

From: Scott Ritchie [e-mail redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, September 28, 2010 6:50 AM
To: Bilski_Guidance
Subject: The progress of science and the useful arts

I know you are probably slogging through a lot of these letters, so I will try and be brief.

Software should not be patentable, and I believe the text of the Bilski decision gives very strong hints that the court feels the same way. The court rejected Bilski's claim because it was deemed obvious, however the court also alluded to how such a patent would violate the constitution's requirement for patents to benefit the progress of science and the useful arts.

The court was explicit in rejecting the case of Bilski on the grounds of obviousness. As a software developer, I can attest to the fact that absolutely no one in this field looks through the patent archive for ideas; this is even the case when developers are willing to infringe patents because their software will never be marketed in the US.

Software patents, even expired ones, simply do not spread the progress of science and the useful arts.

Sincerely,
Scott Ritchie