An official website of the United States Government.

PUBLIC SUBMISSION

Comments Submitted by Benjamin Broderick

Posted by the **Patent and Trademark Office** on Sep 7, 2021

View More Comments 62 (/document/PTO-P-2021-0032-0002/comment)

View Related Comments 145 (/docket/PTO-P-2021-0032/comments)

Share

Comment

1. All patents prevent progress and innovation, just by the sheer numbers of hours of human effort allocated to their tedious details.

2. The mere existence of patents makes one who has a reasonably good product idea feel as though a massive cost and highly-technical process stands between them and the production of their product.

3. The general public misunderstand patents, and think you absolutely have to have one in order to create a product and sell it.

4. Exclusive right to sell a particular product is an obvious hindrance to innovation, as more competition means a variety of prices and more consumers having access, which then leads to more discovery of upgrades.

5. Many great little products have been patented, & individual or group who patented the product did not abundantly market the product, or fell short on seeing the product through to a successful market presence, and so the exclusive right to sell that product was a hindrance to innovation.

6. Patents are good only as the right to sue, presumably to recover losses made from purchases by those who presumably would have instead purchased from the patent holder, but a sale doesn't mean a lost sale. The world has nearly 8 billion people on it, so, proving that one person would have bought from the patent owner if they had not instead bought from a different supplier is extremely hard to do, given the different marketing reach of different suppliers.

7. The cost of the patent is a significant hindrance to the low-income individual, and they may very well feel defeated before they even begin, whereas the patent process might feel fun and empowering to wealthier individuals or groups. Excluding socioeconomic classes that comprise the majority of the world does hinder innovation.

8. The idea of property and theft has been a hard thing for humans to figure out. Some humans feel they are being stolen from if their younger sibling dresses like them or copies certain mannerisms. Humans have not rationally defined property into terms that can consistently make sense, such as the duplicatability of information making it relatively without scarcity compared with material objects, which are known to be scarce or finite in their numbers. Exclusive right to use specific information translates to the use of legalized force to make someone financially pay for their profiting from the sale of products resembling a particular idea that someone filed, & presumably they would have to pay whether or not they knew the product was under the exclusivity protection called a patent. This also prevents innovation, as it creates a big focus on the question of whether one will know enough or have enough legal help to avoid some sort of legal problems later on, especially if they are on a tight budget.

9. The right to sue presumes that one invested dearly to come up with the innovation, through rigorous research and financial investment, but how often are large companies filing patents over innovations that their employees presented? The idea of patents has brought extreme possessiveness of ideas to our modern world, usually in such a way that abundantly stifles innovation. If an employee thought of an idea, is it the right of the company to possess that idea exclusively, or is it the right of the employee to share that idea, and declare it as prior art, public domain? Should the company be able to latch on in exclusive possession of that idea, given the employment agreement probably has that clause written in there? This kind of stuff hinders innovation.

10. Should force and threat of lawsuit be what appeases the nervous insecurities of fear-based individuals, or should they be expected to get financial support from crowdfunding and such types of voluntary measures, and keep what trade secrets they can, if that's what they would want? Why should the whole world be concerned with what someone filed? Why should we expend human effort trying to ensure that competition cannot exist for that idea, under threat of legal actions, when none can even prove that exclusive right to sell is even required to recover R&D costs and gain market prominence? Nobody every has proven that this infinite, non-property, non-material info is better incentivized to emerge through non-competition legal documents and 17 years of exclusive right to sell. What if the competition actually focuses the public's attention way more onto the product than if the product never had competition, and what if the sales of the originator were way higher because of the competition?

Nobody has the right to legally safeguard an idea, because nobody can prove that they were the only ones to come up with that idea, and none of us are without the benefit of the ether of innovations around us, nor are any of us deserving of full credit for any idea that comes to us.

Patents appease insecurities and gratify egos, but they hinder innovations, hold back our entire world, & hold the human spirit to possessiveness.

Comment ID

PTO-P-2021-0032-0016

Tracking Number

kqw-urg6-q8ax

Comment Details | Submitter Info

Document Subtype

Comment(s)

Received Date

Jul 8, 2021

Page Count

1

Your Voice in Federal Decision Making

About (/about) Agencies (/agencies) Learn (/learn)

Reports (https://resources.regulations.gov/public/component/main?main=Reports) FAQ (/faq)

Privacy & Security Notice (/privacy-notice) | User Notice (/user-notice) | Accessibility Statement (/accessibility) | Developers (https://open.gsa.gov/api/regulationsgov/)

Support (/support) Provide Site Feedback