OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
CORRESPONDENCE CONTROL TICKET

Date Printed: Nov 01, 2007 11:39

PAPER NUMBER: LTR-07-0725 **LOGGING DATE:** 10/29/2007

ACTION OFFICE: EDO

To: Sheron, RES

AUTHOR: Po Kee Wong

AFFILIATION: MD

ADDRESSEE: Brian Sheron

cys: EDO
DEDMRS
DEDR
DEDIA
AO

SUBJECT: Forward 2006-1705 -3 doc

ACTION: Appropriate

DISTRIBUTION: Chairman, Comrs

LETTER DATE: 10/29/2007

ACKNOWLEDGED No

SPECIAL HANDLING: Made publicly available in ADAMS via EDO/DPC

NOTES: Encls to: EDO

FILE LOCATION: ADAMS

DATE DUE: **DATE SIGNED:**

From: "Po Kee Wong" <pokwong@verizon.net>
To: "'Brian Sheron'" <BWS@nrc.gov>
Date: 10/29/2007 12:11:41 PM
Subject: RE: FW: 2006-1705-3-RE-doc.doc

Dear Dr. Sheron:

Thank you very much for your message.
Your personal request will be respected from here and after.
However, I must inform you that the communications between you and me about the "High Power Functions" has already been established and docketed (page 12a to page 14a) in the Supreme Court Document 06-1705. A copy of the document of petition 06-1705 is being forwarded to you in this E-mail attachment. There is no need for you to deny our communication because of:
(1) Your letter of communication to me with your own personal signature has been submitted to the Supreme Court.
(2) The NRC FOIA Officers have already confirmed the documents of our communications.
(3) NRC Chairman Dr. Klein is the only official spokesman for NRC. It is his responsibility to make sure that all the computer codes relevant to the safety issues of nuclear power plants being safe in USA.

As a Pro Se Petitioner of this Case 06-1705 on behalf of Po Kee Wong, I believe that I have the constitution right to ask the Supreme Court to subpoena your technical opinion of this case and that the Solicitor General Paul D. Clement should enforce this constitutional law on behalf of the Executive branch of the government for you to testify disregard of your own personal denial.

We all look forward to hearing from your technical opinion about the "High Power Functions" again.

Very truly yours,

Po Kee Wong, Pro Se Petitioner of supreme Court Cases: 06-1705 and 07-209
Tel: 301-585-3453
E-mail: 301-585-3453
In response to your message shown in the following and send to you 4 attachments in this E-mail of response|:

-----Original Message-----
From: Brian Sheron [mailto:BWS@nrc.gov]
Sent: Monday, October 29, 2007 9:56 AM
To: Po Kee Wong
Subject: Re: FW: 2006-1705-3-RE-doc.doc

Dear Dr. Wong,

I am asking you to please stop including me and other NRC employees on further e-mails. The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission is not and has never been involved with your issues. We have instructed all of our

staff to ignore your e-mails and delete them immediately.

>>> "Po Kee Wong" <pokwong@verizon.net> 10/29/2007 7:57 AM >>>
Dear Dr. Allen and Dr. Lee:

Please help to use a TI-83 calculator to calculate the specific problems and obtain the solutions of the equations of " High Power Functions" that are used in " Advanced Dynamics of Finite Objects and Particles" and that they are related to the trajectories calculations of re-entry vehicles and of space shuttles returning to the earth. Your help to make this confirmation of the truth in the document of rehearing for 06-1705 shown below and inform the confirmation of the calculations to the Supreme Justices and to the Solicitor General Paul D. Clement to take the appropriate action about this 06-1705 case will be gratefully appreciated.

From: Po Kee Wong [mailto:pokwong@verizon.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 24, 2007 10:21 AM
To: 'supremectbriefs@usdoj.gov'; 'amy.jones@TIGTA.TREAS.gov'; 'AmericanVoices@mail.house.gov'; 'president@whitehouse.gov'; 'vice.president@whitehouse.gov'; 'SJCCommClerk@sjc.state.ma.us'; 'SJCReporter@sjc.state.ma.us'; 'Juliana.Rice@ago.state.ma.us'; 'jmcdonough@boston.k12.ma.us'; 'jon.dudas@uspto.gov'; 'Joseph.Piccolo@USPTO.gov'; 'John.Whealan@USPTO.gov'; 'Complaints@tigta.treas.gov'; 'Chun-I.Chiang@pentagon.af.mil'; 'comments@mclaughlin.com'; 'fns@foxnews.com'; 'FOIA-Central'; 'foia.liaison@whs.mil'; 'foia@arc.nasa.gov'; 'foia@gsfc.nasa.gov'; 'foia@nsf.gov'; 'foia@msfc.nasa.gov'; 'Chairman@nrc.gov'; 'Chuong.Ngo@USPTO.GOV'; 'FOIA@nrc.gov'; 'foia@nmo.jpl.nasa.gov'; 'Feng, Da H'; 'rstutman@btu.org'; 'Rotella, Robert F. (HQ-MA000)'; 'rsas@kva.se'; 'michael.contompasis@cityofboston.gov'; 'Michelle.Rhee@dc.gov'; 'Mayor@dc.gov'; 'mark.lee@hq.nasa.gov'; 'michael.sohlman@nobel.se'; '9-ANE-ARC-FOIA@faa.gov'; 'em50000@email.ncku.edu.tw'; 'em50920@email.ncku.edu.tw'; 'EDFOIAManager@ed.gov'; 'Emily.C.Spadoni@usdoj.gov'; 'Alexander.Morris@hq.doe.gov'; 'akennedy@hq.nasa.gov'; 'albertychang@yahoo.com'; 'abement@nsf.gov'; 'MFL@nrc.gov'; 'BWS@nrc.gov'; 'tgosnell@btu.org'; 'Yonhua Tzeng'; 'Thinktank@pbs.org'; 'tangbo@btamail.net.cn'; 'Domrosa@snet.net'; 'dshieh@mail.ncku.edu.tw'; 'anisohedral@yahoo.com'; 'aliilik@gmail.com'; 'ljensen@nsf.gov'; 'Ly4010@sina.com.cn'; 'liushengbnu@126.com'; 'Adamyschan@rogers.com'
Cc: 'pokwong@verizon.net'; 'Wong, Adam '; 'kykwong@cs.hku.hk';

'Amorypkw@netvigator.com'; 'simon Tam'; 'daiz_zy@yahoo.com'
Subject: FW: 2006-1705-3-RE-doc.doc

Dear U.S.Solicitor General Paul D. Clement ET AL:

Being forwarded to all of you for your independent review and evaluation is
a copy of my petition for rehearing submitted to U.S. Supreme Court Case
06-1705.

From: Po Kee Wong [mailto:pokwong@verizon.net]
Sent: Wednesday, October 24, 2007 8:48 AM
To: pokwong@verizon.net
Subject: 2006-1705-3-RE-doc.doc

2006-1705

In The

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PO KEE WONG, Pro Se - PETITIONER

VS

USPTO/BPAI Solicitor-RESPONDENT

PETITION FOR AN EXTRAORDINARY WRIT

TO THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT IN RE PO KEE WONG FOR
CASE 03-1322 (SERIAL NO.08/980,657)

ACCORDING TO RULE 44.2 FOR A PETITION FOR REHEARING SEEKING A WRIT OF MANDAMUS

PETITION FOR REHEARING OF AN EXTRAORDINARY WRIT OF MANDAMUS

Submitted by

PO KEE WONG, Pro Se-PETITIONER

2413 Spencer Road, Silver, Maryland 20910-2344

Tel: 301-585-3453; e-MAIL: POKWONG@VERIZON.NET

October 23, 2007

CERTIFICATE

I certify pursuant to Supreme Court Rule 44.2 that this petition for rehearing is restricted to intervening circumstances of a substantial or controlling effect or to other substantial grounds not previously presented, and that it is presented in good faith and not for
delay.

Respectfully submitted to the United States Supreme Court by:

Po Kee Wong, Pro Se Petitioner

2413 Spencer Road

Silver Spring, Maryland 20910-2344 USA

Telephone: 301-585-3453

E-mail: pokwong@verizon.net

October 23, 2007

II

TABLE OF CONTENTS

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION FOR REHEARING: from page No. 1 to page No.
9

Reason No.1: Intervening circumstances from documents of two Supreme Court
Case 06-1705 and Case 07-209.

From page 1 to page 2 of this Petition of Rehearing.

Reason No. 2: Grounds not previously presented from page 2 to page 9 of this
Petition of Rehearing.

REFERENCE: page 10

CONCLUSION: page 10

CERTIFICATE: page I

1

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE PETITION FOR REHEARING

1. The Court should consider and grant this Petition for Rehearing based on
the intervening circumstances of documents submitted to the Court both for
Case 06-1705 and for Case 07-209 having been submitted to the Clerk's Office
of the Court on September 18, 2007. The contents of the submission are being

copied in the following:

Subject: Filing and Service of documents from various FOIA Offices of U.S.
Government according to Supreme Court Rule 29.1.

Dear Mr. Suter:

Please help to enter the following attached documents requested from various
FOIA Offices of U.S. government for Supreme Court Case 07-209:

(1) 2 pages of documents from Michael A. West, Esq.'s September 13, 2007
letter.

(2) 2 pages of my July 25, 20072:41 PM E-mail to FOIA Offices and News Media.

(3) 1 page of PI Information Summary from National Science Foundation FOIA
Office.

(4) 2 pages of PI Information Summary from Volpe Center of DOT.

(5) 3 pages of my communication with FAA of DOT.

(6) 3 pages of PI Information Summary from DOE.

(7) 7 pages of PI Information Summary from Nuclear Regulatory Commission
(NRC).

(8) 13 pages of PI Information Summary from NASA-I-218 Case.

(9) 13 pages of communication with IRS and DOD; NASA and Education Department (ED)(Linda Darby's September 13, 2007 letter attached) for joint

investigations with relevance to NASA -I-218 Case and with request for a
complete PI Summary Information Report from all those Offices are in progress.

PART I. - 15 pages. Entitled "IMPACTS FROM NEW SOLUTIONS OF OLD PROBLEMS IN
MATHEMATICL AND EXPERIMENTAL SCIENCES."

PART II. - 20 pages entitled "REQUEST REVIEW FROM MEMBERS OF CSTB OF NATIONAL ACADEMIES."

Both documents are open technical discussions by qualified mathematicians
and computer scientists on the subject matter directly related to the patent
application number 08/980,657.

Respectfully submitted by

Signature of Po Kee Wong

Po Kee Wong, Pro Se Petitioner for Case 06-1705.

2. The Court should consider and grant this Petition for Rehearing based on
grounds not previously presented as had been submitted and shown in many of
the submitted documents in Reason Number 1.

In particular, the Pro Se Petitioner Po Kee Wong would like to ask Mr. Suter
to provide 9 TI-83 calculators to

3

Each one of the 9 Justices to actually test the calculator's operations in performing the calculation of " High Power Functions" just for three very basic and simple numbers of positive integers 2;3;4 with using the symbol " ^ "to define the definition of "High Power Function " . The following is shown how I can make four junior and high school students in the Montgomery School District to have learned and understood the basic concept of "High Power Functions":

Given:

(A) Integer numbers 2; 3; and 4.

(B) A pair of Mathematical symbol parentheses ( )

(C) A mathematical symbol "^"to be used to define the meaning of "High Power Function"

Define:

The High power Function of First Order in the following symbolic operations from the givens as shown in the followings::

2^3=2x2x2=8 3^4=3x3x3x3=81

4^3=4x4x4=64 3^2=3x3=9

Please note that we do not need to use the given (B) to define the High Power function of first Order!!!

The given (B), symbol parentheses ( ), is specifically used to define the High Power Functions of the Higher Order (Namely, Second; third; fourth.etc .to infinite)

Now you can pick any company's calculators (for example, TI 83 Plus Calculators are now prevailingly used in all American high schools) and IBM and other main frame

4

computers in the world and do the following calculations of problems with
and/or without using the Mathematical Symbolic Parentheses ( ):

(1) Calculate the following problems without using Parentheses ( ):

(a) 2^3^4=4096

(b) 2^4^3=4096

(c) 4^3^2=4096

(d) 4^2^3=4096

(2) Calculate the above problems using

Parentheses ( ):

(e) (2^3) ^4=4096

(f) (2^4) ^3=4096

(g) (4^3) ^2=4096

(h) (4^2) ^3=4096

It is obvious from the end result of the above calculations represented by
(a);(b);(c);(d);(e);(f);(g) and (h) are mixed up without a uniquely defined
ONE VALUE FOR ONLY ONE SYBOLIC REPRESENTATION !!!

(3) Calculate all the above problems with parentheses

( ) again from the top downward:

(i) 2^ (3^4) =2^81=2.417851639E24

(j) 2^ (4^3) =2^64=1.844674407E19

(k) 4^ (3^2) =4^9=262144

(l) 4^ (2^3) =4^8=65536

Now please compare the final values of 4 problems in (2):
(e);(f);(g);(h)
and those in (3): (i);(j);(k);(l)

5

The latter provide the UNIQUELY DEFINED VALUES FOR EACH SYMBOLIC REPRESENTATION OF THE HIGH POWER FUNCTION

Why the UNIQUENESS of a GIVEN FUNCTION is so important? According to all
text books now being used in the entire USA for Algebra II, all students
should be taught to understand in Algebra II about the definition of "RELATION" and that of "FUNCTION" of a given equation of two variables namely (x, y). This can best be explained by a practical example of a given
equation as shown in the following:

(x / 5)^2 + (y /4) ^2 = 1 ..... Equation (1) that is defined a "RELATION"
between x and y. Equation (1) is an ellipse with x- intercepts at point
(-5, 0) and at point (5, 0); with y-intercepts at point (0, 4) and at point
(0,-4).

Equation (1) is also defined as the locus of the sum of two straight line

distances being equal to 10 from a variable point P (x, y) to two fixed
focus point (-3,0) and focus point (3,0) .There are two expressions of y in
terms of x when Equation (1) is resolved into Equations (2) and (3):

y = + 4 ((1-(x/5) ^2) ^ (1/2)).....Equation (2)

y = - 4 ((1-(x/5) ^2) ^ (1/2)).....Equation (3)

Equation (2) is the upper portion of the ellipse while Equation (3) is the
lower portion of the ellipse.

6

For each given value of x, the y values can be uniquely defined in either
Equation (2) or in Equation (3). By definition, therefore, Equation (1) is a
"RELATION" of x and y. Equations (2) and (3) each is a "FUNCTION" of x with
y. With all the above presentations of the concept of "High Power
Functions", the following two Calculators with their identification Numbers
are used:

Calculator TI 83 Identification Number: 33608885 I-0898J Assembled in ROC,
Taiwan.

Calculator TI 83 Plus Silver Edition, Identification Number:
1294V00478
I-10038

Assembled and Made in Taiwan.

Open these two calculators and use the following Window to solve the problems of "high Power functions"

Window:

Xmin=0; Xmax=2; Xscl=1; Ymin= -3000

Ymax=5000; Yscl=1; Xres=1

Y1= (2x) ^ (3x) ^ (4x) - 3000 = 0 x=0.98901472

Y2= (2x) ^ (4x) ^ (3x) - 3000 = 0 x=0.98901472

Y3= (2x) ^ (12x^2) - 3000 = 0 x=0.98901472

It is clear that even though Y1; Y2 and Y3 all look different in representation but they end up with the same solution because the

calculation of the function is started from the bottom upward that is the
cause of the multiple representation of the same function. Y1 and Y2 look
like "High Power Function" of SECOND ORDER but it is actually defined from
Y3 as of FIRST ORDER.

7

Y4= (4x) ^ (3x) ^ (2x) - 3000 = 0 x=0.98609525

Y5= (4x) ^ (2x) ^ (3x) - 3000 = 0 x=0.98609525

Y6 = (4x) ^ (6x^2) - 3000 = 0 x=0.98609525

It is also very clear that even though Y4; Y5 and Y6 all look different but
they also end up with the same solution, because the operation of the function is started from the bottom upward that is the cause of the multiple

representation of the same function. Y4 and Y5 look like "High Power Function" of SECOND ORDER but they are actually defined from Y6 as of FIRST
ORDER.

Y7 = (2x) ^ ((3x) ^ (4x)) - 3000 = 0 x = 0.80332448

Y8 = (2x) ^ ((4x) ^ (3x)) - 3000 = 0 x =0.80478357

Y9 = (4x) ^ ((3x) ^ (2x)) - 3000 = 0 x = 0.909224

Y10 = (4x) ^ ((2x) ^ (3x)) - 3000 = 0 x = 0.94334689

Here Y7; Y8; Y9 and Y10 are actual "High Power Functions" of SECOND ORDER.
Therefore, each equation has its own unique solution!!!

The details of how to use the TI 83 calculators to solve all the above equations have been submitted to the Court as listed in the September 18,
2007 letter PART II documents. However, it is being repeated and shown here
to convince the Supreme Court Justices to examine and to make the correct
final judgment about this Case 06-1705:

Step I:

Open your TI 83 calculators and push the [WINDOW] button and type the following:

Xmin=0 ; Xmax=2 ; Xscl=1 ; Ymin = -3000

Ymax = 5000 ; Yscl =1 ; Xres = 1

Step II:

Push the [Y=] button and type the following for equations
Y1;Y2:Y3;Y4.etc.
The following steps are written to show how to calculate x=? from the equation Y1=(2x)^(3x)^(4x)-3000=0:

High light the equal sign [=] of Y1 by pushing the button [ENTER]. This
means that you have entered the Y1 equation for plotting the curve of equation Y1.

Step III:

Push the button [GRAPH], then you will see the calculator is graphing the Y1
function.

Step IV:

Push the button [TRACE] and start repeatedly pushing the [ARROW] button
pointing to the right hand side until you see from the screen showing

x = 0.9787234 y= - 746.1961 that is the last negative number below the
x-axis (means y=0)

Step V:

Push the same button [TRACE] and [ARROW] button again, you see from the
screen showing

x=1 y=1096

Step VI:

Push the [ARROW] button backward to the point at step IV. At
x=0.9787234 y=
- 746.1961

9

Step VII:

Push buttons [2nd] [CALC], it will show you a list for calculations:
Choose
number2 for ZERO and click the button [ENTER]:

Now the screen will ask you to make a choice

Left Bound?

x=0.9787234 y= - 746.1961

Please click the button [ENTER]

Step VIII:

Push the right [ARROW] button. The screen will ask

Right Bound?

x=1 y=1096 Please click the button [ENTER]

Step IX:

Now the screen will ask

Guess?

x=1 y=1096 Please click the button [ENTER] again

Step X:

Now the screen will show you

Zero

x = 0.98901472 y=0

The above ten steps can be repeated to calculate the zeros of equations of
other High Power Functions: Y2; Y3; Y4; Y5...etc.

Based on the above reason number 1 : Intervening of documents in two Supreme Court Case 06-1075 and Case 07-209 and reason number 2: On grounds
not previously presented, the Court should grant this Petition for Rehearing

of this case 06-1075.

10

REFERENCES

[1] Supreme Court Document 06-1705

[2] Supreme Court Document 07-209

[3] Supreme Court Document 06-1324

[4] Supreme Court Document 03-1322

[5] Supreme Court Document 03-1227

[6] USPTO patent application serial number: 08/980,657 by PO KEE WONG

[7] USPTO document entitled " BRIEF AND SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX FOR APPELLE
DIRECTOR OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE" by John M. Whealan; James R. Hughes; Joseph G. Piccolo, Dated: June 3, 2003.

[8] COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS Civil Action No. 02-3854-F ADMINISTRATIVE
RECORD BY THOMAS F. REILLY, ATTORNEY GENERAL and Juliana deHaan Rice, Assistant Attorney General,

Dated: November 12, 2003.

CONCLUSION

Based on all the technical contents in the above references and all open
publications and discussions about 08/980,657 by the Pro Se petitioner Po

Kee Wong with that the contents had been confirmed and verified by qualified mathematicians worldwide but not known to the two lower levels of
two U.S. Judicial Courts since 1993, it is about time for the U.S. Supreme
Court to act appropriately according to the Supreme Court Rule 44.2 to issue
an order to Solicitor General Paul D. Clement to act and complete the issuance and allowance of the patent application serial number 08/980,657
without further delay.

CC: <president@whitehouse.gov>, <Chairman@nrc.gov>, <supremectbriefs@usdoj.gov>, <vice.president@whitehouse.gov>, <AmericanVoices@mail.house.gov>, <pokwong@verizon.net>, <FOIA@nrc.gov>, "'Wong, Adam '" <Adam.Wong@fcps.edu>

2006-1705

In The

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PO KEE WONG, Pro Se – PETITIONER

VS

USPTO/BPAI Solicitor-RESPONDENT

PETITION FOR AN EXTRAORDINARY WRIT TO THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT IN RE PO KEE WONG FOR CASE 03-1322 (SERIAL NO.08/980,657) ACCORDING TO RULE 20.3.(a) FOR A PETITION SEEKING A WRIT OF PROHIBITION AND MANDAMUS

PETITION FOR AN EXTRAORDINARY WRIT

Submitted by
PO KEE WONG, Pro Se-PETITIONER
2413.Spencer Road, Silver, Maryland 20910-2344
Tel: 301-585-3453; e-MAIL:
POKWONG@VERIZON.NET

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

I. In a patent application case when the examiner makes an initial error of judgment, should the judges of subsequent courts, who rule the case confirmatively with one and the other, be allowed to abuse the Supreme Court Rule 10 – (a) in order to cover up the initial mistakes and to avoid for an exercise of the U.S. Federal Supreme Court's supervisory power?

II. Should all U.S. government officials be given the power to rule against a case that may be construed **in violation of U.S.C. 18 Section 2071?**

III. According to **U.S.C. 1251**, should the U.S. Supreme Court allow anyone in the U.S. Government and/ or anyone else in the world to rule against the **absolute truth of mathematics?**

PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS

The only parties to the proceedings are those listed in the caption of the case.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page
QUESTION PRESENTED.....i.
PARTIES TO THE PROCEEDINGS..... ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....ii
OPINIONS BELOW.....1
JURISDICTION.....1
RELEVANT DOCUMENTS FILED..... 1
REASONS GRANTING THE PETITION.....2
TYPE OF RELIEF BEING SOUGHT 4
CONCLUSION.....4
APENDICES.....1a to 14a
CERTIFICATEF SERVICE.....15a

1

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

PETITION FOR AN EXTRAORDINARY WRIT

According to the U.S. Supreme Court Rule No. 20. Pro Se PETITIONER Po Kee Wong respectfully prays that an extraordinary writ issue to review the judgment below:

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the United States Court of Appeals appears at Appendices page 1a to page 2a.

JURISDICTION

The ORDER by the CAFC about case 2006-1324 (Serial No. 08/980,657) was issued on June 27, 2006. The ORDER was immediately appealed in time by Pro Se Petitioner Po Kee Wong to U.S.Supreme Court started from July 21, 2006 and continued with repeated appeals to Chief Justice John G. Roberts through U.S. Supreme Court Rules No.22 with imputes from the Executive Branch of the U.S. governmental organizations and now continued the appeal by U.S. Supreme Court Rule No. 20

RELEVANT DOCUMENTS FILED

(1) Library of Congress Registration number TX 6-162-487 dated July 22, 2004:**U.S SUPREME COURT CASE NUMBER 03-1277 ON PETITION FOR REHAERING FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT- IN RE PO KEE WONG FOR CASE 03-1322(SERIAL NUMBER 08/980,657) that was also filed at the Clerk's Office.**

(2) Library of Congress Registration number TX 6-162-488 dated July 22, 2004: **U.S SUPREME COURT CASE NUMBER 03-1227 ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT – RE PO KEE WONG FOR CASE 03-1322 (SERIAL NUMBER 08/980,657) that was also filed at the Clerk's Office.**

REASONS FOR GRANTING AN EXTRAORDINARY WRIT

The U.S. Supreme Court should grant this petition for an Extraordinary Writ based on the following reasons in answering the Questions Presented as enumerated in the followings as reasons I.; II. and III ACCORDING TO THE Supreme Court Rules 14.1.(a);20 and 22 respectively and with the reasons having been submitted to the court and published in Library of Congress Documents (1) and (2) enumerated again in the followings :

I. THIS COURT SHOULD GRANT THIS EXTRAORDINARY WRIT BECAUSE THE USPTO EXAMINER HAD MADE AN INITIAL ERROR OF JUDGMENT OF THIS CASE. WHILE EACH ONE OF THE SUBSEQUENT COURTS SHOULD HAVE RULED INDEPEDENTLY AND STAYED AWAY FROM THE INITIALLY MADE MISTAKES. HOWEVER, SINCE THEY HAD CHOSEN TO AGREE WITH ONE AND THE OTHER AND THEREFORE, THE SUPREME COURT SHOULD STEP IN TO EXAMINE AND TO DETERMINE WHETHER THE LOWER COURTS HAVE ABUSED THE SUPREME COURT RULE 10-(a) IN ORDER TO COVER UP THE INITIAL MISTAKES SUCH THAT THEY CAN AVOID FOR AN EXERCISE OF THE U.S. FEDERAL SUPREME COURT'S SUPERVISORY POWER.

II. THIS COURT SHOULD GRANT THIS EXTRAORDINARY WRIT BECAUSE THE CASE HAS BEEN EXHUSTED WITH ALL THE COURT'S PREVIOUS APPELLATE JURISDICTIONS AS EVIDENCED BY THE REASONS LISTED IN THE PETITION FOR REHEARING IN Case No. 03-1227 AND THE QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI FOR CASE No. 03-1322. THEREFORE, ACCORDING TO SUPREME COURT RULE 20 AND ACCORDING TO U.S.C. 18 SECTIONS 2071, THIS COURT SHOULD EXAMINE THIS CASE TO DETERMINE WHETHER ANY U.S. GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS WHO HAVE BEEN INVOLED IN THIS CASE MAY BE CONSTRUED THE VIOLATION.

III. THE ABSOLUTE TRUTH OF MATHEMATICS HAS BEEN CONFIRMED AND OBSERVED AS A GENERAL LAW OF NATURE BY ALL PEOPLE WORLDWIDE IN THOUSANDS OF YEARS AGO AND EVEN UP TO NOW. WHILE ALL OTHER BRANCHES OF SCIENCES AND ENGINEERINGS MAY BE CHANGED WITH TIME IN HISTORY EXCEPT THAT OF THE ABSOULTE THRUTH OF MATHEMATICS.
IF THE JUDICIAL LAWS CHOOSE TO VIOLATE THIS GENERAL LAW OF NATURE, THEN ALL THE RULINGS BY JUDGES IN THE COURTS OF JUDICIAL LAWS WILL COMPLETELY FALL APARTS WITHOUT ANY ORDERS IN ALL THE COURTS WORLDWIDE AT ALL.
IT IS MY PERSONAL OPINION THAT NO ONE ON EARTH SHOULD BE GIVEN THE POWER TO RULE AGAINST THE ABSOLUTE TRUTH OF MATHEMATICS.

ACCORDING TO U.S.C 1251, THE U.S. SUPREME SHOULD GRANT THIS EXTRAORDINARY WRIT NOT TO ALLOW ANYONE IN THE U.S GOVERNMENT AND/OR ANYONE ELSE IN THE WORLD TO RULE AGAINST **THE ABSOLUTE TRUTH OF MATHEMATICS.**

TYPE OF RELIEF BEING SOUGHT

THE U.S. SUPREME COURT SHOULD GRANT THIS EXTRAORDINARY WRIT ACCORDING TO THE ABOVE REASONS I; II AND III TO ISSUE AN ORDER TO THE SOLICITOR GENERAL OF THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT TO INSTRUCT USPTO TO COMPLETE THE ISSUANCE AND ALLOWANCE OF THE PATENT APPLICATION NUMBER 08/980,657.

CONCLUSION

Based on the above reasons I; II; III; and the type of relief being sought, the U.S. Federal Supreme Court should grant this PETITION FOR AN EXTRAORDINARY WRIT ACCORDING TO THE Supreme court Rule 20.3.(a) to grant and complete the issuance and allowance of the U.S. Patent Application Number 08/980,657.

Respectfully submitted by,

Po Kee Wong, Pro Se Petitioner
2413 Spencer Road, Silver Spring, Maryland 209102344 USA
Tel: 301-585-3453 E-mail: pokwong@verizon.net

APPENDICES

NOTE: Pursuant to Feed 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

2006-1324
(Serial No. 08/980,657)

IN RE PO KEE WONG

ON MOTION

Before MICHEL, Chief Judge, LINN and DYK, Circuit Judges. PER CURIAM.

ORDER

The Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office moves to waive the requirements of Fed. Cir.R. 27(f) and to dismiss Po Kee Wong's appeal for lack of jurisdiction. Wong responds.

Wong applied for a patent on a "Uniquely-Corrected Systems and Method to Compute High Power Functions." The Board of Patent and Trademark Appeals affirmed the rejection of the sole claim of the patent. This court affirmed the rejection. In re Wong, 2003 WL 22439880 (Fed. Cir. 2003).

The Patent and Trademark Office issued a notice of abandonment in 2004. In 2005, Wong filed a petition to revive the application. The Commissioner for patents denied the petition on July 19, 2005. Wong filed a notice of appeal on February 14, 2006, seeking review by this

court of the Commissioner's denial of his petition.

The Director argues that we do not have jurisdiction over the appeal from the Commissioner's denial of the petition. We agree. Morganroth v. Quigg, 885 F. 2d 843,846 (Fed. Cir. 1989) ("the Commissioner's denial of a petition to revive a patent application is subject to review in the district court," pursuant to the Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. $$ 701 et seq.). In his response to the motion to dismiss, Wong does not dispute the jurisdictional challenge but instead appears to argue the merits of his case.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

(1) The motion to waive the requirements of Fed. Cir. R. 27(f) is granted

(2) The motion to dismiss is granted.

(3) Each side shall bear its own costs.

FOR THE COURT

JUN 27 2006 Signature

Date **Jan Horbaly**, Clerk

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

ISSUED AS A MANDATE JUN 27 2006

The appeals, submitted to and received by the Clerk's Office in U.S. Supreme Court to examine the ORDER in details, are enumerated in time as shown in the followings: (1) April 17, 2007; (2) March 27, 2007; (3) November 08, 2006.

The contents of the appeals addressed to Honorable Chief Justice John G. Roberts are summarized in the Appeal (1) April 17, 2007 with letters of imputes from the Executive Branches of U.S. Government typed in the subsequent pages in this APPENDICES.

Contents of Appeal (1) April 17, 2007:

Dear Honorable Chief Justice Roberts:

According to the book entitled **RULES OF THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, ADOPTED MARCH 14, 2005; EFFECTIVE MAY 2, 2005, FROM PAGE 22 TO PAGE 23, Rule 20-1,** I am pleading to you to grant me the writ in aid of the Court's appellate jurisdiction, that exceptional circumstances warrant the exercise of the Court's discretionary powers, and that adequate relief cannot be obtained in any other form or from any other court.

Attached with this letter of pleading include the following documents for your consideration:

(1) 1 copy of the March 27, 2007 letter from William K. Suter, Clerk of the Court and signed by Erik Fossum. 1 page.
(2) 1 copy of my most recent pleading document

submitted to you on March 21, 2007 and had been received by the Office of the Clerk with a stamp dated on March 27, 2007. 20 pages.

Respectfully submitted by,
Signature signed
Po Kee Wong, Pro Se Petitioner for Supreme Court Case No. 2006-1324
2413 Spencer Road, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910-2344 USA
Tel: 301-585-3453
E-mail: pokwong@verizon.net

March 27, 2007 letter from Erik Fossum:

RE: Po Kee Wong v. USPTO/BPAI

Dear Mr. Wong:

In reply to your letter or submission, received March 27, 2007, I regret to inform you that the Court is unable to assist you in the matter you present.

Under Article III of the Constitution, the jurisdiction of this Court extends only to the consideration of cases or controversies properly brought before it from lower courts in accordance with federal law and filed pursuant to the Rules of this Court. The Court does not give advice or assistance or answer legal questions on the basis of correspondence.

Your papers are herewith returned.

Sincerely,
William K. Suter, Clerk

By:
Signature signed
Erik Fossum
(202) 479-3392

5a

Contents of Appeal (2) March 27, 2007 letter:

Dear Honorable Chief Justice Roberts:

Pursuant to my March 20, 2007 telephonic conversations
(1) with Mr. Michael Sherry at (571-272-8800 of USPTO as indicated by the FEB 20, 2007 letter) and
(2) with Mr. Erik Fossum (202)-479-3392 in Supreme Clerk, William K. Suter's Office

The following documents (A);(B) and (C) are submitted to you for your consideration to take the appropriate action to end this 13 years old case:

(A) contains:

1. One page February 20, 2007 letter from Mindy B. Fleisher, Chief of Staff from U.S. PTO.
2. USPTO Primary Examiner of Art Unit: 2124 Mr. Chuong D Ngo's signed letter quoted " This communication is to inform applicant that the notice of abandonment mailed on Macrh 18, 2004 has been removed from the file record "one page.
3. Five pages of my previous Supreme Court Documents of Appeals to you as dated received by the Office of the Clerk with a seal dated on November 08, 2006. Total seven pages of documents of (A).

(B) contains:

1. One page December 20, 2006 letter from Mindy B. Fleisher, Chief of Staff from Office of the Commissioner for patents.

2. Three pages of documents from Marguerite A. Murer, Special Assistant to the President and Director of Presidential Correspondence of the White House.
3. Three pages of documents from Erik Fossum from the Supreme Court Clerk's Office.

(C) contains:

Five pages of my technical communications with two Chairmen of U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission and their technical staff members about the correctness and the corrections that should be done in relevance to the patent application number 08/980, 657

Respectfully submitted by,
Signature signed
Po Kee Wong, Pro Se Petitioner for case No. : 2006-1324
2413 Spencer Road, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910-2344
USA
Tel: 301-585-3453
E mail: pokwong@verizon.net

FEB 20 2007 letter from Mindy B. Fleisher of USPTO:

Dear Mr. Wong

Thank you for your recent correspondence to the Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), Mr. Jon Dudas. Your letter has been reffered to this Office of the Commissioner for Patents for response.

7a

Your communication again refers to your patent application, serial number 08/980,657 and specifically requests that immediate action taken to end the prosecution of this 13-year-old application.

As explained to you in previous office letters this application was finally rejected by the examiner. The rejection was affirmed by the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (BPAI). A request for rehearing before the BPAI was denied. The application was appealed to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC), which affirmed the decision of the BPAI. A request for rehearing before the CAFC was denied, and an appeal to the Supreme Court was also denied. Thus, all avenues of appeal have been exhausted, and the application is abandoned.

Most recently, you filed a petition for revival of the application on June 2, 2005, to which the USPTO responded on July 19, 2005. As clearly stated in our response to your petition, the USPTO lacks jurisdiction in this case to grant your petition. Jurisdiction of this case passed from the USPTO upon you filing an appeal to the CAFC.

I hope this information will be useful to you. Please feel free to contact Michael Sherry at (571) 272-8800 if you have any further questions specific to this letter.

Sincerely,
Signature signed

Mindy B. Fleisher
Chief of Staff
Office of the Commissioner for Patents

8a

Contents of Appeal (3) November 08, 2006:

Dear Honorable Chief Justice Roberts:

I am pleading to you to examine the following two documents being sent to you according to the Supreme Court Rule number 22 such that not to allow CAFC and the USPTO/BPAI to abuse the U.S. Supreme Court Rule number 10 such that they can USE THEIR GIVEN POWER to rule against the ABSOLUTE TRUTH OF MATHEMATICS.

In particular, all their rulings may possibly be considered with intentional and/ or unintentional violation of U.S.C. 18 Section 2071 according to all documents of evidences having been submitted to the Supreme Court in the past few years. All those documents of evidences with imputes from the agencies of the Executive Branch of our U.S. government have also been openly published by the U.S. Library of Congress.

Your time and effort spent to issue your own judicial opinion on the submitted questions about this case will be gratefully appreciated by all judicial scholars and by all qualified mathematicians and physicists and scientists worldwide.

The following two documents are included in this submission to you:

(1) 2 pages of my September 23, 2006 12:36 AM E-mail of communication with Thomas L. Stoll, Associate Solicitor of USPTO.

(2) 13 pages of my September 6, 2006 APPEAL TO YOU which have been blocked and never delivered to you.

This submission will be sent to you by U.S. Postal Mail with restriction signed by you personally to prove that you have received this submission under Certified Mail Receipt number 7006-0100-0006-8263-8067.

All the mathematicians and scientists in the world and I are looking forward to hear and read from your opinion of ruling of this case.

Respectfully submitted by,
Signature signed
Po Kee Wong, Pro Se Petitioner of No. 2006-1324
2413 Spencer Road, Silver Spring, Maryland 20910-2344
USA
Tel: 301-585-3453
E-mail: pokwong@verizon.net

October 31, 2005 letter from Marguerite A. Murer:

Dear Po Kee Wong:

On behalf of President George W. Bush, thank you for your letter.
The White House is sending your inquiry to the Department

of Commerce. This agency has the expertise to address your concerns. They will respond directly to you as promptly as possible.
The president sends his best wishes.
Sincerely
Signature signed
Marguerite A. Murer
Special Assistant to the President and Director of Presidential Correspondence

---

10a

November 15, 2005 letter from Marguerite A. Murer:

Dear Dr. Wong:

On behalf of President Bush, thank you for your correspondence regarding the appointment of a new Associate Justice to the Supreme Court. The president appreciates hearing your views.

Judge Samuel A. Alito, Jr., has served on the United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit for the past 15 years. He now has more prior judicial experience than any Supreme Court nominee in more than 70 years. He has participated in thousands of appeals and authored hundreds of opinions. In the performance of his duties, Jude Alito has gained the respect of his colleagues and attorneys for his brilliant legal mind, measured judicial temperament, and decency.

Jude Alito's long career in public service has given him an extraordinary breadth of experience on a wide range of difficult and complex legal issues, and President Bush was pleased to nominate Judge Alito to succeed justice Sandra Day O'Connor. As a Justice Department official, Federal

prosecutor, and judge, he has shown a mastery of the law, a deep commitment to justice and equality, and tremendous integrity. Judge Alito understands that judges must strictly interpret the Constitution and not legislate from the bench. As the President said, his scholarly, fair-minded, and principled approach to the law will serve our Nation well in the Supreme Court.

Judge Alito has devoted his professional life to advancing justice and equality. Early in his career, he worked as an Assistant United States Attorney, handling criminal and civil matters, and argued numerous cases in the United States Courts of Appeals. As Assistant to the Solicitor General, Judge Alito argued 12 cases before the Supreme Court, and in the Justice Department's Office of Legal Counsel, he provided constitutional advice for the President and the Executive Branch. In 1987, he was appointed by President Ronald Reagan as the United States Attorney for the District of New Jersey, one of our country's largest Federal districts. There, he gained a reputation for being both tough and fair while prosecuting white-collar and environmental crimes, violations of civil rights, drug trafficking, and organized crime.

Judge Alito possesses excellent legal training and exemplary judicial qualifications. He is a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Princeton University. He attended Yale Law School, where he served as editor of the Yale Law Journal. He clerked for Judge Leonard Garth on the Third Circuit Court of Appeals.

In 1987, the senate confirmed Judge Alito as the United States Attorney for the District on New Jersey by unanimous consent. In 1990, the Senate confirmed Judge Alito for the United States Court of Appeals, once more by unanimous consent. President Bush believes the Senate will again be impressed by Judge Alito's distinguished record and personal character, and he urges an up or down vote on this important nomination.

12a

For more information on Judge Alito and the nomination process, you may visit the White House website at www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/judicialnominees. Thank you again for writing. Best wishes.

Sincerely,
Signature signed
Marguerite A. Murer
Special Assistant to the President and Director of Presidential Correspondence

---

May 27, 2005 letter from Gregory C. Cwalina of NRC:

Dear Dr. Wong:

This letter is in response to the email you sent to Dr. Brian Sheon of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) on April 22, 2005. your email provided "...topics relevant to NEW NUCLEAR SFATEY STANDARD COMPUTER CODE DEVELOPMENT...in response to the request by Dr. Sheron's March 22, 2005 letter."

Dr. Sheron's March 22, 2005 letter provided an assessment of documents that you provided during the 2005 NRC Regulatory Information Conference. You were informed that members of the NRC staff looked through the documents you provided and were unable to find any information in them that supports your claim that computer analysis codes for nuclear power plant safety calculations are in error. Dr. Sheron's letter stated that NRC analysis methods, as your own calculations show, do not take into account the mathematical fact that exponentiation forms a non-commutative algebra. The March 22, 2005 letter concluded that NRC safety analysis calculations, at least with respect to exponentiation, are correct.

13a

Dr. Sheron's letter stated that the NRC will not pursue this matter further unless you identify specific safety concerns associated with the nuclear power reactors the NRC regulates. The information provided in your April 22, 2005, email does not provide specific safety concerns. Therefore, the NRC will not take any further action regarding your email. Unless you provide specific information in the future, the NRC will not respond to any further request for review of your documents.

Sincerely,

Signature signed
Gregory C. Cwalina, Senior Allegations Coordinator
Plant Support Branch, Division of Inspection Program
Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

March 22, 2005 letter from Dr. Brian W. Sheron of NRC:

Dear Dr. Wong:

On Wednesday, March 9, 2005, at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's (NRC) Regulatory Information Conference, you handed me several documents which you implied showed that computer codes used to analyze nuclear plant performance were inaccurate.

I and several members of my staff have looked through the documents you provided and have been unable to find any information in them that supports your claim that computer analysis codes for nuclear power plant safety calculations are in error. In fact, my staff has reviewed the mathematical formulas presented in your paper and found that that the exponentiation operator, which is at the heart

of your paper, forms a non-commutative algebra over a field. Whether the field is real or complex is irrelevant. In order for the proof of your paper to hold true, the operation must commute (i.e., the ordering of the operation does not change the result). Our analysis methods, as your own calculations show, do take into account the mathematical fact that exponentiation forms a non-commutative algebra. Therefore, you can be assured that our safety analysis calculations, at least with respect to exponentiation, are correct.

I appreciate your interest in nuclear safety. However, unless you identify specific safety concerns associated with the nuclear power reactors the NRC regulates, we do not intend to pursue this matter further. If you have a specific nuclear safety concern, please visit our website at http://www.nrc.gov/what-we-do/regulatory/allegations/safety-concern.html, email allegations@nrc.gov, or call NRC's Toll-Free Safety Hotline at (800) 695-7403

Sincerely,
Signature signed
Brian W. Sheron, Associate Director for Project Licensing and Technical Analysis, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

---

15a

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

According to the Supreme Court Rule 29.4.(a) and 29. 5.(a), I hereby certify that on June 21 , 2007 I , Po Kee Wong, the Pro Se petitioner, caused the following copies of the booklets of **PETITION FOR AN EXTRAODINARY WRIT OF CERTIORARI for the case 2006-1324 to the following parties by U.S. Postal Service:**

40 copies to:
William K. Suter, Clerk, Supreme Court Office of the Clerk
1 First Street, N.E. Washington, DC 20543
Tel: 202-479-3011 and 202-479-3392 (Erik Fossum)
.Fax: 202-479-3230

2 copies to:
Solicitor General, Department of Justice
950 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Room 5614
Washington DC 20530-0001

Tel: 202-514-2217 fax: 202-514-3648

1 copy to:
Jan Horbaly, Clerk/Circuit Executive
United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit
717 Madison Place, N.W. Washington DC 20539
Tel: 202-633-6550 Fax: 202-633-9623

1 copy to:
John M. Whealan; Thomas L. Stoll; Joseph G. Piccolo
Office of the Solicitor
P.O. Box:15667 Arlington, Virginia 22215
Tel: 571-272-9035 Fax: 571-273-0373; 703-305-1324

From: Po Kee Wong [pokwong@verizon.net]
Sent: Saturday, August 18, 2007 12:41 PM
To: infocollects@nrc.gov
Cc: pokwong@verizon.net; 'Wong, Adam '; Chairman@nrc.gov; BWS@nrc.gov; MFL@nrc.gov
Subject: NRC-5.doc
Dear FOIA Officers:

Thank you very much for your information received in time and that they are forwarded to the U.S. Supreme Court Clerk's Office together with the booklets of petitions as indicated by the 3 attached dcouments being sent to you.



Proceedings of the TMCE 2008, April 21–25, 2008, Izmir, Turkey, Edited by I. Horváth and Z. Rusák
© Organizing Committee of TMCE 2008, ISBN ----

IMPACTS FROM NEW SOLUTIONS OF OLD PROBLEMS IN MATHEMATICAL AND EXPERIMENTAL SCIENCES

WONG,PO KEE (□□□)
Systems Research Company
pokwong@verizon.net

WONG, ADAM (□□□)
WONG, ANITA (□□□)
Systems Research Company

ABSTRACT

IMPACTS FROM NEW SOLUTIONS OF OLD PROBLEMS IN MATHEMATICAL AND EXPERIMENTAL SCIENCES

ABSTRACT

Submitted to

Seventh International Symposium on Tools and Methods of Competitive Engineering
TMCE 2008 Ankara Secretariat Dr. Bugra Koku
Middle East Technical University, Turkey E-mail: info@tmce.org

On the Theme of

Collaboration or Competition between East and West
Invited to propose tutorials & to submit the following technical papers:

By
Po Kee Wong, Ph.D.( )

SYSTEMS RESEARCH COMPANY, USA

E-mail:pokwong@verizon.net

In response to the **Call-for-Papers** from TMCE 2008, eight papers are being submitted to all participants of our colleagues worldwide for open review and evaluation and to assess their impacts and values in mathematical and experimental sciences with their applications in **Tools and Methods of Competitive Engineering**:

(1) IMECE 2001/T&S-23408 paper, 7 pages with partial section translation in Chinese.
(2) IMECE 2003-43540 paper, 3 pages.
(3) IMECE 2003-43536 paper, 5 pages.
(4) IAC-02-J.P.02 paper , 7 pages
(5) IMECE 2003-43586 paper, 3 pages.
(6) ICONE 13 -50509 paper, 8 pages
(7) Explanations of a popular geometry problem to satisfy 2 million students in Turkey.
(8) New solutions of a few old geometry and algebra problems with using calculators.

The above papers (1) to (6) together with this abstract had been submitted electronically: to Z.rusak@tudeft.nl;info@tmce.org;info@tmce-symposium.org;defalt@ConfMaster.net

Keywords

TRAJECTORY SOLID ANGLE,

WONG'S ANGLES,

NEW STATISTICAL MECHANICS,

NEW SCATTERING CROSSECTIONS,

NEW HYDROGEN MODEL,

THREE DIMENSIONAL STREAM FUNCTIONS,

VISCO-ELASTO-DYANMAICS,

NEW NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS COMPUTER CODES DEVELOPMENT,

THREE DIMENSIONAL GEAR BOX DESIGN,

HIGH POWER FUNCTIONS,

DIFFICULT GEOMETRY AND TRIGONOMETRY PROBLEMS

1. Introduction

As indicated from the ABSTRACT, on the themes of this TMCE 2008, subject number (7) "Explanations of a popular geometry problem to satisfy 2 million students in Turkey" and subject number (8) "New solutions of a few old geometry and algebra problems with using calculators." are chosen here for the presentations.

Subject number (7) can be obtained from the following Weblink by pressing the key "CTRL + Click to follow link": They are open detailed discussions with Ali Ilik of Turkey and John Berglund of USA and with many others in the Mathforum run by Drexel University in USA.

http://www.google.com/search?q=+site:mathforum.org+Po+Kee+Wong+Angles&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&filter=0

Go to the 2nd second tap of the above Weblink and open the number 5th

Math Forum Discussions

Po Kee Wong Posts: 23 Registered: 12/6/04 ... The **Angle** BDC=x expressed in terms of **Angle** A and **Angle** B After applying the Law of Sine in Trigonometry with ...
mathforum.org/kb/thread.jspa?threadID=1180024&messageID=3872622 23k - Cached - Similar pages

7/24/05	What is your opinion???	Ali ilik
7/25/05	Re: What is your opinion???	John Berglund
7/25/05	Re: What is your opinion???	Ali ilik
8/2/05	Re: What is your opinion???	Po Kee Wong
8/3/05	**Re: What is your opinion???**	**Po Kee Wong**
8/2/05	Re: What is your opinion???	Po Kee Wong

It is my opinion that Po Kee Wong's 8/3/05

Discussion provides the complete answers to Ali Ilik's

Question on "What is your opinion???"

Subject number (8) is an expansion of subject number (2) from real numbers to cover for complex numbers. According to my April 29, 2007 8:02 PM E-mail communication with Dr. Bugra Koku,

(info@tmce.org), paper No. (8) shows the importance of having obtained the closed-formed mathematical solutions of problems and then proceed the numerical evaluation of the solved problems. For examples:

(A) Given the 3 altitudes of a Triangle ABC as Ha=5; Hb=6; Hc=7, how to find all the other unknown properties of the Triangle ABC from the three givens of the Triangle ABC?

(B) Given i=square root of (-1) as the unit imaginary number; Z1=X1 + iY1; Z2=X2+iY2 where X1; X2;Y1;Y2 are real numbers to be determined from solving the following two simultaneous equations:

ArcSin (Z1 + Z2) = (i^i) ^i Equation (1)

ArcSin (Z1 – Z2) = i^(i^i) Equation (2)

Both problems (8)-(A) and (8)-(B) had been submitted to U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) in March 2007 for consideration of review and evaluation and for presentation with challenge to review the accuracy of NRC's computer codes for safety analyses. The complete communication about the problem with USNRC can be obtained from:

Note to Po Kee Wong:

Please refer to Brian Sheron's email to you regarding this subject. Although you have communicated extensively with Dr. Sheron on this subject; I must reiterate that NRC does not intend to communicate on this subject further, particularly in reference to the Regulatory Information Conference.

You do not owe me additional information.

Regards,

Mabel Lee, Director
Program Management, Policy Development and Analysis Staff
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research
USNRC

>>> "Po Kee Wong" <pokwong@verizon.net> 02/14/2007 11:36 AM >>>
?
Dear Ms. Lee and NRC colleagues ET AL:

With reference to my communication with Ms. Mabel F. Lee, the subject matters are linked together and that I owe Ms. Lee answers to the very specific simple high school mathematics problem such that we can compare the numerical values with the NRC computer codes:

Using a 1996 TI 83 Calculator ID: 3360885 I-0898J, all the questions asked in the problem can be obtained from the following answers provided for comparison with those independently obtained from the NRC Mainframe computers:

Answers:

(1) Ta=5.020890995 Tb=6.297805152 Tc=7.188898852

(2) Ma=5.061325394 Mb=6.502261858 Mc=7.233692532

(3) R=4.327894686

(4) r=1.962616822

(5) r(a)=9.130434764 r(b)=5.67367567 r(c)=4.468085103

(6) Denote the Centers of Ex-circles as I(a), I(b) and I(c) each point on the angle bisectors of interior angle A; interior angle B and interior angle C respectively

then :

Segment AI(a)=14.18947453 Segment BI(b)=12.2551884 Segment CI(c)=11.74479173

(7) and (9) are the same question. Denote I as the Center of the In-circle I (Intersection of all three interior angle bisectors) then,

Segment AI=3.050073969

(8)Denote H as the Ortho-center of the triangle ABC, then

Segment AH=1.487971421
Segment BH=4.94271009
Segment CH=6.150321088

(10) Denote O as the Center of the Circum-circle of Triangle ABC, then:

AO=BO=CO=R =4.327894686

(11) Denote M as the Centroid of the Triangle ABC, then:

AM=3.374216929
BM=4.334841239 CM=4.822461688

(12) a=8.526935599
b=7.105779667 c=6.090668286

Please double check over the numerical data that we obtain separately and independently. I may have made typing errors and/or calculation errors in some of those numerical data being shown above.

I look forward to hearing from you that you are willing to accommodate me for presentations of papers in your Sessions

Very truly yours,

Wong, Po Kee

Po Kee Wong, Ph.D. 2007 Registrant ID: No.:999
Pokwong@verizon.net

----- Original Message -----
From: Po Kee Wong
To: Brian Sheron
Cc: Mabel Lee ; DEK@nrc.gov ; JED2@nrc.gov ; KDJ@nrc.gov ; Po Kee Wong
Sent: Wednesday, January 31, 2007 1:22 AM
Subject: Fw: Emailing: comp-codes

Dear Dr. Sheron:

Being forwarded to you is the 2nd of 4 communications with Ms. Lee to identify the current NRC computer codes from opening the attached link in this E-mail.

Please use your current computer programs to solve a very simple "' High School Mathematics " problem and compare with the numbers from mine with yours before we should even go further from here. Please note that we may require the accuracy of the numbers to be smaller than the so-called Nano-range and why not look for (10)^(-50) range/or for (10)^ (-100000) range (assuming our current

computer and calculators are perfectly designed to handle that).

----- Original Message -----
From: Po Kee Wong
To: Mabel Lee
Cc: Po Kee Wong ; pokwong@rcn.com
Sent: Tuesday, January 30, 2007 9:07 AM
Subject: Emailing: comp-codes

Dear Ms. Lee:

The information that I just send in my 2nd E-mail to you has direct impacts to your own NRC computer Codes as shown in the following website:

The message is ready to be sent with the following file or link attachments:
Shortcut to: http://www.nrc.gov/what-we-do/regulatory/research/comp-codes.html

Note: To protect against computer viruses, e-mail programs may prevent sending or receiving certain types of file attachments. Check your e-mail security settings to determine how attachments are handled.

Please check with NIST mathematicians and yours at NRC to do a very simple mathematical calculation as shown in the followings:

Given: The 3 altitudes of a Triangle ABC (Vertices name A,B,C) Ha=5, Hb=6 Hc=7

Find: the following quantities of the Triangle ABC with accuracy to infinite decimal places !!! (assuming all current computers and calculators are perfectly designed to do that)

(1) The lengths of 3 Angle bisectors of the Triangle ABC :Ta=?;Tb=?;and Tc=?.
(2) The 3 medians of the Triangle ABC: Ma=?;Mb=?;Mc=?
(3) The radius of the Circum-circle of the Triangle ABC: R=?
(4) The radius of the In-circle of the Triangle ABC: r=?
(5) The 3 radii of the Ex-circles of the Triangle ABC: r(a)=?; r(b)=? r(c)=?
(6) How to locate the 3 Centers of the Ex-circles of the Triangle ABC?
(7) How to locate the Center of the In-circle of the Triangle ABC?
(8) How to locate the Ortho-center of the Triangle ABC?
(9) How to locate the In-center of the Triangle ABC?
(10) How to locate the Center of the Circum-Circle of the Triangle?
(11) How to locate the Centroid of the Triangle ABC?
(12) What are the lengths of 3 sides of the Triangle ABC: a=? b=? and c=?

Is it fair to ask the above questions from our computer scientists and engineers who do computer codes development for NIST and NRC? If you put this as a questionnaire to ask all the RIC2007 participants , both you and I would like to know the answers from the participants!!!

Very truly yours,

Wong, Po Kee
□ □ □

WONG, PO KEE
Tel:301-585-3453
pokwong@verizon.net

From: Brian Sheron
To: Po Kee Wong
Date: Tue, Jan 30, 2007 1:12 PM
Subject: Re: NRC Regulatory Information Conference

Dr. Wong,

Ms. Lee is the director of my Program Management and development staff. She is not engaged in technical work and is not involved with scientific computer programs.

The NRC's computer programs have been extensively peer-reviewed and and validated against a wide variety of experimental data. As we have repeatedly asked you in the past, if you believe there are errors in the NRC's computer codes, we encourage you to identify those errors to us. Otherwise, we do not intend to discuss this issue with you further.

>>> "Po Kee Wong" <pokwong@verizon.net> 01/30/2007 7:41 AM >>>
Dear Ms. Lee:

Thank you for your E-mail in response to mine addressed to Dr. Klein, Chairman of NRC and to Dr. Brian Sheron, Director, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research.

Instead of making our arguments by words written in English, we should use the computers and calculators to solve many of the very simple and very well defined specific mathematical ,engineering and scientific problems to compare the numerical numbers that you can obtain from your computer codes and to compare with that from mine. If we have obtained deferent numerical numbers from all these well defined simple problems, then for sure that one of us must be wrong!!! To start the comparisons with a very complicated computer code for engineering problems will only add more confusions for the correct judgment of which one is good.
For these reasons, I would like to advise NRC to learn and to understand the technical and scientific contents of my proprietarily owned U.S. patents number 5,084,232(Trajectory Solid Angle);5,848,377 (Wong's Angles) ;6,430,516 (High Speed Rotating Shafts and Nuclear fuel Pin Design) . Please note that all these proprietarily owned patents were generated from my own previous review and evaluation of nuclear power plants in USA and come up with the new solutions. Please try to read the introduction of all those patents. I am forwarding the formation in my next E-mail to you.

I will also call you at your number 301-415-7595 to simplify any of the mis-understanding of the problems.

Very truly yours,

Wong, Po Kee

Po Kee Wong
Tel:301-585-3453
pokwong@verizon.net

In response to your message shown in the followings:

----- Original Message -----
From: Mabel Lee
To: pokwong@verizon.net
Sent: Monday, January 29, 2007 5:19 PM
Subject: NRC Regulatory Information Conference

Dr. Wong:

Your emails to Chairman Klein, Chairman, U. S. NRC and to Dr. Brian Sheron, Director, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research has been forwarded to me for response. Based on a brief discussion with Dr. Sheron, I understand that you have been in contact with the NRC over the years and that the NRC has responded to your submittals and has also provided you with a forum for presentation at a Regulatory Information Conference (RIC) several years ago. Moreover, the staff has previously reviewed your paper and provided you with the areas where we disagreed with your conclusions. Although, we have repeatedly asked you if you were aware of any specific errors in the computer codes used by either the NRC or any of its licensees, and if so, to identify them to us, you have not identified any to date. I understand that you would like to make a presentation at this year's RIC. The Agenda for the RIC has already been set and we cannot provide you with a forum to present your paper.

Mabel Lee, Director
Program Management Policy Development and Analysis Staff
Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research
USNRC

CC: Mabel Lee; pokwong@rcn.com

The principal and the general solutions of the problem (8)-(B) for simultaneous equations of (1) and (2) are:

Z1mn =
(m+n)(pi/2) + (1/2)(-1)^m (Sin(.1835902246) Cosh (.9830028636))
+
i (-(-1)^n Sinh(1) +(-1)^m Cos(.1835902246)Sinh(.9830028634))

Z2mn =
(n-m)(pi/2) –(1/2) (-1)^m Sin(.1835902246) Cosh(.9830028636)
+
i (-(-1) ^n Sinh(1)-(-1)^m Cos(.1835902246) Sinh(.9830028634))

Where n and m are integers in the ranges of

Negative infinite < n < positive infinite

Negative infinite < m < positive infinite

When n=0 and m=0, Z100 and Z200 are called the principal solution of the simultaneous equations (1) and (2).

Z100=.1390498169-.045371242 i

Z200= -.1390498169-2.305031146 i

In summary, the general solutions of Z1mn and Z2mn are:

Case 1:

m=Even integers n=Even integers

Z1mn= (m+ n) pi/2 +.1390498169-.045371242 i

Z2mn = (n-m) pi/2 -.1390498169-2.305031146 i

Case 2:

m=Odd integers n= Even integers

Z1mn = (m + n) pi/2-.1390498169-2.305031146 i

Z2mn = (n- m) pi/2+.1390498169-.045371242 i

Case 3:

m=Even integers n=Odd integers

Z1mn = (m+n) pi/2 + .1390498169+2.305031146 i

Z2mn =(n-m) pi/2 -.1390498169+.045371242 i

Case 4:

m=Odd integers n=Odd integers

Z1mn = (m+n) pi/2-.1390498169+.045371242 i

Z2mn = (n-m) pi/2 +.1390498169+2.305031146 i

2. CONCLUSION

As can be read and seen from the INTRODUCTION of the three looks- like very- simple geometry; trigonometry and algebra problems (7); (8)-(A) and (8)-(B), their correct solutions have never been obtained before until now. Our colleagues must be alerted that there are REAL IMPACTS OF NEW SOLUTIONS OF MANY OLD PROBLEMS IN MATHEMATICAL AND EXPERIMENTAL SCIENCES waiting for us to discover them.

From: Po Kee wong [pokwong@verizon.net]
Sent: Saturday, September 30, 2006 2:42 PM
To: '????'
Cc: 'pokwong@verizon.net'; 'pokwong@rcn.com'
Subject: FW: 11 websites where you can obtain my patents; international conference papers and relevant engineering and scientific documents for open review; evaluation and discussion worldwide

Dear Chairman Sheon:

The following websites are consolidated together to facilitate for your filing and tracing of my work that may be of your interest to collect and edit and put them into the file for your book " History of Nan Tao High School ".

While typing the cc of this E-mail to you, President George Bush's E-mail address pops up. This gives me an idea to ask you whether you want also to invite President Bush of USA and President Hu Jin Tao to come to our Centennial Celebration. They can meet and talk informally about the proposed projects of collaborations between two governments to build: (1) A 3rd. identical observatory and; (2) A new satellite ejection station in the "High Plateau Region of China"

Please call me at + 301-585-3453 to discuss about this idea further if you think this is feasible and mutually beneficial to all of us being involved. Please also respond this E-mail with acknowledgement that you have already received all the E-mails of information having sent to you so far.

With my best regards to you all, I am,

Very truly yours,

WONG, Po Kee (1946-1949 Alumni)

Tel: + 301-585-3453

pokwong@verizon.net

pokwong@rcn.com

From: pokwong [mailto:pokwong@rcn.com]
Sent: Friday, September 29, 2006 10:50 PM
To: pokwong@verizon.net; pokwong
Subject:

(1) Search for Po Kee Wong Angles:
http://www.google.com/search?q=+site:mathforum.org+Po+Kee+Wong+Angles&hl=en&lr=&ie=UTF-8&filter=0

You and all members of CSTB are cordially invited to review and evaluate the TRUTH and the IMPACTS from the following websites about the confrontation between Judges and Mathematicians worldwide on the key issue of whether the Judges should be given the Judicial Power by any governmental institutions in the world to rule against the ABSOLUTE TRUTH of MATHEMATICS:

(2) The following information was the first one of the several public documents to have been submitted back to CAFC for the public hearing of the CAFC case number 2006-1324:

http://mathforum.org/kb/thread.jspa?forumID=206&threadID=478694&messageID=1467123

(3) The following information was the second one of the several public documents to have been submitted back to the CAFC for the public hearing of the CAFC case number 2006-1324 IN RE PO KEE WONG:

http://mathforum.org/kb/message.jspa?messageID=1094424&tstart=0

(4) The following was the third of the several public documents to have been submitted back to the CAFC for the public hearing of the CAFC case number 2006-1324 IN RE PO KEE WONG:

http://mathforum.org/kb/thread.jspa?forumID=130&threadID=357907&messageID=1094423

(5) The following was the fourth (4th.) of several public documents that had been submitted back to the CAFC for the Judges to re-consider their current disposition of the CAFC case number 2006-1324 IN RE PO KEE WONG:

http://mathforum.org/kb/message.jspa?messageID=3566959&tstart=0

(6) Comparison of Trajectory Solid with Geometric Solid in Sacttering Theory:

http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2002iaf..confE.559W

(7) U.S. Patent 5084232:
http://patft.uspto.gov/netacgi/nph-Parser?Sect1=PTO1&Sect2=HITOFF&d=PALL&p=1&u=%2Fnetahtml%2FPTO%2Fsrchnum.h

tm&r=1&f=G&l=50&s1=5084232.PN.&OS=PN/5084232&RS=PN/5084232

(8) U.S. Patent 5848377
http://patft.uspto.gov/netacgi/nph-Parser?Sect1=PTO1&Sect2=HITOFF&d=PALL&p=1&u=%2Fnetahtml%2FPTO%2Fsrchnum.htm&r=1&f=G&l=50&s1=5848377.PN.&OS=PN/5848377&RS=PN/5848377

(9) U.S. Patent 6430516
http://patft.uspto.gov/netacgi/nph-Parser?Sect1=PTO1&Sect2=HITOFF&d=PALL&p=1&u=%2Fnetahtml%2FPTO%2Fsrchnum.htm&r=1&f=G&l=50&s1=6430516.PN.&OS=PN/6430516&RS=PN/6430516

(10) Mathforum Search
http://mathforum.org/kb/profile.jspa?userID=47317

(11) ICONE 13 paper 50509
http://www.conferencetoolbox.org/ICONE13/Author/PaperDetails.cfm

Mail Envelope Properties (47261D0D.7BA : 1 : 29211)

Subject:	Fwd: RE: FW: 2006-1705-3-RE-doc.doc
Creation Date	10/29/2007 1:49:01 PM
From:	CHAIRMAN
Created By:	CHAIRMAN@nrc.gov

Recipients
nrc.gov
OWGWPO03.HQGWDO01
BAC (Billie Champ)

Post Office	**Route**
OWGWPO03.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
Mail		

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
ReplyRequested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results
Message is not eligible for Junk Mail handling
Message is from an internal sender

Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered
Junk Mail handling disabled by User
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator
Junk List is not enabled
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled
Block List is not enabled

Mail Envelope Properties (47260632.B41 : 5 : 47937)

Subject: RE: FW: 2006-1705-3-RE-doc.doc
Creation Date 10/29/2007 12:04:17 PM
From: "Po Kee Wong" <pokwong@verizon.net>

Created By: pokwong@verizon.net

Recipients
nrc.gov
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
BWS (Brian Sheron)

nrc.gov
OWGWPO02.HQGWDO01
CHAIRMAN CC

nrc.gov
OWGWPO03.HQGWDO01
FOIA CC ()

fcps.edu
Adam.Wong CC (Adam ' 'Wong)

mail.house.gov
AmericanVoices CC

whitehouse.gov
vice.president CC
president CC

usdoj.gov
supremectbriefs CC

Post Office	Route
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov
OWGWPO02.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov
OWGWPO03.HQGWDO01	nrc.gov
	fcps.edu
	mail.house.gov
	whitehouse.gov
	usdoj.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time

MESSAGE	18845	10/29/2007 12:04:17 PM
2006.doc(Final).doc	144384	
NRC-5.doc.htm	1727	
tmce_2008_template.doc-7.doc	169984	
FW 11 websites where you can obtain my patents.htm; international conference papers and relevant engineering and scientifi	17738	
Mime.822	473943	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
ReplyRequested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard