

PATENT PROSECUTION

ADVOCACY IN THE

U.S. PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

A CASEBOOK & TRAINING MANUAL

By

Harold H. Fullmer

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author acknowledges the assistance of the distinguished lawyers and staff at Baker Hostetler, Drexel School of Law, & Temple Beasley School of Law, and of his students.

In particular, Professor Greg Mandel, Professor Amy Landers, Professor Sean Seymore, and Attorney John Hemmer have been especially helpful.

This book is dedicated to Charlene, Halbert, Reed, and Grace.

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	i
TABLE OF CASES.....	v
TABLE OF STATUTES.....	viii
TABLE OF RULES.....	ix
TABLE OF REGULATIONS.....	ix

CHAPTER 1. PREFACE.....	1
--------------------------------	----------

CHAPTER 2. INTRODUCTION.....	3
-------------------------------------	----------

A. AN INVENTION CASE STUDY.....	4
B. REVIEW OF SOME BASICS.....	13
C. THE LIFE OF A PATENT.....	19
D. INTRODUCTION TO PATENT EXAMINATION.....	22
E. PARTS OF A PATENT APPLICATION.....	24
F. INTRODUCTION TO PATENT CLAIMS.....	33
G. INTRODUCTION TO FOREIGN PATENT PROSECUTION.....	38

CHAPTER 3. WHAT CLAIMS MEAN.....	48
---	-----------

A. TRADITIONAL BUT NOW-OUTDATED CANONS OF CLAIM CONSTRUCTION.....	48
B. MODERN RULES FOR CONSTRUING CLAIMS IN COURT.....	49
C. CLAIM INTERPRETATION IN THE PATENT OFFICE.....	81
D. EUROPEAN PATENT OFFICE PROSECUTION.....	88

CHAPTER 4. THE MECHANICS OF CLAIMS.....	90
--	-----------

A. INTRODUCTION TO CLAIMS TYPES.....	90
B. CLAIM STRUCTURE AND CONTENT.....	90
C. TYPES OF CLAIMS.....	107
D. PREAMBLES AND THEIR EFFECT.....	115
E. MEANS-PLUS-FUNCTION LIMITATIONS.....	120

CHAPTER 5. PRINCIPLES OF CLAIMING.....	135
---	------------

A. PATENT ELIGIBLE SUBJECT MATTER.....	135
B. INDEFINITENESS IN COURT: REASONABLE CERTAINTY STANDARD.....	145
C. INDEFINITENESS UNDER THE PATENT OFFICE STANDARD.....	147
D. INDEFINITENESS OF CLAIMING AESTHETICS.....	150
E. INDEFINITENESS BY MIXING STATUTORY CLASSES.....	155
F. DEFINING STRUCTURE BY ITS RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER STRUCTURE.....	156
G. CLAIMING ONE OR MORE, PRIMACY OF THE SPECIFICATION.....	161
H. PREFERRED EMBODIMENT.....	164
I. WEIGHT GIVEN TO INSTRUCTIONS.....	166
J. DRAFTING ERRORS.....	169
K. CLAIM DRAFTING SPECIFICS.....	173

CHAPTER 6. CLAIMS AND INFRINGEMENT.....	178
--	------------

SUMMARY OF CONTENTS

A.	DIRECT & INDIRECT INFRINGEMENT.....	178
B.	INDUCEMENT	184
C.	JOINT INFRINGEMENT	195
D.	INFRINGEMENT UNDER THE DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS	202
CHAPTER 7. PRINCIPLES OF THE SPECIFICATION		218
A.	WRITTEN DESCRIPTION REQUIREMENT	219
B.	CLAIM SUPPORT UNDER THE EUROPEAN PATENT CONVENTION	246
C.	DISCLAIMER	247
D.	ENABLEMENT REQUIREMENT	258
E.	DISCLOSURE OF THE BEST MODE	272
CHAPTER 8. PRACTICAL PROSECUTION ASPECTS		277
A.	BASICS OF CONTINUATION PRACTICE.....	277
B.	ADVOCACY IN CONTINUATION PRACTICE	280
C.	PARTS OF THE PATENT APPLICATION REVISITED.....	281
CHAPTER 9. OFFICE ACTION REJECTION AND RESPONSE		292
A.	REJECTION IS DISTINGUISHED FROM OBJECTION	292
B.	ANTICIPATION	294
C.	THE FUNDAMENTALS OF OBVIOUSNESS	295
D.	INVENTIVE STEP IN THE EUROPEAN PATENT OFFICE	301
E.	COMBINING PRIOR ART REFERENCES.....	303
F.	REBUTTING A PROPOSED COMBINATION OF REFERENCES	303
G.	DISCOVERING SOURCE/CAUSE OF A PROBLEM IS PART OF “AS A WHOLE” INQUIRY	304
H.	REBUTTING A PRIMA FACIE REJECTION BASED ON OBVIOUSNESS.....	307
I.	DOUBLE PATENTING.....	316
CHAPTER 10. INEQUITABLE CONDUCT.....		324
A.	DUTY OF CANDOR	324
B.	MATERIAL MISSTATEMENTS	335
C.	DUTY TO DISCLOSE CO-PENDING PROSECUTION.....	338
CHAPTER 11. SAMPLE ANSWERS TO PROBLEMS.....		346

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>AFG Industries, Inc. v. Cardinal IG Company</i> , 239 F.3d 1239 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	89
<i>Andersen Corp. v. Fiber Composites, LLC</i> , 474 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2007).....	74
<i>Asyst Techs., Inc. v. Emtrak, Inc.</i> , 402 F.3d 1188 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	209
<i>Ateliers de la Haute-Garonne v. Broetje Automation USA Inc.</i> 717 F.3d, 1351 (Fed. Cir. 2013).....	270
<i>Atlas Powder v. E.I. duPont de Nemours & Co.</i> , 750 F.2d 1569 (Fed. Cir. 1984)...	89, 255
<i>Auto. Tech. Int’l. v. BMW</i> , 501 F.3d 1274 (Fed. Cir. 2007)	265
<i>Autogiro Co. of America v. United States</i> , 384 F.2d 391 (Ct. Cl. 1967)	47
<i>Bell Communications Research v. Vitalink Communications</i> , 55 F.3d 615 (Fed. Cir. 1995)	113
<i>Burlington Indus., Inc. v. Dayco Corp.</i> , 849 F.2d 1418 (Fed. Cir. 1988).....	317
<i>Callicrate v. Wadsworth Mfg., Inc.</i> , 427 F.3d 1361 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	255
<i>Chef America v. Lamb-Weston</i> , 358 F.3d 1371 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	43, 164
<i>Chiron Corp. v. Genentech Inc.</i> , 363 F.3d 1247 (Fed. Cir. 2004).....	253
<i>Cooper Cameron Corp. v. Kvaerner Oilfield Products</i> , 291 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	234, 235
<i>Cordis Corp. v. Boston Scientific Corp.</i> , 188 F. App’x 984 (Fed. Cir. 2006)	234
<i>Corona Cord Tire Co. v. Dovan Chemical Corp.</i> , 276 U.S. 358 (1928).....	323
<i>Crystal Semiconductor Corp. v. TriTech Microelectronics Int’l Inc.</i> , 246 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2001).....	89
<i>Cultor Corp. v. A.E. Staley Manufacturing Co.</i> , 224 F.3d 1328 (Fed. Cir. 2000).....	246
<i>Cybor Corp. v. FAS Techs., Inc.</i> , 138 F.3d 1448 (Fed. Cir. 1998) (en banc).	64
<i>D.M.I., Inc. v. Deere & Co.</i> , 755 F.2d 1570 (Fed. Cir. 1985).....	71
<i>DSU Med. Corp. v. JMS Co.</i> , 471 F.3d 1293 (Fed. Cir. 2006).....	184
<i>Enzo Biochem v. Applera</i> , 605 F.3d 1347.....	142
<i>E-Pass Techs., Inc. v. 3Com Corp.</i> , 343 F.3d 1364 (Fed. Cir. 2003)	75
<i>Ethicon Endo-Surgery, Inc. v. United States Surgical Corp.</i> , 93 F.3d 1572 (Fed. Cir. 1993).....	226
<i>Ex parte Grasselli</i> , 231 USPQ 393 (Bd. App. 1983), <i>aff’d mem.</i> , 738 F.2d 453 (Fed. Cir. 1984).	102
<i>Ex Parte Paul Stevens</i> , Appeal No. 90-0644, BPAI, June 29, 1990.....	265
<i>Ex parte Porter</i> , 25 USPQ2d 1144 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1992)	86
<i>Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., Ltd.</i> , 344 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2003).	203
<i>Gill v. Wells</i> , 89 U.S. 1 (1874).....	222
<i>Gillette Co. v. Energizer Holdings Inc.</i> , 405 F.3d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 2005).....	88
<i>Gould v. Quigg</i> , 822 F.2d 1074 (Fed. Cir. 1987).....	258

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<i>Graham v. John Deere</i> , 383 U.S. 1, 17 (1966)	64
<i>Graver Tank & Manufacturing Co. v. Linde Air Products Co.</i> , 339 U.S. 605(1950). ...	243
<i>Greenwood v. Hattori Seiko Co., Ltd.</i> , 900 F.2d 238 (Fed.Cir.1990).....	312
<i>Hazel-Atlas Glass Co. v. Hartford-Empire Co.</i> , 322 U.S. 238 (1944)	320
<i>Hewlett-Packard Co. v. Bausch & Lomb, Inc.</i> , 909 F.2d 1464 (Fed. Cir. 1990).....	179
<i>Hormone Research Foundation Inc. v. Genentech Inc.</i> , 904 F.2d 1558 (Fed. Cir. 1990).	99
<i>Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.</i> , 802 F.2d 1367 (Fed. Cir. 1986)	98, 255
<i>In re Angstadt</i> , 537 F.2d 498 (CCPA 1976)	255
<i>In re Barr</i> , 444 F.2d 588 (CCPA 1971).	100
<i>In re Barr</i> , 444 F.2d 5880 (CCPA 1971).	99, 102
<i>In re Bertsch</i> , 132 F.2d 1014 (CCPA 1942)	89
<i>In re Borkowski</i> , 422 F.2d 904 (CCPA 1970).	258
<i>In re Brana</i> , 51 F.3d 1560 (Fed. Cir. 1995).	257, 259
<i>In re Breslow</i> , 616 F.2d 516 (CCPA 1980).	257
<i>In re Buchner</i> , 929 F.2d 660 (Fed. Cir. 1991)	255
<i>In re Certain Limited-Charge Cell Culture Microcarriers</i> , 221 USPQ 1165 (Int’l Trade Comm’n 1983).	255
<i>In re Cook</i> , 439 F.2d 730 (CCPA 1971)	253
<i>In re Ehrreich</i> , 590 F.2d 902 (CCPA 1979)	103
<i>In re Farrenkopf</i> , 713 F.2d 714 (Fed. Cir. 1983).....	303
<i>In re Fisher</i> , 427 F.2d 833 (CCPA 1970).	98, 252, 254, 257
<i>In re Fout</i> , 675 F.2d 297 (CCPA 1982).....	103
<i>In re Ghiron</i> , 442 F.2d 985 (CCPA 1971),	257
<i>In re Gordon</i> , 733 F.2d 900 (Fed. Cir. 1984).....	300
<i>In re Gray</i> , 53 F.2d 520 (CCPA 1931)	88
<i>In re Hedges</i> , 783 F.2d 1038 (Fed. Cir. 1986).....	298
<i>In re Herz</i> , 537 F.2d 549 (CCPA 1976).....	89
<i>In re Hitchings</i> , 342 F.2d 80 (CCPA 1965).....	257
<i>In re Howarth</i> , 654 F.2d 103 (C.C.P.A. 1981),	257, 265
<i>In re Janakirama-Rao</i> , 317 F.2d 951 (CCPA 1963).....	89
<i>In re Johnson</i> , 282 F.2d 370 (CCPA 1960)	257
<i>In re Johnson</i> , 558 F.2d 1008 (CCPA 1977)	102
<i>In re Langer</i> , 503 F.2d 1380 (C.C.P.A. 1974).	266
<i>In re MacLean</i> , 454 F.2d 756 (CCPA 1972)	231
<i>In re Marosi</i> , 710 F.2d 799 (Fed. Cir. 1983)	76
<i>In re Marzocchi</i> , 439 F.2d 220 (CCPA 1971)	253
<i>In re McLaughlin</i> 443 F.2d 1392, (CCPA 1971)	304
<i>In re Morris</i> , 127 F.3d 1048 (Fed. Cir. 1997).....	98
<i>In re Ngai</i> , 367 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2004)	162
<i>In re Prater</i> , 415 F.2d 1393 (CCPA 1969)	98
<i>In re Ratti</i> , 270 F.2d 810 (CCPA 1959).....	300
<i>In re Rinehart</i> , 531 F.2d 1048 (CCPA 1976).....	301
<i>In re Schechter</i> , 205 F.2d 185 (CCPA 1953).....	101
<i>In re Schneller</i> , 397 F.2d 350 (CCPA 1968).	311
<i>In re Schreiber</i> , 128 F.3d 1473 (Fed. Cir. 1997)	100
<i>In re Soll</i> , 97 F.2d 623 (CCPA 1938)	253

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

In re Swinehart, 439 F.2d 210 (CCPA 1971) 99

In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488 (Fed. Cir. 1991) 253, 255, 258

In re Venezia, 530 F.2d 956 (CCPA 1976)..... 100

In re Vickers, 141 F.2d 522 (CCPA 1944)..... 253

In re Wakefield, 422 F.2d 897 (CCPA 1970)..... 101

In re Wallach, 378 F.3d 1330 (Fed. Cir. 2004)..... 218

In re Wands, 858 F.2d 731 (Fed. Cir. 1988)..... 255, 256

In re Weiss, 989 F.2d 1202 (Fed. Cir. 1993)..... 76

In re Wiggins, 488 F. 2d 538 (CCPA 1973) 97

In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557 (Fed. Cir. 1993)..... 253, 256

In re Zletz, 893 F.2d 319 (Fed. Cir. 1989) 75, 98

Innova/Pure Water Inc. v. Safari Water Filtration Sys. Inc. 381 F.3d 1111 (Fed. Cir. 2004) 45

Johnson & Johnston Assocs. Inc. v. R.E. Service Co., Inc. 285 F.3d 1046 (Fed. Cir. 2002) 241

Johnston v. IVAC Corp., 885 F.2d 1574 (Fed. Cir. 1989) 116

Keystone Driller Co. v. General Excavator Co., 290 U.S. 240 (1933) 320

Klein v. Russell, 86 U.S. 433 (1873)..... 52

Kropa v. Robie, 187 F.2d 150 (CCPA 1951)..... 114

KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 187 F 550 U.S. 398 (2007)..... 303

Lampi Corp. v. American Power Products Inc., 228 F.3d 1365 (Fed. Cir. 2000)..... 89

Leapfrog Enterprises, Inc. v. Fisher-Price, Inc., 485 F.3d 1157 (Fed.Cir. 2007)..... 294

Lindemann Maschinenfabrik GMBH v. American Hoist & Derrick Co., 730 F.2d 1452 (Fed. Cir. 1984)..... 255

LizardTech, Inc. v. Earth Resource Mapping, Inc., 424 F.3d 1336 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 224

Mackay Radio & Tel. Co. v. Radio Corp. of Am., 306 U.S. 86 (1939)..... 222

Mannesmann Demag Corp. v. Engineered Metal Products Co., 793 F.2d 1279 (Fed. Cir. 1986)..... 88

Manville Sales Corp. v. Paramount Systems, Inc., 917 F.2d 544 (Fed. Cir. 1990) 179

Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc., 517 U.S. 370 (1996). 62

Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc., 52 F.3d 967 (Fed. Cir. 1995) 45

Mas-Hamilton Group Inc. v. LaGard Inc., 48 USPQ2d 1010 (Fed. Cir. 1998) 123

Maxwell v. J. Baker, Inc., 86 F.3d 1098 (Fed. Cir. 1996)..... 243

Merrill v. Yeomans, 94 U.S. 568 (1876)..... 113

Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer Studios, Inc. v. Grokster, Ltd., 545 U.S. 913 (2005) 175

Mineral Separation v. Hyde, 242 U.S. 261 (1916) 255

Modine Manufacturing Co. v. United States International Trade Commission, 75 F.3d 1545 (Fed. Cir. 1996)..... 42, 246

Multiform Desiccants, Inc. v. Medzam, Ltd., 133 F.3d 1473 (Fed. Cir. 1998)..... 46

O.I. Corp. v. Tekmar Co., 115 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1997) 247

Orthokinetics, Inc. v. Safety Travel Chairs, Inc., 806 F.2d 1565 (Fed. Cir. 1986)..... 147

PC Connector Solutions LLC v. SmartDisk Corp., 406 F.3d 1359 (Fed. Cir. 2005)..... 277, 293

Pioneer Magnetics, Inc. v. Micro Linear Corp., 330 F.3d 1352 (Fed. Cir. 2003)..... 200

Plantronics, Inc. v. Aliph, Inc., 724 F. 3d 1343 (Fed. Cir. 2012) 304

PPG Industries v. Guardian Industries, 156 F.3d 1351 (Fed. Cir. 1998) 89

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Precision Instruments Manufacturing Co. v. Automotive Maintenance Machinery Co.,
324 U.S. 806 (1945)..... 320
Process Control Corp. v. HydReclaim Corp., 190 F.3d 1350 (Fed. Cir. 1999) 98
Q-Pharma, Inc. v. Andrew Jergens Co., 360 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2004). 42
Reading & Bates Construction Co. v. Baker Energy Resources Corp., 748 F.2d 645 (Fed.
Cir. 1984) 103
Regents of the Univ. of Cal. v. Eli Lilly & Co., 119 F.3d 1559 (Fed. Cir. 1997)89, 215,
222
Schriber-Schroth Co. v. Cleveland Trust Co., 305 U.S. 47 (1938). 222
Schwarz Pharma and Warner Lambert v. Paddock Labs, 504 F.3d 1324 (Fed. Cir. 2007)
..... 160
Scripps Clinic & Research Foundation v. Genentech, Inc., 927 F.2d 1565 (Fed. Cir.
1991) 106
Seattle Box Co. v. Industrial Crate & Packing, Inc., 731 F.2d 818 (Fed. Cir. 1984)..... 147
Shatterproof Glass Corp. v. Libbey Owens Ford Co., 758 F.2d 613 (Fed. Cir. 1985)..... 98
Sony Corporation of America v. Universal City Studios, Inc., 464 U.S. 417 (1984) 175
Spectra-Physics, Inc. v. Coherent, Inc., 827 F.2d 1524 (Fed. Cir. 1987) 257, 261
States v. Hartford-Empire Co., 46 F. Supp. 541 (N.D. Ohio 1942) 327
Stratoflex, Inc. v. Aeroquip Corp., 713 F.2d 1530 (Fed. Cir. 1983) 304
Symbol Technologies Inc. v. Opticon Inc., 935 F.2d 1569 (Fed. Cir. 1991)..... 116
Teleflex, Inc. v. Ficoso N. Am. Corp. 299 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2002)..... 55, 267
Texas Digital Systems, Inc. v. Telegenix, Inc., 308 F.3d 1193 (Fed. Cir. 2002)..... 55, 99
Toro Co. v. White Consolidated Industries, Inc., 199 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 1999)..... 247
Turrill v. Michigan Southern & Northern Indiana Railroad, 68 U.S. 491 (1863) 62
United States v. Adams, 383 U.S. 39, 52 (1966)..... 298
United States v. Telectronics, Inc., 857 F.2d 778 (Fed. Cir. 1988) 255
Univ. of Rochester v. G.D. Searle & Co., 358 F.3d 916, 920 (Fed. Cir. 2004). 233
Vas-Cath Inc. v. Mahurkar, 935 F.2d 1555 (Fed. Cir. 1991) 236
Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc., 90 F.3d 1576 (Fed. Cir. 1996) 45, 160
W.L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540 (Fed. Cir. 1983) 299
Wang Labs, Inc. v. America Online, Inc., 197 F.3d 1377 (Fed. Cir. 1999). 246
Water Technologies Corp. vs. Calco, Ltd., 850 F.2d 660 (Fed. Cir. 1988) 89
Westmoreland Specialty Co. v. Hogan, 167 F. 327 (1909)..... 309
YBM Magnex, Inc. v. International Trade Commission, 145 F.3d 1317 (Fed. Cir. 1998)
..... 242, 243

STATUTES

28 U.S.C. § 1295(a)(1)..... 233
35 U.S.C. § 102..... 312
35 U.S.C. § 102(b) 230
35 U.S.C. § 103..... passim
35 U.S.C. § 112..... passim
35 U.S.C. § 112, p 6..... 124, 126
35 U.S.C. § 120..... 242, 271

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

35 U.S.C. § 251.....	52, 233, 235
35 U.S.C. § 255.....	166
35 U.S.C. § 271.....	passim
35 U.S.C. § 271(a).....	195
35 U.S.C. § 271(b).....	179
35 U.S.C. § 271(c).....	175
35 U.S.C. § 282.....	233, 267
35 U.S.C. § 285.....	321

RULES

M.P.E.P. § 201.03(E).....	271
M.P.E.P. § 2011.....	77
M.P.E.P. § 2107.01.....	257
M.P.E.P. § 2107.03.....	257
M.P.E.P. § 2111.....	75, 88, 98
M.P.E.P. § 2111.01.....	75, 98
M.P.E.P. § 2113.....	110
M.P.E.P. § 2131.....	288, 289
M.P.E.P. § 2141.....	297, 303
M.P.E.P. § 2141.02.....	297, 298, 299
M.P.E.P. § 2143.....	299, 300
M.P.E.P. § 2143.02.....	301
M.P.E.P. § 2164.02.....	256
M.P.E.P. § 2164.03.....	256
M.P.E.P. § 2164.05(b).....	256
M.P.E.P. § 2164.06.....	256
M.P.E.P. § 2173.05(b).....	97
M.P.E.P. § 2173.05(e).....	86, 287
M.P.E.P. § 2173.05(g).....	100
M.P.E.P. § 2173.05(p)(II).....	150
M.P.E.P. § 601.....	24
M.P.E.P. § 608.01(m).....	103
M.P.E.P. § 608.01(o).....	287
M.P.E.P. § 706.01.....	286
M.P.E.P. § 804.....	310, 311

REGULATIONS

37 C.F.R. § 1.102.....	226
37 C.F.R. § 1.132.....	301, 302, 304
37 C.F.R. § 1.56.....	320, 325, 326
37 C.F.R. § 1.71.....	213

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

37 C.F.R. § 1.71(c).....	213
37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c).....	91
37 C.F.R. § 1.75(d)(1).....	47
37 C.F.R. § 1.75(e).....	103
37 C.F.R. § 1.97	275
37 C.F.R. § 1.98	275, 317
37 C.F.R. §§ 1.97(b)-(d)	317
37 C.F.R. §1.74.....	279

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1. PREFACE	1
CHAPTER 2. INTRODUCTION	3
A. AN INVENTION CASE STUDY	4
Adam Mossoff: The Rise and Fall of the First American Patent Thicket: the Sewing Machine War of the 1850s.....	4
Notes	11
B. REVIEW OF SOME BASICS	13
1. <i>Patents Rights are Statutory</i>	13
2. <i>Patents Protect Inventions</i>	14
3. <i>A Right To Exclude, Not A Right To Practice.</i>	14
4. <i>Patents are Territorial</i>	14
5. <i>Utility Patent Applications: Provisional and Non-Provisional</i>	14
6. <i>Filing Date and Right of Priority</i>	15
Problems	16
7. <i>Patent Applications Publish 18 Months From The Earliest Priority Date.</i>	16
Problems	17
8. <i>Example of the Use of Patent</i>	17
C. THE LIFE OF A PATENT	19
1. <i>Conception</i>	20
2. <i>Invention Disclosure Form</i>	20
3. <i>Patentability Determination</i>	20
a. <i>Prior Art Search</i>	21
4. <i>Inventor Meeting</i>	22
5. <i>Patent Application Drafting, Filing, & Prosecution</i>	22
6. <i>Notice of Allowance & Issuance</i>	22
D. INTRODUCTION TO PATENT EXAMINATION.....	22
E. PARTS OF A PATENT APPLICATION	24
1. <i>An Introduction To The Parts Of A Patent Specification</i>	25
2. <i>Bibliographic Information</i>	31
3. <i>Background of the Invention</i>	31
a. <i>Field of The Invention</i>	31
b. <i>Description of Related Art</i>	31
4. <i>Summary of the Invention</i>	32
5. <i>Brief Description of Drawings</i>	32
6. <i>Detailed Description</i>	32
7. <i>Abstract of the Disclosure</i>	33
Problems	33
F. INTRODUCTION TO PATENT CLAIMS.....	33
Workbook.....	34
Problems	37
G. INTRODUCTION TO FOREIGN PATENT PROSECUTION	38
1. <i>Foreign Right of Priority</i>	38
2. <i>International Filing Process</i>	39
a. <i>Patent Cooperation Treaty</i>	39
b. <i>Regional Patent Offices, the European Patent Office</i>	40
3. <i>Absolute Novelty</i>	40
EPC Article 54. <i>Novelty</i>	40
Problems	41
CHAPTER 3. WHAT CLAIMS MEAN	48

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A.	TRADITIONAL BUT NOW-OUTDATED CANONS OF CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	48
B.	MODERN RULES FOR CONSTRUING CLAIMS IN COURT	49
1.	<i>Primacy Of The Intrinsic Evidence</i>	49
	Phillips v. AWH Corp.	49
	Notes	61
	Problems	67
2.	<i>Rule Against Importing Limitations From The Specification Versus Construing Terms In View Of The Specification</i>	67
	Rhine v. Casio, Inc.	67
	Notes	70
	ICU Medical v. Alaris Medical Systems	70
	Notes	73
3.	<i>Prosecution History Statements Affect Claim Construction</i>	74
	Gentry Gallery, Inc. v. The Berkline Corp.	74
	Notes	76
4.	<i>Claim Differentiation</i>	76
	Modine Manuf. Co. v. United States International Trade Commission	76
	Notes	79
	Problems	80
C.	CLAIM INTERPRETATION IN THE PATENT OFFICE.....	81
	M.P.E.P. § 2111 Claim Interpretation; Broadest Reasonable Interpretation	81
	M.P.E.P. § 2111.01 Plain Meaning	81
1.	<i>Patent Office Standard Explained</i>	83
	Ex Parte Miyazaki	83
	Notes	83
	Problems	84
	Workbook.....	84
	Thermal Coffee Mug	84
	Workbook.....	88
D.	EUROPEAN PATENT OFFICE PROSECUTION	88
1.	<i>EPO Guidelines for Claim Interpretation</i>	88
2.	<i>Effect On U.S. Claim Scope By Statements Made To Foreign Patent Offices</i>	89
CHAPTER 4. THE MECHANICS OF CLAIMS		90
A.	INTRODUCTION TO CLAIMS TYPES.....	90
	35 U.S.C. § 101 Inventions Patentable.....	90
B.	CLAIM STRUCTURE AND CONTENT	90
1.	<i>Antecedent Basis</i>	90
	M.P.E.P. § 2173.05(e) Lack Of Antecedent Basis	91
	M.P.E.P. § 2173.05(e):A Claim Term Which Has No Antecedent Basis In The Disclosure Is Not Necessarily Indefinite	91
2.	<i>Claim Preamble</i>	92
3.	<i>Claim Transitional Phrase</i>	92
	M.P.E.P. § 2111.03 Transitional Phrases	93
	Problems	95
4.	<i>Claim Body</i>	95
5.	<i>Introduction to Drafting Claims</i>	96
6.	<i>Independent And Dependent Claims</i>	96
	37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) Claims.....	96
	M.P.E.P. § 608.01(N) Dependent Claims.....	97
	Dennis Crouch, Theory of Dependent Claims: Survey Results.....	97
	Notes	100
	Problems	100
7.	<i>Basis For Claim Terminology In Description, M.P.E.P. § 608.01(O)</i>	101
	Notes	101
8.	<i>Relative Terminology</i>	101

TABLE OF CONTENTS

M.P.E.P. § 2173.05(B) Relative Terminology	101
Notes	102
Problems	102
9. <i>Applicant Can Be His Own Lexicographer</i>	102
M.P.E.P. § 2173.05(A) New Terminology	102
Notes	104
10. <i>Functional Limitations</i>	104
M.P.E.P. § 2173.05(G) Functional Limitations.....	104
M.P.E.P. § 2114 Apparatus And Article Claims - Functional Language	105
Notes	106
Problems	106
11. <i>Negative Limitations</i>	106
M.P.E.P. § 2173.05(I) Negative Limitations	106
Problems	107
C. TYPES OF CLAIMS	107
1. <i>Apparatus, Composition Of Matter, And Method Claims</i>	107
2. <i>Jepson Claims</i>	108
M.P.E.P. § 2129 III Admissions as Prior Art	108
Jepson Claim Format	108
37 C.F.R. § 1.75(e) Claims.....	108
Aaron R. Feigelson, Endangered Species: the Jepson Claim	109
3. <i>Markush Claims</i>	110
M.P.E.P. § 803.02 Markush Claims	110
4. <i>Product By Process Claims</i>	111
Abbott Labs v. Sandoz	111
Notes	114
Problems	115
D. PREAMBLES AND THEIR EFFECT	115
American Medical v. Biolitec.....	116
Notes	118
Problems	120
E. MEANS-PLUS-FUNCTION LIMITATIONS	120
Williamson v. Citrix Online, LLC, 792 F.3d 1339 (Fed. Cir. 2015)	121
Notes	128
Cole v. Kimberly Clark	129
Notes	129
Chiuminatta Concrete v. Cardinal Indus.	130
Notes	133
Problems	134
CHAPTER 5. PRINCIPLES OF CLAIMING	135
A. PATENT ELIGIBLE SUBJECT MATTER	135
Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank Int'l.....	135
Notes	141
Preliminary Examination Instructions in view of the Supreme Court Decision in Alice Corporation Pty. Ltd. v. CLS Bank International, et al.	142
Notes	144
B. INDEFINITENESS IN COURT: REASONABLE CERTAINTY STANDARD	145
Nautilus, Inc. v. Biosig Instruments, Inc.	145
Notes	146
C. INDEFINITENESS UNDER THE PATENT OFFICE STANDARD	147
Ex Parte Miyazaki	147
Notes	150
Problems	150
D. INDEFINITENESS OF CLAIMING AESTHETICS.....	150
Datamize v. Plumtree Software.....	150

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Notes	154
E. INDEFINITENESS BY MIXING STATUTORY CLASSES	155
IPXL Holdings v. Amazon.com	155
Notes	156
F. DEFINING STRUCTURE BY ITS RELATIONSHIP TO OTHER STRUCTURE	156
In The Matter Of The Application Of J. William Venezia	156
Notes	158
In re Raymod Giannelli	158
Notes	161
G. CLAIMING ONE OR MORE, PRIMACY OF THE SPECIFICATION	161
Norian Corp. v. Stryker Corp.	161
Notes	163
Problems	164
H. PREFERRED EMBODIMENT	164
Adams Respiratory Therapeutics v. Perrigo Co.	164
Notes	165
I. WEIGHT GIVEN TO INSTRUCTIONS.....	166
Astrazeneca LP v. Apotex, Inc.	166
Notes	168
Problems	168
J. DRAFTING ERRORS	169
Chef America v. Lamb-Weston.....	169
Notes	172
K. CLAIM DRAFTING SPECIFICS	173
1. Hal Wegner, Ten Patent Drafting Rules In the Era of Nautilus and Limelight 173	
Ronald D. Slusky, Patent Prosecution Tips: Drafting Preambles	174
Problems	176
Workbook.....	177
CHAPTER 6. CLAIMS AND INFRINGEMENT.....	178
A. DIRECT & INDIRECT INFRINGEMENT.....	178
1. <i>Direct Infringement</i>	179
2. <i>Indirect Infringement: Contributory Infringement</i>	179
Ricoh Company Ltd v. Quanta Computer Inc.	180
Notes	183
B. INDUCEMENT	184
DSU Medical v. JMS.....	185
Notes	Error! Bookmark not defined.
Astrazeneca v. Apotex.....	186
Notes	193
Problems	195
C. JOINT INFRINGEMENT	195
1. <i>Control or Direction Test</i>	195
Akamai v. Limelight Networks	195
Notes	198
Problems	199
2. <i>Infringing Use Of A Distributed System Under Section 271(A)</i>	200
Centillion Data Systems, LLC v. Qwest Communications Int'l.....	200
Notes	202
D. INFRINGEMENT UNDER THE DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS	202
1. <i>Equivalents And The Presumption Of Surrender</i>	203
Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co.	203
Notes	207
2. <i>Rebutting The Presumption Of Surrender</i>	208
Primos, Inc. v. Hunter's Specialties, Inc.	208

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Notes	210
3. <i>All Elements Rule & Vitiation</i>	211
Freedman Seating Co. v. American Seating Co.	211
Primos, Inc v. Hunter's Specialties, Inc.	216
Notes	217
Workbook.....	217
CHAPTER 7. PRINCIPLES OF THE SPECIFICATION	218
35 U.S.C. § 112 Specification	218
A. WRITTEN DESCRIPTION REQUIREMENT	219
37 C.F.R. § 1.71 Detailed Description And Specification Of The Invention	219
1. <i>Possession Of The Invention Standard For Written Description</i>	220
Ariad Pharmaceuticals, Inc v. Eli Lilly And Co.	220
Notes	228
2. <i>Invalidity For Failure Of The Written Description Requirement</i>	229
ICU Medical v. Alaris Medical Systems	229
Notes	230
Gentry Gallery, Inc. v. The Berklene Corp.	231
Notes	234
Tronzo v. Biomet, Inc.....	234
Notes	238
3. <i>Relationship Of Technical Problem To Claim Support</i>	238
Revolution Eyewear, Inc. v. Aspex Eyewear, Inc.	238
Notes	241
4. <i>Drawings As Written Description Support</i>	241
Cooper Cameron Corp. v. Kvaerner Oilfield Products	241
Notes	243
5. <i>Written Description Cases: A Higher Standard For Biotech Inventions?</i>	244
Notes	246
B. CLAIM SUPPORT UNDER THE EUROPEAN PATENT CONVENTION	246
EPO Guidelines for Examination 6.1 & 6.3: Support in the Description & Objection of lack of support	246
C. DISCLAIMER	247
1. <i>Disclosed But Unclaimed Subject Matter Is Dedicated To The Public</i>	247
Johnson & Johnston Assocs. Inc. v. R.E. Service Co., Inc.	247
Notes	250
2. <i>Express Disclaimer</i>	251
Scimed Life Sys., Inc. v. Advanced Cardio-Vascular Sys. Inc.,	251
GE Lighting Solutions v. Agilight, Inc.....	256
Problems	257
3. <i>Disclaimer During Prosecution</i>	257
Gentry Gallery, Inc. v. The Berklene Corp.	257
Notes	257
D. ENABLEMENT REQUIREMENT	258
M.P.E.P. § 2164 The Enablement Requirement	258
M.P.E.P. § 2164.03 Relationship Of Predictability Of The Art And The Enablement Requirement.....	258
1. <i>Predictable Arts</i>	260
2. <i>Unpredictable Arts</i>	260
3. <i>Test Of Enablement</i>	260
M.P.E.P. § 2164.01 Test Of Enablement.....	261
Undue Experimentation.....	261
M.P.E.P. § 2164.01(A) Undue Experimentation Factors	262
M.P.E.P. § 2164.01(B) How To Make The Claimed Invention	263
M.P.E.P. § 2164.01(C) How To Use The Claimed Invention	263
4. <i>Working Examples</i>	264

TABLE OF CONTENTS

M.P.E.P. § 2164.02 Working Example	264
Lieber-Flarsheim Co. v. Medrad, Inc.	266
National Recovery Techs, Inc., v. Magnetic Separation Sys., Inc.....	268
Notes	271
Workbook.....	272
E. DISCLOSURE OF THE BEST MODE	272
Teleflex, Inc. v. Ficos N. Am. Corp. 299 F.3d 1313 (Fed. Cir. 2002)	273
Notes	275
M.P.E.P. § 2165.03 Requirements For Rejection For Lack Of Best Mode: Assume Best Mode Is Disclosed Unless There Is Evidence To The Contrary	275
CHAPTER 8. PRACTICAL PROSECUTION ASPECTS	277
A. BASICS OF CONTINUATION PRACTICE.....	277
35 U.S.C. § 120 Benefit Of Earlier Filing Date In The United States.	278
In re Chu	278
Notes	279
Santarus v. Par Pharma.....	279
Notes	280
B. ADVOCACY IN CONTINUATION PRACTICE	280
Problem	281
C. PARTS OF THE PATENT APPLICATION REVISITED.....	281
1. <i>Overview Of The Background Section</i>	281
M.P.E.P. § 608.01(C) Background Of The Invention	281
2. <i>Drafting The Field Of The Invention Statement</i>	282
3. <i>Drafting The Background Section</i>	282
c. EPO Perspective of Description of the prior art	283
EPO Guidelines For Examination Rule 4.3; Background Art	283
4. <i>Drafting The Summary Section</i>	283
Hal Wegner, Ten Patent Drafting Rules In the Era of Nautilus and Limelight	284
M.P.E.P. § 608.01(D) Brief Summary Of Invention	284
5. <i>Drafting The Brief Description Of Drawings</i>	285
37 C.F.R. §1.74 Reference To Drawings.	285
6. <i>Drafting The Detailed Description</i>	286
M.P.E.P. § 608.01(G) Detailed Description Of Invention.....	286
Understand the Meaning of “Preferred Embodiment(s)”	288
Straightforward, Definite Wording Describing Structure Before Function	288
7. <i>Drafting The Abstract</i>	290
M.P.E.P. § 608.01(B) Guidelines For The Preparation Of Patent Abstracts	290
8. <i>Boilerplate Language</i>	290
CHAPTER 9. OFFICE ACTION REJECTION AND RESPONSE	292
A. REJECTION IS DISTINGUISHED FROM OBJECTION	292
M.P.E.P. § 706.01 Rejection, Contrasted With Objections	292
1. <i>Claim Objections & Antecedent Basis</i>	292
B. ANTICIPATION	294
A Species Will Anticipate A Claim To A Genus	294
M.P.E.P. § 2131.03 Anticipation of Ranges.....	295
C. THE FUNDAMENTALS OF OBVIOUSNESS	295
KSR Int’l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.	296
Notes	298
Muniauction v. Thomson	299
Notes	301
D. INVENTIVE STEP IN THE EUROPEAN PATENT OFFICE	301
European Patent Convention Article 56	301
EPO Guidelines for Examination; Part G: Patentability; Chapter VII: Inventive Step; 5. Problem-and-solution approach.....	301

TABLE OF CONTENTS

5.2 Formulation of the objective technical problem	302
5.3 Could-would approach	302
Notes	302
E. COMBINING PRIOR ART REFERENCES	303
F. REBUTTING A PROPOSED COMBINATION OF REFERENCES	303
2. <i>The Claimed Invention As A Whole Must Be Considered</i>	303
G. DISCOVERING SOURCE/CAUSE OF A PROBLEM IS PART OF “AS A WHOLE” INQUIRY	304
1. <i>Prior Art Must Be Considered In Its Entirety, Including Disclosures That Teach Away From The Claims</i>	305
2. <i>The Proposed Modification Cannot Render The Prior Art Unsatisfactory For Its Intended Purpose</i>	305
3. <i>The Proposed Modification Cannot Change The Principle Of Operation Of A Reference</i>	306
4. <i>Reasonable Expectation Of Success Is Required</i>	307
H. REBUTTING A PRIMA FACIE REJECTION BASED ON OBVIOUSNESS	307
M.P.E.P. § 2145 Consideration of Applicant’s Rebuttal Arguments	307
1. <i>Submitting Evidence to Rebut a Rejection.</i>	308
2. <i>Economic Infeasibility</i>	309
3. <i>The Age Of References</i>	309
4. <i>Non-Analogous Prior Art</i>	309
5. <i>Obvious To Try Rationale</i>	309
6. <i>Impermissible Hindsight</i>	310
7. <i>Secondary Considerations</i>	310
<i>Transocean Deepwater Drilling, Inc. v. Maersk Contractors USA, Inc.</i>	311
Notes	312
Problems	312
<i>Muniauction v. Thomson</i>	313
Notes	314
8. <i>Unexpected Results</i>	314
<i>In re Zenitz</i>	314
Notes	315
I. DOUBLE PATENTING.....	316
M.P.E.P. § 804 Double Patenting	316
Notes	317
1. <i>Overcoming A Double Patenting Rejection</i>	317
<i>Quad Environmental Techs. Corp v. Union Sanitary Dist.,</i>	318
Notes	318
Workbook.....	319
CHAPTER 10. INEQUITABLE CONDUCT.....	324
A. DUTY OF CANDOR	324
37 C.F.R. § 1.56 Duty To Disclose Information Material To Patentability.....	324
<i>Therasense, Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson And Co.</i>	326
Notes	333
B. MATERIAL MISSTATEMENTS	335
<i>Ferring B.V. v. Barr Labs., Inc.,</i>	335
Notes	338
C. DUTY TO DISCLOSE CO-PENDING PROSECUTION.....	338
<i>Dayco Products, Inc. v. Total Containment, Inc.,</i>	338
<i>Mckesson Information Solutions, Inc., v. Bridge Medical, Inc.,</i>	342
Notes	345
Problems	345
CHAPTER 11. SAMPLE ANSWERS TO PROBLEMS.....	346

CHAPTER 1. PREFACE

This book focuses on advocacy. Parts of the book are similar to a traditional law school casebook. A study of patent prosecution that is not grounded in case law is too shallow. Other parts are hypothetical examples for illustrating principles, without which the study is too ethereal and abstract for the practical job of patenting an invention. Other parts are problems with suggested solutions, like in an engineering, science, or math textbook, to drive the principles home. Finally, some parts are about elevating the practice over rote, advanced technical writing style that is too common.

A few principles about this book and the field of patent prosecution will be helpful in digesting the contents of this book and understanding the corresponding course of study.

The concepts in this book constitute the basic tools of patent lawyers. For most students, studying with this book will be atypical, as the student is required not to merely understand some of the concepts in this course, but to master and internalize each of them.

This book is about advocacy in a specific way. Its target is to practice before the United States Patent and Trademark Office, but the book's real, and lofty, goal is to develop trusted advisors. Even though this book naturally focuses on the basic functions of a patent practitioner; mastering the technical skills for drafting and prosecuting patent applications, even though necessary, is insufficient for a practitioner to be more than a technical writer. There is no substitute for the probing and hard thinking required for effective advocacy.

To illustrate this point, consider the value to a client of the following work. A young lawyer receives information about a technical development from a company and is asked to prepare a patent application. The company is moderately sophisticated in patent matters and requests a prior art search. When the search uncovers a prior art reference that discloses all but one element (X) of the invention, the lawyer discusses the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art reference and then crafts a patent application to emphasize the undisclosed element X. After some prosecution, a patent is granted with claims of moderate scope.

Many patent practitioners would consider this to be excellent representation and a positive outcome, as the client received a patent that covers the product and is apparently of full scope. But consider these additional facts. The subject matter of the patent application is many times more important than any of the other client's products, but no one followed up with the inventors to capture improvements, broaden the initial claims, or investigate capturing related subject matter, such as tooling and methods of making, intermediates, etc. Further, the prior art reference issued to a competitor of the client and had broad claims that arguably covered the client's product. The young lawyer did not know the client's business, so he didn't appreciate the commercial threat. He was not asked about freedom to operate, so he didn't look at the claims of the reference, nor did he search for additional patents assigned to the same competitor. The client would have preferred to pay more for the lawyer to perform more work on this subject matter, but the patent prosecutor's inattention prevented it, to the detriment of his client.

Before beginning, an explanation of the case excerpts in the book: cases have been heavily edited and citations in the case text have been nearly entirely eliminated for improving readability and brevity. Citations have been omitted even where the text of the case includes a quotation; the purpose of the cases in the book is to explain the rules and principles as efficiently as possible. String cites in quoted portions of the M.P.E.P., however, have not been omitted because those cases are often cited by patent examiners.

Finally, patent lawyers and agents speak their own language. Jargon is so commonplace that practitioners forget that it is jargon. There are many adequate glossaries or Wikipedia entries that can help a student understand the jargon.

