

Patenting A.I. Innovations in the U.S.

Kate Gaudry



A.I. Filings in the U.S. are Dramatically Increasing







Proportional Increase in A.I. Filings Most Pronounced for Non-U.S. Applicants





KILPATRICK

But A.I. Filing Trends Depend on Application Area





KILPATRICK TOWNSEND



Perhaps Because Prospects of Patenting A.I. Innovation Depends on Application Area





• U.S. law indicates that any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof can be patented (35 U.S.C. § 101)

- U.S. law indicates that any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof can be patented (35 U.S.C. § 101)
- Unless the innovation is an abstract idea, law of nature, natural phenomena or product of nature (case law)

- U.S. law indicates that any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof can be patented (35 U.S.C. § 101)
- Unless the innovation is an abstract idea, law of nature, natural phenomena or product of nature (case law)
 - Each of these categories are somewhat dynamically defined and applied (case law)

- U.S. law indicates that any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof can be patented (35 U.S.C. § 101)
- Unless the innovation is an abstract idea, law of nature, natural phenomena or product of nature (case law)
 - Each of these categories are somewhat dynamically defined and dynamically applied (case law)
 - Recent effort (2014):



- U.S. law indicates that any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof can be patented (35 U.S.C. § 101)
- Unless the innovation is an abstract idea, law of nature, natural phenomena or product of nature (case law)
 - Each of these categories are somewhat dynamically defined and dynamically applied (case law)
 - More recent effort (2019):
 - Abstract idea must be: mathematical concept, certain method of organizing human activity or mental process or other exception approved by TC Director
 - AND, if abstract idea is integrated into practical idea = eligible
 - Examiner not to issue eligibility rejection unless more likely than not that claim is ineligible



Patenting Prospects of Software/A.I. Innovations has been Volatile in the U.S.



See: Gaudry K, Hayim S. "Artificial Intelligence Technologies Facing Heavy Scrutiny at the USPTO" *IPWatchDog.* 2018.

Raw data from LexisNexis[®] PatentAdvisorSM

¹¹



In the U.S., Inventors must be Human

- U.S. patent statutes do not specifically require that inventors be human. However:
- Legislative history and filing requirements (e.g., provision of "family name") are consistent with this requirement
- U.S. case law requires that inventors be individuals (e.g., not corporations)
- I.P. is a personal property right in the U.S.
- Consider: purpose of U.S. patent system is to promote innovation and disclosure



Conclusions

- A high degree of uncertainty remains regarding which types of artificial-intelligence innovations can be patented in the U.S.
- As of yet, no separate rules/laws distinguish patentability of A.I. innovations from other software innovations
- So as the U.S. struggles to determine which software inventions are sufficiently non-abstract to be patent eligible, patenting A.I. inventions is being affected
- The fact that A.I. patent applications are assigned to many parts of the U.S. patent office further complicates achieving consistent training and applicant predictability