|                  | 1 2 | Grant G. Teeple, Esq. SBN 144760<br>Frederick M. Reich, Esq. SBN 157028<br>Julia M. Williams, Esq. SBN 244400<br>TEEPLE HALL, LLP |   |  |
|------------------|-----|---|---|--|
|                  | 3   | 9255 Towne Centre Drive, Suite 500<br>San Diego, CA 92121<br>Telephone: (858) 622-7878  |   |  |
|                  | 4   | 1 Causiiiii   |   |  |
| 5   E-Mail       |     | fritz@teeplehall.com  | Aails: grant@teeplehall.com<br>fritz@teeplehall.com<br>julia@teeplehall.com |  |
|                  | 6   | Attorneys for Plaintiff RENEWAL SERVICES  |   |  |
|                  | 7   |   |   |  |
|                  | 8   | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  |   |  |
|                  | 9   | SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA   |   |  |
| Teeple Hall, LLP | 10  |   |   |  |
|                  | 11  | RENEWAL SERVICES,   | ) Case No. <u>'15CV1779 WQHDHB</u>  |  |
|                  | 12  | Plaintiff,  | COMPLAINT   |  |
|                  | 13  | vs.   |   |  |
|                  | 14  | UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADE OFFICE,  | Magistrata Judga:   |  |
|                  | 15  | Defendant.  | <ul><li>) Magistrate Judge:</li><li>) District Judge:</li></ul>             |  |
|                  | 16  | Defendant.  |   |  |
|                  | 17  |   | _}  |  |
|                  | 18  |   |   |  |
|                  | 19  | COMPLAINT FOR RELIEF  |   |  |
|                  | 20  | 1. This is an action under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5   |   |  |
|                  | 21  | §552, for injunctive and other appropriate relief and seeking the disclosur   |   |  |

1. This is an action under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA), 5 USC \$552, for injunctive and other appropriate relief and seeking the disclosure and release of agency records pertaining to Plaintiff, Renewal Services, improperly withheld from him by the United States Patent Office

## **Jurisdiction and Venue**

2. This Court has both subject matter jurisdiction over this action and personal jurisdiction over the parties pursuant to 5 USC §552 (a) (4) (B). This Court also has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to 28 USC §1331. Venue lies in the district under 5 USC §552 (a) (4) (B).

1

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

## **Parties**

- 3. Plaintiff Renewal Services, Inc. ("Renewal Services") is a California corporation headquartered in San Diego, California. Amongst other things, Renewal Services provides assistance with patent renewal.
- 4. Defendant United States Patent and Trademark Office ("USPTO") is a Department of the Executive Branch of the United States Government. The USPTO is an agency within the meaning of 5 USC §552 (f).

## **Facts**

- 5. By letter dated October 24, 2014, addressed to the USPTO, Plaintiff, requested copies of all documents containing correspondence addresses, issuance date, and patent number for all patents issued in on or after January 1, 2002. In its letter, Plaintiff explained that its present need for information under FOIA arose from the USPTO's discontinuation of inventor's mailing addresses on patents. Plaintiff further explained that, while the discontinuation of mailing addresses was purportedly done in the interests of inventors' privacy concerns, this information was technically possible via the USPTO's Patent Application Information Retrieval ("PAIR") system. Utilization of the PAIR database, however, is prohibitively cumbersome to Plaintiff, because the current PAIR system uses a "captcha" system to prevent data mining. PAIR also requires searchers to possess certain inputs codes, such as patent number, control number, or a publication number. As Plaintiff explained in its initial FOIA request, the PAIR system has a limiting and chilling effect on the ability for the public to access information, and prevents businesses who service the industry from accessing information sufficient to assist with patent renewals.
- 6. By letter dated October 27, 2014, the USPTO advised Plaintiff that its FOIA request had been received and that it had been docketed as FOIA Request No. F-15-00026.

2

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

- 7. On November 13, 2014, the USPTO responded to Plaintiff's FOIA request. The USPTO stated in its response that it was not obligated to provide information pursuant to FOIA because information was "publically available." The USPTO did not address Plaintiff's stated issues with accessibility of information.
- 8. On March 9, 2015, Plaintiff wrote to the USPTO to renew its FOIA demand. In its March 9, 2015 letter, Plaintiff noted that all information except street address and zip code data was already available for bulk downloads. Plaintiff provided authority noting that FOIA denials are only applicable in narrow circumstances not at issue in Plaintiff's demand.
- By letter dated March 13, 2015, the USPTO advised Plaintiff that its FOIA request had been received and that it had been docketed as FOIA Request No. F-15-00142.
- 10. On April 7, 2015, the USPTO responded to Plaintiff's FOIA request. The USPTO stated in its response that it was not obligated to provide information pursuant to FOIA because information was "publically available" through the PAIR The USPTO did not address Plaintiff's stated issues concerning the system. excessively onerous method for extracting information, nor did it address the fact that addresses and zip codes are excluded from the bulk data currently offered by the USPTO.
- 11. By letter dated May 6, 2015 addressed to the USPTO, Plaintiff filed an administrative appeal.
- By letter dated May 12, 2015, the Appeals office of the USPTO 12. advised Plaintiff that its administrative appeal dated May 6, 2015 had been received on May 11, 2015 and that it had been assigned number A-15-00017.
- 13. By letter dated June 5, 2015, the Appeals Administrator of the USPTO informed Plaintiff that because requested documents were available through public PAIR, the USPTO was denying Plaintiff's appeal.

- 14. Plaintiff has a right of prompt access to the requested records under 5 USC §552 (a) (3) (A).
- 15. The USPTO has wrongfully withheld the sought-after records from Plaintiff.

## **Requested Relief**

Wherefore, Plaintiff prays that this Court:

- A. Order Defendant to disclose the requested records in their entireties and make electronic copies available to Plaintiff;
  - B. Provide for expeditious proceedings in this action;
- C. Award Plaintiff his/her costs and reasonable attorneys' fees incurred in this action; and
  - D. Grant such other relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

Dated: August 13, 2015 TEEPLE HALL, LLP

By: /s/ Grant G. Teeple
Grant G. Teeple, Esq.
Frederick M. Reich, Esq.
Julia M. Williams, Esq.
Attorneys for Plaintiff
RENEWAL SERVICES