Software Patents

Christine Q. McLeod Registered Patent Attorney Saliwanchik, Lloyd & Saliwanchik Orlando • Gainesville

Topics Overview



- Computers and Software Defined
- Legal Protection for Software
- Brief History of Software Patents
- Searching Software Technology
- Drafting Software Patents
- International Software Protection
- Examples of Software Patents

March 2002 Saliwanchik, Lloyd & Sal

The Evolution of Computers



- 1945 ENIAC (Electronic Numerical Integrator and Computer) -- hard wired programmable computer
- 1951 UNIVAC/von Neumann Machines -programmable computers with instruction sequencers
- 1970s Intel's Microcontrollers (e.g., 8008)
- 1980s Mainframe Computers
- 1990s Desktop Computers

March 2002 Saliwanchik, Lloyd & Saliwanchik

Evolution of Computer Software

Hard Wired Machines



ENIAC was hard wired and could not use software

Saliwanchik, Lloyd & Saliwanch

Evolution of Computer Software

Machine Language (01100011)

UNIVAC/von Neumann Machines were programmable with sequenced instructions for stored binary values (0s and 1s)

Evolution of Computer Software

Assembly Language (ADD = 01100011)

Used mnemonics rather than binary code with an assembler to convert language to binary

Saliwanchik, Lloyd & Saliwanc

Evolution of Computer Software

High-Level Language (If x>y, then x+1)

Human readable notations with subroutines and modules (FORTRAN, BASIC, COBOL, PASCAL, C)

March 2002

Evolution of Computer Software

Object-Oriented Language

class Student {int myAge = 5; int temp; temp = myAge +2: myAge = temp;}

Data and procedures that act upon the data are treated as a single object (SIMULA, C++, VISUAL BASIC, JAVA)

Source Code v. Object Code

- <u>Source Code</u> High-level language or object oriented language readable by humans (If x then y, else z)
- <u>Object Code</u> Machine language readable by the computer as a series of 1s and 0s produced when source code is compiled (1100010111010<u>1...)</u>

Source Code/ C++

public boolean action(Event evt, Object arg) { // . . . if (arg. equals ("Search")) { System.out.println("Search event is detected"); PeString firstName = new PeString (entry_1.getText ()(); PeMessage msg = new PeMessage ("Search"); msg.addDataElement (firstName); PeDebug.println("====>msg is: "+msg); //send this event to the UI adaptor pc.sendMessage (msg); } return true; }

Protection of Software

There are more ways to legally protect computer software than virtually any other product:

- Copyrights
- Trade Secrets
- Patents

- Trademarks



Overlap of Protection



Each of these bodies of law may be used to protect different aspects of computer software, although there is a great deal of overlap.

2002 Saliwanchik, Lloyd & Saliwanchik

Copyright Law

\bigcirc

- Original work of authorship fixed in a tangible medium of expression
- Protects the "expression of the idea" not the idea itself
- Exclusive control to reproduce copies, prepare new works, distribute copies, perform the work in public

March 2002 Saliwanchik, Lloyd & Saliwanchik

Copyright Infringement

- Proof of infringement consists of establishing copying (access and substantial similarity)
- Remedies include injunctions, destruction of infringing copies, actual damages and infringer's profits or, if registered, statutory damages up to \$100,000 for willful infringement and attorney fees

March 2002 Saliwanchik, Lloyd & Saliwanchik

Copyright Registration of Software

- Source code, object code, and screen displays are <u>literary works</u> eligible for copyright protection
- Multimedia works are <u>audiovisual works</u> eligible for copyright protection
- Deposit materials with copyright office may include a request for special relief for trade secrets (1st and last 25 pages of source code with trade secret portions of code blocked out)

March 2002 Saliwanchik, Lloyd & Saliwanchik 15

Limitations of Copyright

- Protects "expression" not "idea"
- Does not protect procedures, systems, or methods of operation
- Infringement requires substantial similarity of protectable expression, not just an overall similarity of the works
- Filtration Test: 3 steps abstraction of program, filtration of non-protectable elements, comparison of remaining "golden nugget"

March 2002 Saliwanchik, Lloyd & Saliwanchik 16

Other Limitations of Copyright

- Merger Doctrine: if idea can be expressed only in one way, the expression is not protected (e.g., using efficient sorting algorithms)
- Elements dictated by external programming considerations not protectable expression (standards, industry practices)

March 2002 Saliwanchik, Lloyd & Saliwanchik

Trade Secrets



A trade secret is any formula, pattern, physical device, idea, process, compilation of information or virtually any other information that:

1. is not generally known or readily ascertainable by a competitor,

2. offers an economic advantage, and

3. for which reasonable steps to maintain secrecy are taken.

Trade Secrets in Software

- Computer code (object and source)
- Design specifications
- Flowcharts
- Technical notes
- Software development tools
- System documentation
- Formulas, algorithms
- Data structures and compilations
- Customer lists
- March 2002 Saliwanchik, Lloyd & Saliwanch

Limitations of Trade Secrets

- Does not protect against reverse engineering
- Does not apply to independent creation
- Public disclosure ends the protection

Trademarks ®

A trademark is a distinctive word, phrase, logo, or other device that is used to identify the source of a product and to distinguish the product from others.

e.g., Microsoft, IBM, AOL, PowerPoint, Norton Utilities, Myst



The View in the 70's

- 1972 Gottschalk v. Benson
- 1978 Parker v. Flook
- 1978 In re Freeman

Software technologies <u>not</u> patentable since patent would preempt mathematical algorithm

The View in the 80's

- 1980 In re Walter
- 1981 Diamond v. Diehr
- 1982 In re Abele
- 1989 In re Iwahashi

Software is patentable as a process, if it does not preempt mathematical algorithm

The View in the Early 90's

- 1994 In re Alappat, In re Schrader, In re Lowry, In re Trovato, In re Warmerdam, In re Beauregard
- 1996 PTO's Examination Guidelines for Computer Related Inventions

(90's test for patentability of software:1. Specific machine for performing a process

Specific machine for performing a process
 Series of steps which performs independent physical

- acts (postcomputer process activity)
- 3. Manipulates data to achieve a practical application

March 200

Saliwanchik, Lloyd & Saliwanchik

The View in the Late 90's

1998 – State Street Bank v. Signature Financial Group (apparatus claims)
1999 – AT&T v. Excel (method claims)

Software is patentable provided it it produces a "useful, concrete, tangible result"

Patentability of Software Today

- Produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result, is applied in a useful way, or is reduced to a practical application
- Physical transformation not required
- No exception to patentability for business methods



Who are getting software patents?*

- United States 60%
- Japan 25%
- Europe 9%
- Asia 3% Others 3%



*as of 1999

March 2002

Software Patents by Companies in 1998

- 1200 IBM
- 360 Motorola
- 330 Fujitsu
- 330 Canon
- 310 Microsoft
- 300 Lucent / BellCore
- 280 NEC
- 260 Sun
- 240 Xerox/Fuji Xerox
 240 Mitsubishi
 230 Intel
- 220 Toshiba

• 260 HP

• 250 Sony

• 250 Hitachi

190 Apple Computer

30

farch 2002 Saliwanchik, Lloyd & Saliwanchik

Searching Software Technology



Search Resources and Databases

- <u>Variation of a known technology</u> search U.S. or foreign patents by keyword and class/subclass (LEXIS, INPADOC, JAPIO, USPTO.GOV, etc.)
- <u>Cutting edge technology</u> search literature databases and the Internet in addition to patents (LEXIS/NEXIS, SPI, DIALOG: COMPENDEX, INSPEC, MATHSCI, SOFT, Micro Computer INDEX, etc.)

March 2002





Drafting Software Patents

Patent applications for computerrelated inventions (software) generally are best described as a process or method (i.e., a series of steps to perform a function)

March 2002

iwanchik, Lloyd & Saliwanchik

Format of Application

- <u>Title</u> -- Method, System, Apparatus for...
- <u>Background</u> (Field of Invention) identify the problems and why there is a need for a better method
- <u>Summary</u> Mirrors independent claims (Method, System, Media, GUI)
- Brief Description of Drawings
- Detailed Description
- Claims

March 2002

Written Description Requirement

- Written description of the invention and the manner and process of <u>making and</u> <u>using</u> it
- Enable reproduction of the invention by one skilled in the art without undue experimentation
- 3. Provide the <u>best mode</u> of practicing the invention, including any necessary drawings

36

March 2002 Saliwanchik, Lloyd & Saliwanchik

Organization of Description

- 1. Describe the static physical structure of the invention (hardware)
- 2. Describe the operation or function of the invention (software)
- 3. Provide specific examples and/or results of operation of the invention
- 4. Provide alternate embodiments for drafting claims of sufficient scope

March 2002 Saliwanchik, Lloyd & Saliwanchik 37

Disclosure of Computer Code

- Disclosure of source code is <u>not</u> necessary
- If you choose to include code, new guidelines allow you to include the code on a CD as an appendix (rather than microfiche)
- Disclosing code will satisfy the enablement and best mode requirement
- Copyright protection may be retained but trade secret protection is obviously lost

March 2002 Saliwanchik, Lloyd & Saliwanchik

Copyright Notification in Patent

COPYRIGHT NOTIFICATION

"Portions of this patent application contain materials that are subject to copyright protection. The copyright owner has no objection to the facsimile reproduction by anyone of the patent document, or the patent disclosure, as it appears in the Patent and Trademark Office."

Types of Software Drawings

Hardware/Components

If the invention includes hardware components, then a block diagram or circuit diagram should be included

System Diagram











Types of Software Drawings

Flowcharts

In an application describing a software process, one or more flowcharts should be included that correspond to the process claims (each of the blocks is a step in a specific sequence)



Types of Software Drawings

Functional Block Diagrams

For object-oriented programs, functional block diagrams should be used to show essential connections between processes and relevant data structures (show connectivity not process flow)



Other Types of Drawings

- Database Tables
- Graphical Displays
- Source Code Listings

48

				ŝ			
urani nooripi	unitin wice	FINS NUCRESSO	DUEFONCERO NECONICO N	CEDENCE PREVENTION	TWF CREWERS	0087 288	UPSILL OESION/SCB
	HORNALDAN	944.), 6084	80	18	54	MIR	-73/75-
0	WINSTELLAS	1	148	18.	-	8412	THE REPORT
c	PORTINGS/5		80	- 16	14	8/9	
0	MINERSON AND	MUNICER.	10		88.	Mi5	100000.07
	STREET, SALE		199	16.	+ 1094	61.00	we we
	NUMBER OF STREET	i.r	80		14	\$629	100 01223
G.	USB TWO LD		10		HA.	80.00	selling debt
14	N NUMBER OF	6	80	391	HA.	5005	dant mentional
1	UNIT THAT SHE	3	10	\$53	10.	1649	100.01100
				FIG. 4			









- Method/Process
- Apparatus/Machine
- Article of manufacture

ichik

Method/Process Claims

- Used to define an invention as a series of steps for a process
- Usually the easiest to write since software is, in essence, a series of steps for a process
- Broadest type of claim available

March 2002 Saliwanchik, Lloyd & Saliwanchik 52

Apparatus/Machine Claims

- Used to define a device/system with active components (processor, memory, database, printer, etc.)
- May be drafted in 2 ways:
 - Structural components, and
 - Means -plus -function language

Article of Manufacture Claims

- Used to define a device with no active components (e.g., computerreadable medium, data structure claims)
- Advantage is that the software manufacturer or distributor can be the infringer

Other Types of Claims

- GUI Graphical User Interface claim
- API Application Program Interface claim
- Signal Processing Claim electronic circuits

March 2002

Saliwanchik, Lloyd & Saliwanchik

Priceline's Method Claim (simplified) U.S. Pat. No. 5,794,207

- A method for facilitating transactions between a buyer and a plurality of sellers comprising:
- 1. inputting an offer price
- 2. inputting a credit card
- 3. outputting the offer to sellers
- 4. inputting acceptance by seller
- 5. paying the seller

March 2002 Saliwanchik, Lloyd & Saliwar

Sample Apparatus/Machine Claim

A system for facilitating transactions between a buyer and a plurality of sellers comprising: a storage device, a processor, an input device, etc.

- the processor programmed to
- 1. receive an offer price
- 2. receive a credit card
- 3. output the offer to sellers
- 4. receive acceptance by seller
- 5. pay the seller

March 2002 Saliwanchik, Lloyd & Saliwanchik

56

Sample Article of Manufacture Claim

A computer readable media containing program instructions for facilitating transactions between a buyer and a plurality of sellers comprising program instructions for:

58

- 1. receiving an offer price
- 2. receiving a credit card
- 3. outputting the offer to sellers
- 4. receiving acceptance by seller
- 5. paying the seller

March 2002 Saliwanchik, Lloyd & Saliwanchil

Sample "Means Plus Function"

A system for facilitating transactions between a buyer and a plurality of sellers comprising:

- 1. means for receiving an offer price
- 2. means for receiving a credit card
- 3. means for outputting the offer to sellers
- 4. means for receiving acceptance
- 5. means for paying the seller

March 2002 Saliwanchik, Lloyd & Saliwanchi

Sample Data Structure Claim

- A computer-readable medium having stored thereon a data structure comprising:
- 1. a first field containing data representing identification of a buyer;
- a second field containing data representing an offer price of a buyer in said first field;
- 3. a third field containing data representing identification of a seller;
- a forth field containing data representing acceptance by a seller in said third field of an offer in said second field; etc.

March 2002 Saliwanchik, Lloyd & Saliwanchik

Sample GUI claim

- A graphical user interface (GUI) having windowing capability comprising
 - first windowing means for inputting an offer price
 - second windowing means for displaying an acceptance of the offer by a seller
 - etc.

March 2002 Saliwanchik, Lloyd & Saliwanchik 61

International Patents



- More than <u>half</u> of the 176 countries in the world that grant patents permit the patenting of software-related inventions, at least to some degree.
- The most widely followed doctrine governing the scope of patent protection for softwarerelated inventions is the "technical effects" doctrine that was first promulgated by the European Patent Office ("EPO").

March 2002 Saliwanchik, Lloyd & Saliwanchik

Software Patents in the EPO

- The EPO law regarding patentability of software is more liberal than the individual laws of EPO member countries Spain, Switzerland, and the U.K.
- Better to file EPO application designating those countries rather than filing separate patents applications

Software Patents in Japan

- Japan is similar to Europe and the US
- A computer program that simply performs a mathematical algorithm is not patentable
- If software is used as a means for materializing a law of nature and is linked to appropriate hardware elements, it may be patentable (i.e., claim the computer)

March 2002 Saliwanchik, Lloyd & Saliwanchik

Software Patent in Canada

- 1994 Guidelines: Mere scientific principles are not patentable and presence of computer does not lend to or subtract from patentability
- New and useful process incorporating computer program, if integrated with another practical system is patentable
- Claims should have sufficient precomputer and postcomputer steps to create a novel system

March 2002

Foreign Protection of Software (2001 Update)

Country	Copyright?	Patent?
Argentina	Yes	No
Australia	Yes	Yes
Bosnia	Yes	No
Brazil	Yes	Maybe
Canada	Yes	Yes
Chile	Yes	No
China	Yes	Maybe
France	Yes	Yes
Germany	Yes	Yes



Foreign Protection of Software (2001 Update)

Country	Copyright?	Patent?
Japan	Yes	Yes
Malaysia	Yes	No
Mexico	Yes	Maybe
Panama	Yes	No
Russia	Yes	No
Saudi Arabia	Yes	No
South Africa	Yes	No
Taiwan	Yes	Yes
ик	Yes	Yes



Examples of Software Patents



Operating Systems

- Intercepting calls to a network operating system by replacing the first few instructions of an entry point by a call to an intercept routine. [#5,257,381].
- Statically allocating an initial amount of memory when a program is first loaded according to a size value contained in the program header. [#5,247,674].

Graphics and Windowing Systems

- Use of different colors to distinguish the nesting level of nested expressions in computer programs. [#4,965,765].
- The computer graphics representation of a surface using and array of dots, rather than the more traditional wire frame model. [#5,257,347].
- A calendar tool that includes a bar graph of the duration of each meeting and a composite bar graph of all meetings. [#5,247,438].

Cryptography and Data Compression

- Diffie/Hellman secret key exchange patent. [#4,200,770].
- Hellman/Merkle public key cryptography patent. [#4,218,582].
- Compressing a font by detecting rows and columns that are entirely blank and encoding them separately. [#5,272,768].
- LZW compression patent. [#4,558,302].

Multimedia

- A document storage system that has a digital camera to scan in documents, stores the documents on an optical disk, and uses character recognition software to construct an index. [#4,941,125].
- Compton's famous multimedia search patent. [#5,241,671].

Word Processors

- A word processor that monitors the sequence of keys you type and tries to teach you about new features. [#4,947,346].
- Any word processor with a separate mode that the user selects when they wish to type in a mathematical formula. [#5,122,953].
- A word processor which marks and makes correction to a document using two additional different colors. [#5,021,972].

ik, Lloyd & Saliwanchik

Spreadsheets

- A spreadsheet that has an outline mode to automatically collapse rows that are hierarchically subordinate to another row. [#5,255,356].
- A spreadsheet in which each cell has a "next cell" attribute defining the next cell to advance to after having entering data into the current cell. [#5,121,499].
- Combining two or more spreadsheet tables together to produce a new table in accordance with the indicated row and column headings. [#5,272,628].

March 2002 Saliwanchik, Lloyd & Saliwanchik

74