



# Legislative Briefing

## BSA Position on H.R. 3309, the Innovation Act

***BSA | The Software Alliance urges Congress to enact legislation that reduces the incentive for bad actors to engage in abusive patent litigation — an approach that has broad-based support. BSA cautions against measures that risk undermining innovation by disrupting the patent system itself.***

In that context, BSA believes that H.R. 3309, the “Innovation Act,” has many constructive provisions and a few that are counterproductive. We support the measures that reduce the incentive to engage in ***abusive litigation***. The measures that reduce the incentive to ***innovate*** are a major concern.

### *Issue Analysis*

- **The goal of legislation should be to make life hard for bad actors and better for innovators.** It is important to remember that predatory litigation practices are the problem, not the patent system itself. Right now, being a predatory litigant is too profitable, and defending against such suits is too expensive. Targeted legislation can balance those scales while protecting the patent system itself.
- **Abusive patent litigation is a huge problem that hurts everyone.** It creates a heavy burden for companies across a wide range of industries. No matter how you look at it, it’s a drain on innovation, competitiveness and economic growth.
- **The problem is there’s big money in being a bad actor.** Opportunistic litigants can force defendants into quick settlements — simply because it’s too expensive to defend yourself against a bogus claim. That creates huge leverage. We need to balance the scales.
- **Political consensus dissolves when you shift the focus from stopping bad actors to measures that would disrupt incentives for innovation.** BSA and a broad cross-section of other innovative industries strongly oppose expanding the CBM program because it would undermine the patent system for legitimate innovators.
- **At the end of the day, US innovation and competitiveness is at stake.** If we create different standards for different kinds of invention, we will imperil America’s leadership position in a broad range of industries dependent on science, technology and engineering.

## What We Support and Oppose in H.R. 3309

- **H.R. 3309 includes important reform measures that will reduce the financial incentive for bad actors to engage in abusive patent litigation.** Those proposals enjoy broad-based support among stakeholders — as evidenced by a recent letter to Congress from more than 60 companies, associations and interest groups — and BSA urges lawmakers to move them forward.
  - **BSA supports** allowing courts to shift legal fees to losing parties when they bring spurious claims (i.e., changes to §285).
  - **We support** curbing discovery abuse (i.e., adding §299A).
  - **We support** requiring plaintiffs to be precise in their claims of infringement (i.e., adding §281A.)
  - **We support** making patent cases more efficient and less costly (Sec. 6).
- **We oppose expanding the Transitional Program for Covered Business Method Patents.** Sec. 9(e) of H.R. 3309, which would expand Section 18 of the America Invents Act, would undermine the patent system for legitimate innovators in several ways:
  - A legitimate patent owner would be subject to harassment by an infringing competitor who could use the CBM program to **slow walk a case** through the CBM process while they build market share.
  - Expanding the CBM program would create **different standards for different kinds of inventions**. Any patent that facilitates more efficient data management for a purpose even remotely related to financial activity would be put in a special class for differential treatment. That would cover a broad array of inventions far beyond what people think of as financial services.
- **We oppose eliminating the use of “broadest reasonable interpretation” in review proceedings.**
  - **Sec. 9(c) will help, not hurt trolls.** This limits the ability for the public to challenge invalid patents in both *inter partes* and post-grant review proceedings. It also would undermine 100 years of Patent Office practice.