

# *Mueller on Patent Law, Volume I: Patentability and Validity\**

## **Detailed Table of Contents**

Last revised July 15, 2018 (includes 2018 Annual Update for Vol. I)

### **Chapter 1**

#### **Basic Principles**

##### §1.01 Patents in Context

[A] Introduction

[B] Patents as Strategic Business Assets

[C] Patents and Global Trade

[D] Patents and the Public Interest

[E] Patents as a Form of Intellectual Property (IP) Protection

[1] The Appropriability Problem of Public Goods

[2] IP Rights as an Incentive Mechanism

[3] IP Rights as an Exception to Competition by Imitation

##### §1.02 The Right to Exclude Conveyed by a Patent

[A] Negative, Not Positive, Right

[B] Blocking Patents

##### §1.03 Policy Justifications for Patent Protection

[A] Natural Rights

[B] Reward for Services Rendered

---

\* Full-text access of this treatise is via electronic subscription to the Wolters Kluwer CHEETAH digital research platform, *available at* <http://rus.wolterskluwer.com/product-family/cheetah>.

- [C] Monopoly Profits Incentive
- [D] Exchange for Secrets
- §1.04 Economics of the Patent System
  - [A] Patent Ownership Versus Monopoly Power
  - [B] Cost/Benefit Analysis
    - [1] Costs
    - [2] Benefits
- §1.05 The Term of a Patent
  - [A] Length of Term
  - [B] Patent Term Adjustment
- §1.06 Sources of U.S. Patent Law
  - [A] The Constitution
  - [B] Federal Statutes and Regulations
  - [C] Case Law
- §1.07 Government Entities in the Patent System
  - [A] The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office
  - [B] U.S. Federal Courts
    - [1] U.S. District Courts
      - [i] Eastern District of Virginia
    - [2] U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit
    - [3] U.S. Supreme Court
  - [C] U.S. International Trade Commission

## **Chapter 2**

### **Patent Claims**

#### §2.01 Introduction

- [A] Statutory Basis: 35 U.S.C. §112(b)
- [B] The Paramount Role of Patent Claims
- [C] Definition of a Patent Claim
- [D] Public Notice Function
- [E] Peripheral versus Central Claiming
- [F] Fundamentals of Patent Claim Construction
  - [1] “Own Lexicographer” Rule
  - [2] Default Rule: “Ordinary and Customary” Meaning
  - [3] Claim Interpretation in the USPTO: “Broadest Reasonable Construction” Rule

#### §2.02 Components of Patent Claims

- [A] Preamble
  - [1] Introduction
  - [2] Preamble Language as Claim Limiting
- [B] Transition
  - [1] “Comprising”
  - [2] “Consisting of”
  - [3] “Consisting Essentially of”
  - [4] Other Transition Terminology
- [C] Body

§2.03 Dependent Patent Claims

[A] Statutory Basis: 35 U.S.C. §§112(c)-(e)

[B] Claim Groupings

[C] Multiple Dependent Claims

[D] Claim Differentiation Principle

§2.04 Definiteness Requirement

[A] Statutory Basis: 35 U.S.C. §112(b)

[B] Perspective for Determining Claim Definiteness

[C] Definiteness Standard: *Nautilus v. Biosig* (U.S. 2014)

[D] Representative Examples of Definite and Indefinite Claim Terms

[1] Representative Examples of Definite Claim Terms

[a] *Orthokinetics* (1986)

[b] *Verve, LLC* (2002)

[c] *Young* (2007)

[d] *Hearing Components* (2010)

[e] *Nautilus III* (2014)

[f] *Sonix* (2017)

[2] Representative Examples of Indefinite Claim Terms

[a] *Datamize* (2005)

[b] *Interval Licensing* (2014)

[c] *Teva III* (2015)

[d] *Dow Chemical II* (2015)

[E] Judicial Correction of Harmless Errors in Claims

[F] Use of Antecedent Basis in Patent Claims

[G] Indefiniteness Standard in the USPTO

§2.05 Specialized Claiming Formats

[A] Means-Plus-Function Claims

[1] Functional Claiming Generally

[2] Statutory Basis: 35 U.S.C. §112(f)

[3] The Interpretation and Scope of Means-Plus-Function Elements

[a] Scope-Narrowing

[b] Corresponding Structure

[c] Algorithms for Computer Structures

[d] “Equivalents Thereof”

[4] Presumptions Regarding “Means” Claim Elements

[a] Claim Elements Including the Word “Means”

[b] Claim Elements *Not* Including the Word “Means”

[B] Product-By-Process Claims

[C] *Jepson* Claims

[D] *Markush* Claims

[E] *Beauregard* Claims

## Chapter 3

### Patent-Eligible Subject Matter

#### §3.01 Introduction

- [A] 35 U.S.C. §101: The First Door to Patentability
- [B] The Statutory Categories within §101
- [C] Claiming the Inventive Concept within the Statutory Categories
- [D] Exceptions to §101

#### §3.02 Processes within §101

- [A] Definition of a Process
- [B] Process versus Product
- [C] Computer-Implemented Processes: The Supreme Court’s *Benson* (1972)/*Flook* (1978)/*Diehr* (1981) Trilogy
- [D] Business Methods and the “Abstract Idea” Exception
  - [1] Overview
  - [2] Expansive View: *State Street Bank* (Fed. Cir. 1998)
  - [3] “Mental Processes”
  - [4] “Abstract Idea” Exception Narrows Business Method Patentability
    - [a] *In re Bilski* (Fed. Cir. 2008) (*en banc*)
    - [b] *Bilski v. Kappos* (U.S. 2010)
    - [c] Two-Step Framework of *Mayo v. Prometheus* (U.S. 2012)
      - [i] Step One—Claims Directed to Abstract Idea or Law of Nature?
      - [ii] Step Two—Inventive Concept?

- [d] *Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank* (U.S. 2014)
  - [i] Step One—Claims Directed to Abstract Idea or Law of Nature?
  - [ii]—Inventive Concept?
- [e] Federal Circuit Decisions Applying “Abstract Idea” Exception to Process Patent Eligibility
  - [i] Introduction
  - [ii] Post-*Alice* Decisions Holding Inventions Patent-Uneligible
  - [iii] Does *Mayo/Alice* Step Two Involve Questions of Fact?
  - [iv] Representative Post-*Alice* Decisions Holding Inventions Patent-Eligible
    - [a] *DDR Holdings* (2014)
    - [b] *Enfish* (2016)
    - [c] *McRO* (2016)
    - [d] *Bascom* (2016)
    - [e] *Amdocs II* (2016)
    - [f] *Thales Visionix* (2017)
    - [g] *Finjan* (2018)

[E] Methods of Treatment

- [1] Overview
- [2] Patent-Ineligible “Laws of Nature”
  - [a] *Prometheus v. Mayo* (Fed. Cir. 2010)

[b] *Mayo v. Prometheus* (U.S. 2012)

[c] Unintended Consequences of the Supreme Court's *Mayo*  
Decision

[i] *Ariosa* (2015)

[ii] *Genetic Technologies* (2016)

[iii] *Cleveland Clinic* (2017)

[3] Post-*Mayo* Federal Circuit Life Sciences Decisions Finding  
Patent-Eligible Subject Matter

[i] *CellzDirect* (2016)

[ii] *Vanda* (2018)

§3.03 Machines within §101

[A] Definition of a Machine

[B] Computer-Implemented Machines

§3.04 Compositions of Matter within §101

[A] Definition of a Composition of Matter

[B] Structure versus Properties: Newly Discovered Properties of Known  
Compositions

[C] Products of Nature

[1] Purified Forms of Natural Products

[2] Genetic Materials

[a] *Ass'n for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics* (U.S. 2013)

[b] Post-*Myriad* (U.S. 2013) Federal Circuit Decisions

[D] Spontaneously Generated Compositions



[E] Life Forms

[1] Foundation: *Diamond v. Chakrabarty* (U.S. 1980)

[2] Multi-Cellular Organisms

[3] Clones

§3.05 Manufactures within §101

[A] Definition of a Manufacture

[B] Embedded Software

[C] Electrical Signals

§3.06 Non-Eligible Subject Matter

§3.07 Remedies Exclusion for Medical/Surgical Procedures

## Chapter 4

### The Enablement Requirement

#### §4.01 Introduction

- [A] Disclosure Requirements of Section §112(a)
- [B] Bargain/Exchange Theory
- [C] Enabling “How to Make” and “How to Use”
- [D] Filing Date as Measure of Disclosure Compliance/New Matter Prohibition
  - [1] Incorporation by Reference
  - [2] Biological Deposits
  - [3] Timing for Enablement versus Novelty/Nonobviousness

#### §4.02 Undue Experimentation

- [A] *Wands* Factors Framework
- [B] Predictability of the Technology
  - [1] Generally Predictable Technologies
  - [2] Generally Unpredictable Technologies
  - [3] Exceptions to General Rule
- [C] Scope of Enabling Disclosure Versus Scope of the Claims
  - [1] “Reasonable Correlation” Standard
  - [2] “Full Scope” Enablement
- [D] Use of Working and Prophetic Examples
  - [1] Types of Examples
  - [2] Working Examples Not Mandatory

#### §4.03 Nascent and After-Arising Technologies



## **Chapter 5**

### **The Best Mode Requirement**

§5.01 2011 Legislative Scale-Back of the Best Mode Requirement

§5.02 Best Mode as Enablement-Plus

§5.03 Unclear Policy Objectives

§5.04 No Best Mode Obligation in Many Foreign Countries

§5.05 Best Mode Compliance and Foreign Priority Claims

§5.06 Two-Step Analysis

[A] Step One: Subjective Inquiry

[1] Best Mode of the Inventor, not Assignee

[2] Multiple Inventors

[B] Step Two: Objective Inquiry

[1] Integrating Enablement with Best Mode

[2] Proprietary Materials

[3] Production Details and Routine Details

[4] Manner of Identifying Best Mode

[5] Concealment: Is Intent Required?

§5.07 Scope of the Best Mode Disclosure versus Scope of the Claims

## Chapter 6

### The Written Description of the Invention Requirement

- §6.01 The Varied Meanings of “Written Description”
- §6.02 Priority Policing Mechanism
- §6.03 Policy Rationale
- §6.04 “Inventor in Possession” Test
  - [A] How the Specification Conveys Possession
  - [B] Ambiguity in the Possession Test
- §6.05 Written Description Versus Enablement
- §6.06 Traditional “Time Gap” Situations Invoking Written Description Scrutiny
- §6.07 Federal Circuit’s Expansion of the Written Description Requirement
  - [A] *Regents of Univ. of Cal. v. Eli Lilly and Co.*
  - [B] *Enzo Biochem., Inc. v. Gen-Probe, Inc.*
  - [C] *Univ. of Rochester v. G.D. Searle & Co.*
  - [D] *Carnegie Mellon Univ. v. Hoffmann-La Roche Inc.*
  - [E] *Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly and Co. (en banc)*
  - [F] *AbbVie Deutschland v. Janssen Biotech*
  - [G] *Amgen v. Sanofi* (2017)
- §6.08 Conclusion

## **Chapter 7**

### **Novelty, No Loss of Right, and Priority [Pre-America Invents Act of 2011]**

#### *Chapter Explanatory Note*

#### §7.01 Statutory Basis: 35 U.S.C. §102 (2006)

- [A] Burden of Proof on USPTO
- [B] Claim Interpretation in USPTO
- [C] Prior Art As Defined by §102
- [D] Lack of Novelty Versus Loss of Right
- [E] Persons Who Can Trigger the §102 Provisions
- [F] Geographic Limitations in §102
- [G] Temporal Limitations in §102

#### §7.02 Anticipation

- [A] Definition
- [B] Strict Identity Rule
  - [1] “Four Corners”/Single Reference Rule
  - [2] “Arranged As In the Claim”
    - [a] Generally
    - [b] Reference Not Anticipatory If It Must Be Distorted
  - [3] Exceptions to the Single Reference/”Four Corners” Rule
  - [4] No Analogous Art Requirement for Anticipation
  - [5] To “Suggest” is Not Sufficient for Anticipation
- [C] Species/Genus Relationships
- [D] Question of Fact

§7.03 Inherent Anticipation

[A] Generally

[1] “Necessarily Present”

[2] Reference Filing to “Necessarily Disclose”

[3] Use of Extrinsic Evidence to Establish Inherency

[B] Accidental Anticipation

[C] Contemporaneous Recognition Not Required

§7.04 Enablement Standard for Anticipatory Prior Art

[A] General Principle

[B] Exception for Prior Art Compounds Lacking a Utility

§7.05 Anticipation under §102(a)

[A] Filing Date as *Prima Facie* Invention Date

[1] References Having Effective Date Less Than One Year Before  
Applicant’s Filing Date

[2] Antedating a Putative §102(a) Reference by Establishing Earlier  
Invention Date

[a] Generally

[b] Relying on Inventive Activity Outside the U.S. under 35  
U.S.C. §104

[c] Disclaiming Affidavits

[B] “Known or Used by Others” under §102(a)

[C] “Patented” under §102(a)

[D] “Printed Publication” under §102(a)

- [E] Strategies for Overcoming a §102(a) Anticipation Rejection
- §7.06 Loss of Right/Statutory Bars under §102(b)
  - [A] Introduction
    - [1] Filing Date
    - [2] “Critical Date”
  - [B] Grace Period
  - [C] Policies Underlying the Statutory Bars
  - [D] “Patented” under §102(b)
    - [1] Conceptually Same as “Patented” Under §102(a)
  - [E] “Printed Publication” under §102(b)
    - [1] Public Accessibility
    - [2] The Thesis Cases
    - [3] Confidentiality Norms
    - [4] Scientific or Technical Presentations
      - [i] *Klopfenstein* (2004)
      - [ii] *Medtronic* (2018)
    - [5] Internet Postings
  - [F] “Public Use” Bar of §102(b)
    - [1] Foundation: *Egbert v. Lippmann* (1881)
    - [2] Public Use by Third Parties
      - [a] Generally
      - [b] Corroboration of Oral Testimony
    - [3] Non-Public “Public Use”



- [G] “On Sale” Bar of §102(b)
  - [1] Introduction
  - [2] Policy Considerations
  - [3] When Is An Invention Capable of Being Placed On Sale? *Pfaff v. Wells* (U.S. 1998)
  - [4] Post-*Pfaff* Decisions Interpreting “Commercial Offer”
    - [a] Decisions Finding No Commercial Offer
    - [b] Decisions Finding Commercial Offer
    - [c] Supplier Sales
    - [c] Contingent Sales (Conditions Precedent)
  - [5] Post-*Pfaff* Decisions Interpreting “Ready for Patenting”
    - [a] Inventions Not Ready for Patenting
    - [b] Inventions Ready for Patenting
- [H] Experimental Use Negation of the Statutory Bars
  - [1] Meaning of “Negation”
  - [2] Foundation: *City of Elizabeth v. Nicholson Pavement* (U.S. 1878)
  - [3] Experimental Use Factors
  - [4] Must Experimental Use End with Actual Reduction to Practice?
  - [5] Positioning Experimental Use within the *Pfaff* Framework
- [I] Cannot Antedate a §102(b) Reference
- [J] Cannot Rely on Paris Convention Foreign Priority Date to Remove a §102(b) Reference

§7.07 Abandonment under §102(c)

- §7.08 Foreign Patenting Bar of §102(d)
  - [A] Policy Basis Underlying §102(d) Bar
  - [B] Two Prongs of §102(d)
  - [C] Meaning of “Patented” in §102(d)
- §7.09 Description in Another’s Earlier-Filed Patent Application under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)
  - [A] Foundation: *Milburn v. Davis-Bournonville* (1926)
  - [B] Reference Patent or Application Describes But Does Not Claim Same Invention
  - [C] Ameliorating the “Secret Prior Art” Problem of §102(e)
    - [1] Issued U.S. Patent As §102(e) Prior Art Issued U.S. Patent as §102(e) Prior Art
    - [2] Published U.S. Patent Application as §102(e) Prior Art
    - [3] Published PCT Application as §102(e) Prior Art
  - [D] Effective Date of §102(e) Prior Art
    - [1] Earliest U.S. Filing Date
    - [2] Reference’s Foreign Priority Date Is Not Applicable (*Hilmer* Rule)
  - [E] Provisional §102(e) Rejections
  - [F] Strategies for Overcoming a §102(e) Rejection
    - [1] Generally
    - [2] Corroboration for Declarations
- §7.10 Originality Requirement and Derivation under §102(f)
  - [A] Originality

- [B] Derivation
  - [C] Qualifying as an Inventor
  - [D] Correcting Inventorship
- §7.11 Prior Invention under §102(g)
- [A] Introduction
  - [B] The First-to-Invent Priority Rule
    - [1] Statement of the Priority Rule
    - [2] Reduction to Practice
      - [a] Actual Reduction to Practice
      - [b] Constructive Reduction to Practice
    - [3] Abandonment/Suppression/Concealment
    - [4] Conception
    - [5] Diligence
  - [C] Interference Proceedings under §102(g)(1)
    - [1] Burdens of Proof
    - [2] Conducted under §135(a)
    - [3] Time Bar Under §135(b)
    - [4] Reliance on Foreign Inventive Activity under §104
    - [5] Example: Applying the Priority Rule in Interferences
  - [D] Anticipation under §102(g)(2)
    - [1] Introduction
    - [2] Prior “Making” by Another
    - [3] “In this Country” Requirement

[4] Inurement

[5] Example: Applying the First-to-Invent Priority Rule in Anticipation

## **Chapter 7A**

### **Novelty and Priority [Post-America Invents Act of 2011]**

#### *Chapter Explanatory Note*

§7A.01 Statutory Text: Post-AIA 35 U.S.C. §102

§7A.02 Sense of Congress and Legislative History for Post-AIA 35 U.S.C. §102

§7A.03 Prior Art under Post-AIA 35 U.S.C. §102(a)

- [A] Introduction
- [B] What Section 3 of the AIA Retained
- [C] What Section 3 of the AIA Changed
- [D] Presumptively Novelty-Destroying Events under Post-AIA 35 U.S.C. §102(a)(1)
  - [1] Invention “Patented, Described in a Printed Publication, or in Public Use, [or] On Sale” Before Effective Filing Date
  - [2] Invention “Otherwise Available to the Public” Before Effective Filing Date
  - [3] Does the AIA Permit Secret Prior Art?
- [E] Presumptively Novelty-Destroying Events under Post-AIA 35 U.S.C. §102(a)(2)

§7A.04 Novelty-Preserving Exceptions under Post-AIA 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

- [A] Introduction
- [B] Post-AIA 35 U.S.C. §102(b)(1): Shields against Post-AIA §102(a)(1) Presumptively Novelty-Destroying Events
  - [1] “(A)-Type” Exceptions

[2] “(B)-Type” Exceptions

[C] Post-AIA 35 U.S.C. §102(b)(2): Shields against Post-AIA §102(a)(2)

Presumptively Novelty-Destroying Events

[1] “(A)-Type” Exceptions

[2] “(B)-Type” Exceptions

§7A.05 Effective Date for AIA §3 “First Inventor to File” Amendments

§7A.06 Common Ownership under Joint Research Agreements

## **Chapter 8**

### **Inventorship**

#### §8.01 Originality Requirement

#### §8.02 The Process of Inventing

##### [A] Patent Law's Construct of Inventing: A Two-Step Process

###### [1] Conception

###### [a] Definition

###### [b] Scientific Certainty Not Required

###### [c] Corroboration

###### [d] Importance of Conception

###### [2] Reduction to Practice

###### [a] Actual Reduction to Practice

###### [b] Constructive Reduction to Practice

##### [B] The Reality

#### §8.03 Joint Inventors

##### [A] Statutory Basis

##### [B] Who Qualifies as a Joint Inventor?

###### [1] Conception as the Touchstone

###### [2] Quality of the Contribution

###### [a] "Not Insignificant in Quality"

###### [b] Contribution of an "Essential Element"

##### [C] Burden of Proof and Standard of Review

##### [D] Decisions Denying Joint Inventorship

[E] Decisions Finding Joint Inventorship

[F] The Impact of Inventorship on Ownership

#### §8.04 Correction of Inventorship

[A] Correction of Inventorship in Pending Patent Applications

[B] Correction of Inventorship in Issued Patents

[1] Section 256 Actions Generally

[2] Standing Requirement for Section 256 Actions

#### §8.05 Derivation

[A] Derivation Defined

[B] Derivation in Patent Litigation

[1] Generally

[2] *Agawam* (U.S. 1868)

[3] Derivation Requires Proving Earlier Conception of Entire  
Invention as Claimed

[C] Derivation-Related Proceedings in the USPTO

[1] Derivation as an Issue in Interference Proceedings [Pre-AIA]

[2] Derivation Proceedings Under the America Invents Act of 2011



## Chapter 9

### The Nonobviousness Requirement

§9.01 Statutory Basis: 35 U.S.C. §103

§9.02 Historical Background

[A] *Hotchkiss v. Greenwood* and the Elusive Requirement for “Invention”

[B] The *Hotchkiss* “Ordinary Mechanic”

[C] Replacing “Invention” with Nonobviousness

[1] Patent Act of 1952

[a] Enactment of Section 103

[b] “Shall Not Be Negated”

[c] The “Person Having Ordinary Skill in the Art”

[d] “Would Have Been” Obvious

[2] *Graham v. John Deere Co.* (U.S. 1966)

[a] Constitutionality of Section 103

[b] Analytical Framework for Nonobviousness Determinations:

Overview

§9.03 *Graham* Factor (1): Scope and Content of the Prior Art

[A] Terminology

[B] What Is Prior Art for §103 Purposes

[C] Section 102/Section 103 Overlap

[1] *In re Bass* (C.C.P.A. 1973)

[2] Section 103(c) Exclusion of Commonly-Owned Subject Matter

[Pre-America Invents Act of 2011]

- [3] Section 103(c) Exclusion of Joint Research Work [Pre-America Invents Act of 2011]
- [4] Use of Temporarily Secret Prior Art to Establish Obviousness [Pre-America Invents Act of 2011]
- [D] Analogous Art
  - [1] Required for Obviousness Under §103
  - [2] Test of *In re Wood*
  - [3] Same Field of Endeavor
  - [4] Same Problem Addressed
  - [5] Not Required for Anticipation Under §102

§9.04 *Graham* Factor (2): Differences between Claimed Invention and Prior Art

§9.05 *Graham* Factor (3): Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art

§9.06 *Graham* Factor (4): Secondary Considerations

- [A] Evidentiary Weight
  - [1] Diverging Views
  - [2] Versus Strength of Prima Facie Case
  - [3] Need for Explicit Analysis
- [B] Nexus Requirement
  - [1] Generally
  - [2] Rebuttable Presumption of Nexus
  - [3] Nexus with Entire Claimed Invention versus Novel Features
- [C] Evidence of Commercial Success
  - [1] Generally

- [2] Nexus Requirement for Commercial Success
- [D] Long-Felt But Unsolved Need
- [E] Failure of Others
- [F] “Etc.”
  - [1] Evidence of Copying
  - [2] Evidence of Licensing
  - [3] Evidence of Industry Praise
  - [4] Evidence of Skepticism

#### §9.07 Combining Prior Art Disclosures

- [A] Teaching, Suggestion, or Motivation to Combine
- [B] Reasonable Expectation of Success
  - [1] Degree of “Reasonableness”
  - [2] Timing of Expectation
  - [3] Relation to *KSR* (U.S. 2007)
- [C] “Obvious to Try” (Pre-*KSR* Meaning)
- [D] Unexpected Results
  - [1] Generally
  - [2] Timing of Evidence
  - [3] Placement in *Graham* Framework
- [E] Teaching Away
  - [1] Generally
  - [2] *United States v. Adams* (U.S. 1966)
  - [3] Inoperability

[4] Merely “Not Preferred” is Insufficient

[5] Not Relevant to Anticipation

§9.08 Nonobviousness in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: *KSR v. Teleflex* (U.S. 2007)

[A] Expanding the Reasons for Combining Prior Art Disclosures

[B] Common Sense

[C] Requirement for Explicit Analysis

[D] Redefining “Obvious to Try”

[E] Predictability

[F] Representative Federal Circuit Applications of *KSR*

[1] Mechanical Inventions

[2] Computer/Internet-Implemented Inventions

[3] Pharmaceutical and Biotechnology Inventions

§9.09 The *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness

[A] Generally

[B] *In re Dillon* (1990) (en banc)

[C] Burden-Shifting in Validity Litigation?

[1] Cases Rejecting Burden-Shifting

[2] Cases Approving Burden-Shifting

[D] Overlapping Ranges or Variables

§9.10 Federal Circuit’s Standards of Review for §103 Determinations

[A] USPTO

[1] Factual Findings

[2] “Harmful Error” Requirement

[B] Federal District Court

[1] Factual Findings by Court

[2] Factual Findings by Jury

§9.11 Biotechnological Processes: Section 103(b) [Pre-America Invents Act of 2011]

## Chapter 10

### The Utility Requirement

§10.01 Statutory Basis: 35 U.S.C. §101

§10.02 Practical/Real-World Utility

§10.03 Historical Development

[A] Justice Story's Standard

[B] *Brenner v. Manson* (U.S. 1966)

§10.04 Federal Circuit Examples

[A] Chemical Compounds

[B] Methods of Treating Disease

[C] Genetic Inventions

§10.05 USPTO Examination Guidelines on Utility

§10.06 Inoperability

[A] Examples of Inoperable Inventions

[B] Inoperable Species within a Genus

§10.07 Immoral or Deceptive Inventions

§10.08 Utility Versus How-to-Use Requirement of §112, ¶1

## **Chapter 11**

### **Patent Prosecution Procedures in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

§11.01 Introduction

§11.02 Filing the Patent Application

[A] Non-Provisional/Regular Application

[B] Provisional Application

[C] Incorporation by Reference

§11.03 Examination by the USPTO

[A] Overview

[B] Search of Prior Art

[C] First Office Action

[D] Applicant's Response

[E] Second or Final Office Action

[F] Requests for Continued Examination

[G] Continuing Applications

§11.04 Patent Issuance

§11.05 Patent Term Adjustment

[A] Generally

[B] Overlap Limitation

[C] Treatment of Continued Examination

[D] What Constitutes USPTO Fault for A-Type Delay

§11.06 Publication of Pending Nonprovisional Applications

§11.07 Continuing Application Practice

- [A] Introduction
- [B] Three Types of Continuing Applications
- [C] Filing Requirements
- [D] Effective Filing Date of Claims in Continuing Applications
- [E] Patent Term of Continuing Applications
- [F] Divisional Applications
  - [1] Restriction Requirements
  - [2] Consonance Requirement

§11.08 Claiming Foreign Priority

- [A] Treaty Basis and Statutory Implementation
- [B] “Shall Have the Same Effect”
- [C] “Same Invention”
- [D] Formal Requirements
- [E] First-Filed Foreign Applications

§11.09 Appeals to the USPTO Patent Trial and Appeal Board

- [A] Generally
- [B] Challenging the Board’s Decision
- [C] New Ground of Rejection by Board

§11.10 Civil Actions for a Patent

§11.11 Sample Office Action and Applicant’s Response

§11.12 Sample Patent and its Components



## **Chapter 12**

### **Double Patenting**

§12.01 Introduction

§12.02 Two Types of Double Patenting

[A] Same Invention-Type

[B] Obviousness-Type

§12.03 Policy Bases

[A] Prevent Improper Extension of Patentee's Right to Exclude Others

[B] Prevent Potential Harassment by Multiple Assignees

§12.04 Foundational Case Study

§12.05 Twenty-Year Patent Term Did Not Eliminate Double Patenting Concerns

§12.06 How Double Patenting Differs from Anticipation and Obviousness

[A] Claim-to-Claim Comparison

[B] Prior Art is Not Involved

[C] Similarities

§12.07 Proper Use of the Disclosure to Interpret the Claims

§12.08 Improper Use of the Disclosure as Prior Art

§12.09 Use of Terminal Disclaimer to Overcome Obviousness-Type Double Patenting

[A] Terminal Disclaimers in the USPTO

[B] Terminal Disclaimers in Litigation

[C] Terminal Disclaimer Does Not Admit Claims Patentably Indistinct

§12.10 One-Way versus Two-Way Test for Obviousness-Type Double Patenting