

At CM, the graphic is exaggeratedly small made as a drawing sometimes not even on a quarter of an A4 page whose rotation is not legally recommended (without legal support as in 37CFR 1.173, 37CFR 1.84 (u) (1), 37CFR 1.84 (h) (6)(5)), << 37CFR 1.84 (j) – simply disappearing as the letter from the subsequent article of the law, and (1) and (j) appearing as a new duplication of sections in the meaning of the expression the legislator, an error that is taken advantage of... Thus, according to 37 CFR 1.84 the letter (j) is lost the logical counter after a Latin alphabet and the letter (j) disappears and it goes directly to the letter (k), and even if it were a practice in legislation is not accepted in the sense of an international logic, such a leap of the legislator. It is even more hilarious that an (j) can be found in the subsidiary of 37 CFR 1.84 (h) (5) – “j” but as a subsection after the figure “5” but which shows that the use of (j) can be interpreted in law school, maybe only at “Cornell”! No! It is an error that is also taken advantage of in the case of the CM. Patent, 37 CFR 1.84 (h)(5) “Modified form of construction must be shown in separate views” Does not apply to him. Because the CM, also describes re-forms of wheels: **FIG. 1**, modified to include an atomic generator, with parachutes and with different fuel production in honeycombs with helium from the wings, i.e. two image-planes, systems in a single launch... but even a third system, with launched solar parachutes, so all systems drawn on the same page. Legally, it translates as jumping directly to point 37 CFR 1.84 “(j)” which seems subsidiary to point “(h)” and in the case of CM, it seems to respect “one view must be placed upon another” but it describes forms of construction - systems: **FIG. 2**, respectively “wheels with atomic generator”, together with “energy production with honeycombs, etc., violating point “(h)” although there is no clear “(j)”, it violates both – the order being essential! Neither section 37 CFR (h) – scale, reduction) was respected at CM. It is then drawn at CM, a wheel that is too big, disproportionate to the other sizes of planes around the page, next to the other drawings, in order to excuse the unmet spaces on the sheets, without marking the “break”. In reality, the unreality is hidden -the pieces of airplanes used as an excuse for the “lack of invention”, the lack of aircraft elements used from the state of the art and the disproportionate strings and pipes described in the drawings (Fig. 4, future atomic power plants, exaggerating, again, CM, vs., the engineering reality of our days... Nothing in the state of the art. How can we still talk about a real “prior art” or a “skill person” or at least “First-to File”, as a first publication of a “labory”, in such a patent as that of CM ? He does not put one figure on an A4 page for transparency but restricts the essential details in several and where they are not needed, sketches that leave the examiner compares the peak, erroneously, with the “diomatic”, AM patent. Which clearly describes the continuous lines and dotted lines and along with triangles for **FIG. 3**, constrained to hoses, connected between planes, for the transport of fuels. And **FIG. 4** does not see that the CM patent, describes that the engine of an airplane in general will be fed with the “fog” created through thermodynamic effect “incompletely described” in all sense, at high altitudes and speeds), as well as from an

apgar not heat pump) (diomatic) and through the “capillary” holes, from a “floating” device, super sonic, made up of a “transparent” and bubble-wrapped foil canals, plus holes, from a material that has not yet been discovered with such resistance and characteristics to adhere to... The entire area is imagined over the volume of a mountain, so unrealistically big (... only the length of 20 km in a first approximation to CM), being carried by planes that will spin “menacingly” towards space, like a catapult that is fired and then suddenly stopped, like a slingshot, after spinning and like a “whip”. Other parachutes being clearly described to us, how will they stop moving and repeating the procedure several times, such a spin called exaggerated is say, “contingent reflex method”? And how will it not endanger the lives of any participants in the flight with such planes which, from the vague, dotted drawing, appear to be planes (or are B52 and Airbus, Boeing 57, Antonov s24... – lost in UK; curiously all in the state of the art)?