

## PART 1005—LOAN GUARANTEES FOR INDIAN HOUSING

■ 1. The authority citation for part 1005 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 12 U.S.C. 1715z–13a, 15 U.S.C. 1639c, 42 U.S.C. 3535(d).

■ 2. Revise § 1005.109 to read as follows:

### § 1005.109 Guarantee Fees.

HUD shall establish and collect, at the time of issuance of the guarantee, a fee for the guarantee of loans under this section, in an amount not exceeding 3 percent of the principal obligation of the loan, or any increase established by statute. HUD shall establish the amount of the fee by publishing a notice in the **Federal Register**, and shall deposit any fees collected under this section in the Indian Housing Loan Guarantee Fund.

Dated: February 21, 2014.

**Sandra B. Henriquez,**

*Assistant Secretary for Public and Indian Housing.*

[FR Doc. 2014–04514 Filed 3–4–14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 4210–67–P**

## DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

### United States Patent and Trademark Office

#### 37 CFR Part 1

[Docket No.: PTO–P–2014–0001]

RIN 0651–AC92

### Changes to Continued Prosecution Application Practice

**AGENCY:** United States Patent and Trademark Office, Commerce.

**ACTION:** Interim rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Leahy-Smith America Invents Act (AIA) revised and streamlined the requirements for the inventor's oath or declaration. In implementing the AIA inventor's oath or declaration provisions, the United States Patent and Trademark Office (Office) provided that an applicant may postpone the filing of the inventor's oath or declaration until allowance if the applicant provides an application data sheet indicating the name, residence, and mailing address of each inventor. The rules pertaining to continued prosecution applications (which are applicable only to design applications) require that the prior nonprovisional application of a continued prosecution application be complete, which requires that the prior nonprovisional application contain the

inventor's oath or declaration. This interim rule revises the rules pertaining to continued prosecution applications to permit the filing of a continued prosecution application even if the prior nonprovisional application does not contain the inventor's oath or declaration if the continued prosecution application is filed on or after September 16, 2012, and the prior nonprovisional application contains an application data sheet indicating the name, residence, and mailing address of each inventor.

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* March 5, 2014.

*Comment Deadline Date:* Written comments must be received on or before May 5, 2014.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments should be sent by electronic mail message over the Internet addressed to: [AC92.comments@uspto.gov](mailto:AC92.comments@uspto.gov). Comments also may be submitted by postal mail addressed to: Mail Stop Comments—Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313–1450, marked to the attention of Eugenia A. Jones, Senior Legal Advisor, Office of Patent Legal Administration, Office of the Deputy Commissioner for Patent Examination Policy.

Comments likewise may be sent by electronic mail message over the Internet via the Federal eRulemaking Portal. See the Federal eRulemaking Portal Web site (<http://www.regulations.gov>) for additional instructions on providing comments via the Federal eRulemaking Portal.

Although comments may be submitted by postal mail, the Office prefers to receive comments by electronic mail message over the Internet because sharing comments with the public is more easily accomplished. Electronic comments in plain text are preferred, but comments in ADOBE® portable document format or MICROSOFT WORD® format are also acceptable. Comments not submitted electronically should be submitted on paper in a format that facilitates convenient digital scanning into ADOBE® portable document format.

Comments will be available for viewing via the Office's Internet Web site (<http://www.uspto.gov>). Because comments will be made available for public inspection, information that the submitter does not desire to make public, such as an address or phone number, should not be included in the comments.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Eugenia A. Jones, Senior Legal Advisor, Office of Patent Legal Administration, Office of the Deputy Commissioner for

Patent Examination Policy, at (571) 272–7727.

### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

**Executive Summary: Purpose:** This interim rule permits the filing of a continued prosecution application even if the prior nonprovisional application does not contain the inventor's oath or declaration. This change is to avoid the need for applicants to file the inventor's oath or declaration in an application in order to file a continued prosecution application of that application.

**Summary of Major Provisions:** This interim rule provides that the prior nonprovisional application of a continued prosecution application that was filed on or after September 16, 2012 is not required to contain the inventor's oath or declaration if the prior nonprovisional application contains an application data sheet indicating the name, residence, and mailing address of each inventor.

**Costs and Benefits:** This rulemaking is not economically significant under Executive Order 12866 (Sept. 30, 1993).

**Background:** The Office has revised the rules of practice pertaining to the inventor's oath or declaration to permit an applicant to postpone the filing of the inventor's oath or declaration until payment of the issue fee if the applicant provides an application data sheet indicating the name, residence, and mailing address of each inventor. See *Changes To Implement the Inventor's Oath or Declaration Provisions of the Leahy-Smith America Invents Act*, 77 FR 48776, 48779–80 (Aug. 14, 2012), and *Changes to Implement the Patent Law Treaty*, 78 FR 62367, 62376 (Oct. 21, 2013). The rules of practice pertaining to continued prosecution applications (which are applicable only to design applications) require that the prior nonprovisional application of a continued prosecution application be a design application that is complete as defined by 37 CFR 1.51(b). See 37 CFR 1.53(d)(1)(ii) (requires that the prior nonprovisional application of a continued prosecution application be a design application that is complete as defined by 37 CFR 1.51(b)). 37 CFR 1.51(b) in turn requires that an application contain the inventor's oath or declaration to be complete. See 37 CFR 1.51(b)(2). This interim rule amends 37 CFR 1.53(d)(1)(ii) to permit the filing of a continued prosecution application even if the prior nonprovisional application does not contain the inventor's oath or declaration if the continued prosecution application is filed on or after September 16, 2012, and the prior nonprovisional application contains an

application data sheet indicating the name, residence, and mailing address of each inventor. This change is to avoid the need for applicants to file the inventor's oath or declaration in an application in order to file a continued prosecution application of that application.

### Discussion of Specific Rules

The following is a discussion of the amendments to Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Part 1.

*Section 1.53:* Section 1.53(d)(1)(ii) is amended to change “[t]he prior nonprovisional application is a design application that is complete as defined by § 1.51(b)” to “[t]he prior nonprovisional application is a design application that is complete as defined by § 1.51(b), except for the inventor's oath or declaration if the application is filed on or after September 16, 2012, and the prior nonprovisional application contains an application data sheet meeting the conditions specified in § 1.53(f)(3)(i).”

### Rulemaking Considerations

*A. Administrative Procedure Act:* This interim rule revises the procedures that apply to the filing of a continued prosecution application. The changes in this interim rule do not change the substantive criteria of patentability. Therefore, the changes proposed in this rulemaking involve rules of agency practice and procedure, and/or interpretive rules. *See JEM Broad. Co. v. FCC*, 22 F.3d 320, 326 (D.C. Cir. 1994) (“[T]he critical feature of the procedural exception [in 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(A)] is that it covers agency actions that do not themselves alter the rights or interests of parties, although [they] may alter the manner in which the parties present themselves or their viewpoints to the agency”) (quoting *Batterton v. Marshall*, 648 F.2d 694, 707 (D.C. Cir. 1980)); *see also Bachow Commc'ns Inc. v. F.C.C.*, 237 F.3d 683, 690 (D.C. Cir. 2001) (rules governing an application process are procedural under the Administrative Procedure Act); *Inova Alexandria Hosp. v. Shalala*, 244 F.3d 342, 350 (4th Cir. 2001) (rules for handling appeals were procedural where they did not change the substantive standard for reviewing claims).

In addition, the Office, pursuant to authority at 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(3)(B), finds good cause to adopt the changes in this interim rule without prior notice and an opportunity for public comment, as such procedures are contrary to the public interest. Delay in the promulgation of this rule to provide notice and comment procedures would cause harm to those applicants who file

a continued prosecution application where the prior nonprovisional application does not contain the inventor's oath or declaration. Immediate implementation of the changes in this interim rule is in the public interest because: (1) The public does not need time to conform its conduct as the changes in this interim rule merely ease the requirements for filing a continued prosecution application; and (2) those applicants who are currently ineligible to file a continued prosecution application because the prior nonprovisional application does not contain the inventor's oath or declaration will benefit from the changes in this interim rule. *See Nat'l. Customs Brokers & Forwarders Ass'n v. U.S.*, 59 F.3d 1219, 1223–24 (Fed. Cir. 1995).

Accordingly, prior notice and opportunity for public comment are not required pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553(b) or (c), 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2)(B), or any other law. *See Cooper Techs. Co. v. Dudas*, 536 F.3d 1330, 1336–37 (Fed. Cir. 2008) (stating that 5 U.S.C. 553, and thus 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2)(B), does not require notice and comment rulemaking for “interpretative rules, general statements of policy, or rules of agency organization, procedure, or practice”) (quoting 5 U.S.C. 553(b)(A)). In addition, pursuant to authority at 5 U.S.C. 553(d)(1), the changes in this interim rule may be made immediately effective because they relieve restrictions in the requirements for filing a continued prosecution application.

*B. Regulatory Flexibility Act:* As prior notice and an opportunity for public comment are not required pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 553 or any other law, neither a regulatory flexibility analysis nor a certification under the Regulatory Flexibility Act (5 U.S.C. 601 *et seq.*) is required. *See* 5 U.S.C. 603.

*C. Executive Order 12866 (Regulatory Planning and Review):* This rulemaking has been determined to be not significant for purposes of Executive Order 12866 (Sept. 30, 1993).

*D. Executive Order 13563 (Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review):* The Office has complied with Executive Order 13563. Specifically, the Office has, to the extent feasible and applicable: (1) Made a reasoned determination that the benefits justify the costs of the rule; (2) tailored the rule to impose the least burden on society consistent with obtaining the regulatory objectives; (3) selected a regulatory approach that maximizes net benefits; (4) specified performance objectives; (5) identified and assessed available alternatives; (6) involved the public in

an open exchange of information and perspectives among experts in relevant disciplines, affected stakeholders in the private sector and the public as a whole, and provided on-line access to the rulemaking docket; (7) attempted to promote coordination, simplification, and harmonization across government agencies and identified goals designed to promote innovation; (8) considered approaches that reduce burdens and maintain flexibility and freedom of choice for the public; and (9) ensured the objectivity of scientific and technological information and processes.

#### *E. Executive Order 13132*

*(Federalism):* This rulemaking does not contain policies with federalism implications sufficient to warrant preparation of a Federalism Assessment under Executive Order 13132 (Aug. 4, 1999).

*F. Executive Order 13175 (Tribal Consultation):* This rulemaking will not: (1) Have substantial direct effects on one or more Indian tribes; (2) impose substantial direct compliance costs on Indian tribal governments; or (3) preempt tribal law. Therefore, a tribal summary impact statement is not required under Executive Order 13175 (Nov. 6, 2000).

*G. Executive Order 13211 (Energy Effects):* This rulemaking is not a significant energy action under Executive Order 13211 because this rulemaking is not likely to have a significant adverse effect on the supply, distribution, or use of energy. Therefore, a Statement of Energy Effects is not required under Executive Order 13211 (May 18, 2001).

*H. Executive Order 12988 (Civil Justice Reform):* This rulemaking meets applicable standards to minimize litigation, eliminate ambiguity, and reduce burden as set forth in sections 3(a) and 3(b)(2) of Executive Order 12988 (Feb. 5, 1996).

*I. Executive Order 13045 (Protection of Children):* This rulemaking does not concern an environmental risk to health or safety that may disproportionately affect children under Executive Order 13045 (Apr. 21, 1997).

*J. Executive Order 12630 (Taking of Private Property):* This rulemaking will not affect a taking of private property or otherwise have taking implications under Executive Order 12630 (Mar. 15, 1988).

*K. Congressional Review Act:* Under the Congressional Review Act provisions of the Small Business Regulatory Enforcement Fairness Act of 1996 (5 U.S.C. 801 *et seq.*), prior to issuing any final rule, the United States Patent and Trademark Office will

submit a report containing the rule and other required information to the United States Senate, the United States House of Representatives, and the Comptroller General of the Government Accountability Office. The changes in this interim rule are not expected to result in an annual effect on the economy of 100 million dollars or more, a major increase in costs or prices, or significant adverse effects on competition, employment, investment, productivity, innovation, or the ability of United States-based enterprises to compete with foreign-based enterprises in domestic and export markets. Therefore, this interim rule is not a "major rule" as defined in 5 U.S.C. 804(2).

*L. Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995:* The changes set forth in this notice do not involve a Federal intergovernmental mandate that will result in the expenditure by State, local, and tribal governments, in the aggregate, of 100 million dollars (as adjusted) or more in any one year, or a Federal private sector mandate that will result in the expenditure by the private sector of 100 million dollars (as adjusted) or more in any one year, and will not significantly or uniquely affect small governments. Therefore, no actions are necessary under the provisions of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995. See 2 U.S.C. 1501 *et seq.*

*M. National Environmental Policy Act:* This rulemaking will not have any effect on the quality of the environment and is thus categorically excluded from review under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. See 42 U.S.C. 4321 *et seq.*

*N. National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act:* The requirements of section 12(d) of the National Technology Transfer and Advancement Act of 1995 (15 U.S.C. 272 note) are not applicable because this rulemaking does not contain provisions which involve the use of technical standards.

*O. Paperwork Reduction Act:* The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501 *et seq.*) requires that the Office consider the impact of paperwork and other information collection burdens imposed on the public. This interim rule involves information collection requirements which are subject to review by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. 3501–3549). This rulemaking does not impose any additional collection requirements under the Paperwork Reduction Act which are subject to further review by OMB.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person is required to respond

to, nor shall a person be subject to a penalty for failure to comply with, a collection of information subject to the requirements of the Paperwork Reduction Act unless that collection of information displays a currently valid OMB control number.

#### List of Subjects in 37 CFR Part 1

Administrative practice and procedure, Courts, Freedom of information, Inventions and patents, Reporting and recordkeeping requirements, Small businesses.

For the reasons set forth in the preamble, 37 CFR Part 1 is amended as follows:

#### PART 1—RULES OF PRACTICE IN PATENT CASES

■ 1. The authority citation for 37 CFR Part 1 continues to read as follows:

**Authority:** 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2).

■ 2. Section 1.53 is amended by revising paragraph (d)(1)(ii) to read as follows:

#### § 1.53 Application number, filing date, and completion of application.

\* \* \* \* \*

(d) \* \* \*

(1) \* \* \*

(ii) The prior nonprovisional application is a design application that is complete as defined by § 1.51(b), except for the inventor's oath or declaration if the application is filed on or after September 16, 2012, and the prior nonprovisional application contains an application data sheet meeting the conditions specified in § 1.53(f)(3)(i).

\* \* \* \* \*

Dated: February 27, 2014.

**Michelle K. Lee,**

*Deputy Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Deputy Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.*

[FR Doc. 2014–04807 Filed 3–4–14; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 3510–16–P**

#### DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

#### United States Patent and Trademark Office

#### 37 CFR Part 1

[Docket No.: PTO–P–2014–0003]

**RIN 0651–AC93**

#### Changes to Permit Delayed Submission of Certain Requirements for Prioritized Examination

**AGENCY:** United States Patent and Trademark Office, Commerce.

**ACTION:** Interim rule.

**SUMMARY:** The Leahy-Smith America Invents Act includes provisions for prioritized examination of patent applications (also referred to as "Track I"), which have been implemented by the United States Patent and Trademark Office (Office) in previous rulemakings. This interim rule simplifies the Track I prioritized examination practice to reduce the number of requests for prioritized examination that must be dismissed. In order to enable rapid processing and examination of those applications, the previous rulemakings provided that an application having a request for Track I prioritized examination requires, upon filing of the application, an inventor's oath or declaration and all required fees, and contains no more than four independent claims, thirty total claims, and no multiple dependent claims. Accordingly, any request for Track I prioritized examination not meeting all of the requirements on filing must be dismissed. The Office has found that many such dismissals are due to the application as filed not including a properly executed inventor's oath or declaration, not including the excess claims fees or application size fee due, or improperly including a multiple dependent claim or claims in excess of the permitted number. The Office has determined that the time periods for meeting those requirements when filing a request for Track I prioritized examination could be expanded while maintaining the Office's ability to timely examine the patent application.

**DATES:** *Effective Date:* March 5, 2014.

*Applicability Date:* The changes to 37 CFR 1.102 apply only to applications filed under 35 U.S.C. 111(a) on or after September 16, 2012, in which a first action has not been mailed.

*Comment Deadline Date:* Written comments must be received on or before May 5, 2014.

**ADDRESSES:** Comments should be sent by electronic mail message over the Internet addressed to: [AC93.comments@uspto.gov](mailto:AC93.comments@uspto.gov). Comments also may be submitted by postal mail addressed to: Mail Stop Comments—Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313–1450, marked to the attention of John R. Cottingham, Director, Office of Petitions, Office of the Deputy Commissioner for Patent Examination Policy.

Comments further may be sent by electronic mail message over the Internet via the Federal eRulemaking Portal. See the Federal eRulemaking Portal Web site (<http://>