Kluwer Competition Law Blog

Ensuring Fair Competition: Antitrust Considerations in the US Patent Eligibility Restoration Act of 2023

Konstantin Voropaev (Elbert, Nazaretsky, Rakov & Co) · Monday, July 15th, 2024

The Patent Eligibility Restoration Act of 2023 (PERA), introduced by Senators Thom Tillis and Chris Coons, aims to broaden the scope of patentable subject matter in the U.S. This Act addresses limitations from Supreme Court decisions like Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank International, which have restricted patent eligibility under Section 101 of the Patent Act. One year after its introduction, it is crucial to evaluate its impact on innovation and competition. By broadening patent eligibility, PERA has the potential to foster innovation. However, it also raises significant antitrust concerns. Expanded patent protections could allow dominant firms to amass extensive patent portfolios. This could create barriers to entry and stifle competition from smaller firms. Ensuring that these broader protections do not lead to monopolistic practices is essential to maintaining a competitive market. Effective regulatory oversight and enforcement of antitrust laws are crucial to achieving this balance.

Clarifying Patent Eligibility

PERA seeks to clarify patent eligibility by defining statutory categories. Under Section 101 of the Patent Act, any invention or discovery that is a useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter is eligible for patent protection. This change eliminates judicial exceptions that previously excluded abstract ideas and natural phenomena. However, the Patent Act includes several exclusions from patentability. These include mathematical formulas not part of a useful invention, processes that are primarily economic, financial, business, social, cultural, or artistic unless they require a machine, mental processes performed in the mind, naturally occurring processes, and unmodified natural materials.

By eliminating judicial exceptions and clearly defining statutory categories, PERA aims to provide a more predictable and stable patent eligibility framework. This is intended to foster innovation by offering clearer guidelines on what can be patented. However, this also means that certain inventions previously deemed ineligible due to their abstract nature or status as natural phenomena can now be patented if they fit within the statutory categories. This change could lead to an influx of patents in areas like biotechnology and software, which were previously constrained by judicial exceptions. While this might spur innovation, it also risks enabling dominant firms to secure broad patents. These firms could stifle competition, especially if they extensively patent foundational technologies or minor improvements.

Challenges and Ambiguities

While the goal of fostering innovation is commendable, the broad and sometimes vague language of PERA can result in inconsistent enforcement. Exclusions like “processes primarily economic, financial, business, social, cultural, or artistic” are particularly problematic. Courts may interpret these provisions differently, leading to legal uncertainty. This unpredictability can create an uneven playing field. Certain companies may exploit ambiguities to secure patents that others cannot, leading to monopolistic practices. The provision allowing patents on processes requiring a machine could enable large corporations to patent minor improvements, resulting in extensive portfolios aimed at blocking competitors. This could stifle competition and innovation by smaller firms, a significant antitrust concern.

The ambiguity in PERA’s language, especially regarding exclusions, presents a significant risk of inconsistent enforcement. The term “processes primarily economic, financial, business, social, cultural, or artistic” can be subjectively interpreted by different courts. This can lead to varied outcomes in patent disputes. Large corporations with extensive legal resources might exploit these ambiguities to obtain patents on processes that should arguably remain unpatentable. This strategic use of patents can lead to monopolistic practices. Minor technological improvements may be patented, creating “patent thickets.” These are dense webs of overlapping patents that make it difficult for other companies, especially smaller ones, to innovate without infringing on existing patents.

Opinions and Antitrust Concerns

During the Senate Judiciary Committee’s hearing on PERA, several experts emphasized the importance of addressing antitrust concerns. David J. Kappos highlighted that the current patent eligibility laws create uncertainty, which large corporations can exploit to stifle competition. He supported PERA for its clear guidelines and objective criteria, which would prevent overly broad patents that block competitors. Courtenay C. Brinckerhoff discussed international disparities, noting that other countries allow patents on isolated natural products and diagnostic methods, pushing U.S. companies to innovate elsewhere. She argued that PERA would level the playing field and encourage domestic investment without fostering monopolistic practices. Adam Mossoff emphasized that eliminating vague judicial exceptions under PERA would reduce the risk of dominant firms using ambiguous patents to stifle competition. Richard Blaylock pointed out that PERA’s specific exclusions for non-technical processes would prevent companies from monopolizing fundamental economic practices. Mark Deem highlighted that the lack of clarity in current patent laws has caused significant harm to innovation, particularly in the biotech and medtech industries. He stressed that strong patent protection is essential for encouraging investment in life-saving technologies and that the ambiguity of current laws discourages such investment. Andrei Iancu emphasized that the current judicial framework around patent eligibility is in disarray, leading to deep uncertainty that hampers innovation and competition.

Regulatory Oversight and Future Implications

One of the critical antitrust concerns with PERA is the potential for dominant firms to leverage expanded patent eligibility to amass extensive patent portfolios. These portfolios can create barriers to entry, making it difficult for smaller firms to compete. By obtaining patents on incremental improvements or broad claims, large corporations could engage in strategic patenting, aiming to block competitors rather than innovate. This practice of "patent thickets," can stifle competition and innovation, leading to market monopolization.

While PERA aims to foster innovation by providing stronger patent protections, there is a delicate balance. Encouraging technological advancement should not lead to market dominance and monopolisation. Dominant firms could use their patent portfolios to enforce exclusivity, reducing the incentive for smaller firms to innovate. The result could be reduced competition, higher prices for consumers, and less diversity in the market. Regulatory oversight is essential to ensure that the expanded scope of patentable subject matter does not translate into unfair market practices.

Expanding patent eligibility could also influence technological standards. Companies that secure patents on foundational technologies might dictate the standards adopted across industries. This control can lead to antitrust issues, as it allows these firms to exert significant influence over the direction of technological development and market access. Smaller firms may struggle to comply with these standards or to innovate independently, leading to reduced competition and innovation.

While PERA seeks to enhance innovation by broadening patentable subject matter, its implementation must be carefully managed. Regulatory bodies need to ensure that expanded patent protections do not translate into monopolistic practices. Clear guidelines, consistent enforcement, and robust oversight are essential. This balance ensures technological advancement while maintaining competitive markets. By doing so, PERA can fulfil its promise of fostering innovation while safeguarding the principles of fair competition.

Conclusions

The Patent Eligibility Restoration Act of 2023 (PERA) introduces significant changes to U.S. patent law by expanding the range of patentable subject matter. This shift aims to boost innovation by providing clearer guidelines on patent eligibility. However, it also raises important antitrust concerns. Dominant firms could exploit the broadened scope to create extensive patent portfolios, forming patent thickets that block competition and stifle innovation from smaller firms.

Ensuring fair competition requires robust regulatory oversight and consistent enforcement of antitrust laws. Clear guidelines are essential to prevent these expanded protections from leading to monopolistic practices. By maintaining this balance, PERA can promote technological advancement while safeguarding fair competition principles. Effective management of these aspects will be crucial for PERA to achieve its intended benefits without compromising market competitiveness.

To make sure you do not miss out on regular updates from the Kluwer Competition Law Blog, please subscribe here.

Kluwer Competition Law

The **2022 Future Ready Lawyer survey** showed that 79% of lawyers are coping with increased volume & complexity of information. Kluwer Competition Law enables you to make more informed decisions, more quickly from every preferred location. Are you, as a competition lawyer, ready for the future?

Learn how **Kluwer Competition Law** can support you.

This entry was posted on Monday, July 15th, 2024 at 10:00 am and is filed under Innovation, Intellectual property (IP), Legislation, United States of America
You can follow any responses to this entry through the Comments (RSS) feed. You can leave a response, or trackback from your own site.