Subject: Re: One more example
Posted by Wayne Parham on Sat, 17 Sep 2005 13:25:48 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

That line is the trick, isn't it?Patents describe a physical device or process with unique features. It is those unique features that are claimed, and any product implementation that incorporates those features in a competing product is said to infringe upon the patent. So no copy of the device is required. Any product that does the same thing using the features claimed in the patent is an infringement on that patent.But if a device isn't patented, it isn't protected. The blueprints are copyrighted but the device itself can be disassembled and copied. That seems wrong to me, but I think it is legally correct. Probably is wrong ethically, but I don't believe there is any basis in law that protects an unpatented device from being copied and sold.Another thing I think is goofy is when companies get patents just for marketing purposes, to bring a false validity to an unremarkable idea. Some seem to want to buy respectability by filing worthless patents. And worst of all are those that get patents on trivial products and then use predatory placement to monopolize a market. I think that's probably ethically wrong too.But what do I know, I just sell speakers. I'm just doing my best to make good stuff and earn a living at it, that's all.