

Supreme Court Rules Software and Business Methods Can Still Be Patented

By Geoffrey K. White

July 1, 2010

On June 28, the last day of its current term, the United States Supreme Court ruled, in the much-anticipated *Bilski* patent case, that software and business methods may still be patented. The Court approved the use of the so-called “machine-or-transformation” test, i.e., whether the claimed invention is tied to a particular machine or apparatus or whether it transforms a particular article into a different state or thing, in evaluating the viability of software and business method patent applications, but refused to recognize that test as the sole one for patentability.

Consistent with other recent patent-related cases, the Court indicated its preference for flexible, rather than rigid, tests for determining patentability. It maintained a long-standing tenet of patent law that determinations of whether an invention includes patent-eligible subject matter should focus on whether the claimed invention is a process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, with three specific exceptions: laws of nature, physical phenomena, and abstract ideas. The Court explained that the term “process” does not exclude business methods. It ruled, however, that the claimed invention in *Bilski* (a concept of hedging risk in energy markets) was not patentable since it could most appropriately be categorized merely as a mathematical formula or abstract idea.

Observers hoping for certainty in the Court’s decision are bound to be disappointed, while those pursuing business methods patents may be encouraged in their efforts. For now, the complex battles surrounding these patents will continue to be waged case-by-case.

© 2010 McNees Wallace & Nurick LLC

This document is presented with the understanding that the publisher does not render specific legal, accounting or other professional service to the reader. Due to the rapidly changing nature of the law, information contained in this publication may become outdated. Anyone using this material must always research original sources of authority and update this information to ensure accuracy and applicability to specific legal matters. In no event will the authors, the reviewers or the publisher be liable for any damage, whether direct, indirect or consequential, claimed to result from the use of this material.