

ROUNDTABLE ON PATENT SUBJECT MATTER ELIGIBILITY

- I. THE STRUCTURE OF THIS PRESENTATION**
- II. BACKGROUND / MOTIVATION / OBJECTIVE** *0.5 min*
 - my CV on below URL
 - 30M US\$ lost by VoIP patent
 - I want my money back+++
- III. THE PERSPECTIVE OF SPL** (if MBA framework based) *1.0 min*
 - SPL is a "sub-physical" exact science, i.e. any SPL problem is of FFOL Maths
 - patents are principally "legally absolutely robust", i.e. risks only as to facts (*Teva!!!*)
- IV. THE PERSPECTIVE OF THE IEG** *2.0 min*
 - PRINCIPALLY • NO PATENT CLARITY WITHOUT "ALL of Alice" incl. "inCs"
 - Update the IEG text by • 2 sections explaining "inventive concepts"&"ALL of Alice"
 - " any example by • 1 page quoting its "inCs" & applying "ALL of Alice" on them
 - invite any applicant to add this 1 page to its application
 - PRINCIPALLY • NO SIGNIFICANT CHANGES FOR NEXT 10-20 YEARS
- V. THE INNOVATION EXPERT SYSTEM (IES)** *0.5 min*
 - Patent Biz is manufacture,
 - IES takes it to industrialization (•"inverse Ford")
 - IES automated training for users & examiners
- VI. FLAT QUESTIONS ANSWERING** *3.0 min*

Sigram Schindler – TU Berlin, TELES Patent Rights International GmbH
USPTO – 14.11.2016

www.FSTP-Expert-System.com

The AMDOCS Dissent Stirs up the Key Deficiency of the CAFC's pro-PE *Alice* Decisions,
thus showing:
The Time is Ripe for Ending the §101 Chaos – Properly and Finally!

Sigram Schindler
TU Berlin & TELES Patent Rights International GmbH

AMDOCS^{1,a)} stirs up by its dissenting opinion ("D") the big deficiency of the CAFC's PE decisions, yet its majority opinion ("M") did not use it for progressing to meeting **ALL** *Alice* analysis's requirements.

Its D opinion^{b)} evidently is enabled by a deep concern: That all pro-PE "legal argument chains, LACs" in the CAFCs recent PE decisions^{c)} in absolutely no way confirm, its ETCI would "... **transform THE NATURE of the [originally nPE invention] claim into a patent-eligible application" that by an "**inventive concept**" is made "... **SIGNIFICANTLY MORE than a patent upon the ineligible concept itself^{e)}**". This author fully shares this concern – not withstanding that the M opinion (almost) is correct.**

Indeed, none of these pro-PE CAFC decisions^{c)} uses in its LAC exactly these two key words defining this transformation of an nPE invention, prescribed by the *Alice* analysis for achieving its application's PE^[300,301]. This is an extremely unusual phenomenon in US SPL precedents about ETCIs^{d)}. Moreover, this indicates that none of these CAFC decisions' ETCIs (except that of *DDR*) has really been found to meet 100% of the requirements that the *Alice* analysis correctly recognized as necessary for excluding its threatening the US NPS^{e)} the way that *Alice* shall bar^{u)}. While these are legal errors justifying the above concern, transitionally this unfortunately occurs^{e)}.

Thus, AMDOCS calls for settling the PE problem as indicated by the CAFC's pro-PE decisions, concurring with the Supreme Courts' *Alice* analysis – as US economies require, now properly and finally.