

From: Michael Bradshaw

Sent: Friday, March 8, 2019 6:10 PM

To: Eligibility2020

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0054

I'm a professional software developer, and Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053 is a bad idea. It's bad for the people, and it's bad for businesses.

I urge the USPTO not to adopt the guidance on subject matter eligibility set forth in the Request for Comments, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053. Instead, the USPTO should provide guidance that ensures examiners apply the Supreme Court's Alice v. CLS Bank decision correctly.

The new guidance expands upon a small number of decisions finding patent claims eligible and ignores the far more numerous decisions in which courts have rejected claims as ineligible for patent protection. It distorts the law and will encourage examiners to grant invalid, abstract patents. Such patents wrongly claim basic ideas, increase litigation costs to no benefit, and harm the public interest.

The USPTO's role is not to narrow Supreme Court holdings, it is to apply them. Please abandon revisions to the Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance.

From: Don Coddling

Sent: Friday, March 8, 2019 4:27 PM

To: Eligibility2020

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0054

I urge the USPTO not to adopt the guidance on subject matter eligibility set forth in the Request for Comments, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053. Instead, the USPTO should provide guidance that ensures examiners apply the Supreme Court's Alice v. CLS Bank decision correctly.

The new guidance expands upon a small number of decisions finding patent claims eligible and ignores the far more numerous decisions in which courts have rejected claims as ineligible for patent protection. It distorts the law and will encourage examiners to grant invalid, abstract patents. Such patents wrongly claim basic ideas, increase litigation costs to no benefit, and harm the public interest.

The USPTO's role is not to narrow Supreme Court holdings, it is to apply them. Please abandon revisions to the Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance.

From: Dennis Cooper

Sent: Friday, March 8, 2019 7:08 PM

To: Eligibility2020

Subject: Say no to software patents

I urge the USPTO not to adopt the guidance on subject matter eligibility set forth in the Request for Comments, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053.

As a US citizen who is a software developer, I find that software patents create jails that greatly harm innovation. Software development is largely a collaborative exercise; patents make no sense for it.

I know you guys are crooks, and will ultimately do what the lobbyists paid you for. You're stifling the progression of the human race to benefit a few rich individuals. Shame on you.

From: Paul R. DeStefano

Sent: Friday, March 8, 2019 4:08 PM

To: Eligibility2020

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0054

I urge the USPTO not to adopt the guidance on subject matter eligibility set forth in the Request for Comments, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053.

Instead, the USPTO should provide guidance that ensures examiners apply the Supreme Court's Alice v. CLS Bank decision correctly.

The new guidance expands upon a small number of decisions finding patent claims eligible and ignores the far more numerous decisions in which courts have rejected claims as ineligible for patent protection. It distorts the law and will encourage examiners to grant invalid, abstract patents. Such patents wrongly claim basic ideas, increase litigation costs to no benefit, and harm the public interest.

The USPTO's role is not to narrow Supreme Court holdings, it is to apply them. Please abandon revisions to the Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance.

--

Paul R. DeStefano

From: John Eikenberry

Sent: Friday, March 8, 2019 4:25 PM

To: Eligibility2020

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0054

Software is already protected by Copyright, like all other writing, and does not need additional protection of the underlying ideas any more than works of fiction need patent protection for their plots. It is no different.

I urge the USPTO not to adopt the guidance on subject matter eligibility set forth in the Request for Comments, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053. Instead, the USPTO should provide guidance that ensures examiners apply the Supreme Court's Alice v. CLS Bank decision correctly.

The new guidance expands upon a small number of decisions finding patent claims eligible and ignores the far more numerous decisions in which courts have rejected claims as ineligible for patent protection. It distorts the law and will encourage examiners to grant invalid, abstract patents. Such patents wrongly claim basic ideas, increase litigation costs to no benefit, and harm the public interest.

The USPTO's role is not to narrow Supreme Court holdings, it is to apply them.

Please abandon revisions to the Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance.

--

John Eikenberry

[email address redacted]

Perfection is attained, not when no more can be added, but when no more can be removed. -- Antoine de Saint-Exupery

From: Brian Hamlin

Sent: Friday, March 8, 2019 5:02 PM

To: Eligibility2020

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0054

Hi - as a practicing software developer, I find US Software Patents often reach too far, failing common sense tests, and work against innovation more than support it.. via the EFF online campaign:

quote-

I urge the USPTO not to adopt the guidance on subject matter eligibility set forth in the Request for Comments, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053. Instead, the USPTO should provide guidance that ensures examiners apply the Supreme Court's Alice v. CLS Bank decision correctly.

The new guidance expands upon a small number of decisions finding patent claims eligible and ignores the far more numerous decisions in which courts have rejected claims as ineligible for patent protection. It distorts the law and will encourage examiners to grant invalid, abstract patents. Such patents wrongly claim basic ideas, increase litigation costs to no benefit, and harm the public interest.

The USPTO's role is not to narrow Supreme Court holdings, it is to apply them. Please abandon revisions to the Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance.

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0054

I urge the USPTO not to adopt the guidance on subject matter eligibility set forth in the Request for Comments, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053. Instead, the USPTO should provide guidance that ensures examiners apply the Supreme Court's Alice v. CLS Bank decision correctly.

The new guidance expands upon a small number of decisions finding patent claims eligible and ignores the far more numerous decisions in which courts have rejected claims as ineligible for patent protection. It distorts the law and will encourage examiners to grant invalid, abstract patents. Such patents wrongly claim basic ideas, increase litigation costs to no benefit, and harm the public interest.

The USPTO's role is not to narrow Supreme Court holdings, it is to apply them. Please abandon revisions to the Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance.

From: Adam M. Jacques

Sent: Friday, March 8, 2019 4:00 PM

To: Eligibility2020

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0054

I am a software engineer working in the industry in the United States and strongly disagree with the fact that software patents should be permitted.

I urge the USPTO not to adopt the guidance on subject matter eligibility set forth in the Request for Comments, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053. Instead, the USPTO should provide guidance that ensures examiners apply the Supreme Court's Alice v. CLS Bank decision correctly.

The new guidance expands upon a small number of decisions finding patent claims eligible and ignores the far more numerous decisions in which courts have rejected claims as ineligible for patent protection. It distorts the law and will encourage examiners to grant invalid, abstract patents. Such patents wrongly claim basic ideas, increase litigation costs to no benefit, and harm the public interest.

The USPTO's role is not to narrow Supreme Court holdings, it is to apply them. Please abandon revisions to the Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance.

From: ben Knox

Sent: Monday, February 25, 2019 11:23 AM

To: Eligibility2020

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0054

Regards;

I personally urge the USPTO not to adopt the guidance on subject matter eligibility set forth in the Request for Comments, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053. Instead, the USPTO should provide guidance that ensures examiners apply the Supreme Court's Alice v. CLS Bank decision correctly.

- The new guidance expands upon a small number of decisions finding patent claims eligible and ignores the far more numerous decisions in which courts have rejected claims as ineligible for patent protection.
- It distorts the law and will encourage examiners to grant invalid, abstract patents. Such patents wrongly claim basic ideas, increase litigation costs to no benefit, and harm the public interest.

The USPTO's role is not to narrow Supreme Court holdings, it is to apply them. Kindly abandon revisions to the Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance to accomplish your mandate to support and protect both the economy and citizens of the United States of America.

Sincerely,

Benjamin Knox

KnoxSRH LLC

From: David McFarland

Sent: Friday, March 8, 2019 9:21 PM

To: Eligibility2020

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0054

To Whom It May Concern,

I urge the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office not to adopt the guidance on subject matter eligibility set forth in the Request for Comments, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053. It intends to revise the USPTO examination procedure with respect to the first step of the Alice/Mayo test by '(1) Providing groupings of subject matter that is considered an abstract idea; and (2) clarifying that a claim is not "directed to" a judicial exception if the judicial exception is integrated into a practical application of that exception.'

(1) makes the claim that it is possible to create an enumerated list of groupings of subject matter that is considered an abstract idea. If the concept of the natural numbers is to be taken as an example of such an abstract idea and that the concept of natural numbers requires that it is only countable and not finite, then how can such an abstract idea be enumerated into a finite list of groupings of subject matter? If it is claimed that the concept of calculating is a (a) "mathematical concept", then does that mean that calculating is not a (c) mental process - concepts performed in the human mind or a (b) method of organizing human activity? Or does calculating fall into all three categories (a), (b), and (c)? If so, should that be its own category? Should each combinations of (a), (b), and (c) be a category? What about the (sub?)categories listed after the "-" for each category in the federal register that may be more appropriate to categorize an abstract idea compared to some other (sub)category?

(2) makes the claim that patent claims that are abstract ideas, which are a judicial exception, do not have practical applications in and of themselves. How is this justifiable if the proposed principles themselves are infinite as they include mathematical concepts?

Furthermore, if all abstract ideas do not have practical applications, then as proposed any mathematics, mental processes, and methods of organizing human activity have no practical applications. So, (2) will never be able to applied given no abstract idea has a practical application and furthermore would have no reason to be included in the USPTO examination procedure.

The new guidance expands upon a small number of decisions finding patent claims eligible and ignores the far more numerous decisions in which courts have rejected claims as ineligible for patent protection. It distorts the law and will encourage examiners to grant invalid and inconsistent patents. Such patents wrongly claim basic ideas, increase litigation costs to no benefit, and harm the public interest.

The USPTO's role is not to narrow Supreme Court holdings, it is to apply them. Please abandon revisions to the Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance.

From: Jayden Milne

Sent: Friday, March 8, 2019 5:32 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0054

As a software engineer, I urge the USPTO not to adopt the guidance on subject matter eligibility set forth in the Request for Comments, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053. Instead, the USPTO should provide guidance that ensures examiners apply the Supreme Court's Alice v. CLS Bank decision correctly. Software patents slow innovation for provide a way for large corporations to bully competitors out of business. Writing software is not inventing - it is manufacturing.

The new guidance expands upon a small number of decisions finding patent claims eligible and ignores the far more numerous decisions in which courts have rejected claims as ineligible for patent protection. It distorts the law and will encourage examiners to grant invalid, abstract patents. Such patents wrongly claim basic ideas, increase litigation costs to no benefit, and harm the public interest.

The USPTO's role is not to narrow Supreme Court holdings, it is to apply them. Please abandon revisions to the Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance.

From: Alex Sullivan

Sent: Friday, March 8, 2019 4:18 PM

To: Eligibility2020

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0054

I urge the USPTO not to adopt the guidance on subject matter eligibility set forth in the Request for Comments, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053. Instead, the USPTO should provide guidance that ensures examiners apply the Supreme Court's Alice v. CLS Bank decision correctly.

The new guidance expands upon a small number of decisions finding patent claims eligible and ignores the far more numerous decisions in which courts have rejected claims as ineligible for patent protection. It distorts the law and will encourage examiners to grant invalid, abstract patents. Such patents wrongly claim basic ideas, increase litigation costs to no benefit, and harm the public interest.

The USPTO's role is not to narrow Supreme Court holdings, it is to apply them. Please abandon revisions to the Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance.

From: Henry Tian

Sent: Friday, March 8, 2019 4:29 PM

To: Eligibility2020

Subject: Please reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0054

Dear USPTO representative,

I urge the USPTO not to adopt the guidance on subject matter eligibility set forth in the Request for Comments, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053.

Instead, the USPTO should provide guidance that ensures examiners apply the Supreme Court's Alice v. CLS Bank decision correctly.

The new guidance expands upon a small number of decisions finding patent claims eligible and ignores the far more numerous decisions in which courts have rejected claims as ineligible for patent protection. It distorts the law and will encourage examiners to grant invalid, abstract patents. Such patents wrongly claim basic ideas, increase litigation costs to no benefit, and harm the public interest.

The USPTO's role is not to narrow Supreme Court holdings, it is to apply them. Please abandon revisions to the Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance.

Regards,

Henry Tian

From: Andrew Wilcox

Sent: Friday, March 8, 2019 5:24 PM

To: Eligibility2020

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0054

I urge the USPTO not to adopt the guidance on subject matter eligibility set forth in the Request for Comments, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053. Instead, the USPTO should provide guidance that ensures examiners apply the Supreme Court's Alice v. CLS Bank decision correctly.

The new guidance expands upon a small number of decisions finding patent claims eligible and ignores the far more numerous decisions in which courts have rejected claims as ineligible for patent protection. It distorts the law and will encourage examiners to grant invalid, abstract patents. Such patents wrongly claim basic ideas, increase litigation costs to no benefit, and harm the public interest.

The USPTO's role is not to narrow Supreme Court holdings, it is to apply them. Please abandon revisions to the Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance.

Thank you,

Andrew Wilcox