

Patent number 1800140-4  
IPC G06Q20/00

2019 -03- 18

Date 2019-03-16

Första posten

Applicant:  
Marquise \$Museum of Contemporary Art

Title:  
Dualchain™

---

Reply to the (PRV) Statement filed on 2019-03-14

This chain of statements is following chronologically to the PRV disclosure points.

Claim 1. The Dualchain method is in principle a technical logistical advancement that will enable a wide variety of global industrial applications. Disclosure on token issuance is well documented in the patent application which demonstrates a visual and verbal example of the simplistic token issuance process. The patent filer is available to demonstrate this process in real time to the patent examiner upon request.

Claim 2. The invention has discovered a new use case for a previously one dimensional application, this qualifies as a technical innovation with patentability in countries like the United States and by Swedish PRV representatives on phone exchange debating similar topics which was conducted prior to filing the patent, and remains a strong indication on the merit of the application which may not have been filed without encouragement from Swedish PRV counsel via phone exchange in early 2018. Patent filer (Marquise \$Museum) is issuing a formal request to extend the approval procedure via IPC to the US mainland and islands to safeguard the value building endeavour of Dualchain within a context of IP protection. The method was disclosed in full in the patent filing to PRV, a request is hereby formed to issue a copy of the received documents to ensure that it is the same original content that was delivered by the filer in summer of 2018.

It is suspected due to the nature of PRV statements in the 2019-03-14 disclosure that the original 17 page filing was not received in full, or that there is some fundamental misconception of the invention despite this filing being written in simple english with visual imagery for easy comprehension. Blockchain is a new industry and it is important that explanations are comprehended by PRV examiners in order to capture nuances of this novel technology. PRV examiner expressed in the statement that there is a lack of clarity which is cause for concern and a request to send a copy in full of the examined filing is hereby formed, including an offer by the inventor to demonstrate the invention in real time together with an examiner in Stockholm.

The various products/algorithms that according to examiners statement lack clarity are first layer inventions by prior industry leaders that were already extant before the invention of the new system (Dualchain), Marquise \$Museum is enabling a new abstract second layer use case for these first generation technical inventions, enabling trading security control flow of tokens to prevent user fraud and authentication of valuable merchandise that was not possible before.

Claim 3. The method of utilizing physical merchandise is completely novel from a logistical business perspective with strong value building proprietary elements including disruptive industrial and commercial applications. Marquise \$Museum concedes that this part of the invention which is only one facet of the holistic solution lacks technical character with a business oriented use case and

flow chart, But it is emphasized in this disclosure that the debatable part of the application is only one element within a wider technical application with industrial and commercial use case as conceded by the examiner in his statement. A patent examination IPC transfer between US and Swedish examiners is encouraged in order to safeguard the value building attempts of this project at this critical junction because the United States (which is a large and critical market) merits business methods as patentable inventions. Whereas Swedish examiners due to regulatory differences is expressing disagreements on the merits of technical qualifications based on Swedish patent law.

Additional expenses of IPC transfer to United States or international examination by WIPO will be paid through a separate invoice.

The correct and most up to date terminology of this patent is "Dualchain". It is a correct assessment by the examiner in Stockholm that other terminology that is no longer used refers to the same invention.

This section of the statement by Marquise \$Museum contest the PRV statement concerning patent number 1800140-4 wherein it is argued that a person skilled in the art would not be able to exercise the claimed invention according to section 8 of Swedish patent law.

It is suspected that PRV has not received the correct filing during summer 2018 and it is hereby requested that examiners issue a copy of the received documentation for analysis by Marquise \$Museum because it is functionally impossible for PRV to deliver a statement of this character while in possession of the correct 17 page filing despite it having been sent at two separate occasions via two countries independent mailing systems (Czech Republic and Sweden). The filing was formulated with video explainer conversion in mind through a professional contractor that Marquise \$Museum has employed on one earlier occasion. It is functionally impossible that the level of language including visual imagery is not comprehended by the examiners in Stockholm, which is why there is suspicion of faulty or missing source material used during the examination.

It is a correct statement that the invention contains technical elements to be examined, and that these technical elements are not proprietary of Marquise \$Museum but part of a cryptographic decentralized platform and marketplace called Waves Dex, and internet websites through a domain provider.

It is the novel use case of these technical applications in combination, together with the industrial and commercial value contribution that the Dualchain patent is claimed.

Document D1 is hereby contested in full due to lack of technical evidence that the whitepaper has remained unaltered from inception and with implications through internet research that a Dualchain solution was not part of Bitcars roadmap since inception. There is zero written documentation to support anything remotely similar to Dualchain in their social media presence since early 2018.

There is a security token feature embedded in their product which is widely known in the industry and not something that Marquise \$Museum is seeking to patent.

Bitcars twitter footprint began as late as June 2018 (image provided below) without any mention of anything remotely similar to Dualchain. Their twitter account was registered in September 2017 and it is possible that this account belonged to a previous and unrelated owner prior to June 5<sup>th</sup> 2018 which is the first twitter post made by Bitcar, and subsequently bought by Bitcar from this unrelated owner which is a very common practice on the internet, but long after Marquise \$Museum delivered its priority filing in March 27<sup>th</sup> 2018.



Similarly none if Bitcars Medium articles mention anything remotely similar to the Dualchain logistics platform before late 2018 when Marquise \$Museum had since long delived its filing to PRV:

<https://medium.com/bitcar-mag/bitcar-explained-126e9777e194>

It is simply described as a singular security token where shares of exotic cars can be represented & procured on a decentralized marketplace. This tokenization concept is in the public domain and not of proprietary nature, Marquise \$Museum is not seeking a patent for this part of the application but it is using a similar platform (WAVES) to facilitate certain aspects this the Dualchain invention, which, as was claimed in 1800140-4 is portable to many other platforms which is why a patent must safeguard the invention be extending its functionality to many different types of platforms which are also not proprietary in nature by themselves such as Ethereum, Counterparty, Dash and so forth.

The patent examination concedes that there are differences between Bitcar and the filing 1800140-4 but argues that it is not of technical merit.

Marquise \$Museum contest that there is not a technical benefit for industrial and commercial markets within the novel use case of Dualchain as a product authenticator through separation of decentralized and centralized market control using two distinct blockchain tokens layered into a complex business method that should not by itself be misconstrued as the sole function of the Dualchain patent and thus be singularly measured or dismissed by this criteria.

The inventive step influences user behaviour to conform to the rules of the new system as expressed in the 1800140-4 filing. This new system is designed to prevent user fraud by transferring tokens to peers in order to extract multiple product from the company and incur financial loss as a technical flow chart in 1800140-4 appropriately demonstrates.

It is contested that D1 and Dualchain do not substantially differ due to documented irregularities in the Bitcar project presentation of original documentation. The added features presented in the whitepaper are strongly suspected to have emerged after the Dualchain patent filing was already completed and received in Stockholm during its patent pending status. There is zero documented evidence that this scheme was an original part of Bitcars ICO according to twitter posting and medium articles dating back before late 2018. It is easy to replace a whitepaper on a website with an updated version and forge timestamps.

A seize and desist notice will be dispatched to Bitcar development team through Marquise \$Museum's legal team. A failure to comply will result in further legal steps.

There is no intention to change any claims in 1800140-4 as far as it is verified that the examination team in Stockholm are in possession of the correct source material and have functionally comprehended the application.

Marquise \$Museum is offering to present the scheme in real time to patent examiners upon a specified time and location.

Team is requesting patent filing to extend through WIPO or IPC to include US mainland and islands due to different legal interpretation of business methods and so called "Innovationshöjd". The added cost will be paid through separate invoice from PRV.

Marquise \$Museum is enquiring on the legal possibility of presenting the original 1800140-4 application to the general public and a community of investors who have requested documentation to support the invention prior to participating. Please provide a clarified position on the classified status of this invention, is it possible to present it to the public at this stage or not? When can 1800140-4 be presented to the public?

End of statement