

Authority: Public Law 115–426, 132 Stat. 5489 (44 U.S.C. 2107).

Dated: October 23, 2025.

Stephannie Oriabure,
Chief of Staff.

[FR Doc. 2025–21344 Filed 11–26–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820–SY–P

CIVIL RIGHTS COLD CASE RECORDS REVIEW BOARD

[Agency Docket Number: CRCCRRB–2026–0001–N]

Notice of Formal Determination on Records Release

AGENCY: Civil Rights Cold Case Records Review Board.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Civil Rights Cold Case Records Review Board received 2,883 pages of records from the National Archives and Records Administration (NARA) and the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) related to three civil rights cold case incidents to which the Review Board assigned the unique identifiers 2024–003–020, 2024–003–037, and 2024–003–039. The agencies proposed 65 postponements in the records. The FBI later withdrew 17 of the postponements the Bureau proposed after consultation with the Review Board. On September 12 and October 3, 2025, the Review Board approved 22 postponements and portions of 2 additional postponements, and determined that 2,866 pages in full and 17 pages in part should be publicly disclosed in the Civil Rights Cold Case Records Collection. The Review Board

is still coordinating its review of 18 proposed postponements with the agencies because of the sensitive nature of the information. This information is postponed until this coordination is complete and the Review Board can make a final disclosure decision. By issuing this notice, the Review Board complies with the Civil Rights Cold Case Records Collection Act of 2018 that requires the Review Board to publish in the **Federal Register** its determinations on the disclosure or postponement of records in the Collection no more than 14 days after the date of its decision.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Stephannie Oriabure, Chief of Staff, Civil Rights Cold Case Records Review Board, 1800 F Street NW, Washington, DC 20405, (771) 221–0014, info@coldcaserecords.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Incident identifier	Postponement identifier	Review board decision
2024–003–020	2024–NARA–03–0103 through 2024–NARA–03–0106	Postponed while undergoing Board review.
2024–003–020	2024–NARA–03–0107 through 2024–NARA–03–0126	Approve.
2024–003–020	2024–NARA–03–0127 through 2024–NARA–03–0133	Postponed while undergoing Board review.
2024–003–020	2024–FBI–03–2838c and 2024–FBI–03–2838d	Withdrawn.
2024–003–020	2024–FBI–03–2839 through 2024–FBI–03–2844	Withdrawn.
2024–003–020	2024–FBI–03–2845	Approve with changes.
2024–003–020	2024–FBI–03–2846 through 2024–FBI–03–2851	Withdrawn.
2024–003–037	2025–NARA–03–0083 through 2025–NARA–03–0087	Postponed while undergoing Board review.
2024–003–039	2024–NARA–03–0086 through 2024–NARA–03–0088	Reject.
2024–003–039	2024–NARA–03–0089 and 2024–NARA–03–0090	Postponed while undergoing Board review.
2024–003–039	2024–NARA–03–0091 through 2024–NARA–03–0093	Reject.

Authority: Public Law 115–426, 132 Stat. 5489 (44 U.S.C. 2107).

Dated: September 30, 2025.

Stephannie Oriabure,
Chief of Staff.

[FR Doc. 2025–21343 Filed 11–26–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6820–SY–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[S–320–2025]

Approval of Subzone Status; Elite Logistix, LLC; Rock Hill, South Carolina

On September 12, 2025, the Executive Secretary of the Foreign-Trade Zones (FTZ) Board docketed an application submitted by the South Carolina State Ports Authority, grantee of FTZ 38, requesting subzone status subject to the existing activation limit of FTZ 38, on behalf of Elite Logistix, LLC, in Rock Hill, South Carolina.

The application was processed in accordance with the FTZ Act and Regulations, including notice in the

Federal Register inviting public comment (90 FR 44799, September 17, 2025). The FTZ staff examiner reviewed the application and determined that it meets the criteria for approval. Pursuant to the authority delegated to the FTZ Board Executive Secretary (15 CFR 400.36(f)), the application to establish Subzone 38V was approved on November 25, 2025, subject to the FTZ Act and the Board's regulations, including section 400.13, and further subject to FTZ 38's 2,000-acre activation limit.

Dated: November 25, 2025.

Elizabeth Whiteman,
Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2025–21563 Filed 11–26–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Foreign-Trade Zones Board

[S–326–2025]

Approval of Subzone Status; Coroplast Tape Corporation; Rock Hill, South Carolina

On September 17, 2025, the Executive Secretary of the Foreign-Trade Zones (FTZ) Board docketed an application submitted by the South Carolina State Ports Authority, grantee of FTZ 38, requesting subzone status subject to the existing activation limit of FTZ 38, on behalf of Coroplast Tape Corporation, in Rock Hill, South Carolina.

The application was processed in accordance with the FTZ Act and Regulations, including notice in the **Federal Register** inviting public comment (90 FR 45172, September 19, 2025). The FTZ staff examiner reviewed the application and determined that it meets the criteria for approval. Pursuant to the authority delegated to the FTZ Board Executive Secretary (15 CFR 400.36(f)), the application to establish Subzone 38W was approved on November 25, 2025, subject to the FTZ

Act and the Board's regulations, including section 400.13, and further subject to FTZ 38's 2,000-acre activation limit.

Dated: November 25, 2025.

Elizabeth Whiteman,
Executive Secretary.

[FR Doc. 2025–21564 Filed 11–26–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–DS–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

[Docket No.: PTO–P–2025–0479]

Grant of Interim Extension of the Term of U.S. Patent No. 8,785,125; the Aptima® HPV Assay With the Panther® System

AGENCY: United States Patent and Trademark Office, Commerce.

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 one-year interim extension of the term of U.S. Patent No. 8,785,125 ('125 patent).

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ali Salimi, Senior Legal Advisor, Office of Patent Legal Administration, at 571–272–0909 or ali.salimi@uspto.gov; or Andrea S. Grossman, Legal Advisor at (571) 270–3314 or email andrea.grossman@uspto.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: 35 U.S.C. 156 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. 35 U.S.C. 156(d)(5) generally provides that the term of such a patent may be extended for no more than five interim periods of up to one year each, if the approval phase of the regulatory review period (RRP) is reasonably expected to extend beyond the expiration date of the patent.

On November 20, 2025, Gen-Probe Incorporated, the patent owner of record of the '125 patent, timely filed an application under 35 U.S.C. 156(d)(5) for an interim extension of the term of the '125 patent. The '125 patent claims the medical device known by tradename Aptima® HPV Assay with the Panther® System and a method of using this medical device. The application indicates that the approval phase “continues” for the regulatory period, as described in 35 U.S.C. 156(g)(1)(B)(ii),

for Premarket Approval (PMA) 100042/S038 for the Aptima® HPV Assay with the Panther® System and is ongoing before the Food and Drug Administration for permission to market and use the product commercially.

Review of the patent term extension application indicates that, except for permission to market or use the product commercially, the '125 patent would be eligible for an extension of the patent term under 35 U.S.C. 156. Because it appears reasonable to expect the approval phase of the RRP to continue beyond the expiration date of the patent, *i.e.*, December 8, 2025, interim extension of the '125 patent's 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. 8,785,125 is granted for a period of one year from the original expiration date of the patent.

Charles Kim,

Deputy Commissioner for Patents, United States Patent and Trademark Office.

[FR Doc. 2025–21411 Filed 11–26–25; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510–16–P

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office

[Docket No. PTO–P–2025–0014]

Revised Inventorship Guidance for AI-Assisted Inventions

AGENCY: United States Patent and Trademark Office, Department of Commerce.

ACTION: Examination guidance.

SUMMARY: The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) had issued inventorship guidance for AI-assisted inventions on February 13, 2024.¹ The USPTO hereby rescinds the previously published Inventorship Guidance for AI-Assisted Inventions and replaces it with the guidance below.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Christian Hannon, Senior Patent Attorney, at 571–272–7385; or Courtney Stopp, Patent Attorney, at 571–270–5559, both with the Office of Policy and International Affairs.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

I. Purpose

This notice provides further guidance on the proper legal standard for determining inventorship in patent applications for AI-assisted inventions.

¹ Inventorship Guidance for AI-Assisted Inventions, 89 FR 10043 (Feb. 13, 2024).

II. Rescission of Prior Guidance

The guidance issued on February 13, 2024, titled “Inventorship Guidance for AI-Assisted Inventions” is rescinded in its entirety. The approach set forth in that guidance, which relied on the application of the *Pannu*² factors to AI-assisted inventions, is withdrawn. The *Pannu* factors only apply when determining whether multiple natural persons qualify as joint inventors.³ *Pannu* is inapplicable when only one natural person is involved in developing an invention with AI assistance because AI systems are not persons and therefore cannot be “joint inventors” so there is no joint inventorship question to analyze.⁴

III. Governing Legal Standards

The same legal standard for determining inventorship applies to all inventions, regardless of whether AI systems were used in the inventive process.⁵ There is no separate or modified standard for AI-assisted inventions.

The Federal Circuit has held that AI cannot be named as an inventor on a patent application (or issued patent) and that only natural persons can be inventors.⁶ Artificial intelligence systems, regardless of their sophistication, cannot be named as inventors or joint inventors on a patent application as they are not natural persons.⁷

The Federal Circuit has centered its inventorship inquiry around “conception,” characterizing conception as “the touchstone of inventorship.”⁸ Conception is “the formation in the mind of the inventor, of a definite and permanent idea of the complete and operative invention, as it is hereafter to be applied in practice.”⁹ Conception is complete when “the inventor has a specific, settled idea, a particular solution to the problem at hand, not just a general goal or research plan.”¹⁰

² *Pannu v. Iolab Corp.*, 155 F.3d 1344, 1351 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

³ *Id.*

⁴ See *Thaler v. Vidal*, 43 F.4th 1207, 1212 (Fed. Cir. 2022) (holding that only a natural person(s) may be listed as an inventor(s)).

⁵ See 35 U.S.C. 115(b)(2) (2024) (providing the standard for naming inventorship across all types of utility patent applications).

⁶ *Thaler*, 43 F.4th at 1212.

⁷ See *id.*

⁸ *Burroughs Wellcome Co. v. Barr Labs., Inc.*, 40 F.3d 1223, 1228 (Fed. Cir. 1994) (citing *Sewall v. Walters*, 21 F.3d 411, 415 (Fed. Cir. 1994)).

⁹ *Id.* (citing *Hybritech Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 802 F.2d 1367, 1376 (Fed. Cir. 1986) (quoting 1 Robinson on Patents 532 (1890))).

¹⁰ *Id.*