February 10, 2026

RE: Attorney Docket No. MPROJECT-11
Patent Assessment for Invention Titled "Time File"

Dear Scott:

You have asked me to create a written patent assessment for the Time File technology, including my view on the overall patentability of Time File, differentiation versus existing document management systems, why the system is non-obvious, and any high-level commentary I'm comfortable providing on scope, defensibility, or likelihood of allowance. I will take each of these issues in term.

First, based on the report prepared by my patent search firm and my review of all prior art documents cited therein, I give Time File my highest patentability rating – an 80% chance that we will procure an issued patent. I typically have success beyond this rating, but the USPTO can be unpredictable, and so I cap my likelihood of procuring an issued patent figure at 80%.

Second, the reason for my high rating has to do with Time File's core point of novelty – providing time as a first-class design primitive for single authoritative states. None of the prior art references uncovered by my patent search firm demonstrated this aspect of novelty. Instead, most of the references focused on authoritative states remaining with a latest/current overall version. This drawback in the art is what Time File improves over. Specifically, existing document systems (e.g., word processors, collaborative docs, PDFs, repositories) cause documents to drift over time, cause "versions" to be implemented as copies, forks, or snapshots, cause historical references to be fragile, and cause users to rely on process guarantees when determining what is true within a document. By providing time as a first-class design primitive (e.g., binding an authoritative state of a document to a time output), the Time File system may be configured for a time-addressable document state, authority-enforced document mutability, freeze and lock mechanisms tied to document state, and presentation of authoritative historical states without duplication.

Third, to make a case for obviousness, a patent examiner will have to find a strong base reference. It is of course possible that the patent examiner will find something that my search firm did not, but based on my search firm's results, none of the prior art shows an authoritative

state of a document being bound to a time output. In my experience, we will likely face an obviousness rejection in our first office action, even though I feel very confident in the defensibility of claim 1 as it is written now. This is mostly unavoidable, and as a drafter, it happens to be something I aim for. If we procure an allowance of claim 1 in our first shot, we aimed too small and will get a patent without knowing the outer bounds of the invention's true scope. Additionally, there are 22 dependent claims in the current patent application that is being prepared, and each of them provides additional, and still very defensible aspects of novelty.

Finally, in terms of scope, defensibility, and likelihood of allowance, I feel as confident as I can as a patent attorney that we will procure some sort of patent (no promises of course). Whether we procure truly broad coverage is the more important question. This may require a fight and it may require an appeal. We may however be surprised, and the patent examiner may agree that the prior art does not show binding of an authoritative state of a document to a time output.

Please let me know if you would like me to expand on this assessment.

Best,

John P. Powers, Esq.
Owner, The Powers IP Law Firm