Patent Ext., P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313–1450; by fax marked to her attention at (571) 273–7744; or by e-mail to *Karin.Ferriter@uspto.gov.*

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 156 of Title 35, United States Code, generally provides that the term of a patent may be extended for a period of up to five years if the patent claims a product, or a method of making or using a product, that has been subject to certain defined regulatory review, and that the patent may be extended for interim periods of up to a year if the regulatory review is anticipated to extend beyond the expiration date of the patent.

On May 4, 2005, Intarcia Therapeutics, Inc., on behalf of patent owner Schering Aktiengesellschaft, timely filed an application under 35 U.S.C. 156(d)(5) for a second interim extension of the term of U.S. Patent No. 4,591,585. The patent claims the product atamestane. The application indicates that a New Drug Application for the human drug product atamestane has been filed and is currently undergoing regulatory review before the Food and Drug Administration for permission to market or use the product commercially.

Review of the application indicates that except for permission to market or use the product commercially, the subject patent would be eligible for an extension of the patent term under 35 U.S.C. 156, and that the patent should be extended for an additional period of one year as required by 35 U.S.C. 156(d)(5)(C). Since it is apparent that the regulatory review period will continue beyond the extended expiration date of the patent (June 18, 2005), interim extension of the patent term under 35 U.S.C. 156(d)(5) is appropriate.

An interim extension under 35 U.S.C. 156(d)(5) of the term of U.S. Patent No. 4,591,585 is granted for a period of one year from the expiration date of the patent, *i.e.*, until June 18, 2006.

Dated: May 26, 2005.

Jon W. Dudas,

Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office. [FR Doc. 05–11175 Filed 6–3–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-16-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

[Docket No. 2005-P-064]

Grant of Interim Extension of the Term of U.S. Patent No. 4,567,264; Ranolazine

AGENCY: United States Patent and Trademark Office.

ACTION: Notice of interim patent term extension.

SUMMARY: The United States Patent and Trademark Office has issued a certificate under 35 U.S.C. 156(d)(5) for a third one-year interim extension of the term of U.S. Patent No. 4,567,264.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Karin Ferriter by telephone at (571)272– 7744; by mail marked to her attention and addressed to Mail Stop Patent Ext., Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313–1450; by fax marked to her attention at (571)273– 7744; or by e-mail to Karin.Ferriter@uspto.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Section 156 of Title 35, United States Code, generally provides that the term of a patent may be extended for a period of up to five years if the patent claims a product, or a method of making or using a product, that has been subject to certain defined regulatory review, and that the patent may be extended for interim periods of up to a year if the regulatory review is anticipated to extend beyond the expiration date of the patent.

On March 25, 2005, patent owner Roche Palo Alto LLC, timely filed an application under 35 U.S.C. 156(d)(5) for a third interim extension of the term of U.S. Patent No. 4,567,264. The patent claims the active ingredient ranolazine (RanexaTM). The application indicates, and the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has confirmed, that a New Drug Application for the human drug product ranolazine has been filed and is currently undergoing regulatory review before the FDA for permission to market or use the product commercially.

Review of the application indicates that, except for permission to market or use the product commercially, the subject patent would be eligible for an extension of the patent term under 35 U.S.C. 156, and that the patent should be extended for an additional period of one year as required by 35 U.S.C. 156(d)(5)(C). Since it is apparent that the regulatory review period will continue beyond the extended expiration date of the patent (May 18, 2005), the term of the patent will be extended under 35 U.S.C. 156(d)(5) for an additional year.

An interim extension under 35 U.S.C. 156(d)(5) of the term of U.S. Patent No. 4,567,264 is granted for an additional period of one year from the extended expiration date of the patent, *i.e.*, until May 18, 2006.

Dated: May 26, 2005.

Jon W. Dudas,

Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office. [FR Doc. 05–11176 Filed 6–3–05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-16-P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

[Docket No.: 2003-P-018]

Notice of Availability of and Request for Comments on Green Paper Concerning Restriction Practice

AGENCY: United States Patent and Trademark Office, Commerce. **ACTION:** Request for comments.

SUMMARY: The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) has established a 21st Century Strategic Plan to transform the USPTO into a quality focused, highly productive, responsive organization supporting a market-driven intellectual property system. As a part of this plan, the USPTO is conducting a study of its restriction practice. As part of this study, the Office requested public comments to help guide the study. After careful consideration of the public comments and an internal review, the USPTO has prepared a "Green Paper" describing and evaluating four options to reform restriction practice suggested by various members of the public. Prior to considering the desirability of drafting proposed legislation in a "White Paper" on reforming restriction practice, the USPTO is seeking public comment on the Green Paper.

DATES: Comment Deadline Date: To be ensured of consideration, written comments must be received on or before August 5, 2005. No public hearing will be held.

ADDRESSES: Comments should be sent by electronic mail message over the Internet addressed to: *unity.comments@uspto.gov*. Comments may also be submitted by mail addressed to: Mail Stop Comments— Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA, 22313–1450, or by facsimile to (571) 273–7735, marked to the attention of Robert A. Clarke. Although comments may be submitted by mail or facsimile, the Office prefers to receive comments via the Internet. If comments are submitted by mail, the Office prefers that the comments be submitted on a DOS formatted 3¹/₂ inch disk accompanied by a paper copy.

Comments may also 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.

The comments will be available for public inspection at the Office of the Commissioner for Patents, located in Madison East, Tenth Floor, 600 Dulany Street, Alexandria, Virginia, and will be available through anonymous file transfer protocol (ftp) via the Internet (address: http://www.uspto.gov). Because comments will be made available for public inspection, information that is not desired to be made public, such as an address or phone number, should not be included in the comments.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Robert A. Clarke. Senior Legal Advisor. Office of Patent Legal Administration, Office of the Deputy Commissioner for Patent Examination Policy, by telephone at (571) 272–7735, by mail addressed to: Mail Stop Comments-Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA, 22313-1450, or by facsimile to (571) 273–7735, marked to the attention of Robert A. Clarke, or preferably via e-mail addressed to: robert.clarke@uspto.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The USPTO established a 21st Century Strategic Plan to transform the USPTO into a more quality-focused, highly productive, responsive organization supporting a market-driven intellectual property system. As part of this plan, the USPTO stated it would conduct a study of the changes needed to implement a Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) style Unity of Invention standard in the United States. Prior to starting a detailed study, the USPTO published a notice seeking public comment on a number of issues to help guide the scope and content of a study on the adoption of a Unity of Invention standard in the United States. See Request for Comments on the Study of the Changes Needed to Implement a Unity of Invention Standard in the United States, 68 FR 27536 (May 20, 2003), 1271 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 98 (June 17, 2003). In response to that notice, the USPTO received twenty-six

(26) public comments. Those public comments were posted on the USPTO's Internet Web site.

The USPTO posted a notice summarizing the general nature of the comments received as well as the next steps in the study in November of 2004. See Summary of Public Comments and the Restriction Reform Options to be Studied by the United States Patent and Trademark Office, 1277 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 94 (Dec. 16, 2003) (Notice). The Notice indicated that as a result of the comments received, the USPTO would conduct a detailed business-case analysis on four restriction reform options and prepare a revised timeline to complete the study. The USPTO also replaced the public comments and schedule to implement a PCT-style Unity of Invention standard with the Notice.

The USPTO study included a review of hundreds of applications under each of the studied options including how examination practices would be impacted. This study also included review of the workflow, pendency and overall ability of the USPTO to appropriately implement each of the standards. The interim results of the study are provided in the Green Paper for which we are requesting comment via this notice. The Green Paper is available on the USPTO's Internet Web site (http://www.uspto.gov).

Dated: May 27, 2005.

Jon W. Dudas,

Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office. [FR Doc. 05-11177 Filed 6-3-05; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 3510-16-P

COMMITTEE FOR THE **IMPLEMENTATION OF TEXTILE** AGREEMENTS

Denial of Commercial Availability Request under the United States-Caribbean Basin Trade Partnership Act (CBTPA)

June 1, 2005.

AGENCY: The Committee for the Implementation of Textile Agreements (CITA).

ACTION: Denial of the request alleging that certain coat weight fabrics of 100 percent carded camel hair, 100 percent carded cashmere, or a blend of carded cashmere and wool fibers cannot be supplied by the domestic industry in commercial quantities in a timely manner under the CBTPA.

SUMMARY: On March 30, 2005 the Chairman of CITA received a petition

from Neville Peterson, LLP, on behalf of S. Rothschild & Co., Inc. of New York, New York, alleging that certain coat weight fabrics of 100 percent carded camel hair, 100 percent carded cashmere, or a blend of carded cashmere and wool fibers, classified in subheading 5111.19.6020 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States (HTSUS), cannot be supplied by the domestic industry in commercial quantities in a timely manner. The petition requested that outerwear articles of such fabrics be eligible for preferential treatment under the U.S. - Caribbean Basin Trade Partnership Act (CBTPA). CITA has determined that the subject fabrics can be supplied by the domestic industry in commercial quantities in a timely manner and, therefore, denies the request.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Janet E. Heinzen, International Trade Specialist, Office of Textiles and Apparel, U.S. Department of Commerce, (202) 482-3400.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Authority: Section 213(b)(2)(A)(v)(II) of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act, as added by Section 211(a) of the CBTPA; Section 6 of Executive Order No. 13191 of January 17, 2001; Presidential Proclamations 7351 of October 2, 2000.

BACKGROUND: The CBTPA provides for quota- and duty-free treatment for qualifying textile and apparel products. Such treatment is generally limited to products manufactured from varns and fabrics formed in the United States or a beneficiary country. The CBTPA also provides for quota- and duty-free treatment for apparel articles that are both cut (or knit-to-shape) and sewn or otherwise assembled in one or more beneficiary countries from fabric or yarn that is not formed in the United States, if it has been determined that such fabric or varn cannot be supplied by the domestic industry in commercial quantities in a timely manner. In Executive Order No. 13191 (66 FR 7271), CITA has been delegated the authority to determine whether varns or fabrics cannot be supplied by the domestic industry in commercial quantities in a timely manner under the CBTPA. On March 6, 2001, CITA published procedures that it will follow in considering requests (66 FR 13502).

On March 30, 2005 the Chairman of CITA received a petition from Neville Peterson, LLP, on behalf of S. Rothschild & Co., Inc. of New York, New York, alleging that certain coat weight fabrics of 100 percent carded camel hair, 100 percent carded cashmere, or a blend of carded cashmere