

FROM *STATE STREET* TO *BILSKI*:
PATENT PROTECTION IN THE FINANCIAL INDUSTRY

A DISSERTATION
SUBMITTED TO THE LAW SCHOOL
AND THE COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE STUDIES
OF STANFORD UNIVERSITY
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Stefania Fusco

June 2010

© 2010 by Stefania Fusco. All Rights Reserved.
Re-distributed by Stanford University under license with the author.

This dissertation is online at: <http://purl.stanford.edu/dd022zn1028>

Abstract

In the last few years a renewed interest in the validity of patenting business methods has emerged. The issues appeared to have been settled in 1998 with the *State Street* decision. However, recently the Federal Circuit, following the more restrictive approach toward the patent system adopted by the Supreme Court, has questioned the soundness of the policy of extending patent protection to this type of subject matter.

This new scenario occurred explicitly in *In re Bilski* when the Federal Circuit decided to rehear the case en banc and reconsider the conclusions previously reached in *State Street*. In so doing, the court significantly restricted the ability of inventors to obtain patents in certain fields. Indeed, to secure a patent on a process, it is no longer sufficient to show that an invention produces “a useful, concrete and tangible result.” Now, an applicant also needs to demonstrate that her invention is either tied to a machine or transforms an article into a different state or thing.

In June 2009, the Supreme Court decided to grant certiorari on *In re Bilski*, and the resulting decision is expected to shed light on the proper way to deal with the many questions that this case raises. Ultimately, the issues under consideration revolve around the empirical question of whether the patent system in the specific sector is “doing its job” or, in other words, whether that patent system is fostering the creation of additional business methods. To answer this question, I conducted a two parts empirical investigation of financial methods, as a subset of business methods. Specifically, I studied the innovative types of securities that emerged between 1980 and 2007. Then, I analyzed the patent applications submitted and the patents issued for different types of securities after 1998. Finally, I conducted structured interviews with market participants about the production and consumption of financial methods.

The collected results indicate that after 2004 creators of new types of securities have shown less interest in the patent system. Nevertheless, the rate of innovation in this field has remained constant. The structured interviews reveal that market participants are ambivalent about the benefits that both the financial market and their companies can derive from having exclusive rights on their inventions. They also provide a description of the financial market and of its dynamics that does not fit well with the patents system’s mechanisms. Thus, serious doubts emerge that in the ten years between *State Street* and *In re Bilski* patent protection had any impact on innovation in the financial industry.

Table of Contents

ABSTRACT	IV
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	V
TABLE OF CONTENTS	VI
LIST OF TABLES	IX
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS	X
INTRODUCTION	1
I. BUSINESS METHODS IN THE STATE STREET ERA	4
A. Patentable Subject Matter and a Short Explanation of its Limits	5
B. Brief Description of Life before State Street	11
C. State Street and AT&T	13
D. The World after State Street	16
II. WHAT DO WE KNOW ABOUT FINANCIAL INNOVATION?	22
A. Financial Innovation in General	22
B. Financial Innovation and Patent Protection	25
III. INNOVATIVE SECURITIES AND PATENT PROTECTION	30

A.	Method	31
1.	Securities List Creation	32
2.	Data Collection from the USPTO Website	36
B.	Results	37
1.	Securities and Financial Methods	37
2.	Patents and Patent Applications	41
C.	Discussion	43
IV.	THE MARKET PARTICIPANTS' PERSPECTIVE	49
A.	Method	50
1.	Participants	51
2.	Material	58
3.	Procedure	62
B.	Results	64
1.	Interviews about the Production of Financial Methods	64
2.	Interviews about the Consumption of Financial Methods	72
C.	Discussion	76
V.	IS IN RE BILSKI A DÉJÀ VU?	80
A.	The Origin of Bilski	80
B.	In re Bilski	84
C.	Principal Issues Raised by the Bilski Decision	88
D.	A Conversation with Judge Rader	91

1.	Why <i>Bilski</i> , why now?	92
2.	The transformation prong of the <i>machine-or-transformation</i> test	93
3.	The machine prong of the <i>machine-or-transformation</i> test	95
4.	The Supreme Court's grant of <i>writ of certiorari</i>	95
E.	A few general considerations	96
F.	Seven months of BPAI decisions: preliminary numbers	97
G.	A closer look at the BPAI decision	99
1.	The Machine Prong	100
2.	The Transformation Prong	105
3.	The Transformation of Data	107
	CONCLUSIONS	109
	APPENDIX	112
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	115