§101 REJECTION TEMPLATE

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

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 requires of this title.

Claim*** rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The basis of this rejection is set forth in a two-prong test of:

(1) whether the invention is within the technological arts; and

(2) whether the invention produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

[Technological Arts Analysis]

For a claimed invention to be statutory, the claimed invention must be within the technological arts. Mere ideas in the abstract (i.e., abstract idea, law of nature, natural phenomena) that do not apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts fail to promote the "progress of science and the useful arts" (i.e., the physical sciences as opposed to social sciences, for example) and therefore are found to be non-statutory subject matter. For a process claim to pass muster, the recited process must somehow apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts.

In the present case, [claim analysis]

[Technology only in the preamble]

As to technological arts recited in the preamble, mere recitation in the preamble (i.e., intended or field of use) or mere implication of employing a machine or article of manufacture to perform some or all of the recited steps does not confer statutory subject matter to an otherwise
abstract idea unless there is positive recitation in the claim as a whole to breathe life and meaning into the preamble.

In the present case, [claim analysis]

[Nominal recitation of technology]

Mere intended or nominal use of a component, albeit within the technological arts, does not confer statutory subject matter to an otherwise abstract idea if the component does not apply, involve, use, or advance the underlying process.

In the present case, [claim analysis - analogous to non-functional descriptive data]

[State Street Analysis]

Additionally, for a claimed invention to be statutory, the claimed invention must produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result. ["Usefulness" may be evidenced by, but not limited to, a specific utility of the claimed invention. "Concreteness" may be evidenced by, but not limited to, repeatability and/or implementation without undue experimentation. "Tangibility" may be evidenced by, but not limited to, a real or actual effect.]

In the present case, [claim analysis]
Example 1:

A method for selecting an insurance policy comprising the steps of:
(a) retrieving information from a customer and an insurance policy;
(b) scoring the insurance policy based upon the information from the customer and policy; and
(c) iterating steps (1) and (2) with different policies until a best insurance policy is selected based on a score determined from step (b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC §101

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

The basis of this rejection is set forth in a two-prong test of:

(1) whether the invention is within the technological arts; and

(2) whether the invention produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

For a claimed invention to be statutory, the claimed invention must be within the technological arts. Mere ideas in the abstract (i.e., abstract idea, law of nature, natural phenomena) that do not apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts fail to promote the "progress of science and the useful arts" (i.e., the physical sciences as opposed to social sciences, for example) and therefore are found to be non-statutory subject matter. For a process claim to pass muster, the recited process must somehow apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts.

In the present case, claim 1 only recites an abstract idea. The recited steps of merely obtaining information about a customer and an insurance policy and performing a mathematical analysis to determine the best insurance policy does not apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts since all of the recited steps can be performed in the mind of the user or by use of a pencil and paper. These steps only constitute an idea of how to select an insurance policy over another.
Additionally, for a claimed invention to be statutory, the claimed invention must produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result. In the present case, the claimed invention produces scores for various policies (i.e., repeatable) used in determining and selecting the best insurance policy (i.e., useful and tangible).

Although the recited process produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result, since the claimed invention, as a whole, is not within the technological arts as explained above, claim 1 is deemed to be directed to non-statutory subject matter.
Example 2:

A *computerized* method for selecting an insurance policy comprising the steps of:
(a) retrieving information from a customer and an insurance policy;
(b) scoring the insurance policy based upon the information from the customer and policy; and
(c) iterating steps (1) and (2) with different policies until a best insurance policy is selected based
on a score determined from step (b).

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC §101*

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-
statutory subject matter.

The basis of this rejection is set forth in a two-prong test of:

(1) whether the invention is within the technological arts; and

(2) whether the invention produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result.

For a claimed invention to be statutory, the claimed invention must be within the
 technological arts. Mere ideas in the abstract (i.e., abstract idea, law of nature, natural
 phenomena) that do not apply, involve, use, or advance the technological arts fail to promote the
 "progress of science and the useful arts" (i.e., the physical sciences as opposed to social sciences,
 for example) and therefore are found to be non-statutory subject matter. For a process claim to
 pass muster, the recited process must somehow apply, involve, use, or advance the technological
 arts. In the present case, claim 1 only recites an abstract idea. The recited steps of merely
 obtaining information about a customer and an insurance policy and performing a mathematical
 analysis to determine the best insurance policy does not apply, involve, use, or advance the
 technological arts since all of the recited steps can be performed in the mind of the user or by use
 of a pencil and paper. These steps only constitute an idea of how to select an insurance policy
 over another.
As to technological arts recited in the preamble, mere recitation in the preamble (i.e., intended or field of use) or mere implication of employing a machine or article of manufacture to perform some or all of the recited steps does not confer statutory subject matter to an otherwise abstract idea unless there is positive recitation in the claim as a whole to breathe life and meaning into the preamble. In the present case, none of the recited steps are directed to anything in the technological arts as explained above with the exception of the recitation in the preamble that the method is "computerized". Looking at the claim as a whole, nothing the body of the claim recites any structure or functionality to suggest that a computer performs the recited steps. Therefore, the preamble is taken to merely recite a field of use.

Additionally, for a claimed invention to be statutory, the claimed invention must produce a useful, concrete, and tangible result. In the present case, the claimed invention produces scores for various policies (i.e., repeatable) used in determining and selecting the best insurance policy (i.e., useful and tangible).

Although the recited process produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result, since the claimed invention, as a whole, is not within the technological arts as explained above, claim 1 is deemed to be directed to non-statutory subject matter.
Example 3:

A computerized method for selecting an insurance policy comprising the steps of: (a) retrieving information from a customer database and an insurance policy database; (b) scoring the insurance policy by a processor based upon the information from the customer and policy; and (c) iterating steps (1) and (2) with different policies until a best insurance policy is selected based on a score determined from step (b).

Claim 1 is found statutory.

Claim 1 is within the technological arts because it employs a methodology performed within a computer, the process being effected by technology (i.e., a computer).

Claim 1 produces a useful, concrete, and tangible result because the determined scores of the insurance policy to the customer (i.e., repeatable result - concrete) produces an insurance policy (i.e., a real or actual effect - tangible) that is best suited for that customer (i.e., useful).