In January 2018, Google filed a petition to ask the U.S. Supreme Court to review two precedents from the Federal Circuit. One was the Federal Circuit’s 2014 decision in Oracle v. Google, which focused on computer programs, and the other was the Federal Circuit’s 2010 decision in Apple v. Microsoft, which focused on computer software. As Google pointed out in its petition, the Federal Circuit’s precedents were widely criticized for moving too broadly in copyright law. And in both cases, the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit overruled decisions of the other courts of appeals that were more restrictively applied to computer programs. The Federal Circuit’s decisions were criticized by scholars of intellectual property law for finding that the Constitution commands that copyright law provide an incentive for the author of a computer program to create a unique and creative work, and for failing to understand that creative products of the human mind are protected by copyright law, whether they are tangible or not. The Federal Circuit’s decisions were also criticized because they were too broad and did not reflect the proper balance between the interests of the public and the interests of the copyright owner in the protection of their creative works. The Federal Circuit’s decisions were criticized for expanding the scope of copyright protection for computer programs beyond what is necessary to encourage the creation of new works, and for failing to consider the public interest in the availability and use of computer programs. The Federal Circuit’s decisions were also criticized for failing to consider the public interest in the availability and use of computer programs, and for failing to consider the public interest in the availability and use of computer programs. The Federal Circuit’s decisions were also criticized for failing to consider the public interest in the availability and use of computer programs, and for failing to consider the public interest in the availability and use of computer programs. The Federal Circuit’s decisions were also criticized for failing to consider the public interest in the availability and use of computer programs, and for failing to consider the public interest in the availability and use of computer programs. The Federal Circuit’s decisions were also criticized for failing to consider the public interest in the availability and use of computer programs, and for failing to consider the public interest in the availability and use of computer programs. The Federal Circuit’s decisions were also criticized for failing to consider the public interest in the availability and use of computer programs, and for failing to consider the public interest in the availability and use of computer programs. The Federal Circuit’s decisions were also criticized for failing to consider the public interest in the availability and use of computer programs, and for failing to consider the public interest in the availability and use of computer programs.