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


[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

§1.04 Economics of the Patent System


[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


[3] U.S. Supreme Court

[C] U.S. International Trade Commission
Chapter 2

Patent Claims

§2.01 Introduction


[B] The Paramount Role of Patent Claims

[C] Definition of a Patent Claim

[D] Public Notice Function

[E] Peripheral versus Central Claiming


[1] “Own Lexicographer” Rule


§2.02 Components of Patent Claims

[A] Preamble

[1] Introduction

[2] Preamble Language as Claim Limiting

[B] Transition

[1] “Comprising”


[4] Other Transition Terminology

[C] Body
§2.03 Dependent Patent Claims


[B] Claim Groupings

[C] Multiple Dependent Claims

[D] Claim Differentiation Principle

§2.04 Definiteness Requirement


[B] Perspective for Determining Claim Definiteness


[D] Representative Examples of Definite and Indefinite Claim Terms

[1] Representative Examples of Definite Claim Terms

   [a] *Orthokinetics* (1986)


   [c] *Young* (2007)


   [e] *Nautilus III* (2014)

   [f] *Sonix* (2017)

[2] Representative Examples of Indefinite Claim Terms

   [a] *Datamize* (2005)


[E] Judicial Correction of Harmless Errors in Claims
§2.05 Specialized Claiming Formats

[A] Means-Plus-Function Claims

[1] Functional Claiming Generally


[a] Scope-Narrowing

[b] Corresponding Structure

[c] Algorithms for Computer Structures

[d] “Equivalents Thereof”


[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


[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


[D]  Business Methods and the “Abstract Idea” Exception

   [1]  Overview


      [a]  In re Bilski (Fed. Cir. 2008) (en banc)

      [b]  Bilski v. Kappos (U.S. 2010)


         [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?


[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)


[d] Bascom (2016)

[e] Amdocs II (2016)


[g] Finjan (2018)

[E] Methods of Treatment

[1] Overview


[a] Prometheus v. Mayo (Fed. Cir. 2010)

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

Decision


[ii] *Genetic Technologies* (2016)

[iii] *Cleveland Clinic* (2017)


[i] *CellzDirect* (2016)


§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


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


[D] Spontaneously Generated Compositions
[E] Life Forms


[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


§4.02 Undue Experimentation

[A] Wands Factors Framework

[B] Predictability of the Technology

[1] Generally Predictable Technologies


[3] Exceptions to General Rule

[C] Scope of Enabling Disclosure Versus Scope of the Claims

[1] “Reasonable Correlation” Standard


[D] Use of Working and Prophetic Examples

[1] Types of Examples


§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


§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


[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.


[E] Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lily and Co. (en banc)

[F] AbbVie Deutschland v. Janssen Biotech


§6.08 Conclusion
Chapter 7

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

Chapter Explanatory Note


[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


[F] Geographic Limitations in §102

[G] Temporal Limitations in §102

§7.02 Anticipation

[A] Definition

[B] Strict Identity 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”


[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)
§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


[3] Confidentiality Norms

[4] Scientific or Technical Presentations


[F] “Public Use” Bar of §102(b)


[2] Public Use by Third Parties

[a] Generally

[b] Corroboration of Oral Testimony

[3] Non-Public “Public Use”
“On Sale” Bar of §102(b)

[1] Introduction

[2] Policy Considerations


[a] Decisions Finding No Commercial Offer

[b] Decisions Finding Commercial Offer

[c] Supplier Sales

[c] Contingent Sales (Conditions Precedent)


[a] Inventions Not Ready for Patenting

[b] Inventions Ready for Patenting

[H] Experimental Use Negation of the Statutory Bars


[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
§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
   [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

[D] Anticipation under §102(g)(2)
   [1] Introduction
   [2] Prior “Making” by Another
   [3] “In this Country” Requirement
[4] Inurement

Chapter 7A

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

Chapter Explanatory Note


§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] 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?


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

[A] Introduction


Presumptively Novelty-Destroying Events

[1] “(A)-Type” Exceptions
[2] “(B)-Type” Exceptions


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


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

[C] Derivation-Related Proceedings in the USPTO
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


[a] Enactment of Section 103

[b] “Shall Not Be Negated”

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

[d] “Would Have Been” Obvious


[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


[C] Section 102/Section 103 Overlap


[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]


[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


[C] Evidence of Commercial Success

[1] Generally

[D] Long-Felt But Unsolved Need

[E] Failure of Others

[F] “Etc.”

[1] Evidence of Copying

[2] Evidence of Licensing


[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”


[C] “Obvious to Try” (Pre-KSR Meaning)

[D] Unexpected Results

[1] Generally


[3] Placement in Graham Framework

[E] Teaching Away

[1] Generally


[3] Inoperability
Merely “Not Preferred” is Insufficient

Not Relevant to Anticipation


[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


   [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


[D] Overlapping Ranges or Variables

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

[A] USPTO

   [1] Factual Findings

[B] Federal District Court

[1] Factual Findings by Court


§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


§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