



Shaun Kennedy

Partner
303.295.8377
Denver, Washington, DC
skenney@hollandhart.com



Thomas Morales

Associate
303.295.8277
Denver
TAMorales@hollandhart.com

GAO: No bid protest jurisdiction over USPTO's use of a request for information to limit participation in future procurement

Insight — September 24, 2020

Thomson Reuters Westlaw Today

This article was published in Westlaw Today on September 24, 2020.

Contractors responding to a request for information ("RFI") issued pursuant to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office's ("USPTO") Alternative Competition Method may be surprised to learn that they may have no opportunity to challenge the agency's decision to exclude them from bidding on a future procurement.

Such was the case in a recent Government Accountability Office (GAO) bid protest decision, CGI Federal, Inc; Ascendant Servs., LLC, B-418807.1; B-418807.2, 2020 WL 4901733 (Comp. Gen. Aug. 18, 2020).

Shaun Kennedy and Thomas Morales co-authored an article for Westlaw Today titled, "GAO: No bid protest jurisdiction over USPTO's use of a request for information to limit participation in future procurement." The authors review a GAO bid protest decision that exposes a potential jurisdictional void regarding and the opportunity for government contractors to challenge competitive decisions under the USPTO's Alternative Competition Method.

Please click [here](#) to read the full article: GAO: No bid protest jurisdiction over USPTO's use of a request for information to limit participation in future procurement.

About the Authors:

Shaun Kennedy is of counsel with the Government Contracts Practice Group at Holland & Hart LLP. He brings broad expertise to federal and state government contracts, guiding clients in bid protests and claims litigation, general counseling, and internal investigations. Thomas Morales is an associate with the firm's Government Contracts and Construction practice groups. He joined the firm after working as a project and operations manager for an electrical subcontractor and now uses his industry.

This publication is designed to provide general information on pertinent legal topics. The statements made are provided for educational purposes only. They do not constitute legal or financial advice nor do they necessarily reflect the views of Holland & Hart LLP or any of its attorneys other than the author(s). This publication is not intended to create an attorney-client relationship between you and Holland & Hart LLP. Substantive changes in the law subsequent to the date of this publication might affect the analysis or commentary. Similarly, the analysis may differ depending on the jurisdiction or circumstances. If you have specific questions as to the application of the law to your activities, you should seek the advice of your legal counsel.