

From: [REDACTED]
To: [FN-OMB-IntellectualProperty](#)
Subject: Intellectual Property and Risks to the Public
Date: Saturday, February 27, 2010 10:43:35 AM

To Victoria Espinel, Int. Prop Enforcement Chief - Office of Business Management:

I read your call for input and am happy to provide my input. I fear that the very term Intellectual Property is often being misused to cover anti-competitive strategies and to fence off ownership of matter inappropriately. In both of these cases use of the IP phrase and the subsequent enforcement threats harm the rights and potentially the very health and safety of the general public.

I think it's critical that the Administration look at the origin of the copyright and the patent and compare them to today's practice. Copyright periods have been expanded far beyond what is rational. Patents are being used to protect monopolies on genetic information, software, and miniscule changes in a products form or function only.

In my opinion, copyright is for the expression of ideas or thoughts – they may be visual arts, mathematical and logical processes, verse or even speech. A limited protection period is appropriate (certainly not 70 or 100 years) and sharing those expressions within the basic copyright constraints must be encouraged.

Patents are now a bludgeon for use in extortion and market protection. The very rational for software patents is wrong and causes severe damage to a vast number of innovators, users and consumers. Patents on plants, genotypes, etc. has established the risk and possibly the reality of physical harm to both U.S and world populations.

In summary, I urge the Executive Office of the President to position itself as a strong advocate of the individual with respect to copyright and patent definition, implementation and enforcement.

Thank you for your time.

Signed,

Glenn Branch
1222 S. Patton Ave.
San Pedro, CA