

San Francisco, 6 April 2008.

John Hennessy
Office of the President
Building 10
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305-2061

Dear John,

This note is intended to strongly support Robert Shafer in his position that Stanford University should not grant any level of credibility to the 6188988 patent held by ABL. This patent is a sham, and parrots research that was performed at Stanford by Ted Shortliffe, Jim Fries, and others long before the patent was granted. The laziness of the US PTO in granting patents by default when they do not find prior art in their own files is irresponsible. Any modest literature search, or consult with an expert would have disallowed this patent to be granted. For the US PTO to leave the resulting conflicts to be dealt subsequently by lawyers is disastrous for innovative industry, who can neither afford the fees nor the halt in investor funding when their IP is threatened.

I have been involved in defending against a similar patent troll, again for an invention that involved AI technology plans sketched by Stanford researchers, without the originator ever having implemented anything close to what was claimed.

Stanford may be concerned about the cost, but it is in a much better position than other defendants. It has little to lose if it gets sued, and if a trial ensues Stanford has the expertise in-house to mount a vigorous counter attack. I believe most knowledgeable faculty members would be willing, even anxious to support Stanford on a pro-bono basis. I would certainly make myself available. The effect of taking action in this case will be that Stanford will be viewed as hero to industry, rather than as a wimp.

Feel free to contact me if I can be of any further help. I can certainly provide documentation and pointers to make the case of Stanford's priority.



Gio Wiederhold

Prof. Emeritus CS, EE, and Medicine, and still kicking!