The FSTP-Project’s Reference List

Many FSTP-Project mails, including this one, are written in preparation of the textbook[12] – i.e. are not fully self-explanatory independent of other FSTP-mails.


[2] The term ‘Artificial Intelligence’ here denotes specific cutting edge deterministic IT & Mathematics areas, e.g. in Knowledge Representation (KR)/Description Logic (DL)/Natural Language (NL)/Semantics/Semiotics/(Nonsequential) System Design/…, i.e. a resilient fundament for analyzing 35 USC/SPL by AI-based “Facts Screening/Transforming/Presenting, FSTP-Technology, developed here, induced by the US Supreme Court’s framework decisions[12]. All the ETCIs’ meanings, especially Molecular Biology meanings of all ‘BIO- prefixed’ acronyms, are based on so understood AI.


[18] USSC: SSBG’s AB in CLS, 07.10.2013[5].


[26] USSC: SSBG’s AB in Bliski, 06.08.2009[1].


[38] CAFC, Transcript of the Hearing in TELES vs. CISCO/USPTO, 08.01.2014[1].

[39] CAFC, Transcript of the en banc Hearing in CLS vs. ALICE, 08.02.2013[1].

[40] SSBG’s Brief to the CAFC in case ‘453[1].

[41] SSBG’s Brief to the CAFC in case ‘902[1].

[42] SSBG’s Amicus Brief to the CAFC in case CLS, 06.12.2012[1].


[45] USSC: SSBG’s AB as to Cls, 28.01.2014[1].


[47] S. Schindler: “Automatic Generation of All ASTs for an Invention’s SPL Test.”.


[50] NAUTILUS v. BIOSIG, PFC, 2013[1].


[52] Public Knowledge et al., AB, 2013[1].

[53] Amazon et al., AB, 2013[1].

[17] USSC Decision in KSR v. Teleflex, 30.04.2007i)
USCC Decision in Bilski v. Kappos, 28.06.2010i)
USCC Decision in Mayo v. Prometheus, 20.03.2012i)
USCC Decision in AMP v. Myriad, 13.06.2013i)
USCC Decision in Nautilus v. Biosig, 02.06.2014i)
USCC Decision in Alice v. CLS, 19.06.2014i)
[19] G. Quinn: “Judge Michel says Alice Decision ‘will create total chaos’”, IPWatch, i.
[27] S. Schindler: “The Rationality of a Claimed Invention’s (CI’s) post-Mayo SPL Test – It Increases CI’s Legal Quality and Professional Efficiency in CI’s Use”, in prep.
[29] USSC: Order as to denial [121], 14.10.2014i)
[31] BGH, “Demonstrationsschranken” decision”.
[33] ... Press, ...... to go into [137] ......... “ .......” .......
[34] “Turmoil ......”, see program of AIPLA meeting, DC, 23.10.2014
[35] “Dark side of Innovation”, ...... see [137]
[38] R. Rader: Confirming that socially unacceptable CIs as extremely preemptive, such as for example [119], should be patent-eligible, AIPLA meeting, DC, 24.10.2014.
[39] A. Hirshfeld: Announcing the USPTO’s readiness to consider also hypo. CIs in its EG, AIPLA meeting, DC, 24.10.2014.
[40] S. Schindler: “Alice-Tests Enable ‘Quantifying’ Their Inventive Concepts … “, USPTO&GWU, 06.02.2015i), see also [175i].
[43] S. Schindler: “Practical Impacts of the Mayo/Alice/Biosig-Test”, t., Drake Uni. Law School, 27.03.2015i)
[48] USSC’s Order as to denial [92], 08.12.2014i).
[55] “ALICE AND PATENT DOOMSDAY IN THE NEW YEAR”, IPG, 06.01.2015).
[64] USSC Decision in Markman, 23.04.1996i.
[66] R. Rader: Questions as to the FSTP-Test, WIPIP, USPTO&GWU, 06.02.2015.
[181] CAFC Decision in Cuzozzo, 04.02.2015.
[184] S. Schindler: “PTOs Efficiency Increase by the FSTP-Test, e.g. EPO and USPTO”, LESI, Brussels, 10.04.2015.
[185] R. Chen: Commenting politely on “tensions” about the BRI, PTO/IPO-EF Day, 10.03.2015.
[187] P. Michel: Moderating the SPL paradigm ref. by Mayo/Alice, PTO/IPO-EF Day, 10.03.2015.
[188] P. Michel: Asking this panel as to diss. of Mayo/Alice, PTO/IPO-EF Day, 10.03.2015.
[190] A. Hirshfeld: Remark on EPQI’s ref. of pat. ap. examination, PTO/IPO-EF Day, 10.03.2015.
[191] 16th Int. Roundd. on Sem., Hillo, 29.04.2015.
[196] See the panel at the IPBCGlobal’2015, San Francisco, 14-16.06.2015.
[197] S. Schindler: “Mayo/Alice – The USSC’s Requirement Statement as to Semiotics in SPL & ETCIs, USPTO, 06.05.2015.
[207] K.-J. Melulisi, report about a thus caused problem with a granted patent at the X. Senate of the German BGH.
[209] CAFC Decision in Ariosa, 12.06.2015.
[213] CAFC Decision in Teva, 18.06.2015.
[220] CAFC Decision in LBC, 23.06.2015.
[221] CAFC Decision in Cuzozzo, 08.07.2015.
[223] CAFC Decision in Int. Ventures, 06.07.2015.
[228] D. Kettelberger, see [227]
I. Kant: "What Real Progress has Metaphysics Made in Germany since the Time of Leibniz and Wolff?", Ababis B., NY, '83.


[240] USSC: PIC by Cuozzo.

[241] S. Schindler: "Draft of an Amicus Brief to the USSC in Cuozzo supporting", publ. 05.11.2015.


[248] USSC Decision in Parker vs. Flock, 22.06.1978

[249] CAFC Denial of En Banc Petition in Ariosa v. Myriad


[253] USPTO Cert Petitions in Halo v. Pulse and Stryker v. Zimmer, 22.06.2015


[255] CAFC Oral Argument in Lexmark v. Impression, 02.10.2015

[256] CAFC Decision in Carnegie v. Marvell, 04.08.2015


[258] S. Schindler: "BRIPTO by the USPTO or BRI by the Supreme Court?", 03.02.2016.


[264] W. Quine, see Wikipedia.


[289] CAFC, Decision in TJL, 17.05.2016.

[290] CAFC, Decision in Enfish, 12.05.2016.


[296] USPTO: "Patent Public Advisory Com., Quarterly Meeting, IT Update", 05.06.2016, USPTO's home page


[306] USSC, Decision in Diamond v. Diehr, 03.03.1981.


[327] tbd


[329] M. Holoubek: tbd


[336] EU's Biotech Directive

[337] EU's CII Directive
[338] EU's Enforcement Directive
[339] EU's SBC Regulation
[342] J. Herdor: “Just When You Thought the CAFC would Softening … the Tide Turns Again”, PATENTDOCS
[344] CAFC, Decision in AMDOCS v. OPENET TELECOM, 01.11.2016
[362] USPTO/PTAB: Ex parte Schulhauser, 2016, )
[364] S. Schindler: “The PTAB’s Schulhauser Dec. is Untenable”, publ. 08.03.2017
[365] R. Katznelson: “Can the Supreme Court’s erosion of patent rights be reversed?”, IPWatchdog, 02.03.2017
[370] Tbd
[376] AIPLA: "Legislative Proposal and Report On PE Subject Matter", 12.05.2017
[378] see the correct reference in the V.27 of the [372] at the below URL, in a few days.
[379] ABA: Letter by D. Suchy to the USPTO, 28.03.2017
[380] SIPO: Message by H-M Tso, J. Yi, 31.03.2017
[383] B. Stoll: “101 in the Future”, AIPLA, 17.05.2017
[386] Tbd
[389] AIPLA: “Patent Venue Statute is not Modified by General Venue Statute”, 22.05.2017
[397] CAFC, Decision in ARIOSA v. SEQUENOM, 12.06.2015\(^*\).
[399] USSC, PIC in SEQUENOM v. ARIOSA, 21.03.2016\(^*\), DENIED on 27.06.2016.
[411] D. Kolker: “USPTO Guidel. on Subject Matter Eligibility”, BCBCP Partnership Meet., 02.08.2017\(^*\)
[414] L. Fischer: “S.M Eligibility”, BCBCP Partnership Meeting, 02.08.2017\(^*\)


S. Schindler: “Finally, CAFC & USPTO Started Friendly ….! One Year of Andrei Iancu’s Spirit in the USPTO — and All US Legal Patent-Business is of Good-Will.”, publ. 05.03.2019.

CAFC, Decision in Athena v. Mayo, 06.02.2019

G.Quinn: “Why the CAFC is to Blame ..“, IPWATCHDOG, 25.02.2019


R. Taylor, see*)

D. Reardon, G. Quinn: „Alice is Due for Reversal: Science Proves Its Reasoning Unsound”, 21.03.2019


S. Schindler: “Andrei Iancu Will Resolve the PE-Problem as Required by Incentivizing Innovation”, ABA-IPL, publ. 22.04.2019


CAFC, Decision in Athena v. Mayo, 06.02.2019

USSC: PIC in Berkheimer

USSC: PIC in Hikma

CAFC, Decision in Cleveland v. True Health, 01.04.2019

*) documents and complete Ref.-list available at www.FSTP-expert-system.com