Re Item III

Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability

No opinion on the patentability of the subject-matter of the claims is issued because the application entirely consists of subject-matter claimed for which a meaningful search is not possible, even not in the light of the description. As no search has been performed the subject-matter of claims 1-3 can not be examined with regard to the question whether they meet the requirements of novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability.
The reasons for not issuing a search report are provided in the following.
The set of claims consists of three independent claims 1 to 3 which are explicitly directed to a scientific theory defining a way of calculating a potential energy of matter or light and a method of creating a situation having no defined time with the help of three different formulas, only. i.e., the subject-matter claimed does not have any technical character.
Furthermore, even in the light of the description of the application a meaningful search is not possible. Starting with the title of the application already there it is made clear that the content of the application relates to a theory with formulas derived from said theory. Furthermore, the description of the application as a whole including the figures does not comprise a single embodiment where said formulas demonstrate to enable a technical effect in for example a device. Therefore, even in the light of the description a meaningful search of an embodiment of the application is not possible.

The applicants attention is drawn to the fact that from a principal point of view subject-matter claimed is only in that case patentable if this subject-matter has a technical character. i.e., a formula or a theory, per se, is not patentable but a device implementing this formula could be. As an example, a machine generating energy by implementing the instructions as defined in a formula could from a principle point of view be patentable but the theory with said formula alone is not.

To conclude, a meaningful search of the content of the application is not possible because neither the claims nor the application as a whole define any technical features in terms of which the matter for which protection is sought may be defined and which could be searched. Therefore, neither the claims standing on their own nor interpreted in the light of the description of the application nor embodiments as disclosed in the description of the application allow for a meaningful search.