

From: . Debbi

Sent: Friday, March 1, 2019 11:00 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Gary AOL

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 11:28 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: . Rob

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 3:50 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Rob

Libertyville, IL

60048

From: aimee

Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2019 9:22 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: arni

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 3:01 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Brian

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:47 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Brian

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 9:14 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Thanks,

Brian

From: Brian

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 1:29 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: chezza

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:03 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Chuck

Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 3:52 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: craig @ excel4x

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 11:17 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

-----Original Message-----

From: Dale

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 9:08 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Dan

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:45 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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

Dan

From: David

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 6:48 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: David

Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 12:12 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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,

David

From: Dennis

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 7:24 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: ED

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:37 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: eff. lionel

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 4:27 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Fig

Sent: Monday, February 25, 2019 7:33 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Cc: figinybor

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Gage

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 4:55 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: garytbyrd

Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2019 12:27 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: H

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:58 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Harlequin

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:28 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: hessian13

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 3:47 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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

From: Horton

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:31 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Hugo

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 9:01 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: isauri@goat.si

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 5:02 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: John

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 4:12 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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

From: Jonathan

Sent: Friday, March 1, 2019 3:14 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: junkmail

Sent: Friday, March 1, 2019 5:16 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: keith

Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 12:36 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Kira

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 9:45 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

-Kira

From: koll@externet.hu

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:31 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: kontakt

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:09 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: ltrsfrombrad

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 3:03 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: mark

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:28 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Mark

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:35 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: marvinroman

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 3:24 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Mattia

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 10:46 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Mattias

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 1:44 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: MCMANUSLOSANGELES

Sent: Sunday, February 24, 2019 12:07 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: meath8636

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 3:27 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: mentesseg

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 12:29 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Merry

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 7:30 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: minecraft3388

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:53 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: mopowah

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 7:39 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: n1f6h

Sent: Sunday, March 3, 2019 3:40 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: outlook_4E6E50AC9CC976CA

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 4:43 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Paúl

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 4:07 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Paul

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 3:50 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: pedoseal

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 9:25 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: prrnbsn

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 8:54 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Rail

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 5:38 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Randall

Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 6:56 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

I implore 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.

From: Ray

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:46 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Rob

Sent: Tuesday, February 19, 2019 9:19 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: robertlearle

Sent: Monday, February 25, 2019 4:11 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Robin

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 11:35 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Ron

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:15 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: sabastet

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 5:54 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: scerdy3

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 5:03 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Scot

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 8:03 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Sincerely,

Albuquerque, NM

-----Original Message-----

From: Scott

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 12:01 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

--

If there is no struggle there is no progress. Those who profess to favor freedom and yet depreciate agitation...want crops without plowing up the ground, they want rain without thunder and lightning. They want the ocean without the awful roar of its many waters.... Power concedes nothing without a demand. -Frederick Douglass, 1857

From: Sister Sue

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:48 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Snj Jr

Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2019 4:31 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: standup4freedom

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 3:01 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Sue

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 5:39 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: thepccat

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 3:43 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P- 2018-0053

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: thepccat

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 3:39 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P- 2018-0053

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: Trevor

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 4:37 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Vern

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:34 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: w3irdo13

Sent: Monday, February 25, 2019 12:26 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: will

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 8:05 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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, post haste!

Kind regards,

~w

40204

From: William

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:45 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: wyomason-IMAP

Sent: Sunday, February 24, 2019 11:17 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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 as bases for the patent, 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: kiriup

Sent: Tuesday, March 5, 2019 5:19 AM

To: Eligibility2019@USPTO.GOV

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Lizzy

Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 8:33 PM

To: Eligibility2019@USPTO.GOV

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: llevey 54

Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 8:19 PM

To: Eligibility2019@USPTO.GOV

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: mtomec

Sent: Monday, March 4, 2019 12:43 PM

To: Eligibility2019@USPTO.GOV

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Outlook Team

Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 5:56 PM

To: Eligibility2019@USPTO.GOV

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: pmc

Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 6:38 PM

To: Eligibility2019@USPTO.GOV

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Get to work, and uphold the law.

From: Rob

Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 10:17 PM

To: Eligibility2019@USPTO.GOV

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: trespassers

Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 6:53 PM

To: Eligibility2019@USPTO.GOV

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: 99Chemicals

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 3:34 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Kevin Faccenda

From: Eka A.

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 7:12 PM

To: Eligibility2019@USPTO.GOV

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Scott Abbott

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 9:08 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Alexandre Hannud Abdo

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:44 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

Ni!

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: bret abel

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 6:20 PM

To: Eligibility2019@USPTO.GOV

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

I strongly 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. If implemented, this guidance 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 the proposed revisions to the Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance.

From: Susan Abell

Sent: Friday, March 1, 2019 9:33 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Ezekiel Aborishade

Sent: Friday, March 1, 2019 3:08 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Markus Adam

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 9:40 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Ari Adams

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 2:37 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Adams, Wayne B

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 12:59 PM

To: Eligibility2019@USPTO.GOV

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Shooters Admin

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 6:28 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Murray...

From: aleth aeon

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 9:42 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Matthew Agen

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:15 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Anthony Agtuca

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:43 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: norm ahlquist

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:48 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Carver Akiteru Oblander

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 4:52 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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 for your consideration.

From: Peter Allan

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 5:55 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

It's been a refreshing few years since Alice, not to encounter a regular stream of outrageous abuse cases. Let's not go back to that!

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: bredt allen

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 4:10 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Bredt Allen

From: James Allen

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 6:25 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Todd Allis

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:15 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Todd Allis

San Jose CA

From: Dan Allison

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:18 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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,

Dan Allison

From: Per Almgren

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 5:04 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Per Almgren

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 5:05 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Joanne Alonso Byars

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:10 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Jeff Altaffer

Sent: Sunday, February 24, 2019 7:13 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Jill Alters

Sent: Monday, February 18, 2019 8:43 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Jill Alters

From: Justin alvey

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 7:56 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

The United States needs a patent system that encourages innovation rather than protecting the interests of big rightsholders. For this reason, 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: Brent Ames

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 8:09 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: do an

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 2:08 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTOâ€™Pâ€™2018â€™0053

I urge the USPTO not to adopt the guidance on subject matter eligibility set forth in the Request for Comments, Docket No. PTOâ€™Pâ€™2018â€™0053. Instead, the USPTO should provide guidance that ensures examiners apply the Supreme Courtâ€™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 USPTOâ€™s role is not to narrow Supreme Court holdings, it is to apply them. Please abandon revisions to the Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance.

dogan ozkan

99701, alaska

u.s.a.

From: jean-paul anceaux

Sent: Monday, March 4, 2019 3:18 AM

To: Eligibility2019@USPTO.GOV

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: anderson

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 3:36 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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,

David J. Anderson

From: Gregory Anderson

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 8:10 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Jake Anderson

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:52 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Software patents that are not defined carefully harm small businesses and limit the ability for American companies to innovate and compete.

From: James Anderson

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:34 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Brian Anderton

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:12 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

I strongly 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.

Brian Anderton

From: Aleksandar Andevski

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 3:24 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: ????? ???????

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 3:09 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: -- ...-- -.-. .. -.-

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 4:31 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: CHRISTIAN ANTALICS

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:59 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

To Whom It May Concern:

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.

Best Regards,

Christian Antalics

Eagle Pass, Texas

From: Steve Antonoff

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:07 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: John Armstrong

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:17 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

We don't need more patent trolls and roadblocks for emerging businesses.

Thank you,

John Armstrong

From: X Arneson

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:03 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Grace Asikainen

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:23 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: James Austin

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 12:00 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Benjamin Austin

Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 4:59 PM

To: Eligibility2019@USPTO.GOV

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: tja

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 8:23 AM

To: Eligibility2019@USPTO.GOV

Subject: Adopt the guidance on subject matter eligibility set forth in the Request for Comments, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053.

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.

Giant corporations are destroying independent innovation and inventors.

Teresa Avatarici

Teresa J. Avatarici

President, TLCS Innovation Services

Think globally, act locally. Service is #1

Technology as a Tool

From: avrame

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:21 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Elijah Aydnwylde

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:14 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

-Elijah Aydnwylde

From: Pedro Azevedo

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:45 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Bob B

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:19 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

To: eligibility2019@uspto.gov

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Tm B

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:32 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Becky Bacheller

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 4:38 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

-----Original Message-----

From: Chris Bacon

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:13 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Chris Bacon

From: Jürgen Bader

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 4:29 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

To whom it may concern

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.

Best regards

Juergen Bader

From: Dave Badia

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 5:52 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

David Badia

From: David Bagby

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:27 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Alice was a good decision and limited the spread of bad patents which never should have been issued. Adding a "with a computer" to another idea does not and should not make something patent-able. Rather, it demonstrates that the combination idea should not be patent-able since it squarely falls into the "it is obvious" category - an obvious to a lay person, not just to one skilled in the art.

David Bagby

President

Calypso Ventures, Inc.

From: Andrew C. Bairnsfather

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:22 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

Dear US Patent Office,

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.

Respectfully,

Andrew C. Bairnsfather

P.S. The Electronic Frontier Foundation is correct on many points, including this.

Horrible companies and people are grossly abusing the patent system and it has stunted growth, at least. More than a few software vendors were threatened with some bogus claim about another company "inventing" the ability to buy something within a mobile phone app. Ridiculous. Other examples abound at the EFF.org website.

From: Greg Baker

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:09 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Please reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

I am writing to 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,

Greg Baker

From: Joey Baker

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:52 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

To whom it may concern:

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,

-Joey Baker

From: Charles Baldwin

Sent: Thursday, February 14, 2019 7:15 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: David L Ballenger

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 1:36 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

- David L Ballenger

From: Yellowstone Ballet

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 12:32 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Piotr Bandyk

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 7:26 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Respectfully,

Piotr Bandyk

From: Ariel Banks

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:30 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: jim barber

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:10 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Cc: jim barber

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Sincerely,

James S. Barber

From: Chris Bare

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:49 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

I urge the USPTO reject 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: Steve Bargelt

Sent: Sunday, March 3, 2019 7:37 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Steven Barnes

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:27 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Sincerely,

Steven A. Barnes

From: N Barnett

Sent: Saturday, March 2, 2019 8:56 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Debra Barnhardt

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 11:25 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Joshua Barnhill

Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 5:04 PM

To: Eligibility2019@USPTO.GOV

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Richard Barons

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 9:15 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Sincerely,

Richard Barons

From: Jon Barrilleaux

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:09 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Dan Basso

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:48 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

As the CEO of a successful software company that I started 38 years ago, I have been directly impacted by patent trolls. Technology that we developed and implemented in the 1980's was patented by a troll in 2002. We were threatened with a lawsuit if we did not pay "royalties". We refused. We are still unaware of the next step the pariahs might take. The "company" that secured the patent is composed of lawyers who have developed nothing except some pretty graphics and descriptions of our implemented technology. It is wrong and threatens the continued opportunity for entrepreneurs to develop innovative technology. Most upstart software development companies are not capitalized sufficiently to withstand a legal challenge. Software Patents should not be granted unless there is a demonstrated operational system and the software is in commercial use.

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.

Sincerely,

Danny R Basso

CEO Systemware, Inc.

From: Malcolm Bastron

Sent: Sunday, February 24, 2019 9:13 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

--

Malcolm Bastron

demlt01@charter.net

From: Angel Bateman

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 4:49 AM

To: Eligibility2019@USPTO.GOV

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Joe Bates

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:04 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: John Bates

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:44 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Sincerely,

John Bates

From: Robin Bates-Pualuan

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:52 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Alan Beatty

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 4:56 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Sincerely,

Alan Beatty

Concerned Citizen

From: Andrew Beatty

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 2:15 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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 for your attention,

From: Bill & Michelle Becker

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:02 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Please reject the new guidelines on subject matter eligibility - Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

USPTO,

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

The new guidance ignores the 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.

William H. Becker

Lancaster, PA

From: Brady

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 8:53 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Bradley Becker

Salida, Colorado

From: Andrew B

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 1:29 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Andrew J. Beeler, Jr

From: Marilyn Beidler

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:53 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Amanda Bennett

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:52 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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,

Amanda Bennett

Austin, Texas

From: Barry Bennett

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:13 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: T Bergeron

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:56 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Margaret Bergsrud

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:49 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Martin Berka

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:44 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: In opposition of new subject matter eligibility guidelines (Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053)

Greetings,

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

The new guidance expands upon a few decisions finding patent claims eligible and ignores the great majority of decisions in which courts have rejected claims as ineligible. It distorts the law and 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 should stand by Alice instead of further cluttering the patent space with useless generalities. Please abandon revisions to the Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance.

Sincerely,

Martin Berka

Technical Lead, Unico Power Corporation

503-927-9479

From: Mark Bernard

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:26 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO–P–2018–0053

Hello,

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,

Mark Bernard

49 Fischer Ave

Kingston, NY 12401

From: Ed Bettinardi

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:25 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Ed Bettinardi, small business patent holder

From: Wayne BEVERLY

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 7:37 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: V Rao Bhamidipati

Sent: Friday, March 1, 2019 1:50 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Damian Biagi

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:49 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

To Whom it May Concern:

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,

Damian Biagi

Pelham, MA

From: Lyle Bickley

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 6:17 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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,

Lyle Bickley

--

73 NM6Y

Bickley Consulting West Inc.

Black holes are where God is dividing by zero

From: Dan Bidwa

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:31 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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 in the Request 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, impede business and innovation, 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: randy billington

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 7:28 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Ken Biondi

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 12:12 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Sincerely,

Ken Biondi

From: Roger.Blair

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:53 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: John Blakeman

Sent: Sunday, February 24, 2019 3:57 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Sincerely,

John Blakeman

From: Michael Blanc

Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 2:45 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: hvblanchard hvblanchard

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 9:17 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

Dear US Patent Office,

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.

Very Sincerely,

Hugh Blanchard

Yorktown, VA

From: Joe Blankenship

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 4:45 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

Hello!

As a researcher and small business entrepreneur, I agree with the below sentiment:

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.

Respectfully,

Joe Blankenship

Lead Data Scientist - CGRII

From: William Blasko

Sent: Monday, February 25, 2019 7:24 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Sam Bleckley

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 12:13 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

--

Sam Bleckley

MI 49548

From: Charles Bloch

Sent: Monday, February 18, 2019 9:57 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Charles Bloch

Sent: Saturday, March 2, 2019 2:25 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Dan Bloch

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:06 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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,

Dan

Dan Bloch

Mountain View, CA

From: Harlan Bloom

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:24 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Gregory Blum

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:40 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

To whom it may concern,

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.

Sincerely,

Gregory

.....

Gregory Blum

68 Mangels Ave

San Francisco, CA

94131

From: Michael Blum

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 3:11 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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. Your rules must make it easier for a member of the public to easily and inexpensively challenge the validity of a patent that has been issued. Patent trolls are a drain to our economy and the government must assist that growth and not allow parasites to profit on the investment and labor of others.

Please abandon revisions to the Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. Please govern yourselves accordingly.

Yours truly,

Michael Blum

From: Cameron Blume

Sent: Sunday, March 3, 2019 1:21 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Michael Boer

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:25 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Michael Boer

9504 Ravenna Ave NE

Seattle WA

From: Aleksander Bogacz

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:21 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Chad Bohlmann

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 9:18 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Sincerely,

Chad

From: Christopher Bolduc

Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 7:48 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Mariana Bondila

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:01 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Philippe Borgia

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:34 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Paul Stephen Borile

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 2:47 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Anonymous Bosch

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:14 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Sincerely,

Claudio Salazar

From: Mark Bosky

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:08 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: STOP ALLOWING GARBAGE PATENTS. SYSTEM IS BROKEN. Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Marla Bottesch

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 5:53 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Andrew Bourdon

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:43 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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,

Andrew Bourdon

From: Joe Bourguignon

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:29 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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,

-joe

From: Randy Bowie

Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2019 1:28 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Giles Bowkett

Sent: Sunday, March 3, 2019 11:11 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

--

Giles Bowkett

From: Tobias Boyd

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:55 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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,

-T.

Tobias Boyd

130 NE 72nd Ave

Portland OR 97213

15037019827

From: Tom Boyd

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:37 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: M Boyer

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:48 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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

From: Jonathan Boyne

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 6:55 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Dan Brackett

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 7:00 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

I strongly 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.

Dan Brackett <cellular electronic mail>

From: Harold Breeden

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 7:14 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Mike Breen

Sent: Monday, March 4, 2019 2:27 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Joe Breighner

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:09 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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 Bressler

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:19 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Robin Bressler

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:19 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Robert Brewster

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:33 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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,

Robert Brewster

From: Jonathan Brier

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 4:38 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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,

Jonathan Brier

PhD Student

University of Maryland College of Information Studies

From: Steven Briggs

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:43 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Steven Briggs

Weaverville, NC 28787

From: Wesley Brilhante

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:54 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: dante briones

Sent: Monday, February 25, 2019 10:28 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

--

Dante Briones

dbriones@gmail.com

415 283 5462

From: Vivian Broadhead

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:17 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Edd Bromiel

Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 9:28 PM

To: Eligibility2019@USPTO.GOV

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Charlie Brooks

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:43 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

Dear Sir or Madam:

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.

Sincerely,

Charles L. Brooks

From: Duncan Brown

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:27 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Eric Brown

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:05 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Sincerely,

Eric N. Brown

From: G.L. Brown

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:51 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

Importance: High

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: Gregory Brown

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:10 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Lewis Brown

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 12:29 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

I strongly 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.

Most sincerely,

Lewis Brown

From: Marty Brown

Sent: Sunday, February 24, 2019 10:09 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Matt Brown

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 3:41 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

-matt

From: Robert Brown

Sent: Saturday, March 2, 2019 3:21 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Sanford Brown

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:23 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

Importance: High

The USPTO must not 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.

Sincerely,

Sanford Brown

Covington, GA

From: shailar brown

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:48 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Carl Brown

Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 5:05 PM

To: Eligibility2019@USPTO.GOV

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Richard Brown

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 6:47 PM

To: Eligibility2019@USPTO.GOV

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

Hi,

I'm writing to you as an independent small business involved in software development. The proposed actions are harmful to actual software innovators. The patent office is not an employment program for IP lawyers to litigate junk patents, nor is it part of its mission to enable non-value-creating "business models" like patent trolling.

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,

Richard Brown

From: Walter W Brown

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 6:19 PM

To: Eligibility2019@USPTO.GOV

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Al Browne Jr

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:49 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

Dear Sir/Madam,

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.

From: Chalmers Browne

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 4:51 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Theo Browne

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 4:53 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

I'm a software engineer that grew up in a farming neighborhood in Plymouth, Massachusetts. I worked hard, built awesome things, and eventually found my way to San Francisco pursuing my dreams in technology. The technologies that helped me get here were built in an era before patent trolls, and if we aren't careful, these trolls might prevent young engineers like myself from finding success.

The following is a letter penned by the EFF that puts my feelings on this matter better than I ever could.

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 for taking the time to read this.

-Theo

From: Marshall Browning

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 5:46 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Mercedes Brugh

Sent: Sunday, February 24, 2019 8:22 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

Dear Sir or Madam,

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.

Mercedes Brugh

Logansport, IN

From: Simon Bruins

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 7:07 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

Dear Sir/Madam,

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.

Best regards,

Simon Bruins

From: Perry F. Bruns

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:22 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Jim Brunton

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:21 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Scott Buchner

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:22 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Peter Buck

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 6:23 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Nancy Buckholt

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:53 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Darrell Budic

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 6:14 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Phil Budne

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:11 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Philip Budne

35 Central St

Arlington MA

2476

From: Michael Buhrley

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 4:04 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

As a small business owner that has seen the effects of patents which wrongly claimed basic ideas 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.

Michael Buhrley

ADVENT | COMPANIES

From: Chuck Burgess

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 9:34 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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 Burke

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 8:24 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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 for the consideration,

Adam Burke

Aurora, IL

From: Jane Burn

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:58 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Jane Burn

11220

From: Steve Burrows

Sent: Sunday, February 24, 2019 7:01 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: John Busco

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:52 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Respectfully,

John Busco

San Jose, CA 95126-1558

From: David Busey

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 4:19 PM

To: Eligibility2019; David Busey

Subject: Protect "Alice v. CLS Bank" regarding Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

Although this language has been written by another person, I have read it carefully. I agree with every sentence. Please accept this as my own opinion.

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,

Dave Busey

Zipcode: 17529

From: Lisa Bynum

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:42 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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,

Lisa Bynum

From: Mike Byrnes

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:47 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

Hello -

I support the Alice v. CLS Supreme Court decision and 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.

Mike Byrnes

--

Michael Byrnes

603.400.8269

about.me/byrnes

From: Lonnie Byrnside

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 2:37 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Bytez

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 6:56 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: John C

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 7:12 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Josef Cacek

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 4:24 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Best Regards,

-- Josef Cacek

c.p. 512, 664 23 Cebin, Czech Republic

From: John Callas

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 10:06 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: bcamero

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:28 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Sincerely

Ms. Beth Camero

5626 Arlyn Way

Fair Oaks, CA 95628

From: Evan Cameron

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 2:50 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Dudley and Candace Campbell

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:20 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

We 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.

Sincerely,

Dudley and Candace Campbell

From: Nathan Campbell

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:14 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Sincerely,

Nathan Campbell

From: stewart

Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 12:24 AM

To: Eligibility2019@USPTO.GOV

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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

Stewart Campbell

Mobile: +61 414 292 398

Email: stewartcampbell@nebtrex.com

From: Daniel M. Capella

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 5:32 AM

To: Eligibility2019@USPTO.GOV

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Neal Cardwell

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 7:57 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Please reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: John Caris

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:08 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Steve Carlson

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:17 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: dcc

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:16 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

Importance: High

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 for your earnest attention.

D. Carr

From: Txus Carrera

Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2019 1:21 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Bob Carter

Sent: Monday, February 25, 2019 11:39 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Sincerely, Bob Carter

7017 Mission Road

Everson, WA 98247

From: Jim Caruso

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:50 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Many thanks,

James W. (Jim) Caruso

CEO

M1PR, Inc.

415 State St

Roswell, GA 30075

From: Daniel Casner

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:43 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Sincerely,

Daniel Casner

From: Federico Ariel Castagnini

Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 5:56 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Matthew Castillon

Sent: Sunday, February 17, 2019 1:24 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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,

Matthew Castillon

From: Deborah Cate

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 8:02 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Deborah Cate

From: Franchita Cattani

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:44 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Ramazan Cav

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:28 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Gene Cavanaugh

Sent: Saturday, March 2, 2019 11:53 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Ron Cemer

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:58 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Ronald Cemer

From: Katie Challenger

Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2019 11:06 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Matthew Cherkasky

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 7:16 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Kindly,

Matthew Cherkasky

From: James H Chesky

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 9:45 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

--

James Chesky [email redacted] Vancouver, WA

From: Kyle Chessman

Sent: Friday, March 1, 2019 8:37 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Gerald Cheves

Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2019 4:49 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

--

siamo arrivati sani e salvi

From: Steve Chew

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 5:29 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Patents are important, but are being abused.

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,

Steve Chew

From: John Chin

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 7:33 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

Hi,

Abstract software patents hurt inventors of every type. 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 for your time,

John Chin

From: Patrick China

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:34 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Bridget Chisholm

Sent: Sunday, February 24, 2019 10:15 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Jane Christensen

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 8:35 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Jane Christensen

From: Bruce Christopher

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 3:35 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Yours truly,

Bruce Christopher

From: Kostas Chrysikos

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 4:14 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Sc Chu

Sent: Sunday, February 17, 2019 2:49 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Alex Chudzik

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:21 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Matt Ciampaglia

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:08 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

-matt Ciampaglia

Leominster, MA 01453

From: Mckenna Cisler

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 6:36 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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, adversely affect smaller innovators, 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.

Sincerely,

Mckenna Cisler

From: Cormac Clancy

Sent: Sunday, March 3, 2019 1:03 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: conrad clark

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 2:46 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: G C

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:29 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Sincerely,

Gregg Clark

From: Kenneth Clark

Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 11:00 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Matt Clark

Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 3:31 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: claycocke

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 6:34 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Chris

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:32 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Best,

Chris Cleary

From: Joseph Cleeton

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:56 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Michael Clement

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 3:23 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Michael Clement

From: Benjamin Cline

Sent: Sunday, March 3, 2019 11:31 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Steve Cline

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 9:19 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Thanks, Steve Cline, software developer

From: Nathan Clonts

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:28 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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,

Nathan Clonts

From: Robert Clyne

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:55 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Robert Clyne

130 First St.

Yale, MI 48097

clyne@mich.com

810-387-3101

rom: Bcochran3

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 1:19 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:25 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Jonathan Collins

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 3:37 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Thanks,

Jonathan

From: Curtis Colly

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 5:39 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Fred Condo

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 4:29 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

Patents are constitutionally required to "promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts" but overly broad, inadequately examined patents have subverted the Constitution's purpose, especially in the areas of information technology and software. For that reason:

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.

--

Fred Condo, Ph.D., Chief Engineer at Quinn Interactive, Inc. (affiliation for ID only) <https://quinn.com> & <https://quinnlabs.com>

From: Richard Cone

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 10:32 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Respectfully, Richard Cone

From: Ian Conery

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:13 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: David Connell

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:25 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Claire Connelly

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 12:26 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Joe Cook

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:48 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Joe Cook

Cook's Computer and Software Service

cookspc@pine-net.com

From: Public

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 4:20 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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 for your time,

Dee Cooke

Durango, CO 81303

From: Dan Cooney

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:58 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

yours,

Dan Cooney

From: C. Ivan Cooper

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:16 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

C. Ivan Cooper

From: William Cooper

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 9:47 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Peter Coro

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 5:23 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Steve Corwin

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:59 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Bill Costa

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:13 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: PLEASE reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

...BC

From: Robert Costa

Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 10:04 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: David Coulet

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:40 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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 for reading me,

From: Clayton Cowles

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:33 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

(sorry about the boilerplate text)

Thanks,

Clayton

From: Alex Cox

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 3:06 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

Dear Patent Office

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 very much for considering this.

Sincerely

Alex Cox

1892 Colestin Rd

Ashland

OR 97520

From: Samantha Cramer

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:13 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Mark

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:24 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Mark Creighton

From: Jessica Cresseveur

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:18 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

To Whom It May Concern:

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,

Jessica Cresseveur

New Albany, IN 47150

From: Thomas Crites

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:22 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Nick Critser

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 10:10 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

--

Nick Critser

Systems Analyst/Programmer

Arthur W. Diamond Law Library

Columbia University

ecritser@law.columbia.edu

1(212)854 0405

GPG - Fingerprint

6A2C D078 DA48 C336 3FB3 894D 2623 D0E0 843D 4025

From: Cross Activities

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:45 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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,

Nathan

From: Jonnie Crowe

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 3:59 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Jim Crowell

Sent: Friday, February 15, 2019 6:03 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Sincerely,

James Crowell

From: Jonathan Cruise

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 8:59 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Derek Crumb

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:14 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Derek Crumb

From: Kyle Cucci

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 2:50 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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,

Kyle Cucci

From: Leah C

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 8:21 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

To whom it may concern,

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.

Sincerely,

Leah Cunningham

From: Derek G Currie

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:51 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

The US patent system has become a source of a multitude of bad patents and a resulting multitude of expensive, pointless, needless court trials. This problem has been ongoing for decades, with no resolution evident. Now, the USPTO is planning to make this unsustainable and unacceptable problem worse?

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.

And please! Mature the USPTO into a US government agency worthy of the 21st century. If the office doesn't become intimately savvy with modern technology, it will continue to fail US citizens on into the interminable future. That can't happen.

Derek Currie

Derek G Currie

derekcurrie@mac.com

711 Hickory Street, #2

Syracuse, NY 13203-1938

USA

From: Cathy Curtis

Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 3:04 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

-----Original Message-----

From: Jason Curtis

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 5:41 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Please reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

I urge the USPTO to not 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 for your attention,

Jason Curtis

Alpine, CA 98122

From: Rich Curtis

Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 6:21 PM

To: Eligibility2019@USPTO.GOV

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: John Cusick

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 9:41 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

A classic example, and an absolutely ridiculous patent, is Patent No. 8,738,435, which allows the patent of nothing more than targeted marketing email. C'mon... don't you all have better ways to spend your time and the Public's money?

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,

John C.

From: Tim Cuthbertson

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 9:40 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Raymond Cvetovich

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:00 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: George Czerw

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:58 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

As a concerned citizen, I am writing to strongly urge the USPTO not to adopt the guidance on subject matter eligibility as set forth in the Request for Comments, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053. Instead, the USPTO should be providing guidance that ensures its examiners correctly apply the Supreme Court's decision on Alice v. CLS Bank.

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

The USPTO's role is not to narrow the Supreme Court's holdings, rather it is to properly apply them. The citizens of this country require a fair and balanced patent system, not one that favors patent trolling companies, licensing companies and corporate patent-holders. The USPTO's recent patent-granting actions are the main reason why pharmaceutical prices in the US are 4 to 5 times higher than those in Europe. Your office should be more concerned with the effects that granting a frivolous patent will have on our economy and the price of goods available to US residents than with corporate profitability.

Please abandon your proposed revisions to the Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance.

Thank-you for your consideration.

From: Tabitha D

Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2019 10:15 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Jonas Dahlen

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:51 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Yandex Dailyllama

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 3:17 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Roseann Dal Bello

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:06 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: John Dale

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 3:25 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: morgan dalton

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 7:27 PM

To: Eligibility2019@USPTO.GOV

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

Hi,

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.

Abstract software patents hurt inventors of every type.

Thanks,

Morgan Dalton

From: Pirooz Daneshmandi

Sent: Friday, March 1, 2019 12:02 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Mark Daniels

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 8:56 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Sincerely,

Mark Daniels

--

Perhaps what is called for at this time, more than anything else, is a spiritual minimalism, a reliance on the principle of less is more: less distraction, less cynicism, less entertainment, less pleasure seeking for its own sake, less indiscriminate consumption of information and fantasy, and more inner silence, more concentration upon our own nature and being, more unmediated sharing of each others' simple human presence, more development of our innate human qualities of friendship, nurturing, awareness, sensitivity, humbleness, and awe.

Kabir Helminski - "Soul Loss and Soul Making," essay in Alexandria volume 5

From: Matt Daniels

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:41 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Charles Darby

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 7:53 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Charles Darby

From: Alex Davie

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 9:01 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Scott Davis

Sent: Friday, March 1, 2019 4:45 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

-Scott Davis

Denver, CO

From: Vincent Davis

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:20 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Vincent Davis

From: Graham Dawson

Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 5:01 PM

To: Eligibility2019@USPTO.GOV

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Sincerely,

Graham Dawson

From: simon day

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:12 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: dbeanieb@att.net

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:41 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Marivette De Jesus

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 1:21 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Bill de la Vega

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 8:20 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

I request that the USPTO not 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.

Respectfully

From: Jeffrey DeLucca

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:23 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

I trust the EFF is not misleading me with this form letter, but have not read deeply into the issue. Below is what they have to say, and I support it.

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,

Jeffrey De Lucca of Waldorf, MD 20602

From: Ricardo de Luna

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 12:12 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Ricardo de Luna

From: Presto De Marshall

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 11:44 AM

To: Eligibility2019@USPTO.GOV

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Laura de Veth

Sent: Sunday, March 3, 2019 4:20 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Kind regards Laura

Verstuurd vanaf mijn iPhone

From: Janos Deak

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 5:34 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Bri

Sent: Monday, February 25, 2019 1:25 PM

To: Eligibility2019@USPTO.GOV

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

Hello,

I stand firmly with the electronic frontier foundations below recommendations on recent proposed changes. As a software developer I strongly oppose any new 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. 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.

Warm Regards,

Brianna Dean

From: Dezri Dean

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 4:04 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

To: eligibility2019@uspto.gov

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Eric Dean

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:47 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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 for your time,

Eric Dean

From: Eugene Dean

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 5:05 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: phorum

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:26 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

Dear Patent Office,

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.

Sincerely,

Vic DeAngelo

From: Ken DeBacker

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:46 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: David Deck

Sent: Sunday, March 3, 2019 8:53 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: ruth decker

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 6:43 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Howard Deiner

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:59 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Martin Deinhofer

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 3:50 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Best Regards

Martin

--

Martin Deinhofer, MSc

Research and Development, International Projects Working MON-WED - so please be patient with answers!!

University of Applied Sciences Technikum Wien Hoechstaedtplatz 6, 1200 Vienna, Austria, Europe

T: +43 1 333 40 77-297, F: +43 1 333 40 77-99 297

E: martin.deinhofer@technikum-wien.at

I: embsys.technikum-wien.at

From: Ida DelVecchio

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:45 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Daniel Demmel

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 5:49 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Please reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Brandon Denning

Sent: Friday, March 1, 2019 11:26 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Brett Dennison

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 9:27 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO%2??P%2??2018%2??0053

I urge the USPTO not to adopt the guidance on subject matter eligibility set forth in the Request for Comments, Docket No. PTO%2??P%2??2018%2??0053. Instead, the USPTO should provide guidance that ensures examiners apply the Supreme Court%2??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%2??s role is not to narrow Supreme Court holdings, it is to apply them. Please abandon revisions to the Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance.

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android

From: Melvyn Depeyrot

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:39 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Hasan Dervish

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:49 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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.

Sincerely

Hasan Dervish

From: Thanos Diacakis

Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2019 10:17 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

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: Rainmac

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:52 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

To whom:

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,

Mitchell Diamond

Sunnyvale, CA