March 5, 2012

Via Electronic Mail
preissuance_submissions@uspto.gov

The Honorable David J. Kappos
Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and
Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office
Mail Stop Comments - Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Attn: Nicole D. Haines, Legal Advisor
Office of Patent Legal Administration, Office of the Associate
Commissioner for Patent Examination Policy

Re: Changes To Implement the Preissuance Submissions by Third Parties
Provision of the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act, USPTO Docket
No. PTO–P–2011–0073

Dear Under Secretary Kappos:

I am writing on behalf of the American Bar Association Section of
Intellectual Property Law (the “Section”) to provide comments in response to the
request of the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“the Office”) published
in the Federal Register on January 5, 2012 (PTO–P-2011-0073). In
particular, the Section submits the following comments on the Changes
To Implement the Preissuance Submissions by Third Parties Provision of the
Leahy-Smith America Invents Act, 77 Fed. Reg. 448 (the “Notice”).
These comments have not been approved by the American Bar Association’s House
of Delegates or Board of Governors and should not be considered to be views of the
American Bar Association.

As the Office recognizes, the purpose of this provision of the Leahy-Smith
America Invents Act is to “provide[] a mechanism for third parties to contribute to
the quality of issued patents…” The Section fully agrees that the quality of
examination benefits, and potentially erroneous grants may be avoided, when the
examiner assigned to an application considers all relevant, non-cumulative prior art.
This serves the public interest by potentially avoiding erroneous grants of patent
rights and reducing the need for more burdensome proceedings challenging such grant after a patent has issued.

The Office has proposed a gatekeeper function so that third party submissions that do not meet certain requirements are not entered into the file history and not presented to the examiner for consideration. This mechanism is “intend[ed] to protect applicants” from obtaining knowledge of non-compliant submissions so that such applicants will not then have a separate duty of disclosure for references contained in such non-compliant submissions. The Section is concerned, however, that at least some of the conditions required for entering a third party submission are unnecessary and overly strict application of the requirements may prevent an examiner from considering relevant, non-cumulative prior art.

Moreover, the proposed gatekeeper function will not fully “protect applicants” from obtaining knowledge of non-compliant submissions. As the Notice contemplates, even where a submission is entered, the examiner may elect not to consider some of the references “because the document was listed improperly, a copy of the document was not submitted, or a concise description was not provided for that document.” Similarly, a third party submitter may voluntarily elect to serve a copy on the applicant.

In the interest of getting relevant prior art before the examiner, the Section favors eliminating the proposed gatekeeper function and instead suggests that the Office rely upon self-policing until such time as the Office observes significant abuses of the procedures permitting third party submissions. Because the proposed rules require a statement that a third party “submission complies with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §122(e) and [37 C.F.R. §1.290]” and because such statements are subject to 37 C.F.R. §11.18(b), the Section believes this self-policing mechanism is sufficient to discourage filings for any purpose other than to improve the quality of examination.

The Section looks forward to working with the Office as it continues to implement provisions of the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act. If you should have any questions or we can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Sincerely,

Robert A. Armitage
Section Chairperson
American Bar Association
Section of Intellectual Property Law