



Life Sciences Patent Eligibility: The US and Beyond

Dr. Leslie Fischer, Senior Patent Attorney
March 9, 2017, Alexandria, VA
The University of Texas School of Law
12th Annual Advanced Patent Law Institute



U.S. Patent Eligibility



35 U.S.C. §101 – Four Categories of Eligible Subject Matter


Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful **process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter**, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Judicial exceptions (JE) made by US courts: one cannot claim a **law of nature (NL)**, a **natural phenomena (NP)**, or an **abstract idea (AI)**.

Why: granting a monopoly over the basic tools of scientific and technological work would pre-empt use of these tools in all fields, thereby impeding innovation.

Article I, §8, Clause 8 of the constitution empowers the US Congress:

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries.



³ L. Fischer/UT Conference/March 2017/VA



U.S. Patent Eligibility SCOTUS



Prometheus v. Mayo

A method of optimizing .. treatment of an immune-mediated gastrointestinal disorder, comprising:

(a) **administering** a drug providing 6-thioguanine to a subject; and

(b) **determining** the level of 6-thioguanine in the subject,

wherein a level of 6-thioguanine less than about 230 pmol per 8×10^8 red blood cells indicates a need to increase the amount of the drug and **wherein** a level of 6-thioguanine greater than about 400 pmol per 8×10^8 red blood cells indicates a need to decrease the amount of the drug.

- The claims do not add enough to the NL to describe an eligible process.
- **administering** - merely refers to a preexisting audience.
- **determining** - merely a routine activity.
- **wherein** - merely describes the natural law without instructing its **application**.
- **application** must be significant, not too preemptive of JE, and include elements beyond the JE that constitute an “inventive concept” that is significant and separate from the NL itself.
- “appending conventional steps, specified at a high level of generality, to laws of nature, natural phenomena, and abstract ideas cannot make those laws, phenomena, and ideas patentable.” (WURC)

Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank

- Confirms that the *Mayo* test is *the test* for claims under § 101.
- Analyze steps individually & as ordered combination (*Diehr* - claims cannot be deconstructed into their component steps but must be considered as a whole).
- *The Mayo/Alice two-step test*:
 - (1) Is the claim directed to a JE (NP, AI, NL)?
 - (2) Does the claim contain an “inventive concept” sufficient to “transform” the claim into a patent-eligible application of the JE?

Dicta (*below*) supports the idea that a **solution to a technical problem** is not an AI, and a claim drawn to such a solution, even if broad, will satisfy the *Alice/Mayo* two-step.

According to SCOTUS, “the claims in *Diehr* were patent eligible because they improved an existing technological process, not because they were implemented on a computer.” In contrast, the *Alice* claims did not “improve the functioning of the computer itself” or “effect an improvement in any other technology or technical field.”

(1) method for exchanging financial obligations, (2) computer system; (3) computer-readable medium

Find the full text of this and thousands of other resources from leading experts in dozens of legal practice areas in the [UT Law CLE eLibrary \(utcle.org/elibrary\)](http://utcle.org/elibrary)

Title search: Life Sciences Patent Eligibility: The US and Beyond

Also available as part of the eCourse

[2017 Advanced Patent Law \(USPTO\) eConference](#)

First appeared as part of the conference materials for the
12th Annual Advanced Patent Law Institute session

"Section 101 and Lifesciences: Current U.S. and International Perspectives"