

NOTE: This order is nonprecedential.

United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

In Re STANLEY A. SANSONE,
Petitioner

2026-124

On Petition for Writ of Mandamus to the United States
Patent and Trademark Office in Nos. 16/255,511 and
17/490,525.

ON PETITION AND MOTION

Before DYK, REYNA, and HUGHES, *Circuit Judges*.

PER CURIAM.

O R D E R

Stanley A. Sansone petitions for a writ of mandamus related to the United States Patent and Trademark Office's ("PTO") handling of his patent applications: U.S. Patent Application Nos. 16/255,511 and 17/490,525. He also moves to proceed *in forma pauperis*.

A writ of mandamus is an extraordinary remedy and may only issue if a petitioner has shown a clear and indisputable right to relief and there are no other adequate means to attain the relief desired. *See Cheney v. U.S. Dist.*

Ct. for D.C., 542 U.S. 367, 380–81 (2004)). Mr. Sansone has not met this demanding standard.

As to U.S. Patent Application No. 16/255,511: Mr. Sansone has not shown entitlement to a writ regarding the PTO’s denial of his petition to withdraw its notice of abandonment, *see In re Makari*, 708 F.2d 709, 711 (1983) (“We do not have jurisdiction to review decisions” of the Director “on petitions”), or that he has no available alternative means to obtain relief on his challenge.¹

As to U.S. Patent Application No. 17/490,525: it appears the PTO, on October 21, 2025, issued a Notice Requiring Extension of Time Fee predicated on Mr. Sansone’s failure to file a timely reply to an October 3, 2025 Office Action, Appx 61–62. While he appears to contend that the examiner afforded his response an incorrect date of receipt, he has not shown inadequacy of the PTO’s process to accord a different filing date, *see* MPEP § 503.IV, or otherwise shown a clear and indisputable right to relief.

Accordingly,

IT IS ORDERED THAT:

(1) The petition is denied.

¹ We note Mr. Sansone’s pending appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia relating to the PTO’s consideration of the 16/255,511 application. *Sansone v. U.S. Pat. & Trademark Office*, 2025-2017.

IN RE SANSONE

3

(2) The motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* is granted.

FOR THE COURT



Jarrett B. Perlow
Clerk of Court

April 16, 2026
Date