



ROBIC

+ LAW
+ BUSINESS
+ SCIENCE
+ ART

SINCE 1892
LAWYERS, PATENT AND TRADEMARK AGENTS

BILSKI: BUSINESS METHODS AND SOFTWARE STILL PATENTABLE IN THE US

ADAM MIZERA^{*}
ROBIC, LLP

LAWYERS, PATENT AND TRADE-MARKS AGENTS

The long awaited decision in the Bilski matter in the US was issued on June 28, 2010. The US Supreme Court rejected a patent application based on a method of risk management in financial markets. However, in its judgment, the Court provided a certain number of comments that appear to indicate that business methods are still patentable in the US and that software can continue to be patentable in that jurisdiction.

The Bilski case¹ results from an appeal of a judgment of the Court of Appeals of the Federal Circuit in the United States which had re-examined the validity of patents on business methods. More particularly, a majority of the Court of Appeals had rejected a patent application based on a method of risk management in financial markets. The Court of Appeals had determined that such a patent application could not be valid if the object of the application was not attached to a physical machine or if it did not produce a change of state or transformation of a product (referred to as the "machine-or-transformation" test).

The US Supreme Court rejected the idea that this test, established by the Court of Appeals of the Federal Circuit, be the sole test to establish patentability of an invention. The Court determined that in the case at hand, the method of risk management was not an innovation that could be protected through a patent. The Supreme Court avoided using the "machine-or-transformation" test and preferred referring to previous Supreme Court decisions to establish that the claimed method was too abstract to be patentable.

In rendering its decision, the US Supreme Court however did not establish any new tests to evaluate patentable subject matter for patent applications in the US. Consequently, the uncertainty surrounding what constitutes patentable subject matter in the US remains.

The Supreme Court declared in its decision however that business methods as such could nevertheless in certain cases be protected through patents. Moreover,

© CIPS, 2010.

^{*} With ROBIC, LLP a multidisciplinary firm of Lawyers, and Patent and Trade-mark Agents. Published in the Summer 2010 Newsletter of the firm (Vol. 14, No. 2). Publication 068.121E.

¹ <http://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/09pdf/08-964.pdf>.

ROBIC, LLP
1001 Square-Victoria - Bloc E - 8th floor
Montreal, Quebec, Canada H2Z 2B7
Tel.: 514 987-6242 Fax: 514 845-7874
www.robic.ca info@robic.com

although the Court did not explicitly comment on the patentability of software, the Court did not make any statement that would appear to go against the concept of the patentability of software in the United States.

Consequently, patent applicants who want to protect software innovations do not yet have a clear test to determine whether or not their software invention represents a patentable invention in the US. While one awaits subsequent Court decisions to apply the principles established in the *Bilski* decision, Canadian patent applicants can in the meantime refer to a new chapter in the Manual of Patent Office Practice in Canada related to computer implemented inventions. This new chapter is available for consultation². The chapter gives several examples of inventions with software components, as well as the opinion of the Canadian Patent Office on what constitutes patentable subject matter in these inventions. The public is invited to provide comments on this chapter until August 19, 2010. Observations and suggestions can be provided to the Canadian Patent Office³.

One must note however that this Canadian chapter on the question of patentability of software may also require modifications once the *Amazon.com* case⁴, related to the rejection of Amazon.com's patent application on one-click shopping, is heard and the decision is rendered by the Federal Court of Canada. Case law on the patentability of software appears therefore to be as active as recent technological and innovative developments in this field.



² [http://www.cipo.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/cipointernet-internetopic.nsf/vwapj/consultation_chapitre16-chapter16-eng.pdf/\\$FILE/consultation_chapitre16-chapter16-eng.pdf](http://www.cipo.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/cipointernet-internetopic.nsf/vwapj/consultation_chapitre16-chapter16-eng.pdf/$FILE/consultation_chapitre16-chapter16-eng.pdf).

³ <http://www.cipo.ic.gc.ca/eic/site/cipointernet-internetopic.nsf/eng/wr02486.html>.

⁴ <http://newsletter.robic.ca/nouvelle.aspx?lg=EN&id=114>.

ROBIC, LLP

1001 Square-Victoria - Bloc E - 8th floor

Montreal, Quebec, Canada H2Z 2B7

Tel.: 514 987-6242 Fax: 514 845-7874

www.robic.ca info@robic.com

