
Kluwer Patent Blog

Patent case: Glasswall Solutions Ltd. v. Clearswift Ltd., USA

Brian Craig (Wolters Kluwer Legal & Regulatory US) · Friday, January 11th, 2019

Patent claims relating to a virus-protection software to filter e-mail and electronic files are merely generic computer functions and not covered by a patent-eligible concept, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit has ruled. In affirming a decision of the federal district court in Seattle, Washington to dismiss the patent infringement case brought by Glasswall Solutions Limited against Clearswift Ltd., the Federal Circuit held that the patent claims are an abstract idea and merely require the conventional manipulation of information by a computer. Additionally, the appeals court held that the claims merely recite steps that do not amount to anything more than an instruction to apply the abstract idea of filtering nonconforming data and regenerating a file without it (Glasswall Solutions Ltd. v. Clearswift Ltd., December 20, 2018, Linn, R.).

Case date: 20 December 2018

Case number: No. 2018-1407

Court: United States Court of Appeals, Federal Circuit

A full summary of this case has been published on [Kluwer IP Law](#).

To make sure you do not miss out on regular updates from the Kluwer Patent Blog, please [subscribe here](#).

Kluwer IP Law

The **2022 Future Ready Lawyer survey** showed that 79% of lawyers think that the importance of legal technology will increase for next year. With Kluwer IP Law you can navigate the increasingly global practice of IP law with specialized, local and cross-border information and tools from every preferred location. Are you, as an IP professional, ready for the future?

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

79% of the lawyers think that the importance of legal technology will increase for next year.

Drive change with Kluwer IP Law.

The master resource for Intellectual Property rights and registration.



2022 SURVEY REPORT
The Wolters Kluwer Future Ready Lawyer
Leading change

This entry was posted on Friday, January 11th, 2019 at 1:21 pm and is filed under [\(Indirect\) infringement, AI, Case Law, United States of America](#)

You can follow any responses to this entry through the [Comments \(RSS\) feed](#). Both comments and pings are currently closed.