. 3/14:

Section Item No. (6) Issues:
On whether Claim 1 should be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by " Sharp EL-5200 Graphic Scientific Calculator Owner's Manual."

Section Item No. (8) Arguments:
There are 3 arguments against the issue listed in Section Item No. (6).
They are identified by the Roman numerals as I, II, and III and each one of them will be summarized and reiterated again in the followings:

1. From page 3/14 to 4/14 arguing that:

Wong v. USPTO Case No. 03-1322

4^3^2 should be done correctly by 4^(3^2) = 4^9 = 262,144
3^2^3 should be done correctly by 3^(2^3) = 3^8 =6,561
Please note that in calculating of 2^3^2 incorrectly by (2^3)^2 = 2^6 =64
While the correct answer should be done 2^(3^2) = 2^9 = 512

II. From page 5/14 to page 6/14:
By all the examples in argument I., the incorrect use of parentheses for calculation of " High Power Functions" will lead to non-unique representations of the original function, in particular whenever involved in solving equations of "High Power Functions". Therefore, many of the current and previous calculators having been mentioned and listed in the APPEAL BRIEF will lead to the wrong answer for the " High Power Function" as indicated.

III. From page 6/14 to page 14/14
This Section contains the most important arguments in the APPEAL BRIEF. This Section provides the actual evidences of 5 most update Calculators, listed with their identification numbers. They are Sharp EL-9600C; TI-92; TI-82; TI-83 and HP-38G. that were used to compare their performances in solving equations involved in " High Power Functions".
The Appellant Po Kee Wong respectfully begs the Judges to spend a little more of their precious time to read and check over the contents from page 6/14 to page 14/14 again.

The main reason that the Judges have made their DECISION ON APPEAL appeared on page 3/7 to 4/7 is being quoted in the following:

Quoted " The example given by examiner at pages 3 and 4 of the answer relies upon " the priority levels of individual calculations " as set forth at the top of page 227 of Sharp. Significantly, these include the requirement as set forth at the top of page 228 of that reference that " parenthesized calculations have precedence to any calculations. " According to the example given by the examiner at pages 3 and 4 of the answer regarding the statement of the rejection, we similarly understand the reference to perform a parenthesized high power calculation first before this result is utilized as the power to the base number itself. Therefore, the claim contains no recitations in any manner, such as in the form of a negative limitation that it functions without the use of parenthetical elements, the claim clearly reads upon the subject matter disclosed in Sharp as argued by the examiner " unquoted.

THE KEY WORDS IN THE ABOVE MAIN REASON BY THE JUDGES ARE:

(1) " PARENTHESIZED CALCULATIONS HAVE PRECEDENCE TO ANY OTHER CALCULATIONS "
(2) " SUCH AS IN THE FORM OF NEGATIVE LIMITATION THAT IT FUNCTIONS WITHOUT THE USE OF PARENTHETICAL ELEMENTS "

THE ABOVE KEY WORDS CAN BE ENCOUNTERED IN THE FOLLOWINGS:

Wong v. USPTO Case No. 03-1322

KEY WORDS (1) ARE NOT TRUE WHEN THE PARENTTHESIZED CALCULATIONS ARE APPLIED FROM THE BASE NUMBER UPWARD. THIS WILL CAUSE MUTIPLE REPRESENTATIONS OF THE ORIGINAL ORDER OF THE HIGH POWER FUNCTIONS.

KEY WORDS (2) ARE NOT TRUE AS THEY CAN BE SHOWN FROM THE FOLLOWING MATHEMATICAL PROOFS AND FOLLOWED BY AN NUMERICAL EXAMPLE FOR FUNCTIONS OF COMPLEX NUMBERS WITH OPEN CHALLEGES TO ALL PREVIOUS AND CURRENT COMPUTING MACHINES FOR THEIR NOT BEING ABLE TO SOLVE THE GIVEN PROBLEM INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITING TO THE UTILIZATION OF SHARP EL-5200 GRAPHIC SCIENTIFIC CALCULATOR AND ITS OWNER'S MANUAL.

Given:

Complex numbers Z1 =a1 + ib1, Z2 = a2 + ib2, Z3 = a3 +ib3, Z4 = a4 + ib4,.....an+ibn
Where a1, b1, a2, b2, a3, b3, a4, b4.....an, bn all are real numbers (positive and /or negative; rational and/or irrational numbers) and i=(-1)^(1/2), the unit imaginary number.

It is defined:

Z12 = Z2^Z1 as the High Power Function of 1st Order and

Z23 = Z3^Z2 also as the High Power Function of 1st Order.

Please note that no need to use parenthesis to define the High Power Functions of 1st Order.

Now the question is how to define logically, the High Power Function of the 2nd and the higher Orders, namely Z123 and Z1234, from using the definition of the High Power Function of 1st Order?

Z123 = Z3^Z2^Z1=?

It is obvious that there are only two choices for Z123 as shown in the followings:

The 1st choice is

Z123 = Z (12) 3 = Z3^Z(12) = Z3^(Z2^Z1)

Which is a true High Power Function of 2nd Order by using the definition of High Power Function of 1st Order.

Wong v. USPTO Case No. 03-1322

The 2nd choice is

Z1 (23) = Z (23)^Z1 =(Z3^Z2)^Z1
Now the question is that the 2nd choice a unique representation and
That it is a high power function of the 2nd Order?

The answers to these questions are that they are not!

It can be easily shown that from mathematics

Z1 (23) =(Z3^Z2)^Z1 =(Z3)^(Z2xZ1) =(Z3)^(Z1xZ2) = (Z3^Z1)^Z2

All these 4 different representations are the same High Power Functions of 1st Order!
None of them is a High Power Function of 2nd Order.
Their values are all the same but they are completely different from the 1st choice.

The above general proofs should be sufficiently answered to the rejection of this patent application by the Examiner Chuong and the Judges' decision.

All the above arguments can be put through a true test to solve a real problem openly challenge to the utilization of all calculators listed in the APPEAL BRIEF, in particular, by using Sharp EL-5200 Graphic Scientific Calculator and its Owner Manual to solve a very specific general problem:

Given:

Z1=x1 + iy1, Z2=x2 + iy2, where x1, y1, x2, y2 are unknown real numbers to be determined from solving the two following simultaneous equations involved in High Power Functions of Complex Numbers. i=(-1)^(1/2) is the unit imaginary number.

Arc Sin (Z1 + Z2)- (3^(1/2) – i) ^ ((1 + i3^(1/2)) ^(-1 + i)) =0.....Eq.(1)

Arc Sin (Z1 - Z2)- ((3^(1/2)-i)^(1 + i3^(1/2))) ^ (-1 + i) = 0 .....Eq. (2)

What is the Principal Solution of Z1 and Z2?

What are the General Solutions of Z1 and Z2?

This problem is considered the simplest one in comparison with those problems involved in functions of complex variables of many Elementary Transcendental Functions appeared in my U.S. Patent No. 6,430,516 (Primary Examiner-Kamini Shah)

Wong v. USPTO Case No. 03-1322

Furthermore, as can be seen from the HANDBOOK OF MATHEMATICAL FUNCTIONS with formulas, graphs, and mathematical tables edited by Milton Abramowitz and Irene A Stegun and published by DOVER PUBLICATIONS, INC. , NEW YORK in 1965, it was also first published by the National Bureau of Standard (Now NIST) in 1964 that was way ahead in time compared with the publication of the Sharp EL-5200 Graphic Scientific Calculator Owner's Manual. The use of the signs of parenthesis ( ), plus (+), minus(-) division (/) are parts of Mathematical Laws which are used by everyone for Centuries. They are widely used in the HANDBOOK to define various ELEMENATRY TRANSCENDENTAL FUNCTIONS. Thus, all those signs are not exclusively invented and owned by Sharp. Therefore, according to, 35 U.S.C. 102(b) ALL the Calculators and their Manuals mentioned in the APPEAL BRIEF including the Sharp EL-5200 Graphic Scientific Calculator and its Owner's Manual should NOT be allowed for patents at all.

In analogy to the patents being granted in a new Drug which is usually expressed in its Chemical Structure by means of Chemical Symbols like H, representing Hydrogen, C representing Carbon, Thus CH sub. 4 means Methane. These are very common elements and chemical compounds. Now, if someone invents a drug that can completely cure AIDS and that the drug must be shown in its structures by means of the Chemical Elements Symbols like C, H, O... etc. Should the USPTO deny the patent of the new drug because they must use the well- known Symbols in Chemistry like C, H, O and/or many other elements to show the Chemical Structure of the Drug?

My point is that the use ; of Parentheses (Mathematical Law of Association); of the Plus and Minus signs (The Mathematical Laws of Addition and Subtraction); of the Laws and signs of Multiplication and Division, are no difference in using the Chemical Symbols to show the structures of a particular compound of different Characteristics. Thus, the Characteristics of the High Power Functions and that the Characteristics of the new chemical compound to cure AIDS should be considered appropriate for patent applications.

The above arguments are respectfully submitted to the BOARD FOR REHEARING, your time and effort spent to re-examine this REHEARING is appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

Po Kee Wong

Po Kee Wong
2313 Spencer Road, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910-2344
Tel. And Fax: 301-585-3453
E-mail: pokwong@rcn.com

2003 ASME INTERNATIONAL MECHANICAL ENGINEERING CONGRESS AND R&D EXPO Proceedings
IMECE2003
November 15-21, 2003, Washington DC USA

IMECE2003-43540

THE UNIQUELY-CORRECTED METHOD TO COMPUTE HIGH POWER FUNCTIONS

Po Kee Wong/SYSTEMS RESEARCH COMPANY (SRC)
U.S. Federal Supply Code: 5R583

Adam Wong/SYSTEMS RESEARCH COMPANY(SRC)
U.S. Federal Supply Code: 5R583

Anita Wong/SYSTEMS RESEARCH COMPANY (SRC)
U.S. Federal Supply Code : 5R583

ABSTRACT

The present paper provides a unique correction of the calculating procedures that have been prevailingly used in all computers and calculators for several decades. This correction must be made, based on the impacts of the computers and calculators have been extensively used in various fields of sciences, engineering, technologies and mathematics in education.

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, several large companies that produce hand-held calculators have been competing continuously with one and other to break into the market for educators of all levels to learn and to use their calculators for teaching in the classrooms. During the summer months of June-August, 1995, many seminars were conducted in the metropolitan Boston Areas in the State of Massachusetts. CASIO offered workshops for the use of CFX-9800G; Texas Instruments offered workshops for the use of TI-82; Hewlett Packard offered for the use of HP 38G. Educators from the Boston Public Schools of the City of Boston, Massachusetts were invited and assigned to attend the workshops offered by CASIO and TI. Educators from everywhere were invited to attend the HP 38G workshops. It was undoubtedly that all the participants in these workshops were benefited from utilizing the calculators to implement their mathematics and science curricula in one way or the other. In particular, educators from the State of Massachusetts came for the workshops enthusiastically because they were given Professional Development Points (PDP) to fulfill the requirements for their re-certification to teach in the State of Massachusetts. Others came to seek for the choices of the appropriate calculator in order to implement their curricula effectively in their own classes. In addition to the above reasons, the first author of this paper also participated all the workshops in order to select the appropriate calculator for the Advanced Placement Calculus that was being offered at the Charlestown High School of the Boston Public Schools under the grant funded by the EAGLE program of the Boston Plan For Excellence in The Public Schools in academic year 1995-96. The author learned a lot from attending those workshops and also fed back his opinions that could and should be updated and to be built-in into the calculators for wider applications not only for teaching but also for research in Physics and Mathematics. For examples: special functions like circular cylindrical and spherical Bessel's Functions; Legendre Functions and Error Function should be built-in into the calculator to solve many problems in Physics and in Engineering; likewise the Largrange Interpolation Formula should also be built-in for curve fitting...etc. After finishing the participation of all four workshops in July-August 1995, the first author was asked by Mr. Richard Stutman, a BPS mathematics teacher and colleague working in the Boston Teacher's Union (BTU), to solve a fun- and- game problem that was involved in high power functions of infinite orders. Responding to his request, the author sought to solve the problem by means of the CFX-9800G; TI-82 and HP-38G. As a result of this effort, a major error in the procedures of calculating the high power functions was found simultaneously in all three calculators CFX-9800G; TI-82 and HP-38G. The major error had been corrected and filed for examination with the U.S. Patent Office in order to clear the legal liability problems from the companies.

SUMMARY OF THE CORRECTION

Copyright © #### by ASME

Mathematical procedures of calculation of a mathematical function in symbolic form can be defined in many ways almost at our own wills. However, there are examples that procedures and the symbolic expression of the mathematical functions will not be unique if one changes its standard calculating procedures. The power functions are some of these examples. The errors to calculate the high power functions contribute from CFX-9800G; TI-82; and HP-38G are that they all start from the base upward to the higher exponential power, while the correct way should be started downward from the top exponential power to the base. These can be cleared from the following examples A and B:

A. Errors in Numerical Computations

$$4^{3^{2}} = 64^{2} = 4096 \text{ is not correct}$$

$$3^{2^{3}} = 9^{3} = 729 \text{ is not correct}$$

$$2^{3^{2}} = 8^{2} = 64 \text{ is not correct}$$

B. Errors in Symbolic Representation uniquely Involved in Solving Equations of High Power Functions.

$x^{x^{x}} - 2 = 0$ means $x^{x^{2}} - 2 = 0$ leads to wrong answer x = 1.1414213562

$x^{x^{x^{x}}} - 2 = 0$ means $x^{x^{3}} - 2 = 0$ leads to wrong answer x= 1.336709735

$x^{(2x)^{(3x)}} - 2 = 0$ means $x^{(6x^{2})} - 2 = 0$ leads to wrong answer x = 1.100152079

DETAIL DESCRIPTION OF THE CORRECTION

The above examples A and B in errors can be corrected as the followings:

A. Correct Numerical Computation.

$$4^{3^{2}} = 4^{9} = 262{,}144$$

$$3^{2^{3}} = 3^{8} = 6{,}561$$

$$2^{3^{2}} = 2^{9} = 512$$

B. Correct Symbolic Representation Uniquely Involved in Solving Equations of High Power Functions.

$$x^{x^{x}} - 2 = 0 \qquad x = 1.476684337$$

$$x^{x^{x^{x}}} - 2 = 0 \qquad x = 1.446601432$$

$$x^{(2x)^{(3x)}} - 2 = 0 \qquad x = 1.064146805$$

$$(3x)^{(2x)^{x}} - 2 = 0 \qquad x = .6140723908$$

C. Examples of Correct Solutions of more Complicated Equations of High Power Functions.

$$x^{2(x^{2})} - 5x^{(x^{2})} + 6 = 0$$

Copyright © #### by ASME

$x = 1.41421356$ and $x = 1.565552276$

$$(x)^{2(x)^{(x)}} - 5(x)^{(x)} + 6 = 0$$

$x = 1.476684337$ and $x = 1.635078475$

Denote $y1(x) = x$; $y2(x) = x^{x}$; $y3(x) = x^{x^{x}}$;.....etc.

The solutions of the following equations of High Power Functions can be obtained:

$y2(x) - 2 = 0$ $x = 1.559610469$

$y3(x) - 2 = 0$ $x = 1.476684337$

$y4(x) - 2 = 0$ $x = 1.446601432$

$y5(x) - 2 = 0$ $x = 1.432694806$

$y6(x) - 2 = 0$ $x = 1.425385621$

$y7(x) - 2 = 0$ $x = 1.421227912$

$y8(x) - 2 = 0$ $x = 1.418734462$

$y9(x) - 2 = 0$ $x = 1.417182504$

$y10(x) - 2 = 0$ $x = 1.416190183$

$y15(x) - 2 = 0$ $x = 1.414502086$

$y20(x) - 2 = 0$ $x = 1.414258764$

$y30(x) - 2 = 0$ $x = 1.414214713$

$y40(x) - 2 = 0$ $x = 1.414213592$

$y40(x) - 3 = 0$ $x = 1.447839583$

$y40(x) - 4 = 0$ $x = 1.449395757$

$y40(x) - 5 = 0$ $x = 1.44979292$

$y40(x) - 6 = 0$ $x = 1.449978187$

$y40(x) - 7 = 0$ $x = 1.450087526$

$y40(x) - 8 = 0$ $x = 1.4501607$

$y40(x) - 9 = 0$ $x = 1.450213659$

$y40(x) - 10 = 0$ $x = 1.450254088$

CONCLUSION

What is claimed is:

1. A unique method of calculating and solving equations involved with High Power Functions has been made for all current and future computers and calculators that are built-in with the wrong procedures to calculate the High Power Functions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The first author of this paper thanks to his friend and colleague Mr. Richard Stutman of Boston Public Schools for the fun-and–game problem which led to the discovery of the errors for the calculation of High Power Functions in computers and calculators back to 1995.

REFERENCES

All documents that have been filed with the U.S. Patent Applications No. 08/980,657 by Po Kee Wong since 1995.

Copyright © #### by ASME

RIC 2003
Session Number W4 2:15-3:15 pm
Location: Presidential Ballroom April 16, 2003

FUNDAMENTAL CHALLENGING PROBLEMS FOR DEVELOPING NEW NUCLEAR SAFETY STANDARD COMPUTER CODES

Po Kee Wong, Ph.D
Chief Executive Officer
Systems Research Company (SRC)
U.S. Federal Supply Code: 5R583
pokwong@rcn.com 301-585-3453

Problem No. (3):Given

Z1=x1 +I y1, Z2 = x2 + I y2, where x1, y1, x2, y2 are unknown real numbers to be determined from solving the two following simultaneous equations involved in High Power Functions of Complex Numbers. where i = (- 1) ^ (1/2) is the unit imaginary number.

Find the Principal Solution of Z1 and Z2 from the followings:

Arc Sin (Z1 + Z2)- (3^ (1/2) - i) ^ ((1 + i 3^(1/2))^ (-1 + i)) =0....Eq.(1)

Arc Sin (Z1 - Z2) -((3^(1/2) -i)^(1 + i 3^(1/2))) ^ (-1 + i) = 0 .....Eq.(2)

The above specific problem is considered the simplest problem in comparison with other problems involved in functions of complex variables of many Elementary Transcendental Functions in the general solutions of a set governing equations of Thermo-Visco-Elastodynamics appeared in many references shown in the U.S. Patent No. 6,640,516 that have been used for LOCA, Fuel Pin Design, and Thermal Hydraulic Transient Analysis in Nuclear Power Plants and Aerospace Industries for years since 1968.

RESPONSES TO:

RECEIVED
2003 JUL 11 AM 9:36
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS
FEDERAL CIRCUIT

(1) MOTION- FROM USPTO DIRECTOR TO STRIKE ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED BY PRO SE APPELLANT PO KEE WONG. Dated July 2, 2003

(2) ORDER- FROM U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT JUDGE LOURIE. Dated June 30, 2003.

SUBMITTED TO:
U.S.COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT
ON JULY 11, 2003
FOR
CASE NUMBER: 03-1322
(SERIAL NUMBER: 08/980,657)
IN RE PO KEE WONG

Response (1):

The Appellant Po Kee Wong opposes USPTO DIRECTOR'S MOTION on the bases of: Rules 16(a) and 16(b) listed on page 30 and: Rule 15(b)(2) on page 25-26 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure –Federal Circuit Rules, Published on May 1, 2001 Washington, D.C.

The 11 documents listed on page 3 of the USPTO DIRECTOR'S MOTION can be verified and classified in the following to show which rules can be applied to admit the 11 documents:

Document Number	Applicable Rules
1. Letter to Mr. Jan Horbaly,	16(a);16(b);15(b)(2)
2. Feb,11,2003 E-mail to Craig Feinberg	16(a) and 16(b)
3. May 8,2003 E-mail to Hughes.....	15(b)(2)
4. April 27, 2003 E-mail to Dr. Giacconi	15(b)(2)
5.Jan.27,2003 E-mail to Dr. Meserve	15(b)(2)
6. IMECE2001/T&S-23408 Paper	15(b)(2)
7. IMECE2003-43540 Paper	16(a);15(b)(2)
8. IMECE2003-43586 Paper	15(b)(2)
9. IMECE2003-43546 Paper	15(b)(2)
10.Presentation RIC2003 Session W4	16(a);16(b);15(b)(2)
11.U.S. Patent 6,430,516	16(a);16(b);15(b)(2)

Response (2):

Based on both Rules 16(a) and 16(b), the Appellant Po Kee Wong respectfully asks The Federal Circuit Judge LOURIE to Examine again the first 3 pages of the " REPLY BRIEF AND SUPPLEMENTALY APPENDIX FOR APPELLANT PO KEE WONG." SUBMITTED TO THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT COURT ON JUNE 11, 2003

The two MOST IMPORTANT admissible documents, being designated as

(A) Appellant Po Kee Wong's February 11, 2003 E-mail communication with Administrator, Craig R. Feinberg,

USPTO Program and Resource Administration, Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences. 3 pages. and

(B) Appellant Po Kee Wong's December 16, 2002 " REQUEST FOR REHEARING." 5 pages, submitted to Mr. Craig R. Feinberg with precise mathematical proofs and arguments against the decision to have denied for REHEARING by USPTO.

Document (A) should have been listed immediately right after page number SA0005 in the APPELLE'S BRIEF and that Document (B) should have been listed immediately right after page SA 0011 in the APPELLE'S BRIEF.

Apparently, both MOST IMPORTANT admissible documents have been omitted by the APPELLE'S BRIEF.

However, fortunately both of these two MOST IMPORTANT admissible documents can be tracked and seen from the attachments I.2 and II.2 in the original INFORMAL BRIEF OF APPELLANT that was submitted to the Federal Circuit Court on February 19, 2003.

With the above Responses (1) and (2), the Pro Se Appellant Po Kee Wong would like to ask the Court to deny the USPTO Director's Motion such that to allow all the 11 documents to be admissible to the Court, pursuant to Federal Circuit Rule 47.

6. Your justifiable action to provide a fair trial for the Case 03-1322 can be achieved and will be appreciated by all educators; engineers; scientists and many other professionals worldwide.

Respectfully submitted

Po Kee Wong

Po Kee Wong, Pro Se Appellant

2413 Spencer Road
Silver Spring, Maryland, 20910-2344
Tel. And Fax: 301-585-3453
E-mail: pokwong@rcn.com

C.C.:
John M. Whealan
Solicitor

James R. Hughes
Joseph G. Piccolo
Associate Solicitors

P.O.Box 15667
Arlington, Virginia 22215
Tel.: 703-305-9035 Fax:703-305-9373

Attorneys for the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (Appellee)