

# PUBLIC SUBMISSION

<b>As of:</b> 1/14/21 4:44 PM
<b>Received:</b> January 07, 2021
<b>Status:</b> Pending_Post
<b>Tracking No.</b> 1k5-9l34-h0y3
<b>Comments Due:</b> January 07, 2021
<b>Submission Type:</b> API

**Docket:** PTO-P-2020-0042  
Proposed Continuing Legal Education Guideline

**Comment On:** PTO-P-2020-0042-0001  
Proposed Continuing Legal Education Guidelines

**Document:** PTO-P-2020-0042-DRAFT-0009  
Comment on FR Doc # 2020-22420

---

## Submitter Information

**Name:** Matthew Prater  
**Address:**  
5710 SPRING RIVER LN  
FULSHEAR, TX, 77441-2051  
**Email:** pratspam@mac.com  
**Phone:** 6512466457  
**Organization:** n/a

---

## General Comment

As a registered patent attorney tasked with purchasing patent prosecution services I have an opportunity to measure the quality of services rendered from different providers across the country. I find some difference in the quality of services rendered by counsel admitted only in states with no CLE requirement, versus that of attorneys in states with more stern requirements. Thus, I am of the opinion that heightened CLE requirements help foster a culture of quality.

Accordingly, I view this proposal as a set of positive changes that can improve the public's view of patenting, and the quality of the work done by the apparatus they have built.

The USPTO's bar is treasure to be protected, and I support this proposal as a sound and reasonable effort to increase quality.

Reg 61,891