

March 21, 2000

Box 8
Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, DC 20231

Attn: Mark Nagumo
Fax: 703-305-9373
mark.nagumo@uspto.gov

Attn: Linda Therkorn
Fax: 703-305-8825
linda.therkorn@uspto.gov

Dear Mr. Nagumo/Ms. Therkorn:

We are writing in response to the Patent and Trademark Office Request for Comments on the Revised Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications under the 35 U.S.C. 101 para. 1 "Utility" requirement, as published in the Federal Register on December 21, 1999.

The Indigenous Peoples Council on Biocolonialism is a non-profit organization with headquarters in Nixon, Nevada. We are organized to assist indigenous peoples in the protection of their genetic resources, indigenous knowledge, and cultural and human rights from the negative effects of biotechnology. Our Board of Directors is comprised of a variety of native and non-native scientists, attorneys, ethicists, and spiritual leaders. We support and affirm the No Patents on Life Campaign, which can be accessed by our website at www.ipcb.org.

We believe the PTO should further amend the revised guidelines. We note that U.S. patent law excludes "products of nature" from patentable subject matter. One of the most basic tenets of modern western biology is that the genetic material of an individual is inherited from previous generations. Our genes are derived from our parents, grandparents, and their progenitors through the germline. It is clear that human genes are the products of nature.

It therefore seems that, in order to be considered the proper subject of patents-- an "invention," a patent claim for genetic sequences would have to establish that the sequence does not occur in any known organism. The Patent Office Guidelines should therefore instruct examiners clearly that any patent applications which claim that the sequences to be patented are

present in the human genome should be denied, since there is no inventive step in merely describing what already exists in nature. While descriptions of such sequences might be accurately defined as "discovery," they are clearly not an "invention."

Further, under existing patent law, patents cannot be granted for something which is "prior art". Applying for a patent would require the applicant to prove that no prior knowledge of that use existed among any community in order to meet the prior art requirement. This would require the applicant to prove that no cultural knowledge of that use existed prior to the discovery or invention for which the patent is sought.

The Patent and Trademark Office may receive claims for nucleic acid sequences that are claimed to be truly invented. In fact only a tiny fraction of the genomes of the many different species of animals and plants have had their genetic sequences determined. It is therefore not possible at the present time to ascertain that any nucleic acid sequence is an invention.

The prudent course would be for the Patent and Trademark Office to seek clarification from Congress on whether naturally occurring genetic sequences are properly subject to the patenting system. In the interim, the PTO should impose a moratorium on patenting of genetic sequences.

The extension of patents to genetic sequences is a profound misuse of patent system and represents the privatization, only to support corporate interests, of something that is not an invention and should not be subject to corporate ownership. No individual, institution, or corporation should be able to claim ownership over species or varieties of organisms.

Sincerely

Debra Harry, Executive Director
Indigenous Peoples Council on Biocolonialism

Debra Harry, Director
Indigenous Peoples Council on Biocolonialism
Tel: (775) 574-0248 Fax: (775) 574-0259
Cell: (775) 848-0073
Email text message to cell: <mailto:7758480073@mobile.att.net>
Email: ipcb@ipcb.org Website: www.ipcb.org