



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
OFFICE OF THE GENERAL COUNSEL

August 26, 2021

VIA EMAIL

Ms. Alex Moss
Public Interest Patent Law Institute
alex@piplus.org

RE: ***Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) Request No. F-21-00163***

Dear Ms. Moss:

The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) FOIA Office has received your e-mail dated Friday, July 9, 2021 requesting a copy of the following documents pursuant to the provisions of the Freedom of Information Act, 5 U.S.C. § 552:

Request all guidance, training materials, claim charts, instructional videos, and other electronic or printed matter, including model and exemplary claim analyses, provided to patent examiners regarding the application of Section 101 of the Patent Act, including the application of Supreme Court and Federal Circuit decisions applying Section 101.

Here is the link to the Subject Matter Eligibility webpage that hosts all of the publicly available information on this subject, including all training and resources that were developed by OPLA and provided to the examiners. [Subject matter eligibility | USPTO](#)

The USPTO has identified 15 pages of documents that are responsive to your request and are releasable. Portions of these documents however have been redacted pursuant to Exemption (b)(5) of the FOIA.

Exemption (b)(5) of the FOIA, 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(5), protects an agency's deliberative process privilege. Mapother v. Dep't of Justice, 3 F.3d 1533, 1537 (D.C. Cir. 1993). This privilege applies to documents, which reflect "advisory opinions, recommendations and deliberations comprising part of a process by which governmental decisions and policies are formulated." NLRB v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., 421 U.S. 132, 150 (1975), quoting Carl Zeiss Stiftung & Co. v. V.E.B. Carl Zeiss, Jena, 40 F.R.D. 318, 324 (D.D.C. 1966).

Here, the withheld information consists of opinions and recommendations regarding proposed agency actions, i.e., antecedent to the adoption of an agency position (Judicial Watch, Inc. v. U.S. Dep't of Commerce, 337 F.Supp.2d 146, 172 (D.D.C. 2004)), and are deliberative, i.e., a direct part of the deliberative process in that it makes recommendations or expresses opinions on legal or policy matters. Skinner v. U.S. Dep't of Justice, 2010 WL 3832602 (D.D.C. 2010)(quoting Vaughn v. Rosen, 523 F.2d 1136, 1143-44 (D.C. Cir. 1975)). Facts expressed in

these deliberative communications are not reasonably segregable, and thus are not suitable for disclosure.

Pre-decisional, deliberative documents or comments "are at the heart of Exemption (b)(5), and sanctioning release of such material would almost certainly have a *chilling effect* on candid expression of views by subordinates [within an agency]." Schell v. Dep't of HHS, 843 F.2d 933, 942 (6th Cir. 1988) (emphasis added). In particular, disclosure of documents or comments reflecting the positions discussed, but not ultimately adopted as agency decisions are deliberative, and thus exempt from disclosure. Arthur Andersen & Co. v. Internal Revenue Service, 679 F.2d 254, 258 (D.C.Cir. 1982).

You may contact the FOIA Public Liaison at 571-272-9585 for any further assistance and to discuss any aspect of your request. Additionally, you may contact the Office of Government Information Services (OGIS) at the National Archives and Records Administration to inquire about the FOIA mediation services they offer. The contact information for OGIS is as follows: Office of Government Information Services, National Archives and Records Administration, 8601 Adelphi Road-OGIS, College Park, Maryland 20740-6001, e-mail at ogis@nara.gov; telephone at 202-741-5770; toll free at 1-877-684-6448; or facsimile at 202-741-5769.

You have the right to appeal this initial decision to the Deputy General Counsel, United States Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. An appeal must be received within 90 calendar days from the date of this letter. See 37 C.F.R. § 102.10(a). The appeal must be in writing. You must include a copy of your original request, this letter, and a statement of the reasons why the information should be made available and why this initial denial is in error. Both the letter and the envelope must be clearly marked "Freedom of Information Appeal."

Sincerely,

Dorothy G. Campbell

Dorothy G. Campbell
USPTO FOIA Officer
Office of General Law