

From: Benny Koelewijn

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 3:18 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: James Kohler

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:55 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: Dave Kolars

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 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: Sam Kome

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:59 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: Sue Korlan

Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 4:35 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: Keith Koski

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 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.

Sincerely,

Keith Koski

From: Subscripts

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

To: Eligibility2019

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

Please DO NOT adopt guidance on subject matter eligibility in the Request for Comments, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053.

You should give info to make sure that examiners use Alice v. CLS Bank decision in the proper way!

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

Supreme Court rulings are not to be changed by the patent office. You're supposed to apply the rules.

Please do not change the Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance.

Thank you for your time.

K Kozlow

From: Philip Kovac

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 6:24 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.

Thank you for your time,

Philip Arthur Kovac, Software Engineer

From: Kevin Kraft

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:47 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: A Krager

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 7:14 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: Ryan Kramer

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 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: Keith Kratochvil

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: Larry Krigbaum

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 4:29 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: Phil Kritzman

Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 8:53 PM

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.

Regards,

Philip Kritzman

5757 N St. Louis Ave. Unit 2

Chicago IL 60659

From: John Kuempel

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:18 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 Kuplack

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 1:46 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: R L

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 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: Ricky L

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 8:25 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: Kyle Lacy

Sent: Saturday, February 16, 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: Jared Laiti

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:08 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: Ray Lance

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:38 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: Frank Landis

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.

These new revisions to the Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance expand upon a small number of decisions finding patent claims eligible and ignore the far more numerous decisions in which courts have rejected claims as ineligible for patent protection.

The revisions will distort the law and will encourage examiners to grant invalid, abstract patents. Such patents wrongly claim basic ideas, increase litigation costs to no benefit, and harm the public interest.

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

The USPTO'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 opportunity to register my comment on this important policy issue.

Richard Franklin Landis

Murphy, North Carolina 28906

From: James Lang

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 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: Rich Lang

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.

From: TOM LANGAN

Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 3:51 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 Langasek

Sent: Sunday, February 24, 2019 7:43 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.

--

Steve Langasek

From: Rafe Langston

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: Hilmar Lapp

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 3:47 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: Chad R. Larson

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 10:56 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.

--crl

From: Dale Larson

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 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.

From: Dana Larson

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: Darren Larson

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 6:58 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: Jacqueline Lasahn

Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 1:23 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.

This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.

<https://www.avast.com/antivirus>

From: Megan Lasswell

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.

Sincerely,

Megan Lasswell

From: unhommemasque

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 1:17 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, increase litigation costs to no benefit, and harm the public interest.

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

Steve Latek

Toledo, OH

From: Cody Laurent

Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 6:37 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.

Very Respectfully,

Cody Laurent

From: steven lawrence

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:57 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 Lawson

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 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.

As a paralegal in my first career, and a computer and networking engineer in my second, I can read a patent application quite accurately (not to mention my father held several). Many of the patents in software were based on a faulty understanding of the technology involved. Alice v. CLS Bank helped the situation by allowing the true experts in technological fields to comment on the uniqueness and novel claims of a patent. The new guidance expands upon a small number of decisions finding patent claims eligible and ignores the far more numerous decisions in which courts have rejected claims as ineligible for patent protection. It distorts the law and will encourage examiners to grant invalid, abstract patents. Such patents wrongly claim basic ideas, increase litigation costs to no benefit, and harm the public interest.

The USPTO'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 H. Lawson

From: Alexis Layton On Behalf Of Alexis Layton

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:59 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.

-Alexis

From: Stephen Leake

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 9:55 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: Josh Leavitt

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.

From: Richard Leckinger

Sent: Friday, March 1, 2019 12:52 PM

To: Eligibility2019

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

Greetings

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

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

The USPTO'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

Richard

From: Anika Ledlow

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 6:05 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: Stephen Lee

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

Stephen Lee

From: Ardy Leenders

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:57 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: Ben Leggett

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 6:48 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.

Original Message-----

From: Robert J Leibowitz

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 6:38 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.

Robert Leibowitz

From: Doris Leicher

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 4:36 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: Kevin Leiva

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 4:44 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: David Lemon

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 2:58 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Cc: David Lemon

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

For 30 years I worked in the software industry, and I was part of a team reviewing prospective patents for submission. I also contributed to authoring several patents myself, so I got to learn something about what goes into a solid claim. I was fortunate that the company I worked for had a firm position of refusing to pay claims from obvious patent trolls. I've read that you question the existence of these questionable businesses, but we saw many such claims.

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

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

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

My thanks for your consideration of this important issue.

David Lemon

From: Dave Lennert

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 7:33 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: William Lenon

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.

I am in full agreement with the above.

William Lenon

From: Mike LeRoy

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 9:03 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: Lisa LeVasseur

Sent: Monday, March 4, 2019 8:03 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.

Thank you for your consideration!

Sincerely,

Lisa LeVasseur

From: Sherwin

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 4:54 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.

Sherwin Levinson, President

S. M. Levinson & Assoc., Inc.

From: Liza Levy

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 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: Robert Levy

Sent: Friday, February 15, 2019 5:07 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: Jay Libove

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.

Jay Libove

Voorhees, NJ

From: Shawn Liddick

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

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.

Alan Liechty

From: Daniel Lieuwen

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 4:15 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: Jacob Lifshay

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: Dave Lindbergh

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:54 AM

To: Eligibility2019

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

As a practicing engineer for the last 35 years (with 6 issued patents), I find it ironic that our patent system, which is supposed to encourage innovation, instead stifles it – the risk of company-killing lawsuits over genuinely independent inventions (and therefore, in my book, obvious ones) far outweighs any encouragement.

Therefore I urge the USPTO to reject the guidance on subject matter eligibility in the Request for Comments, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053. Instead, the USPTO should provide guidance that ensures examiners apply the Supreme Court's *Alice v. CLS Bank* decision correctly.

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

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

--Dave Lindbergh, 70 Dividence Road, Reading MA 01867

From: Steve Lindblad

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 11:32 PM

To: Eligibility2019@USPTO.GOV

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

To the USPTO,

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

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

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

Steve Lindblad

4932 Winterset Dr

Minnetonka, MN 55343

From: Scott Lipsig

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: Chris Lish

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 10:16 PM

To: Eligibility2019@USPTO.GOV

Subject: Reject Proposed Revisions to Patent Subject Matter Eligibility -- 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance (Docket ID: PTO-P-2018-0053-0001)

Thursday, March 7, 2019

Subject: Reject Proposed Revisions to Patent Subject Matter Eligibility -- 2019 Revised Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance (Docket ID: PTO-P-2018-0053-0001)

To Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office Andrei Iancu,

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

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

The USPTO'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 of my comments. Please do NOT add my name to your mailing list. I will learn about future developments on this issue from other sources.

Sincerely,

Christopher Lish

San Rafael, CA

From: Christopher Liston

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 12:48 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* precedence correctly.

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

The USPTO'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 Littleton

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:37 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.

{o,o}

l)_)

-"-"

From: Ckls Livestock

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 7:28 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: Nicholas LoCicero

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.

From: Christy Lockhart

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:00 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: Shal Twin Oaks

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:56 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.

Thank you.

- sincerely, Robert M Loeser

138 Twin Oaks Rd

Louisa VA 23093

From: Jolynn Loftus

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:18 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.

From: Trevor Lohrbeer

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 12:38 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.

--

Trevor Lohrbeer

trevor@fastfedora.com

<http://fastfedora.com>

FastFedora

From: Summer Long

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: Dana Longley

Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 6:14 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.

Thanks,

Dana Longley

From: Crissman Loomis

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 7:02 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: Jonathan Loran

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:44 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: Jeff Lorentzen

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 3:54 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: Anthony Loro

Sent: Sunday, March 3, 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: Mark Lotspaih

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 6:43 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.

NOTICE: This email may be subject to disclosure under the public records law of the State of Ohio. This email and any attachments to it may be confidential and are intended solely for the use of the individual or organization to whom it is addressed. Any views or opinions expressed are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Miamisburg City School District. Please contact the sender if you believe you have received this email in error.

P Please consider necessity, cost, and the environment before printing

From: Gregory Love

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 8:22 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: Jada Loveless

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 9:51 PM

To: Eligibility2019

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

Good Evening-

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

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

The USPTO'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-

Jada Loveless

From: Dan Lowe

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 10:12 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.

From: Patsy Lowe

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 3:56 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: Rebecca Lowe

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: Greg Lowry

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:34 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: Michael A. Lowry

Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 6:34 PM

To: Eligibility2019@USPTO.GOV

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,

Michael L.

—

Michael A. Lowry

michael.lowry@gmail.com

From: Michael Luderitz

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:44 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: John Lund

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:58 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.

Thank you,

John Lund

From: Karen E. Lund

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 2:11 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.

Karen E. Lund

From: Eric Lundquist

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

Thank you,

Eric Lundquist

Austin, Texas

From: Sonia Lyris

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:16 AM

To: Eligibility2019

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

I am very concerned about this matter.

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

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

The USPTO'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,

Sonia Lyris

--

Sonia Lyris | slyris@gmail.com

From: Andrew Lytvynov

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 7:02 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: ben m

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 8:16 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 Macdonald

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:58 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: Martin MacKerel

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

To: Eligibility2019

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

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

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

The USPTO'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,

Martin MacKerel

From: Michael Macmillan

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: Robert Macmillan

Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 6:41 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.

Robert & Lil Macmillan

From: Rhona Mahony

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

To: Eligibility2019

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

Dear Patent Office staff person,

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

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

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

harm the public interest.

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

~~Rhona Mahony

Zip code: 94305

From: mailforjdc

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.

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.

sincerely,

michael w malsberger

From: dirtyduck man

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:13 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: Linux Man

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 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.

Yes, I am sure you are getting many messages with this template, so let me add my own personal \$0.02. Not only is Alice vs. CLS Bank an important decision that should be upheld, but it needs to be the start for further patent reform!

From: Brad Manette

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 6:22 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: Roger March

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.

--

-- What does not kill you

Will likely try again ...

Roger March, roger@icmanage.com,

2105 S Bascom Ave, Suite 120, Campbell, CA 95008

From: Justin Marin

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 3:10 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: Curtis R. Markham

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 4:16 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.

Thank you for your time,

Curtis R. Markham, MD, FASAM, DABAM, DABA

From: marc maron

Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 4:46 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: Timothy Marroquin

Sent: Sunday, March 3, 2019 3:13 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: Craig Marshall

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.

Sincerely,

Craig Marshall

2280 Argonne Ave

Long Beach, CA 90815

From: R. J. Marti

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 9:38 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: Bob Martin

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:52 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 time and consideration.

Bob Martin

From: Brian Martin

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: Geoff Martin

Sent: Monday, February 25, 2019 11:58 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.

From: John Martin

Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 8:01 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: marxriv

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:42 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.

Regards,

Marx

From: Ron Mason

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.

From: Kirk Masterson

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:15 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,

Kirk Masterson

Portland, OR 97218

From: John Matenkosky

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 7:02 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: Ed Mathis

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 6:13 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.

--

Ed Mathis

From: Alex

Sent: Sunday, March 3, 2019 10:27 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.

Alex Mattern

From: Luke Mattfeld

Sent: Friday, March 1, 2019 11:01 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: Gregory Matthews

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.

From: john matthews

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:34 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.

John Matthews

Elk Rapids, MI 49629

From: Kim Mattis

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 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,

Kimberly A. Mattis

Rohnert Park, CA 94928

From: Blaine Matulevich

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:25 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: Rick Mauck

Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 5:06 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: Parnell Maxwell

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: Michael J. McAllister

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:54 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,

Michael McAllister

From: Joe McCain

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 3:48 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: Angela McClendon

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:36 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.

Sincerely,

~Angela McClendon

Bay St Louis, Mississippi

From: Rick McClinton

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 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. You must abandon revisions to the Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance. You have duty to defend honest individual inventors.

From: David McConnell

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: Mike McCormick

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 12:06 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.

T

he USPTO'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 McCormick, CISSP

[email redacted]

Founder & President

Taproot Security LLC

From: John McDermon

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 1:34 AM

To: Eligibility2019

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

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

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

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

--John McDermon

From: Jimmy McDermott

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 7:56 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: Baret McGavock

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 6:04 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket # PTO-P-2018-0053

I urge the USPTO not to adopt the guidance on subject matter eligibility set forth in the Request for Comments, Docket # PTO-P-2018-0053. Instead, the USPTO should provide guidance that ensures examiners apply the Supreme Court's Alice v. CLS Bank decision correctly.

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

The USPTO'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: Karen McGeer

Sent: Sunday, March 3, 2019 3:22 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.

Karen McGeer

Orinda, CA 94563

From: Janice McGowan

Sent: Saturday, March 2, 2019 11:19 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: John McGready

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 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: Jay McHugh

Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 5:19 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: Spencer McIntyre

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.

Spencer McIntyre

From: William C. McIntyre, III

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

Sincerely,

William C. McIntyre, III

Colorado Springs, CO

From: Kevin M

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 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.

Sincerely,

Kevin McKaig

From: Ken McKay

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 5:06 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: George McKee

Sent: Monday, February 25, 2019 11:20 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.

Best regards,

- George McKee

12721 Timberlake Dr.

Cypress, TX 77429

From: Scott McKee

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 3:58 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: Alex McKenzie

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:28 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Cc: editor@eff.org

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

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

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

The USPTO'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,

Alexander McKenzie

3209 Lake Pointe Blvd, Villa A

Sarasota, FL 34231

amckenzie3@yahoo.com

From: Peter McKnight

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 8:09 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.

Peter McKnight

91 Pleasant Ridge Drive

West Hurley NY 12492

From: Randy McLaughlin

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:47 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: Steve McLaughlin

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 10:51 AM

To: Eligibility2019@USPTO.GOV

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.

—

Stephen McLaughlin

Austin, TX 78741

From: Duane McLemore

Sent: Monday, March 4, 2019 12:51 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: Jordan McLeod

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:33 PM

To: Eligibility2019

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

Salutations,

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

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

The USPTO'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,

Jordan McLeod

From: Bert McMahan

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: cmcmann

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 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.

Thank you,

Charles McMann

Parkville, MD

From: Bill H. Sr. McMullen

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:59 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: Gail McMullen

Sent: Monday, February 25, 2019 4:21 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: Brian McNaughton

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 3:31 PM

To: Eligibility2019

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

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

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

The USPTO'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 do it ASAP! Thank you!

From: McPadden, Ryan

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:47 PM

To: Eligibility2019

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

Stop issuing patents that suppress innovation.

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

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

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

Ryan McPadden

DevOps Engineer / Senior Consultant

CAPCO | 151 Southhall Lane #400 | Maitland, FL 32751

W: www.capco.com

From: McRae/Tharp

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

Patents should be issued for truly innovative ideas, not for enabling large companies to claim abstract concepts as their own simply by adding computer code.

The USPTO'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 ~

Susan McRae

1231 Miller Ave NE

Olympia WA 98506

From: Me Me

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:22 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: Ragde Trebor Me

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:33 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: Timothy Meadows

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: Ryan W. Medeiros

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:54 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.

Sincerely,

Ryan Medeiros,

Albany, CA

From: Vince Medlock

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 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: Brent Meeker

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 3:00 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Cc: Senator Kamala Harris

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

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

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

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

Brent Meeker

104 Catalina Dr

Camarillo CA

From: Ketan Mehta

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.

Ketan

From: Ross Meier

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.

From: Ross Allen Meier

Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2019 8:04 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.

Get Outlook for Android

From: DU Mengmeng

Sent: Wednesday, February 27, 2019 12:36 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.

From: Le TM

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 7:40 AM

To: Eligibility2019

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

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

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

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

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

LETM

--

Cordialement

T. Mercier

From: Ingvaras Merkys

Sent: Monday, March 4, 2019 5:33 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: Howard Messing

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

Howard Messing

From: Luke Metzger

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 10:02 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: 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

From: Bonnie Meyers

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 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: mfb

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:34 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: Mary Michaelis

Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2019 4:26 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: Wayne Mickel

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 9:02 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 Miles

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.

Thank you,

Scott Miles

835 21st Street South

Arlington, VA 22202

From: Kenny Millar

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 4:33 AM

To: Eligibility2019

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

Dear Sir / Madam

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

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

The USPTO'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,

Kenny Millar.

From: Cameron

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 9:46 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.

Cameron Miller

81101

From: Dan Miller

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 4:21 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.

Thank you,

Dan Miller

From: Glade Miller

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 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: Jonathan Miller

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.

Jonathan Miller

From: Michael Miller

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

Michael C Miller

From: Ray Miller

Sent: Thursday, February 14, 2019 2:06 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: Timothy Miller

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:08 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: John Millican

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 5:20 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.

From: Richard S Milliot

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 6:26 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: Blake Mills

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

Thanks for your time.

From: Ed Mills

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 8:37 PM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTOâEUR"âEUR"2018âEUR"0053

I urge the USPTO not to adopt the guidance on subject matter eligibility set forth in the Request for Comments, Docket No. PTOâEUR"âEUR"2018âEUR"0053. Instead, the USPTO should provide guidance that ensures examiners apply the Supreme CourtâEUR(tm)s Alice v. CLS Bank decision correctly.

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

The USPTOâEUR(tm)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 Mills

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

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Reject new guidelines on subject matter eligibility

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

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

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

-Joshua Mills

From: Patrick Mills

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 4:18 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.

Patrick Mills

Advanced TechService LLC

From: Dave Milner

Sent: Monday, February 25, 2019 3:05 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: Alexander Mitchell

Sent: Friday, March 1, 2019 1:29 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: James Mitchell

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 10:03 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: Noah Mittman

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:47 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: Walter Moczygemba

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 8:38 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

Thank you for your time,

Walter Moczygemba

From: G David Modica

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 10:02 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.

David Modica

From: Sam Mojo

Sent: Thursday, February 14, 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.

From: Lanie Molinar

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 3:26 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: Jane

Sent: Sunday, February 24, 2019 3:58 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 Monahan

2010 Desmond Drive

Decatur, Ga 30033

From: Marc Monis

Sent: Tuesday, February 19, 2019 9:05 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.

From: Mike Monson

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:55 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: Is Montero

Sent: Sunday, March 3, 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: Rowena Montgomery

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 10:07 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: Bergen Moore

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 3:56 PM

To: Eligibility2019

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

Hello there,

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

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

The USPTO'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,

Bergen

From: Eric Moore

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:24 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: James Moore

Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2019 11:16 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 Moore On Behalf Of John Moore at Tiny Vital Systems LLC

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 12:11 PM

To: Eligibility2019

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

I am a software and hardware patent holder in the US and Canada. I am also a Republican and a supporter of President Trump.

But, the patent system is badly broken, especially regarding software patents. Over the last 30 years, thousands of patents have been issued covering obvious "inventions" in software, and those patents give a monopoly to their holders and an opportunity to patent trolls. The result is a reduction in innovation, especially among small companies and individuals, because only the large corporations can afford to fend off patent trolls and fight these inappropriate patents. This is the opposite of the intent of the patent system, as laid down in the US Constitution.

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

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

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

The USPTO'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 Moore

Tiny Vital Systems, LLC

Scottsdale, AZ

From: Matias Moreno

Sent: Tuesday, February 26, 2019 8:36 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.

--

Bienestar, Logística y Organización

www.visionblo.com

Este mensaje es privado y confidencial. Si usted ha recibido este mensaje por error, borre dicho mensaje y cualquier adjunto que pudiera contener. Este mensaje es de carácter informativo, y no debe interpretarse como una oferta de venta o de compra de valores ni de instrumentos financieros relacionados.

This message is private and confidential. If you receive this message by mistake, please delete the message and attachments. This message is provided for informational purposes only, and should not be construed as a solicitation or offer to buy or sell any securities or related financial instruments.

From: Doug Morris

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 3:36 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: Richard Morris

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 8:31 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.

Thank you.

—Richard Morris

From: Rick Morris

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:59 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: Roy Morris

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:31 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: roy_morris

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 10:20 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.

Roy Morris, Esq.

From: Ryan Morris

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: Steven Moses

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 4:39 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: Keith Mosher

Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 5:17 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: Pushparaj Motamari

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 8:42 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: Lawrence Motyka

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 4:39 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.

Sincerely,

Lawrence Motyka

Newark, Delaware, USA.

From: mtomec

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:56 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: 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 Alice decision made it clear that abstract ideas can't be patented just by adding computer language. The new guidance is creating rules to bypass this Supreme Court ruling. It distorts the law and will encourage examiners to grant invalid, abstract patents.

The USPTO's role is not to narrow Supreme Court holdings, it is to follow the law set down by the Supreme Court. Abstract software patents hurt inventors of every type. Please abandon revisions to the Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance.

From: Lisa Mueller

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 5:00 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: Dan Mullen

Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 9:28 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.

Dan Mullen

From: Annie

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:01 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.

Annie Mullin

From: Allen Mulvey

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: Jim Mulville

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: davehmur

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 6:02 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.

David Murray

Boulder CO

From: Doug Murray

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:39 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: Mystic Trader

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:30 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: Mark Nahabedian

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 10:34 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: Ashot Nalbandyan

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: Patrick Nance

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 9:13 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.

Remember we're all in this together. Abstract concept software patents do nothing but waste our national productivity.

Sincerely,

Patrick Nance MD

From: Jim Napier

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 6:54 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: Kevin Neaton

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:08 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: David Needham

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 8:30 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: Dan Neely

Sent: Sunday, February 24, 2019 3:44 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: Brian Nelson

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:01 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.

From: Adam Nemitoff

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:31 AM

To: Eligibility2019

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

As a Software Developer, I have personally been affected by spurious patents that are stifling innovation!!!

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

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

The USPTO'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,

Adam Nemitoff

14 Chopek Ln

Waldwick, NJ 07463

From: Robert

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 8:58 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.

Bad patent result in settlements rather than going to court to invalidate the bad patent as it is less expensive to pay a settlement than argue against a bad patent. Large companies are affected just as much as smaller companies and paying settlements for bad patents should not be considered a cost of doing business.

Thank you,

Robert J. Nesterowich

From: Dave Newman

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 7:43 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.

Dave Newman

dave@fournewmans.org

From: Stephen Nickels

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.

Cheers,

Stephen

From: Rael Nidess, M.D.

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

To: Eligibility2019

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

Dear Sirs | Madams:

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

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

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

Rael Nidess, M.D.

Marshall, TX

From: Nora Nielsen

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

Thank you,

Nora Nielsen

From: Paul Nielsen

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 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: Ray Niemeir

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 9:41 AM

To: Eligibility2019

Subject: Please do not enact the new guidelines on subject matter eligibility, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053

Please provide guidance that ensures examiners apply the Supreme Court's Alice v. CLS Bank decision correctly.

The change would encourage examiners to grant more invalid and abstract patents, causing expensive damage to the public interest.

Thank you,

Ray Niemier

Phoenix, AZ 85020

From: Oliver Niesner

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 3:53 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: Henri Nievelstein

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 1:55 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: Bob Niles

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 4:25 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: Jennifer Nilson

Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 9:59 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.

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

From: Richard Nishizawa

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 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: Laser Nite

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 8:46 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.

Laser Nite

CEO

Animet, Inc.

641-233-8654

From: RAY NOEMER

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

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:21 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: Steven Norris

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 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.

Don't feed the patent trolls.

From: Bartosz Nowicki

Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 3:49 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.

From: Chris Nowlan

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.

Chris Nowlan

From: Johnny O.S

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 3:46 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: Jim OBrien

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.

James OBrien

Ridgewood, NJ

From: Brian O'Connell

Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 8:07 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: Alain O'Dea

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 6:28 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.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Dan Oelke

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:31 PM

To: Eligibility2019

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

I am a software engineer by training and trade. I am an inventor with a few patents to my name. Patent trolls are a real problem that harm the US economy.

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

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

The USPTO'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 R Oelke

From: Christa Oeschger

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 5:50 PM

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.

Please do not ruin the future of creativity in this country by enabling those with malevolent intent to destroy the production of our nations future.

Regards,

Christa Oeschger

From: Brad Offman

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.

From: Milo Oien-Rochat

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 7:53 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: AGOlbert

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.

Art Olbert

1906 Raleigh Avenue

Austin, Texas 78703

512-322-9881 (W)

512-619-3279 (M)

AGOlbert@olbert.com

AGOlbert@att.net

<http://www.linkedin.com/in/ArtOlbert>

From: Todd Olfert

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 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.

Sincerely,

Todd Olfert

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

From: Chris Oliver

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 7:20 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.

From: Wallace C. Olson Jr.

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.

Our system is very broken and this guidance only makes it worse.

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

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

--

=====

all that exists is reasonable, but not necessarily sensible...

Perfection is not attainable, but if we chase perfection, we can catch excellence.

-Vince Lombardi

From: Massabesic OM

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 6:22 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: Nick O'Neill

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 1:46 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.

--

nick o'neill | 202.286.9712 | chat with me and my nickbot ;)

From: Taka

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:19 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,

Taka Ono

Baltimore, MD 21224

From: Chanan Oren

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 1:01 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.

--

Chanan Oren

From: ralmendros | Orkume

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 12:33 AM

To: Eligibility2019

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

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,

Ricardo Almendros | Calle Laguna, 64 28923 - Alcorcón (Madrid - Spain)

From: jafar osman

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 6:22 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: Ertem Osmanoglu (US - ADVS)

Sent: Friday, March 1, 2019 4:19 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: Borut Osonkar

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 3:49 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,

Borut Osonkar

From: Headarmor

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.

Thank-you,

Dave Oster

Lake Stevens, WA

From: James O'Toole

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:52 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: Sherry Otterstrom

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:42 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.

From: Robert Otto

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 3:02 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: Ray Otwell

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:00 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: Anton Outkine

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 9:20 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.

From: Outlook Team

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

Sent: Saturday, February 16, 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.

Thank you,

Mike:o

Mike Overholt

mover@charter.net

From: Buddy Owens

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

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

The USPTO'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 Oxner

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 10:03 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.

Mark Oxner

Fort Worth, TX 76112

From: Charlie Page

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 10:59 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: Independents unite

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 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, Darren Page

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

From: Ian Page-Echols

Sent: Friday, February 15, 2019 7:22 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: James Pagitt

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:11 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: Rich Painter

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 1:05 AM

To: Eligibility2019

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

I oppose this new guidance that erodes improvements recently made to reduce inappropriate grants.

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

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

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

richard painter, PE

software and systems engineer

From: Brecht Palombo

Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 5:50 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: Pramod Pancha

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.

From: Aditya Pant

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 6:59 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: Lara Papadakis

Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 12:10 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.

Sent from my iPhone

From: Austin Parker

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.

From: Dennis Parker

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:12 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.

--

Thanks,

Dennis

From: Greg Parkhouse

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:01 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: Ed Parrish

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.

Sincerely

Edward Parrish

From: Vik Paruchuri

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 4:42 PM

To: Eligibility2019

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

I run a small business that employs 20 Americans. I urge the USPTO not to adopt the guidance on subject matter eligibility set forth in the Request for Comments, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053. Instead, the USPTO should provide guidance that ensures examiners apply the Supreme Court's Alice v. CLS Bank decision correctly. Adopting the new guidance will harm my business and our ability to operate.

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

The USPTO'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: Matteo Pasotti

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 3:33 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: Jim Pasquale

Sent: Friday, March 1, 2019 1:36 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: David Patenaude

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 7:49 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.

Regards,

David Patenaude

DISCLAIMER: The information contained in this e-mail and any attachments is confidential and may be legally privileged. If the recipient of this message is not the intended addressee, be advised that you have received this message in error and that legal professional privilege is not waived and you are requested to re-send to the sender and promptly delete this e-mail and any attachments. If you are not the intended addressee, you are strictly prohibited from using, reproducing, disclosing or distributing the information contained in this e-mail and any attached files. Curtin University, Malaysia (Curtin Malaysia) advises that this e-mail and any attached files should be scanned to detect viruses. Curtin Malaysia does not represent or warrant that this e-mail including any attachments is free from computer viruses or defects. Curtin Malaysia shall not be responsible for any loss or damage incurred in their use.

From: Binu Paulose

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

Binu Paulose

--

-- Binu | 718.869.1292

From: Gene Pavlovsky

Sent: Monday, February 25, 2019 3:37 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: Judy Payne

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:16 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.

From: Minister Peacefulpoet

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 7:01 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: Tracy Pease

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 6:32 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: Tom Pendleton

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.

Malo Periculosam Libertatem Quam Quietum Servitium

Tom Pendleton

12460 John Arthur Dr

Foley, AI 36535-9429

USA

+1-615-270-4609 - Google Voice (SMS and/or Voicemail Only - I don't answer unknown callers)

From: Susanna Perkins

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.

Susanna Perkins

WordPress Building Blocks

The Anywhereist Podcast

From: David Peterson

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

Sincerely David Peterson

From: DadOSix

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 1:07 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.

-Jarom Petrich

From: Andy Petruski

Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 5:29 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: Wendy Pfile

Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 2:05 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.

Thanks for your time,

Wendy Pfile

From: Kevin Pheasey

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 9:28 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.

These aren't 'monster stories'. These are verifiable incidents and the fact that you are denying they happen is appalling. A patent for some general idea like 'shopping carts' is destructive to our economy and entrepreneurs. The government should be protecting the people, not corporations.

From: Rob Phelps

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

Sincerely,

Robert Phelps

From: Allison Phillips

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

To: Eligibility2019

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

Hello, thank you for your time.

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

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

The USPTO'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 Piche

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:40 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: Eric Piehl

Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 2:09 PM

To: Eligibility2019

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

USPTO,

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

PTO-P-2018-0053. Instead, the USPTO should provide guidance that ensures examiners apply the Supreme Court's *Alice v. CLS Bank* decision correctly.

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

The USPTO'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: Ann Pinkerton

Sent: Sunday, February 24, 2019 12:41 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,

Ann Pinkerton

Oakland, CA 94618

From: Richard Pinney

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:00 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.

Richard Pinney

1151 Sugarloaf Blvd.

Sugarloaf Key, FL 33042

From: Hugo Pipping

Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 3:56 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.

Thank you,

Hugo

From: Dennis G. Pitcock

Sent: Sunday, March 3, 2019 10:17 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, increase litigation costs to no benefit, and harm the public interest.

The USPTO'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: Clinton Pittman

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: Robert Pitz

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 5:13 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.

Robert Pitz

Geek Activist | OpSec | Anti-Surveillance | Humanist

From: Pixelated_Prophecies

Sent: Friday, February 15, 2019 8:49 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: pmcs

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: Joseph Pochis

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:27 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: Ari Pollak

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: John Poole

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:36 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: J Poolner

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 6:22 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

Respectfully,

--James Poolner

From: George Post

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.

George P. Post

94805

From: R Alexander Post

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 8:07 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,

Robert Post

From: Jérôme Poulin

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 1:07 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: Alex Powell

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.

From: Stephen Powell

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 12:41 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.

Respectfully,

Stephen T Powell

Central, SC 29630

From: Mark Powell

Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 4:57 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.

Best regards,

-Mark

From: John Pray

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 11:49 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.

Thank you,

John Pray

From: Jessica Prescott

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 6:39 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.

Jessica Prescott

Woodstock, GA 30189

From: R.S. Preuss

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 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.

Thank you for your attention.

-- Robert Preuss

Ballston Spa, NY

From: LL Price

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

To: Eligibility2019

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

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

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

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

Linda Price

2052 Bradbury St.

Medford OR 97504

From: Sage Price

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 8:33 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.

Thanks,

Sage

From: Harley Privitera

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:56 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 Probst

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.

From: Sergey Prokushkin

Sent: Friday, February 22, 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: Niels Provos

Sent: Sunday, March 3, 2019 12:28 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: jason prudencio

Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2019 11:23 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: mark pruet

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 9:53 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: edd.purcell

Sent: Sunday, March 3, 2019 9:41 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.

Edd Purcell

From: JIquinn

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 8:00 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.

Sent from my Xperia by Sony smartphone

From: R

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: Jason R

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 6:19 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: Jon R

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:39 PM

To: Eligibility2019

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

Hello, my name is Jon Richardson.

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

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

The USPTO'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 of this matter.

From: Matt Radford

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 11:11 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.

-matt

From: radialmill

Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 5:56 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: Vikram Rajan

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 Ralph

Sent: Monday, February 25, 2019 2:03 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.

Your faithfully,

Adam Ralph

Flims, Switzerland

From: Tim Ramsey

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 9:20 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.

From: Mark Randall

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 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: Ray Ransom

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:07 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: Tiffany Rapplean

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 6:16 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.

From: Jack

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 12:59 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.

Sincerely,

Jack Rasiel

From: Ann Rausch

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 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.

Thank you,

Ann Rausch

From: Brent Read

Sent: Monday, February 25, 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: Blue Red

Sent: Saturday, March 2, 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: Sylvie R

Sent: Friday, February 22, 2019 2:08 PM

To: Eligibility2019

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

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

The new guidance expands upon a small number of decisions finding patent claims eligible and ignores the far more numerous decisions in which courts have rejected claims as ineligible for patent protection. It distorts the law and will encourage examiners to grant invalid, abstract patents. Such patents wrongly claim basic ideas, increase litigation costs to no benefit, and harm the public interest. There are only too many people around who are latent cannibals and extortionists. Let's not make it easy for them.

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

Sylvie Reichmann

Oneco, FL

Original Message-----

From: Jim Reid

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 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.

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

The USPTO'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 Reid

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

To: Eligibility2019

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

The USPTO should 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 but to apply them. Please abandon revisions to the Patent Subject Matter Eligibility Guidance.

Sincerely,

Matthew Reid

1311 Pine St

Calistoga CA 94515

From: Bini Reilly

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.

From: Kenneth Reiszner

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 8:16 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.

Kenneth D. Reiszner, Ph.D., President

REAL, Inc.

From: Stefan Reitshamer

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 11:36 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.

Thank you.

Stefan Reitshamer

468 Marrett Rd

Lexington, MA 02421

From: Joe Remington

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

Sincerely,

Joe Remington

From: Merv Renton

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 6:59 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.

Regards,

Merv Renton

=====

From: Heidi Reyes

Sent: Friday, March 1, 2019 7:37 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,

Heidi Reyes

--

<https://fiberwoman15.com> ~~ <http://www.flickr.com/photos/crodigtap/>

From: Kevin Reynolds

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.

Thank you,

Kevin Reynolds

From: Alyssa Riceman

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

Alyssa Riceman

From: Paul Richard

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:55 AM

To: Eligibility2019

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

Let's get rid of some frivolous lawsuits.

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

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

The USPTO'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 Richards

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.

As a professional software developer, I have seen the wastefulness and damage to productivity that results from the abuse of the patent system for profit.

thank you,

Michael Richards

Berkely, California

From: Trevor Richardson

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 2:08 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: Rigby, Jennifer L.

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 7:33 PM

To: Eligibility2019

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

Hey there, below you'll find a pre-written email, but rather than just send that I wanted to also send my own comments. Patent trolling/restricting broad concepts based on patents and copyrights because a company bought the idea despite having no plans to do anything with it (and really the idea of broad concepts being copyright-able in itself) isn't cool and will be harmful to not only average people but innovative companies as well! Please consider carefully the better-worded idea presented below:

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

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

The USPTO'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 Riley

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 10:14 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: Joseph Rinier

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 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.

Thanks,

JHR

From: Cash Rion

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 7:04 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: Dominik Riva

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.

This Mail is part of a campaign but I'm still an independent participant. As a software engineer software patents bother me since years.

Regards,

Dominik Riva

From: Jeff Rivard

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:40 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: Javier Rivera-Diaz

Sent: Monday, February 25, 2019 3:33 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: Nina Rizzo

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 10:56 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: LOUIS ROBERTS

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 8:36 PM

To: Eligibility2019

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

To: All Parties Responsible:

With due respect, I strongly urge that USPTO does not adopt the guidance on subject matter eligibility as set forth in the RFC, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053.

In my view, the USPTO should instead provide guidance and direction to ensure examiners correctly apply the Supreme Court's Alice v. CLS Bank decision correctly.

Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053 proposes guidance that expands upon a small number of decisions finding patent claims eligible, while ignoring the far more numerous decisions in which courts have rejected claims as ineligible for patent protection.

Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053 distorts the law. It will encourage examiners to grant invalid, over-broad, abstract patents. Such patents wrongly claim basic ideas, increasing litigation costs to no benefit. This proposed action enables "patent trolls" a "net" with which to capture vast amounts of intellectual property, thereby wrongfully enriching them, while damaging true innovation.

For these reasons, Docket No. PTO-P-2018-0053 is not in the public interest. The USPTO'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 your for your attention to this matter.

G Louis Roberts

2215 Beta Street, SE

Lacey WA 98503

From: Doug Robinson

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 1:04 PM

To: Eligibility2019

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

Folks:

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

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

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

Seriously, stop overly broad patents in software. I say this as a software patent holder!

Cheers:

Doug

—

Doug Robinson

From: lindsay robinson

Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 12:40 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: Stuart Robinson

Sent: Thursday, March 7, 2019 10:07 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: Peter Roche

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 7:29 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: Ted Roche

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 4:39 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: Ted Roche

Sent: Thursday, February 28, 2019 3:21 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: Owen Rodabaugh

Sent: Wednesday, February 20, 2019 5:13 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.

Thanks,

Owen Rodabaugh

97224

From: Justin Rodriguez

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 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: Bobby Roe

Sent: Saturday, February 23, 2019 9:17 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.

– Bobby Roe

23-Feb-19

From: garth rogers Sent: Thursday, February 21, 2019 9:39 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: John Rogers

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

To: Eligibility2019

Cc: John Rogers

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

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

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

The USPTO'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 Rogers

jmrogers55@msn.com