Hello,

I feel that the software patents often being applied for, approved, and granted are generic in their terminology, use, and enforcement. This allows patents that miss the essence of what the patent office was designed to facilitate: innovation. Individuals have to worry about big corporations suing for "generic idea #1" that the corporation amassed during buying other companies or just by blanketing their industry with patents that cover their own products. Big corporations are also known for using their own patents in "patent wars" whereby companies fight law suites by "enforcing" their patents.

Although software patents can sometimes be beneficial (if they are covering VERY, VERY specific things that are non-intuitive), they are often damaging to those trying to innovate. Ideas such as "streaming video over Internet" have been made generic and patented at the expense of everyone else. These are obvious in the sense that before "streaming video..." we had "streaming audio..." and before both of those there were "downloading audio..." Many software patents do not cover a specific use that an individual couldn't (and would) think up and implement easily in an afternoon.

Please take this under advisement going forward. I personally feel the market would be better without software patents at this time.

Regards,
Mark Caudill