

Software Copyrights and Patents

Abby Cañedo Carysse Dacuba Vincent Paul Fiestada
Arel Latoga Troi Lobaton

University of the Philippines Diliman

2016

Table of Contents

- 1 Abstract
- 2 Introduction
- 3 Intellectual Patents
- 4 Apple versus Samsung
- 5 Oracle versus Google
- 6 Methodology
- 7 Results and Discussion
- 8 Conclusion

Abstract

Several students from the College of Science and the College of Engineering

Abstract

Several students from the College of Science and the College of Engineering were asked regarding popular issues in technological copyrights and patents

Abstract

Several students from the College of Science and the College of Engineering were asked regarding popular issues in technological copyrights and patents with focus on the trials between Samsung versus Apple and Oracle versus Google.

- Abstract
- Introduction**
- Intellectual Patents
- Apple versus Samsung
- Oracle versus Google
- Methodology
- Results and Discussion
- Conclusion

Introduction

The issues of technological patents and copyrights has been an infamous one for

- Abstract
- Introduction**
- Intellectual Patents
- Apple versus Samsung
- Oracle versus Google
- Methodology
- Results and Discussion
- Conclusion

Introduction

The issues of technological patents and copyrights has been an infamous one for software developers, hardware manufacturers, designers, and other stakeholders in the industry.

Introduction

The issues of technological patents and copyrights has been an infamous one for software developers, hardware manufacturers, designers, and other stakeholders in the industry. It is often a good point to ponder if these patents and copyrights really protect their owners

Introduction

The issues of technological patents and copyrights has been an infamous one for software developers, hardware manufacturers, designers, and other stakeholders in the industry. It is often a good point to ponder if these patents and copyrights really protect their owners or if they only limit creativity and control in the industry.

Intellectual Properties

Intellectual properties can be classified as art, designs, inventions, etc.

Intellectual Properties

Intellectual properties can be classified as art, designs, inventions, etc. The IP's respective owners grant them control over their usage and protect their interests.

Patents

Patents are given to owners of inventions to prevent others from stealing credit without their permission.

Patents

Patents are given to owners of inventions to prevent others from stealing credit without their permission. Patented products must be new and fresh, compared to existing patented products.

Apple versus Samsung

On April 14, 2011, Apple sued Samsung for infringement of patents.

Apple versus Samsung

On April 14, 2011, Apple sued Samsung for infringement of patents. Apple was then counter-sued 22 days later upon the premise that Apple infringed Samsung's wireless tech.

Apple versus Samsung

On April 14, 2011, Apple sued Samsung for infringement of patents. Apple was then counter-sued 22 days later upon the premise that Apple infringed Samsung's wireless tech.

Design Similarities



Samsung was sued for similarities in design, among other things.

Design Similarities



Apple's "home button", "rounded corners", and "tapered edges."

Design Similarities



Apple's "On Screen Buttons"

Design Similarities



The Galaxy Tab 10.1 allegedly infringing the Apple iPad patent.

Oracle versus Google

Oracle demanded Google for financial compensation upon its alleged violations on the Java API,

Oracle versus Google

Oracle demanded Google for financial compensation upon its alleged violations on the Java API, as implemented on the Android operating system.

Oracle versus Google

Oracle demanded Google for financial compensation upon its alleged violations on the Java API, as implemented on the Android operating system. Google's defense was that the parts of the Java APIs copied were too trivial to the overall functionality

Oracle versus Google

Oracle demanded Google for financial compensation upon its alleged violations on the Java API, as implemented on the Android operating system. Google's defense was that the parts of the Java APIs copied were too trivial to the overall functionality of the Android OS.

Methodology

The survey conducted was divided into three parts:

- Apple versus Samsung
- Google versus Oracle
- Personal thoughts

Methodology

The first part (Apple versus Samsung) asked respondents if they were familiar with the issue

Methodology

The first part (Apple versus Samsung) asked respondents if they were familiar with the issue and asked them if they agree that Samsung did infringe on Apple's design patents.

Methodology

The first part (Apple versus Samsung) asked respondents if they were familiar with the issue and asked them if they agree that Samsung did infringe on Apple's design patents. The next set in the first part are about the amicus curiae, featuring impartial opinions from third parties.

Methodology

The second part (Google versus Oracle) is partitioned similarly to the first part.

Methodology

The second part (Google versus Oracle) is partitioned similarly to the first part. The respondents are asked if they were familiar with the issue

Methodology

The second part (Google versus Oracle) is partitioned similarly to the first part. The respondents are asked if they were familiar with the issue and if they agree with the rulings.

Methodology

The second part (Google versus Oracle) is partitioned similarly to the first part. The respondents are asked if they were familiar with the issue and if they agree with the rulings. The next set of questions are again about the amicus curiae.

Methodology

The second part (Google versus Oracle) is partitioned similarly to the first part.

Methodology

The second part (Google versus Oracle) is partitioned similarly to the first part. The respondents are asked if they were familiar with the issue

Methodology

The second part (Google versus Oracle) is partitioned similarly to the first part. The respondents are asked if they were familiar with the issue and if they agree with the rulings.

Methodology

The second part (Google versus Oracle) is partitioned similarly to the first part. The respondents are asked if they were familiar with the issue and if they agree with the rulings. The next set of questions are again about the amicus curiae.

Methodology

The third part was reserved for personal thoughts.

Methodology

The third part was reserved for personal thoughts. The questions asked put the respondent in the shoes of a patent owner

Methodology

The third part was reserved for personal thoughts. The questions asked put the respondent in the shoes of a patent owner and how they would react if they were in similar situations.

Results

Respondents had a fair amount of familiarity with the products in question.

Results

Respondents had a fair amount of familiarity with the products in question. The data also showed a large overlap over the familiarity of respondents.

Results

Respondents had a fair amount of familiarity with the products in question. The data also showed a large overlap over the familiarity of respondents. Many respondents were familiar with several of the products, with more than half showing familiarity.

Results

For the Apple versus Samsung case, only 60% of the respondents knew about it.

Results

For the Apple versus Samsung case, only 60% of the respondents knew about it. People were leaning towards Samsung as most of the votes were for them not actually infringing.

Results

For the Apple versus Samsung case, only 60% of the respondents knew about it. People were leaning towards Samsung as most of the votes were for them not actually infringing.

Results

As for the amicus briefs, respondents mostly agreed that a patent infringement should not be worth the entire product.

Results

As for the amicus briefs, respondents mostly agreed that a patent infringement should not be worth the entire product. However, most also agreed with the opposing brief in that it is the design that sells a product.

Results

As for the amicus briefs, respondents mostly agreed that a patent infringement should not be worth the entire product. However, most also agreed with the opposing brief in that it is the design that sells a product. Interestingly enough is that less than half agreed with both amicus briefs.

Results

An overwhelming 93% were not aware of the Oracle versus Google case.

Results

An overwhelming 93% were not aware of the Oracle versus Google case. Around half agreed that APIs aren't protected by copyright.

Results

An overwhelming 93% were not aware of the Oracle versus Google case. Around half agreed that APIs aren't protected by copyright. Around half also agreed that the Java API should be protected by copyright.

Results

An overwhelming 93% were not aware of the Oracle versus Google case. Around half agreed that APIs aren't protected by copyright. Around half also agreed that the Java API should be protected by copyright. However, 81% agreed that Google's use of the APIs were under fair use.

Results

An overwhelming 93% were not aware of the Oracle versus Google case. Around half agreed that APIs aren't protected by copyright. Around half also agreed that the Java API should be protected by copyright. However, 81% agreed that Google's use of the APIs were under fair use.

Results

74% of the respondents agreed with the amicus brief stating that APIs should not be copyright-protected.

Results

74% of the respondents agreed with the amicus brief stating that APIs should not be copyright-protected. Only less than half agreed with the second brief stating copying Oracle's IP to jump-start a venture was not fair use.

Results

74% of the respondents agreed with the amicus brief stating that APIs should not be copyright-protected. Only less than half agreed with the second brief stating copying Oracle's IP to jump-start a venture was not fair use.

General Opinion

Half of the respondents agreed that someone should be stopped if a more popular derivative of your work was created.

General Opinion

Half of the respondents agreed that someone should be stopped if a more popular derivative of your work was created. An even significant number said that they would demand for a portion of the profits.

General Opinion

Half of the respondents agreed that someone should be stopped if a more popular derivative of your work was created. An even significant number said that they would demand for a portion of the profits.

General Opinion

In the case of Apple versus Samsung, respondents were inclined towards Samsung and attest for their non-infringement.

General Opinion

In the case of Apple versus Samsung, respondents were inclined towards Samsung and attest for their non-infringement. However, in the case of Oracle versus Google, opinions were a bit more equal.

General Opinion

In the case of Apple versus Samsung, respondents were inclined towards Samsung and attest for their non-infringement. However, in the case of Oracle versus Google, opinions were a bit more equal.

Conclusion

With all things considered, intellectual property rights should be upheld and the work of original creators acknowledged, but not at the expense of potential innovations made by interested third parties.