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

[C] Monopoly Profits Incentive

[D] Exchange for Secrets

§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)

[b] Interval Licensing (2014)


[d] Dow Chemical II (2015)

[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)


[d] Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank (U.S. 2014)

[i] Introduction

[ii] Post-Alice Decisions Holding Inventions Patent-Uneligible

[iii] Representative Post-Alice Decisions Holding Inventions Patent-Eligible

[iii-a] DDR Holdings (2014)

[iii-b] Enfish (2016)


[iii-e] Bascom (2016)


[E] Methods of Treatment

[1] Overview


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


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


[iii] Cleveland Clinic (2017)

§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 Lilly 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”

[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

§ 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


[3] Confidentiality Norms

[4] Scientific or Technical Presentations

[5] Internet Postings

[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”

[G] “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)
Issued U.S. Patent As §102(e) Prior Art

Published U.S. Patent Application as §102(e) Prior Art

Published PCT Application as §102(e) Prior Art

Effective Date of §102(e) Prior Art

Earliest U.S. Filing Date

Reference’s Foreign Priority Date Is Not Applicable (Hilmer Rule)

Provisional §102(e) Rejections

Strategies for Overcoming a §102(e) Rejection

Generally

Corroboration for Declarations

Originality Requirement and Derivation under §102(f)

Originality

Derivation

Qualifying as an Inventor

Correcting Inventorship

Prior Invention under §102(g)

Introduction

The First-to-Invent Priority Rule

Statement of the Priority Rule

Reduction to Practice

Actual Reduction to Practice

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


[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


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


Presumptively Novelty-Destroying Events

“(A)-Type” Exceptions

“(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

[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


[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]
Section 103(c) Exclusion of Joint Research Work [Pre-America Invents Act of 2011]

Use of Temporarily Secret Prior Art to Establish Obviousness [Pre-America Invents Act of 2011]

Analogous Art

- Required for Obviousness Under §103
- Test of In re Wood
- Same Field of Endeavor
- Same Problem Addressed
- 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

- Evidentiary Weight
  - Diverging Views
  - Versus Strength of Prima Facie Case
  - Need for Explicit Analysis

- Nexus Requirement
  - Generally
  - Rebuttable Presumption of Nexus
  - Nexus with Entire Claimed Invention versus Novel Features

- Evidence of Commercial Success
  - Generally
Nexus Requirement for Commercial Success

Long-Felt But Unsolved Need

Failure of Others

“Etc.”

Evidence of Copying

Evidence of Licensing

Evidence of Industry Praise

Evidence of Skepticism

§9.07 Combining Prior Art Disclosures

Teaching, Suggestion, or Motivation to Combine

Reasonable Expectation of Success

Degree of “Reasonableness”

Timing of Expectation

Relation to KSR (U.S. 2007)

“Obvious to Try” (Pre-KSR Meaning)

Unexpected Results

Generally

Timing of Evidence

Placement in Graham Framework

Teaching Away

Generally

United States v. Adams (U.S. 1966)

Inoperability

[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

§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

§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
Three Types of Continuing Applications

Filing Requirements

Effective Filing Date of Claims in Continuing Applications

Patent Term of Continuing Applications

Divisional Applications

1. Restriction Requirements

2. Consonance Requirement

§11.08 Claiming Foreign Priority

Treaty Basis and Statutory Implementation

“Shall Have the Same Effect”

“Same Invention”

Formal Requirements

First-Filed Foreign Applications

§11.09 Appeals to the USPTO Patent Trial and Appeal Board

Generally

Challenging the Board’s Decision

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

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