

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

**COMPLAINT REGARDING INVENTION PROMOTER**

Instructions: Read the reverse side of this form before completing and submitting the form. Complete as much of the form as possible and return it to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Mail Stop 24, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 or fax to (571) 273-0170. Please type or write clearly.

Name of the Invention Promotion Company:

Davison Design &amp; Development, Inc

Invention Promoter's Address:

595 Alpha Drive

City Pittsburgh

State Pa.

Zip Code 15238-2911.

Complainant's Name:

Heidi Morris

Complainant's Address:

5175 Porter Rd.

City North Olmstead

State Ohio

Zip Code 44070-3166

Customer's Name:

Heidi Morris

**WHAT IS YOUR COMPLAINT?**

Please be as specific as possible within the space provided

Name of mass media invention promoter advertised in: (i.e., TV, Radio, Newspaper, Magazine, Other)

internet advertising

Invention promotion services offered to be performed:

pre-development agreement (\$695.00) and New Product Sample Agreement " (\$14,222.00)

Explanation of complaint between customer and invention promoter:

My complaint is that Davison did fraud and they would not give me my money back until I found a lawyer in Pittsburgh and sued them. The arbitrator said:

The record in this case clearly demonstrates that Davison Design represented to Ms. Morris that having a working prototype of her invention was necessary for achieving commercial success; that Davison Design had the ability to assess the requirements for the prototype; to design and produce a fully operating prototype for her, and to provide her with that operating prototype, with supporting information...To be clear, a "virtual rendering" as provided to Ms. Morris is not an operating prototype, nor is a mockup of the product. The unit Davison Design sent to Ms. Morris was not a fully operating product, and the danger warning accompanying the unit is inconsistent with it being a fully operating sample that could be tested...Based upon the foregoing, I conclude that Davison Design materially misrepresented, directly and by implication, the product and sample development services she would receive from Davison Design. Any limitation on Davison Design's intended services were not disclosed to Ms. Morris and represent material omissions, all in violation of the AIPA §297.

In the end, I got double my money back and Davison had to pay my lawyer. But, Davison did fraud and they knew it. I should not have to hire a lawyer. I was lucky to find a lawyer

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

*Heidi Morris*

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

*3/13/23*

Burden Hour Statement: This collection of information is provided for by 35 U.S.C. § 297(d). The information regarding invention promoters will be released to the public. This form is estimated to take 15 minutes to complete. This time will vary depending upon the needs of the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you are required to complete this form should be sent to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Mail Stop Chief Information Officer, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS.