

**From:** John Chamberlain  
**Sent:** Friday, January 04, 2013 3:23 PM  
**To:** SoftwareRoundtable2013  
**Subject:** Comments on software patent review and approval policy

Hello, as a software developer engaged in creating new algorithms and complex, intelligent software for military purposes I am well experienced with the tenor of typical software patents and patents in which software is specified as a component of the innovation.

In many cases granted patents have little or no validity and are developments that are obvious to practitioners of the art.

I specifically object to several aspects of the current policy:

(1) The policy of defaulting to an acceptance of an application and letting challenges be worked out in court is absolutely outrageous and creates a huge cost to society. This blanket acceptance of meritless patent applications is hindering rather than fostering technology development in the United States and abroad. THE DEFAULT ASSUMPTION SHOULD BE THAT THE PATENT IS INVALID.

(2) Allowing multifarious patents. Currently, applicants are allowed to submit multifarious patents that list dozens and dozens of "inventions" and "claims". Needless to say, many of the claims constitute obvious technology that has no validity as an "invention". The policy of the patent office should be to deny multifarious claims and restrict inventions to the kernel or essential element of the invention.

(3) Allowing vague, overly broad claims. Many patents I survey have ridiculously vague, overbroad claims. As an example, Raytheon was recently awarded Patent US8251288B2 for "network-centric" targetting with the typical litany of overbroad claims which border on absurdity. Just to cite two of these out of dozens:

"a prepare module configured to plan for targeting engagements and to identify a target;"

"a sense module configured to locate targets of opportunity and targets generated by the prepare module to form targeting information;"

How is "identifying a target" an invention? It is not. A caveman spotting a bison to kill is identifying a target. This is not an invention and is not a valid claim. Likewise, claiming an ability to identify "targets of opportunity" is absurd. Every targetting system ever created does this. Allowing patents with these huge list of obvious functionalities is beyond all logic and intensifies the waste of money and time in litigation disposing of all these absurd claims which never should have been allowed in the first place.

Software, as you know, is a highly reproductive science in which we engineers constantly borrow and adapt from each other. Very little software is produced contains genuinely novel ideas deserving of patent protection and it is arguable that allowing ANY software patents produces any useful effect, because the damage done by non-deserving patents so far outweighs the benefit of the few that are deserving.

Best regards,

+ + + + +

John S. Chamberlain  
Senior Software Engineer  
Decision Management Systems  
Government Services  
Charles River Analytics Inc.  
617.491.3474 x644  
[www.cra.com](http://www.cra.com)

THIS MESSAGE IS INTENDED FOR THE USE OF THE PERSON TO WHOM IT IS ADDRESSED. IT MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL AND EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. If you are not the intended recipient, your use of this message for any purpose is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please delete the message and notify the sender so that we may correct our records.