The Indian Journal for Research in Law and Management

Open Access Law Journal – Copyright © 2026

Editor-in-Chief – Dr. Muktai Deb Chavan; Publisher – Alden Vas; ISSN: 2583-9896

Patent law in the age of algorithms: Understanding the Alice Judgement

- ***DARWIN SAMRAT***

I. Introduction

The rapid evolution of digital technologies, particularly artificial intelligence (AI), machine learning, and algorithm-driven innovations, has significantly challenged traditional frameworks of patent law. Central to this debate is the extent to which abstract ideas, especially algorithms, are patentable. The landmark decision of the United States Supreme Court in ***Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank International*** reshaped the contours of patent eligibility under **Section 101 of the Patent Act**. The ruling has had far-reaching implications for software patents, fintech innovations, and more recently AI-based inventions.

This case commentary critically examines the ***Alice*** **judgment**, its doctrinal framework, and its impact on patent law in the age of algorithms. It further explores how the decision has influenced judicial interpretation, innovation policy, and the global patent landscape.

II. Background of the Alice Case

The dispute in ***Alice Corp. Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank International*****, 573 U.S. 208 (2014)**, involved patents held by Alice Corporation relating to a computerized scheme for mitigating "settlement risk" in financial transactions. The method essentially used a third-party intermediary to ensure both parties fulfilled their obligations before completing a transaction.

Alice Corporation claimed that its invention was patentable because it involved implementation through a computer system. CLS Bank challenged the patents, arguing that they merely claimed an abstract idea implemented on a generic computer, which is not patentable under **Section 101 of the Patent Act.**

The Supreme Court unanimously held that the claims were not patent eligible, as they were directed to an abstract idea and did not contain an "inventive concept" sufficient to transform the abstract idea into a patent-eligible application.

III. The Two-Step Alice/Mayo Test

The Court in *Alice* reaffirmed and applied the framework developed in ***Mayo Collaborative Services v. Prometheus Laboratories, Inc.*, 566 U.S. 66 (2012)**, establishing a two-step test to determine patent eligibility:

Step One: Determine Whether the Claims Are Directed to a Patent-Ineligible Concept

The Court first examines whether the claims are directed to an abstract idea, law of nature, or natural phenomenon. In *Alice*, the Court found that the concept of intermediated settlement is a "fundamental economic practice" and thus an abstract idea.

Step Two: Determine Whether There Is an "Inventive Concept"

If the claims are directed to an abstract idea, the next step is to determine whether the elements of the claim, individually or as an ordered combination, transform the nature of the claim into a patent-eligible application. This requires more than merely implementing the idea on a generic computer.

The Court concluded that Alice's claims failed this test because the use of a generic computer did not add anything significantly more than the abstract idea itself.

IV. Doctrinal Significance of the Alice Decision

The ***Alice* judgment** represents a pivotal moment in patent jurisprudence, particularly in defining the boundaries of patentable subject matter.

A. Reinforcement of Judicial Exceptions

The decision reinforced the longstanding judicial exceptions to patent eligibility abstract ideas, laws of nature, and natural phenomena. The Court emphasized that monopolizing these fundamental building blocks would impede rather than promote innovation.

B. Expansion of the "Abstract Idea" Doctrine

One of the most significant consequences of *Alice* is the broad and somewhat ambiguous interpretation of "abstract ideas." Courts have since categorized a wide range of concepts such as data processing, financial transactions, and even certain software functionalities as abstract.

C. Heightened Scrutiny of Software Patents

The decision has led to increased scrutiny of software patents, particularly those that involve business methods or algorithms. Many patents have been invalidated post-*Alice* for lacking an inventive concept.

V. Impact on Algorithm-Based Innovations

A. Challenges for AI and Machine Learning Patents

Algorithms form the backbone of AI and machine learning technologies. However, under the *Alice* framework, many algorithm-based inventions risk being classified as abstract ideas. Courts often require a technical improvement or specific application to establish patent eligibility.

For instance, in ***Enfish, LLC v. Microsoft Corp***., the Federal Circuit upheld patent eligibility where the claims were directed to a specific improvement in computer functionality. This suggests that algorithmic inventions may be patentable if they demonstrate a technical enhancement rather than merely performing abstract processes.

B. The "Technical Improvement" Requirement

Post-*Alice*, courts have increasingly focused on whether an invention improves the functioning of a computer or another technological process. This approach aligns with the European Patent Office's emphasis on "technical character."

However, this requirement creates uncertainty for innovators, particularly in fields like fintech and data analytics, where the line between abstract ideas and technical applications is often blurred.

VI. Criticism of the Alice Framework

The ***Alice*** **decision** has been widely criticized for its lack of clarity and consistency.

A. Vagueness of the "Abstract Idea" Standard

Critics argue that the Court failed to define "abstract idea" with precision, leading to inconsistent judicial outcomes. Different courts have applied the test in varying ways, resulting in unpredictability.

B. Over-Invalidation of Patents

Empirical studies indicate a significant increase in patent invalidations under Section 101 following *Alice*. This has raised concerns about weakening patent protection for software and emerging technologies.

C. Impact on Innovation

While the Court aimed to prevent monopolization of basic ideas, critics argue that the decision may discourage investment in software and AI innovation due to uncertainty in patent protection.

VII. Comparative Perspective: India and the EU

A. India

Indian patent law under **Section 3(k) of the Patents Act, 1970**, explicitly excludes "computer programs per se" from patentability. However, Indian courts and the Patent Office have adopted a

nuanced approach, allowing patents for inventions that demonstrate a "technical effect" or "technical contribution."

The Indian approach, while similar in spirit to *Alice*, arguably provides clearer guidance by focusing on technical effect rather than abstractness.

B. European Union

The European Patent Convention (EPC) also excludes programs for computers "as such" under **Article 52**. However, the European Patent Office allows patents for software-related inventions that produce a technical effect.

Compared to *Alice*, the European approach is considered more structured and predictable, emphasizing technical contribution rather than abstract ideas.

VIII. Post-Alice Jurisprudence

Subsequent decisions have attempted to refine the *Alice* framework:

1. In ***DDR Holdings, LLC v. Hotels.com, L.P.*****,** the Federal Circuit upheld patent eligibility where the invention addressed a problem specific to the Internet.
2. In ***Berkheimer v. HP Inc***., the court held that whether a claim contains an inventive concept can be a question of fact.

These cases illustrate the evolving nature of **Section 101** jurisprudence and the ongoing effort to balance innovation with legal certainty.

IX. Policy Implications

The ***Alice*** **decision** reflects a broader policy tension between encouraging innovation and preventing undue monopolization. In the age of algorithms, this tension is particularly acute.

On one hand, granting patents for algorithms may stifle competition and hinder technological progress. On the other hand, denying patent protection may reduce incentives for innovation, especially in capital-intensive fields like AI.

Policymakers must strike a balance by providing clear guidelines that protect genuine technological advancements while excluding abstract ideas.

X. Conclusion

The ***Alice*** **judgment** has fundamentally reshaped patent law in the digital era, particularly with respect to algorithm-based inventions. While the decision has succeeded in curbing overly broad patents, it has also introduced significant uncertainty into the patent system.

As technology continues to evolve, the limitations of the *Alice* framework become increasingly apparent. Courts, legislators, and patent offices must work towards a more coherent and predictable standard that accommodates the realities of modern innovation.

In the age of algorithms, the challenge lies not merely in defining what is patentable, but in ensuring that the patent system continues to fulfill its core objective: promoting the progress of science and useful arts.