

Index

ABANDONMENT

Generally, **8:266-8:272**
Adequate utility, **7:44**
Correction of inventorship, **10:67, 10:68**
Examination of Original Application (this index)
General abandonment, relation to, **8:271**
History, **1:20, 1:21, 8:267-8:269**
Joint inventorship, **10:52**
Modern law, **8:279-8:272**
Non-obviousness, **9:28, 9:29, 9:34, 9:39**
Novelty bar, relation to, **8:268**
Potential issues, **8:272**
Priority (this index)
Processes, **5:30**
Section 102(c), generally, **8:266-8:272**
Statutory history, **8:269**
Technological scope, **13:89**

ABBREVIATED APPROVAL APPLICATION

Adequate commerciality, **14:7**

ABBREVIATED NEW-DRUG APPLICATION (ANDA)

Adequate commerciality, **14:62, 14:64, 14:79, 14:80**

ABILITY OR SKILL

Skill (this index)

ABSOLUTE NOVELTY

Priority (this index)

ABSTRACT ACTS AND MATTERS

Adequate utility, **6:18, 7:6**
Claims, **4:97**
Computer-related inventions, **5:44**
Inventorship, **10:9, 10:13, 10:17**
Joint inventorship, **10:52**
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:78**

ABSTRACT ACTS AND MATTERS

—Cont'd

Processes, **5:19, 5:26, 5:39**
Static physical configurations, **5:10**

ABTOX, INC. v. EXITRON CORP.

Adequate commerciality, **14:71**

A.C. AUKERMAN CO. v. R.I. CHAIDES CONST. CO.

Estoppel, **24:17**

ACCIDENT

Reissue of patent, **16:25**

ACCIDENTAL ANTICIPATION

Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)

ACCIDENTAL DISCOVERY

Priority, **8:44**

ACCOUNTABILITY

Correction of inventorship, **10:61**
Joint inventorship, **10:50-10:53**

ACCOUNTING

Processes, **5:28**

ACCRUAL

Six-year limitation, section 286 defense, **21:21, 21:22**

ACCURACY

Definitional accuracy, **4:9**
Technological scope, **13:54**

ACCUSED ACTIVITY

Geographic Scope of Infringement (this index)

ACTIVELY INDUCES INFRINGEMENT

Indirect infringement, **15:15**

ADAMS v. EDWARDS

Priority, **8:44**

ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS

Adequate commerciality, **14:31**

ADDITIONS AND DELETIONS

—Cont'd

Anticipation, lack of, **8:32**
Priority, **8:147**

ADEQUATE COMMERCIALITY

Abbreviated approval application, **14:7**
Abbreviated new-drug application (ANDA), **14:62, 14:64, 14:79, 14:80**
Abtox, Inc. v. Exitron Corp., **14:71**
Additional uses, capacity for, **14:31**
Allergan, Inc. v. Alcon Laboratories, Inc., **14:79**
Alternative purpose, use of claimed structure for, **14:37**
Amendments
Hatch-Waxman Act, below
Patent Act, **14:24, 14:44, 14:45**
TRIPs, **14:10**
Amusement, **14:12, 14:63**
Appeal and review
Hatch-Waxman Act, below
Paper Converting Machine Co. v. Magna-Graphics Corp., **14:26**
Application
abbreviated approval application, **14:7**
abbreviated new-drug application (ANDA), **14:62, 14:64, 14:79, 14:80**
declaratory judgment action, **14:80**
new-drug application (NDA), **14:62**
Approval
Approved Drug Products with Therapeutic Equivalence Evaluations, **14:76**
experimental use, **14:57**
FDA approval, **14:63**
Hatch-Waxman Act, below
technical infringement, **14:75, 14:78, 14:79**
Aro Mfg. Co. v. Convertible Top Replacement Co., **14:32**
Attorneys' fees, **14:78**
Bauer & Cie v. O'Donnell, **14:33, 14:39**

ADEQUATE COMMERCIALITY

—Cont'd

Capacity for use, questions of, **14:29-14:31**
Certification, **14:78**
Chemical arts, **14:61**
Circumstantial evidence, intent as, **14:16**
Common-law exception, **14:51**
Community Patent Convention, **14:46**
Competition, generally, **14:6**
Conner Peripherals, Inc. v. Western Digital Corp., **14:27**
Construction and interpretation, **14:65, 14:69, 14:70, 14:79**
Contracts and agreements
offers for sale, generally, **14:47**
TRIPs, **14:10**
Conveyance of title, **14:18**
Copyright, comparison to, **14:15**
Counterfeit goods, TRIPs, **14:10**
Court of claims, **14:51, 14:55**
Curiosity, satisfaction of, **14:12**
Damages, **14:19, 14:78**
Date of invention, **14:10**
Declaratory judgment action, availability of, **14:80**
Deepsouth Packing Co. v. Laitram Corp.
generally, **14:22-14:24**
holding, **14:23**
making, developments after 1982, **14:25-14:27**
subsequent enactment of section 271(f), **14:24**
Definitions
direct infringement, **14:1**
infringement, **14:10**
infringement, acts of, below
offers to sale, **14:47**
policy justifications, definition without reference to intent, **14:14-14:17**
selling, **14:39**
using, **14:33**
De Graffenried v. U.S., **14:27**
Delay, **14:26**

INDEX

ADEQUATE COMMERCIALITY

—Cont'd

- Delivery, **14:40**
- De minimis activities. Experimental, noncommercial and de minimis activities, above
- Doctrine of Equivalents, **14:17, 14:29**
- Douglas v. U.S., **14:55**
- Drug Price Competition and Price Restoration Act of 1984. Hatch-Waxman Act, below
- E.I. DuPont De Nemours and Co. v. Monsanto Co., **14:36**
- Eli Lilly and Co. v. Medtronic, Inc., **14:65, 14:69-14:71**
- Embodiments, **14:42**
- Embrex, Inc. v. Service Engineering Corp., **14:59**
- Enercon GmbH v. International trade Com'n, **14:39, 14:40**
- Evidence, **14:6, 14:15, 14:16**
- Exceptions, exclusions, and exemptions, generally, **14:1**
- Exclusive rights, **14:42**
- Exclusivity, commercial, **14:12**
- Experimental, noncommercial and de minimis activities
 - generally, **14:12, 14:50-14:80**
 - court of claims, development in, **14:55**
 - experimental uses, generally, **14:50-14:59**
 - federal circuit courts, developments in, **14:56-14:59**
- Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FDCA), **14:62, 14:63, 14:70, 14:76, 14:80**
- Food and Drug Administration (FDA), **14:63, 14:64, 14:79, 14:80**
 - genomic material, use of, **14:58**
- Hatch-Waxman Act, below
- history, **14:52**
- policy justification, **14:53**
- pre-federal circuit developments, **14:54**
- recent developments, **14:59**

ADEQUATE COMMERCIALITY

—Cont'd

- Experimental, noncommercial and de minimis activities—Cont'd
 - regulatory approval, experimental use for, **14:57**
- Expiration of patent, **14:61**
- Faroudja Laboratories, Inc. v. Dwin Electronics, Inc., **14:36**
- Federal Circuit, U.S. Court of Appeals for, generally, **14:6**
- Food and Drug Administration (FDA), generally, **14:6, 14:7**
- Foreign countries, **14:33**
- FTC, **14:58**
- General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), **14:10, 14:33, 14:46**
- Generic drugs, **14:63, 14:64**
- Genome structure and inventions, **14:51, 14:58**
- Hatch-Waxman Act
 - generally, **14:6, 14:60-14:74**
 - amendments
 - Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938, amendment to, **14:62**
 - 1988 amendments, **14:66**
 - safe harbor, **14:75**
 - 2003 amendments, **14:9, 14:66, 14:80**
 - appeal and review
 - generally, **14:6**
 - Eli Lilly and Co. v. Medtronic, Inc., **14:65, 14:70**
 - experimental uses, **14:51**
 - technical infringement, **14:79**
 - approval, pre-market regulatory approval, generally, **14:6**
 - early history, **14:62**
 - Eli Lilly and Co. v. Medtronic, Inc., **14:65, 14:70**
 - Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FDCA), **14:62, 14:63, 14:70, 14:76, 14:80**
 - Food and Drug Administration (FDA), **14:63, 14:64, 14:79, 14:80**

ADEQUATE COMMERCIALITY
—Cont'd

Hatch-Waxman Act—Cont'd
 historical development, generally, **14:6-14:9, 14:61-14:67**
 initial act, **14:64**
 Merck KGaA v. Integra
 Lifesciences I, Ltd., **14:67**
 Roche Prod. Inc. v. Bolar
 Pharmaceutical Co., Inc.,
 14:63
 safe harbor, section 271(e)(1)
 generally, **14:68-14:74**
 Eli Lilly and Co. v. Medtronic,
 Inc., **14:70**
 medical devices, application to,
 14:69
 medical devices, class I and II,
 14:71
 Merck KGaA v. Integra
 Lifesciences I, Ltd., **14:73**
 reasonably related uses, **14:72-**
 14:74
 subsequent developments, **14:74**
 section 271(e)(1), generally. Safe
 harbor, section 271(e)(1),
 above this group
 section 271(e)(2), generally.
 Technical infringement, sec-
 tion 271(e)(2), below this
 group
 technical infringement, section
 271(e)(2)
 generally, **14:75-14:80**
 declaratory judgment action,
 availability of, **14:80**
 induced infringement, relation
 to, **14:79**
 limitations on remedies, **14:78**
 special issues, **14:77-14:80**
 statutory mechanics, **14:76**
 veterinary biological products
 generally, **14:1, 14:50**
 historical development, **14:8**
 safe harbor, **14:69**
 statutory amendments, **14:66**
 technical infringement, **14:79**
 High Tech Medical Instrumentation,
 Inc. v. New Image Industries,
 Inc., **14:30**

ADEQUATE COMMERCIALITY
—Cont'd

Historical development
 generally, **14:1-14:10**
 amendments of 2003, **14:9**
 early U. S. statutes, **14:3**
 experimental, noncommercial and
 de minimis activities, **14:52**
 General Agreement on Tariffs and
 Trade (GATT), **14:10**
 Hatch-Waxman Act, above
 Keplinger v. De Young, **14:3**
 offers to sale, **14:46**
 Patent Act of 1836, **14:4, 14:5**
 Patent Act of 1870, **14:4**
 Patent Act of 1952, **14:5**
 Statute of Monopolies of 1623,
 generally, **14:2**
 Statute of Monopolies of 1790,
 14:3
 Statute of Monopolies of 1793,
 14:3
 Statute of Monopolies of 1800,
 14:3
 Whittemore v. Cutter, **14:3**
 Hoffman-La-Roche, Inc. v. Zenith
 Laboratories, Inc., **14:62**
 Holding, **14:23**
 Hughes Aircraft Co. v. U.S., **14:27**
 Identical subject matter, **14:12**
 Immunity, **14:7, 14:68, 14:72**
 Imports and exports, **14:23, 14:24**
 Independent inventions, **14:11, 14:15**
 Indirect infringement, contrast with,
 14:17
 Inducement, **14:79**
 Infringement, acts of
 generally, **14:18-14:49**
 additional uses, capacity for, **14:31**
 alternative purpose, use of claimed
 structure for, **14:37**
 contrasting making with using,
 14:35
 date of offered sale, **14:48**
 Deepsouth Packing Co. v. Laitram
 Corp., **14:22-14:24**
 definitions
 making, generally, **14:20-14:27**

INDEX

ADEQUATE COMMERCIALITY

—Cont'd

Infringement, acts of—Cont'd
definitions—Cont'd
offers of sale, **14:47**
selling, **14:39**
using, **14:33**
delivery, **14:40**
historical development, **14:46**
holding, *DeepSouth Packing Co. v. Laitram Corp.*, **14:23**
making, contract with, **14:35**
making, generally, **14:19-14:31**
method inventions, inapplicability to, **14:28, 14:43**
method inventions, use of, **14:34-14:36**
methods, application to, **14:49**
modifications required before use, **14:30**
1982, development after, **14:25-14:27**
offers to sale, generally, **14:44-14:49**
offers to use, **14:35**
Paper Converting Machine Co. v. Magna-Graphics Corp., **14:26**
questions of capacity for use, **14:29-14:31**
Radio Corporation of America v. Andrea, **14:21**
relationship of offers for sale and selling, **14:44**
sale versus license, **14:41**
section 271(i), generally, **14:48**
selling, generally, **14:35, 14:38-14:44**
serial performance by different persons, **14:36**
subsequent developments, **14:27**
subsequent enactment of section 271(f), effect of, **14:24**
transfer of embodiments versus intellectual property rights, **14:42**
using, generally, **14:32-14:37, 14:49**
Injunctions, **14:78**
Intellectual property rights, **14:42**

ADEQUATE COMMERCIALITY

—Cont'd

Intent, **14:14-14:17, 14:29, 14:79**
International acts and matters
Community Patent Convention, **14:46**
General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), **14:10, 14:33, 14:46**
TRIPs, **14:10**
Uruguay Round Agreement, **14:10**
WTO Agreement, **14:46**
International Trade Commission (ITC), **14:39, 14:40**
Investigational new drug (IND), **14:67, 14:73**
Joy Technologies, Inc. v. Flakt, Inc., **14:27, 14:28, 14:43**
Judgments, **14:80**
Jurisdiction, **14:47**
Justification. Policy justifications, below
Keplinger v. De Young, **14:3**
License, sale versus, **14:41**
Limitations and restrictions
experimental, noncommercial and de minimis activities, **14:68, 14:75, 14:78**
making, **14:22, 14:26**
offers for sale, **14:45, 14:48**
policy justifications, **14:12**
using, **14:33, 14:37**
Madey v. Duke University, **14:59**
Making, generally, **14:1**
Marketing regulation of FDA, **14:7**
Medical devices, **14:69, 14:71**
Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act, **14:9, 14:66**
Merck KGaA v. Integra Lifesciences I, Ltd., **14:67, 14:73, 14:74**
Method claims and inventions
making, **14:27, 14:28**
offers to sale, **14:49**
selling, **14:43**
using, **14:32, 14:34-14:37**
Modifications, **14:30, 14:64**
Monetary relief, **14:78**
Multiple capabilities, **14:31**

ADEQUATE COMMERCIALITY

—Cont'd

Name-brand drugs, **14:63**
 New-drug application
 generally, **14:62 et seq.**
 abbreviated new-drug application (ANDA), **14:62, 14:64, 14:79, 14:80**
 1982, development after, **14:25-14:27**
 Noncommercial activities. Experimental, noncommercial and de minimis activities, above
 Notice and knowledge, **14:14, 14:53, 14:61, 14:76**
 NTP, Inc. v. Research In Motion, Ltd., **14:28**
 Offering for sale, generally, **14:1**
 Offers to use, **14:35**
 Paper Converting Machine Co. v. Magna-Graphics Corp.
 making, **14:19, 14:25-14:27, 14:30**
 offers for sale, **14:48**
 Patent Act of 1793, **14:32**
 Patent Act of 1836, **14:4, 14:5**
 Patent Act of 1870, **14:4**
 Patent Act of 1952, **14:5, 14:42**
 Patent Act of 1977, **14:35, 14:49**
 Patent Law Amendments Act of 1984, **14:24**
 Pending actions, **14:80**
 Performance, **14:36**
 Personal jurisdiction, **14:47**
 Pfizer v. International Rectifier, **14:63**
 Pharmaceuticals
 exception, generally, **14:1**
 Hatch-Waxman Act, above
 Philosophical gratification, **14:63**
 Philosophical inquiry, strictly for, **14:12**
 Policy justifications
 generally, **14:11-14:17**
 circumstantial evidence, intent as, **14:16**
 commercial exclusivity, **14:12**
 copyright, comparison to, **14:15**
 definition without reference to intent, **14:14-14:17**

ADEQUATE COMMERCIALITY

—Cont'd

Policy justifications—Cont'd
 experimental, noncommercial and de minimis activities, **14:53**
 indirect infringement, contrast with, **14:17**
 rule-based implementation, **14:13**
 Possession, **14:32, 14:41**
 Pre-federal circuit developments, **14:54**
 Preliminary injunction, **14:31**
 Pre-market regulatory approval.
 Hatch-Waxman Act, above
 Price, **14:12, 14:47, 14:63**
 Profits, **14:12**
 Public knowledge, **14:53**
 Quality immunity, **14:7**
 Questions of capacity for use, **14:29-14:31**
 Radio Corp. of America v. Andrea, **14:21, 14:22, 14:26**
 Reasonable apprehension, **14:80**
 Reasonableness, **14:72**
 Reasonable relationship, **14:68, 14:73**
 Reasonably capable of use, **14:19**
 Reasonably related uses, **14:72-14:74**
 Regulatory approval, experimental use for, **14:57**
 Relevance of proof, **14:16**
 Research tools, **14:74**
 Restatement of Contracts, **14:47**
 Roche Prod. Inc. v. Bolar Pharmaceutical Co., Inc.
 experimental, noncommercial and de minimis activities, **14:57, 14:58, 14:63, 14:64, 14:66**
 historical development, **14:6, 14:7**
 making, **14:26**
 Rotec Indus., Inc. v. Mitsubishi Corp., **14:40, 14:47**
 Rule-based implementation, **14:13**
 Safe harbor
 generally, **14:7**
 Hatch-Waxman Act, above
 Sales
 exclusion from making, using, offering for sale or selling, generally, **14:1**

INDEX

ADEQUATE COMMERCIALITY

—Cont'd

- Sales—Cont'd
 - perform process, sale of materials to, **14:28**
- Section 154, **14:19**
- Section 154, generally, **14:1**
- Section 156. Hatch-Waxman Act, above
- Section 271(a), generally, **14:1**
- Section 271(e). Hatch-Waxman Act, above
- Section 271(e), pharmaceuticals exception, **14:1**
- Section 271(e)(1)
 - generally, **14:7**
 - Hatch-Waxman Act, above
- Section 271(e)(2)
 - generally, **14:7**
 - Hatch-Waxman Act, above
- Section 271(e)(3), **14:7**
- Section 271(e)(4), **14:7**
- Section 271(e)(5), **14:9**
- Section 271(f), **14:24**
- Section 271(i), **14:48**
- Serial performance by different persons, **14:36**
- Single-source control, **14:12**
- Special damages, **14:78**
- Standard Havens Products, Inc. v. Gencor Industries, Inc., **14:27**
- State of mind, **14:17**
- Statute of Monopolies. History, above
- Stearns-Roger Mfg. Co. v. Ruth, **14:29**
- Strict liability, **14:14**
- Subsequent developments, **14:27, 14:74**
- Subsequent enactment of section 271(f), effect of, **14:24**
- Summary judgment, **14:36, 14:79**
- Supreme Court cases, see lines throughout this index topic
- Tariff Act, **14:39**
- Technical infringement, section 271(e)(2). Hatch-Waxman Act, above
- Temporal scope, **11:6**

ADEQUATE COMMERCIALITY

—Cont'd

- Term of patent, **14:26**
- Territorial limitations, **14:22**
- Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. v. Pfizer, Inc., **14:80**
- Third parties, **14:32**
- 3D Systems, Inc. v. Aarotech Laboratories, Inc., **14:47**
- Time and date
 - expiration of patent, **14:61**
 - offers to sale, **14:48**
 - technical infringement, **14:76**
 - term of patent, **14:26**
 - TRIPs, **14:10**
- Title, conveyance of, **14:18**
- Toppan v. Tiffany Refrigerator Car Co., **14:42**
- Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, Agreement on (TRIPs), **14:10, 14:27, 14:46**
- Trade shows, **14:33**
- Transfers, **14:42**
- TRIPs, **14:10, 14:27, 14:46**
- Union Oil Co. of California v. Atlantic Richfield Co., **14:37**
- Uruguay Round Agreement of GATT, **14:10**
- U.S. Court of Appeals for Federal Circuit, generally, **14:6**
- USCA, Title 21, Sections 151 to 158, **14:76**
- USCA, Title 28, Section 1498, **14:55**
- USCA 35 § 271(e)(2)(A), **14:79**
- Use, offers to, **14:49**
- Using, generally, **14:1**
- Van Kannell Revolving Door Co. v. Revolving Door & Fixture Co., **14:39, 14:40, 14:46**
- Veterinary biological products.
 - Hatch-Waxman Act, above
- Warner-Lambert Co. v. Apotex Corp., **14:79**
- Waymark Corp. v. Porta Systems Corp., **14:27**
- Weed Chain Tire Grip Co v. Cleveland Chain & Mfg Co., **14:31**
- White v. Walbridge, **14:20**

ADEQUATE COMMERCIALITY
—Cont'd

Whittemore v. Cutter, **14:3, 14:52**
Willfulness, **14:78**
WTO Agreement, **14:46**

ADEQUATE DIFFERENCES
Processes, **5:29**

ADEQUATE DILIGENCE
Priority, **8:78**

ADEQUATE DISCLOSURE
Disclosure (this index)

ADEQUATE EVIDENCE
Priority, **8:260**

ADEQUATE KNOWLEDGE
Adequate utility, **7:4**

ADEQUATE PRICE
Policy justification, **1:38**

ADEQUATE RANGE
Adequate disclosure, **7:23-7:26**

**ADEQUATE SUBJECTIVE
INSIGHT**
Non-obviousness, **9:41-9:43**

ADEQUATE SUGGESTION
Non-obviousness, **9:66**

ADEQUATE UTILITY
Utility Requirement (this index)

AD HOC PROCESS
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:31

ADJUSTMENT
Change and Modification (this index)

**ADMINISTRATIVE LAW AND
PROCEDURE**
Adequate utility, **6:4, 7:5, 7:29**
Claims, **4:2, 4:6**
History, **1:17, 1:25**
Non-obviousness, **9:14-9:16, 9:16**
Non-statutory hybrid inventions,
5:59, 5:81, 5:83
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO)
(this index)
Priority, **8:192**

**ADMINISTRATIVE PATENT
JUDGES**

Generally, **2:22**

**ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE
ACT (APA)**

Generally, **2:21, 2:26, 2:28, 2:41 et
seq.**
Application to legal rules of APA,
2:49
Application to review, **2:42, 2:43**
Clear error, **2:43**
Common law, **2:43**
Dickenson v. Zurko, **2:43**
Interpretative rules, **2:48, 2:51**
Legal rules, **2:45 et seq.**
Procedural versus nonprocedural rules,
2:46
Review of facts, **2:41 et seq.**
Substantive/legislative rulemaking
authority of USPTO, **2:50**
Substantive/legislative rules, **2:47**

**ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES
ACT**

Review of facts, Patent and
Trademark Office (PTO), **2:41-
2:43**

ADMISSIBILITY

Non-obviousness, **9:59**

ADMISSIONS

Non-obviousness, **9:42**

**ADVANCED HYDRAULICS, INC. v.
OTIS ELEVATOR CO.**

Estoppel, **24:13**

ADVANCE-OVER-THE-ART
Non-obviousness, **9:31**

ADVICE

Generally, **2:22**
Non-obviousness, **9:66**

ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Generally, **2:22**

AESTHETIC THOUGHT
Processes, **5:26**

INDEX

A.F. STODDARD & CO. v. DANN
Correction of inventorship, **10:64**

AFFECTED SUBJECT MATTER
Medical activity, section 287(c)
defense, **20:17**

AFFIDAVITS
Non-obviousness, **9:25, 9:36, 9:37, 9:73**
Priority (this index)

AGE
Inventorship, **10:7**

AGENTS AND AGENCY
Inventorship, **10:13, 10:14, 10:17**
Joint inventorship, **10:25**
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO)
(this index)

AGGREGATION OF ELEMENTS
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:51**

AIDING AND ABETTING
Indirect infringement, **15:17**

ALDEN v. DEWEY
Anticipation, lack of, **8:7**

ALEXANDER MILBURN CO. v. DAVIS-BOURNONVILLE CO.
Non-obviousness, **9:33**
Priority, **8:140**

ALGORITHM
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:80**

ALL-CLAIMS RULE
Joint inventorship, **10:38-10:41**

ALL-ELEMENT RULE
Anticipation, lack of, **8:11-8:14, 8:23, 8:32**
Claims (this index)
Priority, **8:57**
Technological scope, **13:22, 13:113**

ALLERGAN, INC. v. ALCON LABORATORIES, INC.
Adequate commerciality, **14:79**

ALLOCATIONS AND TRADEMARK OFFICE EFFICIENCY ACT
Generally, **2:22**

ALLOYS
Static physical configurations, **5:9**

ALTERNATIVE ORGANIZATION
Claims (this index)

AMBIGUITY
Generally, **2:40**
Non-Obviousness (this index)

AMENDMENTS
Generally, **2:18**
Adequate Commerciality (this index)
Adequate disclosure, **7:34, 7:41**
Adequate utility, **7:38, 7:41**
Anticipation, lack of, **8:8**
Claims (this index)
Correction of inventorship, **10:57, 10:58, 10:63**
Eleventh Amendment, **1:14**
Examination of Original Application (this index)
Fourteenth Amendment, **1:14**
Geographic scope, **12:29, 12:36-12:38**
History, **1:14, 1:18, 1:20, 1:25**
Hybrid claim presentations and nonlimiting recitations, **4:75-4:78**
Joint Inventorship (this index)
1984 amendments to section 116, **8:8**
Non-Obviousness (this index)
Prior inventor, prior-user rights, **22:10**
Priority, **8:124**
Processes, **5:39**
Static physical configurations, **5:14**
Statutory subject matter, **5:6**

AMERICA INVENTS ACT
Adequate disclosure, **7:32**
History, **1:26**
Processes, **5:33**

**AMERICAN INVENTORS
PROTECTION ACT OF 1999**

Prior inventor, prior-user rights,
22:15

**AMERICAN MEDICAL
ASSOCIATION (AMA)**

Processes, **5:39**

**AMERICAN STANDARD, INC. v.
PFIZER INC.**

Priority, **8:66**

**AMGEN, INC. v. CHUGAI
PHARMACEUTICAL CO.,
LTD.**

Priority, **8:45**

AMUSEMENT

Adequate commerciality, **14:12,
14:63**

AMUSEMENT DEVICES

Adequate utility, **6:15**

ANALOGOUSNESS

Non-obviousness, **9:18, 9:19**

ANDA

Abbreviated New-Drug Application
(ANDA) (this index)

ANDREWS v. HOVEY

Priority, **8:206, 8:251**

ANIMALS

Adequate utility, **6:5, 6:18**

Static physical configurations, **5:8,
5:17**

Statutory subject matter, **5:16-5:18**

ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS

Generally, **2:20**

ANOTHER

Joint Inventorship (this index)

Non-obviousness, **9:46, 9:47**

ANTICIPATION, LACK OF

Generally, **8:1 et seq.**

Abandonment (this index)

Aidental anticipations. Technical
sufficiency of invalidating event,
below

**ANTICIPATION, LACK OF
—Cont'd**

Accidental events, **8:23, 8:25**

Additional elements, **8:32**

Adequate disclosure, **8:16**

Adequate utility, **6:7, 7:18, 7:29,
8:22**

Alden v. Dewey, **8:7**

All-element rule, **8:11-8:14, 8:23,
8:32**

Amendments, **8:8**

Analogies to paragraphs 102(g) and
§ 116, **8:5**

Background information, **8:30**

Background knowledge, **8:29, 8:32**

Biotechnology, **8:22**

Brenner v. Manson, **8:22**

Business, **8:27**

Change and modification, **8:22**

Chemical compound, **8:22**

Chemistry, **8:22**

Circumstantial evidence, **8:27**

Claimed invention, relation to, **8:11-
8:14**

Claims, **4:2, 4:71**

Coinventor, **8:5**

Combination, **8:12**

Commercial exploitation, **8:20**

Completeness, generally, **8:1**

Complete vs. substantial prior
conception, **8:7**

Compositions, **8:28**

Conception, **8:5-8:7, 8:9, 8:14**

Configuration, **8:25**

Conflicts, **8:29**

Congress, **8:8**

Constitutional law, **8:1**

Construction and interpretation

derivation vs. originality, Section
102(f), **8:5, 8:9**

technical sufficiency of invalidat-
ing event, **8:10, 8:14, 8:18,
8:29**

Contests, **8:6**

Contribution, **8:5, 8:8, 8:23, 8:26**

Copying, **8:9**

Court of Customs and Patent Appeals
(CCPA), **8:7, 8:22**

INDEX

ANTICIPATION, LACK OF

—Cont'd

Creative mental acts and processes,
8:5, 8:6
De facto single-source control, **8:20**
Definition of invent, **8:4**
Delay, Section 102(d), **8:1**
Derivation vs. originality, Section
102(f)
 generally, **8:2-8:9**
 analogies to par. 102(g) and § 116,
 8:5
 complete vs. substantial prior
 conception, **8:7**
 conception only, invent as, **8:6**
 definition of invent, **8:4**
 evidence, **8:9**
 1984 amendments to Section 116,
 8:8
 policy justification, **8:3**
Devices, **8:28**
Disclosures, **8:22**
Disparate onset. Foreign Countries
 (this index)
Double patenting, **8:28**
Effective filing date, **8:22**
Embodiments, **8:13**
Enablement. Technical sufficiency of
 invalidating event, below
Evidence, **8:9, 8:27, 8:32**
Exceptions and exclusions, **8:1, 8:14,**
 8:21
Federal Circuit, **8:10, 8:29, 8:31**
Filing date of application, Section
102(b), generally, **8:1**
First-in-time concepts, **8:1**
First-to-invent, **8:1**
Foreign Countries (this index)
Genus and specie, **8:13**
Germany, **8:22**
Gillman v. Stern, **8:21**
Great Britain, **8:1**
History, **1:22**
How-to-use, **8:22**
Incorporation of outside sources,
 8:30-8:32
Incorporation of paragraph 112, par.
1, **8:17**

ANTICIPATION, LACK OF

—Cont'd

Inference, **8:16, 8:32**
Infringement, **8:18, 8:29**
Inherency. Technical sufficiency of
 invalidating event, below
In re Hafner, **8:22**
Inoperative disclosures, **8:22**
Instructions to jury, **8:7**
Interference, **8:1, 8:6**
International trade, **8:1**
Invalidating event. Technical suffi-
 ciency of invalidating event,
 below
Joint inventorship, **8:8, 10:33, 10:42**
Justification, **8:3, 8:26-8:28**
Limitations and restrictions
 derivation vs. originality, Section
 102(f), **8:8**
 technical sufficiency of invalidat-
 ing event, **8:11, 8:25, 8:27,**
 8:31
Mental acts and matters
 derivation vs. originality, Section
 102(f), **8:5, 8:6**
 technical sufficiency of invalidat-
 ing event, **8:23**
Metallizing Engineering Co. v.
 Kenyon Bearing & Auto Parts
 Co., **8:21**
Mitchell v. Tighlman, **8:27**
1984 amendments to Section 116, **8:8**
Non-informing public use, **8:20**
Non-limiting recitations, effect of,
 8:14
Non-Obviousness (this index)
Non-statutory hybrid inventions,
 5:53, 5:71, 5:74, 5:84
Notice and knowledge. Technical
 sufficiency of invalidating event,
 below
Novelty, Section 102(b), generally,
 8:1
On-sale activity, paragraph 102(b),
 8:20
Ordinary course of prosecution, **8:22**
Ordinary skill in the art
 technical sufficiency of invalidat-
 ing event, **8:29, 8:31**

ANTICIPATION, LACK OF

—Cont'd

Originality, Section 102(f), generally, **8:1**
 Outside sources, **8:30-8:32**
 Patentability, generally, **8:1**
 Patent Act of 1790, **8:1**
 Patent Act of 1836, **8:1**
 Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:3, 8:14, 8:21**
 Peerless Roll Leaf Co. v. H. Griffin & Sons, **8:21**
 Pharmaceutical arts, **8:29**
 Policy justification, **8:3, 8:18, 8:21, 8:26-8:28**
 Possession, **8:10, 8:18-8:20, 8:30**
 Potential conflicts, **8:29**
 Practical utility, **8:22**
 Preservation of public domain, **8:28**
 Printed publications, paragraph 102(b), **8:19**
 Prior art, **8:7, 8:24**
 Prior conception, **8:7**
 Prior events. Technical sufficiency of invalidating event, below
 Prior filing, **8:21**
 Priority, generally, **8:1**
 Prior public possession, **8:18**
 Prior public use, paragraph 102(b), **8:21**
 Prior use, **8:18**
 Processes, **5:24, 8:28**
 Publication, **8:19, 8:31**
 Public possession, **8:19, 8:30**
 Public use, **8:21**
 Qualification
 derivation vs. originality, Section 102(f), **8:7**
 technical sufficiency of invalidating event, **8:12, 8:18, 8:19, 8:22**
 Recitations, **8:14**
 Reduction-to-practice, **8:5, 8:6, 8:8**
 Reference, **8:13, 8:22, 8:25**
 Regular result, **8:25**
 Research and development, **8:27**
 Sales, **8:20**
 Secret public use, **8:21**

ANTICIPATION, LACK OF

—Cont'd

Section 102, generally, **8:1**
 Section 102(a), **8:18**
 Section 102(b), **8:19-8:22**
 Section 102(c). Abandonment (this index)
 Section 102(d). Foreign Countries (this index)
 Section 103, **8:23**
 Section 103 vs. Section 112, par. 1, **8:31**
 Section 116, **8:6**
 Section 119, **8:22**
 Seymour v. Osbourne, **8:18, 8:31**
 Single-source control, **8:20**
 Skilled in the art, **8:31**
 Specification, **8:22**
 Sporadic vs. regular result, **8:25**
 Static physical configurations, **5:9, 5:16**
 Statutory subject matter, **5:1**
 Subcombination, **8:12**
 Substantial prior conception, **8:7**
 Sufficiency. Technical sufficiency of invalidating event, below
 Supplements, **8:31**
 Supreme Court, **8:18, 8:22, 8:27**
 Teaching, **8:19, 8:31**
 Technical completeness, generally, **8:1**
 Technical sufficiency of invalidating event
 generally, **8:10-8:32**
 accidental anticipations and inherency
 generally, **8:23-8:29**
 circumstantial evidence, **8:27**
 obviousness, anticipation vs., **8:24**
 policy justifications, **8:26-8:28**
 potential conflicts, **8:29**
 preservation of public domain, **8:28**
 sporadic vs. regular result, **8:25**
 all-elements rule, **8:11-8:14**
 background knowledge vs. additional elements, **8:32**

INDEX

ANTICIPATION, LACK OF

—Cont'd

Technical sufficiency of invalidating event—Cont'd
claimed invention, relation to, **8:11-8:14**
combination, **8:12**
enabling knowledge, required presence of
generally, **8:15-8:22**
incorporation of paragraph 112, par. 1, **8:17**
inoperative disclosures, **8:22**
on-sale activity, paragraph 102(b), **8:20**
paragraph 102(a), **8:18**
paragraph 102(b), **8:19-8:22**
printed publications, paragraph 102(b), **8:19**
prior public use, paragraph 102(b), **8:21**
underlying rationale, relation to, **8:16**
genus and specie, **8:13**
incorporation of outside sources, **8:30-8:32**
inherency. Accidental anticipations and inherency, above in this group
knowledge. Enabling knowledge, required presence of, above in this group
non-limiting recitations, effect of, **8:14**
Section 103 vs. Section 112, par. 1, **8:31**
subcombination, **8:12**
Technological completeness, **8:32**
Tests, **8:5**
Tighlman v. Proctor, **8:27**
Time and date, **8:1**
Time-wise priority, **8:5**
Timing of event. Priority (this index)
Underlying rationale, relation to, **8:16**
Use, **8:21**
Validation. Technical sufficiency of invalidating event, above
Value judgment, **8:1**

ANTI-SLAVERY PROVISIONS

Static physical configurations, **5:17**

ANTITRUST

Claims, **4:80**

History, **1:7**

ANY MENTAL ACTIVITY

Processes, **5:27**

ANY NEW AND USEFUL ART, MACHINE, MANUFACTURE, OR COMPOSITION OF MATTER

Statutory Subject Matter (this index)

ANY NEW AND USEFUL PROCESS, MACHINE, MANUFACTURE, OR COMPOSITION OF MATTER

Statutory Subject Matter (this index)

ANY USEFUL ART, MANUFACTURE, ENGINE, MACHINE, OR DEVICE, OR ANY IMPROVEMENT THEREIN

Statutory Subject Matter (this index)

APA

Administrative Procedure Act (APA) (this index)

APPARATUS

Adequate utility, **6:15, 7:24**

Descriptions, **5:29**

Geographic scope, **12:25, 12:33**

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:80**

Processes (this index)

Static physical configurations, **5:8**

APPEAL AND REVIEW

See also Judicial Review (this index)

Adequate Commerciality (this index)

Adequate disclosure, **7:52, 7:54, 7:57**

Appellate Division of United States Court of Claims, **2:37**

Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (BPAI) (this index)

Claims (this index)

Computer-related inventions, **5:42**

Correction of inventorship, **10:64**

APPEAL AND REVIEW—Cont'd

Court of Customs and Patent Appeals (CCPA) (this index)
 De novo review on appeal, **2:39**
 District Court (this index)
 Examination of Original Application (this index)
 History, **1:19, 1:21, 1:24**
 Indirect infringement, **15:8, 15:9, 15:12, 15:22**
 Joint inventorship, **10:38, 10:51**
 Non-Obviousness (this index)
 Non-Statutory Hybrid Inventions (this index)
 Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) decisions, generally, **2:9**
 Priority, **8:46, 8:60**
 Processes, **5:21, 5:26, 5:27, 5:30, 5:35**
 Reexamination, **16:126**
 Static physical configurations, **5:9, 5:12, 5:15, 5:17**
 Temporal scope, **11:29**
 Utility Requirement (this index)

APPLICANT

Joint inventorship, joint applicants distinguished, **10:21**

APPLICATION

Generally, **2:12, 2:32**
 Adequate Commerciality (this index)
 Adequate disclosure, **7:56**
 Claims (this index)
 Correction of inventorship, **10:56**
 Examination of Original Applications (this index)
 Filing Application (this index)
 Filing Date of Application (this index)
 Foreign Countries (this index)
 Geographic scope, **12:40**
 History, **1:18**
 Inventorship, **10:8**
 Joint Applications (this index)
 Joint Inventorship (this index)
 Noninfringement pleading, **17:9-17:13**
 Non-Obviousness (this index)

APPLICATION—Cont'd

Policy justification, **1:38**
 Priority (this index)
 Processes, **5:24, 5:26**
 Static physical configurations, **5:8, 5:9**
 Technological scope, **13:106**
 Temporal Scope of Infringement (this index)
 Utility Requirement (this index)

APPLIED TECHNOLOGY

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:61**
 Statutory Subject Matter (this index)

APPOINTMENT TO OFFICE

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:22**

APPRECIATION

Priority, **8:46, 8:58**
 Subjectivity (this index)

ARBITRARY, CAPRICIOUS OR ABUSE OF DISCRETION

Judicial review, **2:41**

ARIAD PHARMACEUTICALS, INC. v. ELI LILLY AND CO.

Adequate disclosure, **7:38**

ARISTOTLE

History, **1:2**

ARO MFG. CO. v. CONVERTIBLE TOP REPLACEMENT CO.

Adequate commerciality, **14:32**
 Indirect infringement, **15:11, 15:12, 15:20, 15:24**

ARRHYTHMIA RESEARCH TECHNOLOGY, INC. v. CORAZONIX CORP.

Computer-related inventions, **5:44**

ARTICLE I

History, **1:10**
 Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:1**

ARTICLES OF CONFEDERATION

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:4**

INDEX

AS A WHOLE

Claims, hybrid claim presentations
and nonlimiting recitations, **4:82**
Non-obviousness, **9:1, 9:5, 9:6, 9:12**
Non-statutory hybrid inventions,
5:48, 5:56

ASEXUALLY REPRODUCED PLANTS

Static physical configurations, **5:12**

ASSIGNING MEANINGS

Claims (this index)

ASSIGNMENT

Adequate disclosure, **7:54**
Adequate utility, **7:51**
Correction, **10:66-10:68**
Defenses, estoppel, **17:42, 17:43**
History, **1:16**
Inventorship (this index)
Non-obviousness, **9:46, 9:47**

ASSISTANTS

Commissioners, **2:22**
Judge of circuit court, **2:33**
Secretary of commerce, **2:22**

ASSOCIATIONS

History, **1:4**

ASSUMPTION

Adequate disclosure, **7:29**

AS-YET-UNDISCOVERED

Adequate utility, **7:14**

AT TIME INVENTION WAS MADE

Non-obviousness, **9:21**

ATHENAEUS

History, **1:2**

ATLANTIC THERMOPLASTICS CO. v. FAYTEX CORP.

Claims, **4:74**

AT&T CORP. v. EXCEL COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

Computer-related inventions, **5:44**

AT THE TIME INVENTION WAS MADE

Non-obviousness, **9:32**

AT THE TIME THE INVENTION WAS MADE

Non-obviousness, **9:21, 9:24**

ATTORNEY GENERAL

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:15, 2:20

ATTORNEYS

Laches, lack of counsel, unreasonable
delay, **2:22**
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:22

ATTORNEYS' FEES

Adequate commerciality, **14:78**

AT&T v. EXCEL COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

Processes, **5:23, 5:37**

AUKERMAN v. CHAIDES

Laches, **23:16**

AUTHORS AND AUTHORSHIP

History, **1:11**
Inventorship, **10:6, 10:16**
Static physical configurations, **5:11**

AVOIDANCE

Defenses, **17:6**

BACK FIRING

Claims, **4:85**

BACKGROUND

Adequate utility, **7:10, 7:13, 7:16,**
7:19
Anticipation, lack of, **8:29, 8:30,**
8:32
Non-obviousness, **9:17, 9:19, 9:74**

BACTERIA

Static physical configurations, **5:14,**
5:17

BAIN v. MORSE

Central vs. peripheral claiming, **4:9**
Priority, **8:101, 8:197**

BASS

Non-obviousness, **9:37**

BATTIN v. TAGGERT

Reissue of patent, **16:21**

BAUER & CIE v. O'DONNELL

Adequate commerciality, **14:33, 14:39**

Express and implied licenses, **19:19**

Indirect infringement, **15:6, 15:7**

Misuse of patent, **18:13**

**BAYER AG v. SCHEIN
PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.**

Adequate disclosure, **7:52, 7:53**

BEDFORD v. HUNT

Adequate utility, **6:4, 6:6, 6:7, 6:9**

**BEMIS v. CHEVRON RESEARCH
CO.**

Correction of inventorship, **10:64**

BEST MODE

Adequate Disclosure (this index)

Adequate utility, **7:1, 7:5, 7:9**

America Invents Act, diminution of
defense, **1:26**

BEYOND REASONABLE DOUBT

Priority, **8:68, 8:69**

BIFURCATED TREATMENT

History, **1:5**

BIGHAM v. GODTFREDSEN

Priority, **8:66**

BILATERAL CONTRACT

Justification, **1:38**

BILSKI v. KAPPOS

Processes, **5:32**

BINARY CLASSIFICATION

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:58**

**BINARY-CODED DECIMALS
(BCD)**

Computer-related inventions, **5:44**

BIOENGINEERING

Static physical configurations, **5:13**

BIOLOGICAL COMPONENTS

Static physical configurations, **5:17**

BIOLOGICAL DEPOSITS

Adequate disclosure, **7:22**

Adequate utility, **7:9**

BIOLOGICAL MATERIALS

Adequate disclosure, **7:11**

Statutory subject matter, **5:6**

BIOLOGICAL PROCESSES

Claims, **4:6**

BIOMATERIAL DEPOSITORY

Adequate utility, **7:37**

**BIOTECHNOLOGICAL PROCESS
PATENT AMENDMENT ACT
OF 1995**

Non-obviousness, **9:1, 9:82, 9:83**

BIOTECHNOLOGY

Adequate utility, **6:6, 7:14**

Anticipation, lack of, **8:22**

Claims, **4:75, 4:77, 4:80**

Non-Obviousness (this index)

Priority, **8:50**

Processes, **5:39**

Static physical configurations, **5:14**

Statutory subject matter, **5:1, 5:2, 5:16-5:18**

**BLACKLEDGE v. WEIR & CRAIG
MFG. CO.**

Joint inventorship, **10:51**

**BLACKSTONE'S
COMMENTARIES**

Inventorship, **10:4**

BLAKE v. SMITH

Indirect infringement, **15:4**

BLOCKING PATENT

Claims, **4:63**

**BLONDER-TONGUE
LABORATORIES, INC. v.
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS
FOUNDATION**

Invalidity, **17:28-17:31**

BLUE-PENCIL RULE

Non-Statutory Hybrid Inventions
(this index)

BOARD OF EXAMINERS

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:32, 2:33

INDEX

BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES (BPAI)

Generally, **2:22, 2:37**
Computer-related inventions, **5:42**
Joint inventorship, **10:46**
Judicial review of decisions, **2:38**
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:83**
Priority, **8:46, 8:66**

BOARD OF USEFUL ARTS

Non-obviousness, **9:2**

BONITO BOATS V. THUNDER CRAFT BOATS

Historical origins of patent grant,
1:13.70

BPAI

Board of Patent Appeals and Interfer-
ences (BPAI) (this index)

BRAND NAMES

Adequate disclosure, **7:12**

BREACH

Invalidity, **17:40**

BREADTH AND NARROWNESS

Claims, **4:63**

BREADTH OF CLAIM

Adequate disclosure, **7:4, 7:23-7:26,**
7:33

BREATHE LIFE AND MEANING INTO STATEMENTS IN BODY

Claims, **4:99**

BREEDING

Static physical configurations, **5:15,**
5:17

BRENNER v. MANSON

Adequate disclosure, **7:14**
Adequate utility, **6:6, 6:7, 6:17-6:19**
Anticipation, lack of, **8:22**
Priority, **8:50, 8:53, 8:57**

BROWN v. DUCHESNE

Geographic scope, **12:4**

BUBBLE HIERARCHY

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:78**
Processes, **5:23**

BUDDING

Static physical configurations, **5:14**

BURDEN OF PLEADING

Six-year limitation, **21:20**

BURDEN OF PROOF

Adequate utility, **6:16, 7:46**
Claims, **4:2, 4:74, 4:93**
Invalidity, **17:17**
Laches, **23:39**
Non-obviousness, **9:75**
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:13
Six-year limitation, **21:19**
Technological scope, **13:84**

BURR v. DURYEE

Reissue of patent, **16:28**

BUSINESS ENTITIES AND METHODS

Anticipation, lack of, **8:27**
Inventorship (this index)
Joint inventorship, **10:52**
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:80**
Processes, **5:23, 5:32.50**
Static physical configurations, **5:10**
Statutory Subject Matter (this index)

CALCULATIONS

Non-statutory hybrid inventions,
5:81, 5:83
Reissue of patent, **16:117**

CAMPBELL v. CITY OF HAVERHILL

Laches, **23:8**
Six-year limitation, **21:6**

CANCELLATION

Claims, **4:1**
Technological scope, **13:104**

CAP

Claims, **4:97, 4:98**

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES

Inventorship, **10:17**

CAPITAL RESOURCES

Inventorship, **10:17**

CARBICE CORPORATION OF AMERICA v. AMERICAN PATENTS DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Indirect infringement, **15:8-15:10**
Misuse of patent, **18:15**

CARDINAL CHEMICAL CO. v. MORTON INTERNATIONAL, INC.

Invalidity, **17:24, 17:25**

CARLTON v. VOKEE

Reissue of patent, **16:29**

CARTER RULE

Joint inventorship, **10:53**

CARTER v. BRAINTREE

Reissue of patent, **16:19**

CASE LAW

See specific case headings throughout this index

See also Supreme Court (this index)

Adequate disclosure, **7:9, 7:25**

Adequate utility, **6:14, 7:2, 7:14, 7:23, 7:46**

Bonito Boats v. Thunder Craft Boats, **1:13.70**

Compco Corp. v. Day Brite Lighting, Inc., **1:13.50**

Description requirement, disclosure, **7:37, 7:38**

Disclosure, **7:37, 7:38**

Erie Railroad v. Tompkins, **1:13.30**

Kewanee Oil Co. v. Bicron Corp., **1:13.60**

Medical and diagnostic procedures, Pallin v. Singer, section 287(c) defense, **20:5**

Metallizing Engineering v. Kenyon Bearing, **8:243**

Misuse of patent, **18:19-18:21**

Misuse of Patent (this index)

Non-Obviousness (this index)

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:53, 5:72, 5:73-5:75, 5:83-5:85**

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:20, 2:26, 2:28, 2:34, 2:43, 2:48**

CASE LAW—Cont'd

Policy justification, **1:29**

Prior inventor, prior-user rights, section 273 defense, **22:2-22:16**

Priority, **8:50, 8:56, 8:63**

Processes, **5:21, 5:22, 5:24-5:26**

Reissue of patent, **16:44**

Six-year limitation, section 286 defense, **21:2-21:15**

Static physical configurations, **5:15, 5:17**

Stiffel Co. v. Sears, Roebuck & Co., **1:13.40**

Technological Scope of Infringement (this index)

Utility requirement, **6:14**

CATEGORIES OF ESTOPPEL

Early categories, **24:5**

CAUSES OF ACTION

History, **1:14**

Reissue of patent, **16:48, 16:49**

CCPA

Court of Customs and Patent Appeals (CCPA) (this index)

CENTRAL CLAIMING

Claims (this index)

Technological scope, **13:5-13:7, 13:114**

CERTIFICATES AND CERTIFICATION

Adequate commerciality, **14:78**

Static physical configurations, **5:14, 5:15**

CERTIORARI

Adequate utility, **6:6**

Non-obviousness, **9:33**

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:34, 2:43**

Static physical configurations, **5:17**

CHALLENGES

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:15**

Processes, **5:39**

INDEX

CHANGE AND MODIFICATION

Adequate commerciality, **14:30, 14:64**
Adequate utility, **6:18, 7:13, 7:22, 7:38**
Anticipation, lack of, **8:22**
Claims, **4:5, 4:6, 4:94, 4:101**
Correction (this index)
Examination of Original Application (this index)
History, **1:16, 1:23, 1:25**
Inventorship, **10:7, 10:14, 10:18, 10:45**
Joint inventorship, **10:45, 10:50**
Non-Obviousness (this index)
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:68, 5:81**
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), generally, **2:1**
Processes, **5:19, 5:24, 5:28, 5:30**
Static physical configurations, **5:14**
Temporal scope, **11:12-11:15**

CHARGE TO JURY

Adequate utility, **6:9**
Priority, **8:44**

CHECKPOINT SYSTEMS, INC. v. U.S. INTERN. TRADE COM'N

Correction of inventorship, **10:67**

CHEMICAL ARTS

Adequate commerciality, **14:61**

CHEMICALS AND CHEMISTRY

Generally, **5:5, 5:9**
Adequate disclosure, **7:25, 7:26**
Adequate utility
generally, **6:7, 6:19**
markers, construction of, **6:18**
process, **6:17**
products, **6:1, 6:6, 6:16**
Anticipation, lack of, **8:22**
Bonding, **5:9**
Claims (this index)
Compositions, **5:17**
Field, **5:8**
Hybrid claim presentations and nonlimiting recitations, **4:75-4:78**

CHEMICALS AND CHEMISTRY

—Cont'd

Non-Obviousness (this index)
Priority, **8:46, 8:50**
Processes, generally, **5:39**
Static physical configurations, **5:8, 5:9, 5:17**
Statutory Subject Matter (this index)

CHEVRON U.S.A., INC. v. NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL

Generally, **2:48**

CHIEF JUSTICE OF DISTRICT COURT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:33**

CIRCUIT COURT FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCUIT

Non-obviousness, **9:33**

CIRCUIT COURTS

Generally, **2:33**
Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, **5:27**
Regional federal circuit courts of appeal, **1:24**

CIRCUITS (HARDWARE)

Computer-related inventions, **5:41**

CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE

Adequate commerciality, **14:16**
Adequate utility, **6:20**
Anticipation, lack of, **8:27**
Claims, **4:31**
Indirect infringement, **15:15, 15:16, 15:22, 15:24**
Non-Obviousness (this index)
Priority (this index)

CIRCUMSTANTIAL INFERENCE

Indirect infringement, **15:15**

CITY OF ELIZABETH v. NICHOLSON PAVEMENT CO.

Priority, **8:250**

CIVIL ACTIONS

Invalidity, full and fair opportunity to litigate, **17:31**

CIVIL ACTIONS—Cont'd

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:7, 2:38
Priority, 8:68
Processes, 5:39

CLAIMED

Defined, 13:98

CLAIMS

Generally, 4:1 *et seq.*
Abstract identifier, 4:97
Accuracy, definitional, 4:9
Adequate disclosure, 4:2, 7:7-7:9
Administrative proceedings, 4:6
Administrative publications, 4:2
All-elements rule
 hybrid claim presentations and
 nonlimiting recitations, 4:71-
 4:74, 4:80-4:82
 policy justification and historical
 development, 4:6
 tripartite form of individual claims,
 4:97
Alternative organization. Central vs.
 peripheral claiming, below
Amendment of claim, 4:69
Amendment of language, 4:94
Amendment of statutes
 Biotechnological Process Patent
 Amendments Act of 1995,
 4:75, 4:77
 multiple claims in single patent,
 4:102
 policy justification and historical
 development, 4:5, 4:6
 section 103(b), 1995, 4:75-4:78
Anticipation, lack of, 4:2, 4:71, 8:11-
 8:14
Antitrust, 4:80
Appeal and review
 central vs. peripheral claiming, 4:9
 construction and interpretation,
 4:19
 hybrid claim presentations and
 nonlimiting recitations, 4:76,
 4:80
 means expressions, 4:93
 policy justification and historical
 development, 4:6

CLAIMS—Cont'd

As a whole, consideration, 4:82
Assigning meanings
 peripheral claiming, below
 policy justification and historical
 development, 4:2
Atlantic Thermoplastics Co. v. Faytex
 Corp., 4:74
Back firing, 4:85
Bain v. Morse, 4:9
Biological processes, 4:6
Biotechnological Process Patent
 Amendments Act of 1995, 4:75,
 4:77, 4:80
Biotechnology, 4:77, 4:80
Blocking patent, 4:63
Body, 4:96, 4:97
Breadth and narrowness, 4:63
Breathe life and meaning into state-
 ments in body, 4:99
Burden of countering alternative
 position, 4:2
Burden of proof, 4:74, 4:93
Cancellation of claims, 4:1
Cap, 4:97, 4:98
Central claiming
 generally, 4:2-4:6
 adequate utility, 7:5, 7:46
 history, 1:21, 1:23
 means expressions, below
 peripheral claiming compared.
 Central vs. peripheral claim-
 ing, below
 processes, 5:21
Central vs. peripheral claiming
 generally, 4:8-4:62
 alternative organization. Construc-
 tion and interpretation, below
 in this group
 construction and interpretation
 generally, 4:10-4:60
 alternative organization
 generally, 4:54-4:60
 application to claims, 4:58-
 4:60
 general example of semantic
 and pragmatic meanings,
 4:56
 illustrative diagram, 4:59

INDEX

CLAIMS—Cont'd

- Central vs. peripheral claiming
 - Cont'd
- construction and interpretation
 - Cont'd
- alternative organization
 - Cont'd
- illustrative diagram of semantic and pragmatic meanings, **4:57**
- recommendation, **4:60**
- semantic and pragmatic meanings, **4:55-4:57**
- contract interpretation, **4:52, 4:53**
- decision maker. Identity of decision maker, below in this group
- extrinsic sources. Intrinsic vs. extrinsic sources, below in this subgroup
- fact, law versus. Law versus fact, below in this subgroup
- hierarchy of sources, generally, **4:32-4:60**
- historical development
 - generally, **4:33-4:40**
 - Johnson Worldwide v. Zebco, **4:36**
 - Phillips v. AWH, **4:39**
 - subsequent developments, **4:40**
 - Texas Digital Instruments v. Telegenix, **4:38**
 - Toro v. White Consol. Industries, **4:37**
 - Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc., **4:34**
- identity of decision maker
 - generally, **4:11-4:24**
 - judge versus jury, below in this subgroup
 - law versus fact, below in this subgroup
- instructions to jury. Judge versus jury, below in this subgroup
- intrinsic vs. extrinsic sources
 - generally, **4:41, 4:50-4:53**

CLAIMS—Cont'd

- Central vs. peripheral claiming
 - Cont'd
- construction and interpretation
 - Cont'd
- intrinsic vs. extrinsic sources
 - Cont'd
- contract interpretation analogy, **4:52, 4:53**
- statutory interpretation, contrast with, **4:51**
- judge versus jury
 - generally, **4:21-4:24**
 - application to interpretation, **4:23, 4:24**
 - example decisions, **4:24**
 - instructions to jury, generally, **4:22**
 - verdicts, generally, **4:22**
- jury. Judge versus jury, above in this subgroup
- law versus fact
 - generally, **4:12-4:20**
 - appellate review, **4:19**
 - corollary issues, **4:18-4:20**
 - finality, **4:19**
- Lighting Ballast Control LLC v. Phillips Electronic North America Corp., **4:17.50**
- Markman v. Westview Instruments, **4:16, 4:17.50, 4:17.75**
- mixed questions of law and fact, **4:14**
- preclusion of issue, **4:20**
- stare decisis, **4:20**
- Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc., **4:17.50**
- underlying questions of fact, **4:17-4:17.50**
- patentability versus validity, **4:62**
- questions of law and fact. Law versus fact, above in this subgroup
- required process, **4:61**

CLAIMS—Cont'd

Central vs. peripheral claiming
—Cont'd
construction and interpretation
—Cont'd
special sub-rules
generally, **4:42-4:49**
claims, **4:43**
contra proferentum, **4:48**
dictionaries, **4:46**
expert testimony, **4:47**
prosecution history, **4:45**
specification, **4:44**
validity, preservation of, **4:49**
statutory interpretation
contrasted with intrinsic
and extrinsic sources, **4:51**
target meaning
generally, **4:25-4:31**
application to patent
interpretations, **4:29-4:31**
author and recipient meanings, generally, **4:26-4:28**
contract interpretation,
example, **4:28**
patentee's intended meaning
as circumstantial evidence, **4:31**
patentee's meaning versus
recipient's meaning,
4:30, 4:31
statutory interpretation,
example, **4:27**
verdicts. Judge versus jury,
above in this subgroup
definitional accuracy, **4:9**
evidence, intrinsic vs. extrinsic
sources. Construction and
interpretation, above in this
group
extrinsic sources. Construction and
interpretation, above in this
group
fact. Construction and interpreta-
tion, above in this group
Federal Circuit courts
historical development, deci-
sions after Vitronics, **4:35-4:38**

CLAIMS—Cont'd

Central vs. peripheral claiming
—Cont'd
Federal Circuit courts—Cont'd
Johnson Worldwide v. Zebco,
4:36
notice and definitional accuracy,
4:9
Texas Digital Instruments v.
Telegenix, **4:38**
Toro v. White Consol.
Industries, **4:37**
historical development. Construc-
tion and interpretation, above
in this group
instructions to jury. Construction
and interpretation, above in
this group
intrinsic vs. extrinsic sources.
Construction and interpreta-
tion, above in this group
law vs. fact. Construction and
interpretation, above in this
group
notice, **4:9**
questions of law and fact.
Construction and interpreta-
tion, above in this group
special sub-rules. Construction and
interpretation, above in this
group
target meaning. Construction and
interpretation, above in this
group
verdicts. Construction and inter-
pretation, above in this group
Change and modification
generally, **4:5, 4:6, 4:94, 4:101**
see also entries beginning:
“Amendment, “ above
Chemicals
dominance and subservience, **4:65, 4:66**
hybrid claim presentations and
nonlimiting recitations, **4:73-4:76, 4:80-4:82**
policy justification and historical
development, **4:4, 4:6**
starting and ending materials,
4:75-4:78

INDEX

CLAIMS—Cont'd

- Circumstantial evidence, **4:31**
- Clinton Administration, **4:77**
- Closed formats, **4:98**
- Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), **4:73**
- Combinations
 - dominance and subservience, below
 - means expressions, below
 - subcombination, **4:64**
- Commentary, means expressions, **4:90**
- Common law, **4:5, 4:77, 4:78**
- Competitors, **4:2**
- Comprising, **4:98**
- Compulsory license, **4:63**
- Computer industry, **4:81**
- Configurations, **4:87, 4:94**
- Conflict between tribunals, **4:80**
- Congress
 - definiteness and notice, **4:94**
 - hybrid claim presentations and nonlimiting recitations, **4:75, 4:80**
 - means expressions, **4:87, 4:88, 4:93**
 - multiple claims in single patent, **4:103**
 - policy justification and historical development, **4:5, 4:6**
- Consisting essentially of, **4:98**
- Consisting of, **4:98**
- Construction and interpretation, generally, **4:1 et seq.**
- Contract interpretation, **4:28, 4:52, 4:53**
- Contra proferentum, **4:48**
- Contributions, **4:9, 4:64, 4:83**
- Corresponding structure, **4:5, 4:91, 4:93**
- Costs and expenses, **4:63, 4:73, 4:83, 4:94**
- Court of Appeals, **4:76**
- Court of Appeals for Federal Circuit, **4:6, 4:80, 4:88, 4:93**
- Court of Customs and Patent Appeals (CCPA), **4:76, 4:93**
- Cross licenses, **4:63**

CLAIMS—Cont'd

- Damages, **4:80**
- Decision maker. Central vs. peripheral claiming, above
- Defective specification, **4:2**
- Definiteness, **4:6, 4:94**
- Definitional accuracy, **4:9**
- Definition of patent rights, generally, **4:4**
- Dependent, multiply, **4:5**
- Dependent claims, **4:102, 4:103**
- Dependent form, **4:5**
- Determinations, **4:72, 4:73, 4:91**
- Diagrams, **4:63, 4:97**
- Dictionaries, **4:46**
- Disclaimers, **4:2**
- Disclosure, see lines throughout this index topic
- Discretion of applicants, **4:2**
- District courts
 - definiteness and notice, **4:94**
 - hybrid claim presentations and nonlimiting recitations, **4:73, 4:80, 4:81**
 - means expressions, **4:93**
 - policy justification and historical development, **4:6**
- DNA sequences, **4:66**
- Doctrine of Equivalents
 - central vs. peripheral claiming, **4:9**
 - means expressions, **4:87, 4:88, 4:92**
 - policy justification and historical development, **4:4, 4:6**
- Doctrine of Overclaiming, **4:64**
- Dominance and subservience
 - generally, **4:7, 4:63-4:66**
 - genus and specie, **4:65**
 - infringement, **4:66**
 - limitations and restrictions, **4:63, 4:65**
 - product method, **4:66**
 - subcombination, **4:64**
 - tripartite form of individual claims, **4:97**
- Drawing, **4:2**
- Electrical arts, **4:65**
- Electronics industry, **4:81**

CLAIMS—Cont'd

Embodiments

- central vs. peripheral claiming, **4:8**
- dominance and subservience, **4:63, 4:64**
- means expressions, **4:84, 4:86, 4:87, 4:89, 4:91, 4:92**
- policy justification and historical development, **4:2, 4:3**

En banc, **4:74, 4:78, 4:93**

English law, **4:2**

Entitlement, **4:2, 4:6**

Equivalents

- Doctrine of Equivalents, above
- mechanical equivalents, **4:84, 4:86, 4:92**
- structural equivalents, **4:92**

Europe, **4:80**

European Patent Convention, **4:73**

Evans v. Eaton, **4:2**

Evidence

- central vs. peripheral claiming, above
- hybrid claim presentations and nonlimiting recitations, **4:73, 4:74, 4:80**
- means expressions, **4:93**

Examination

- dominance and subservience, **4:69**
- ex parte examination, **4:94**
- policy justification and historical development, **4:3**

Exceptions and exclusions

- central vs. peripheral claiming, **4:8**
- dominance and subservience, **4:64**
- hybrid claim presentations and nonlimiting recitations, **4:75**
- means expressions, **4:85**
- policy justification and historical development, **4:4**
- tripartite form of individual claims, **4:99**

Ex parte examination, **4:94**

Ex parte Markush, **4:100**

Ex parte prosecution, **4:87, 4:89**

Expert testimony, **4:47**

Expressions. Means expressions, below

CLAIMS—Cont'd

Extrinsic sources. Central vs. peripheral claiming, above

Fact. Central vs. peripheral claiming, above

Federal Circuit courts

central vs. peripheral claiming, above

hybrid claiming, below

means expressions, **4:88, 4:91, 4:93**

policy justification and historical development, **4:6**

Federal trial courts, **4:80**

Finality, **4:19**

Foreign countries, **4:8, 4:9, 4:63**

Formal statement, **4:2**

Format required, generally, **4:95-4:103**

Genus and specie, **4:4, 4:63, 4:65**

Germany, **4:8**

Grammatical structure, **4:87**

Halliburton Oil Well Cementing Co. v. Walker, **4:86**

History

generally, **4:1**

central vs. peripheral claiming, above

means expressions, below

policy justification and historical development, below

Hybrid claiming

generally, **4:68-4:79**

amendments to section 103(b), 1995, **4:75-4:78**

chemical processes, starting and ending materials in, **4:75-4:78**

conflict with all-elements rules, **4:71**

dominance and subservience, above

Federal Circuit courts

chemical process, starting and ending materials in, **4:75**

indefinite vs. nonlimiting, **4:69**

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) guidelines, **4:78**

process, products defined by, **4:74**

INDEX

CLAIMS—Cont'd

Hybrid claiming—Cont'd

Federal Circuit courts—Cont'd
traditional practice, **4:76, 4:77**
general practice, **4:70**

hostility to traditional practice,
4:77

impetus to discard anomalies,
hybrid claiming as, **4:82**

indefinite vs. nonlimiting, **4:69**

infringement, **4:71-4:74, 4:80**

infringement determination, **4:73**

multiple-category hybrids, gener-
ally, **4:67-4:82**

non-obviousness, **9:77**

nonstatutory elements, hybrid
inventions incorporating, **4:79**

other forms of hybrid claims, **4:81**

patentability determinations, **4:72**

Patent and Trademarks Office
(Patent and Trademark Office
(PTO)), generally, **4:67-4:82**

process, products defined by, **4:74**

processes, **5:29, 5:36**

single-category requirement, gen-
erally, **4:67-4:82**

specific rules, **4:70**

statutory subject matter, **5:38**

traditional practice, **4:76**

I claim, **4:4**

Identical to technological configura-
tion, invention as, **4:71**

Identity and identification

central vs. peripheral claiming,
above

object and claimed invention, **4:97**

Illustrative diagrams, **4:57, 4:59**

Improvements, **4:2**

Incorporation by reference, **4:102**

Indefinite vs. nonlimiting, **4:69**

Independent claims, **4:102**

Independent form, **4:5**

Individual claims, **4:96-4:99**

Infringement

determination, **4:73**

dominance and subservience, **4:66**

CLAIMS—Cont'd

Infringement—Cont'd

hybrid claim presentations and
nonlimiting recitations, **4:71-
4:74, 4:80**

means expressions, **4:87, 4:92**

multiple claims in single patent,
4:101, 4:102

policy justification and historical
development, **4:2, 4:4, 4:6**

required format, **4:95**

tripartite form of individual claims,
4:97, 4:98

In re Brouwer, **4:77, 4:78, 4:80**

In re Donaldson Co., **4:6, 4:80, 4:93**

In re Durden, **4:76-4:78, 4:80, 4:81**

In re Ochiai, **4:77, 4:78, 4:80**

In re Papesch, **4:82**

In re Pleudemann, **4:77, 4:78, 4:80**

Insert, **4:98**

Instructions to jury. Central vs.
peripheral claiming, above

Intent, **4:2, 4:3, 4:31, 4:87**

Interference, **4:9**

Interim supplemental guidelines,
4:89

Interpretation, generally, **4:1 et seq.**

Intrinsic vs. extrinsic sources. Central
vs. peripheral claiming, above

Inventor's contribution, **4:2-4:4**

Issuance, **4:6**

Jepson-style claims, **4:99**

Johnson Worldwide v. Zebco, **4:36**

Judges

generally, **4:63**

central vs. peripheral claiming,
above

Judgment, **4:2**

Judicial decisions, **4:87, 4:91, 4:92**

Judicial determinations, **4:73**

Judicial reaction under peripheral
claiming practice, **4:86**

Judiciary Branch, **4:6**

Jurisdiction, **4:6**

Jury. Central vs. peripheral claiming,
above

Justification. Policy justification and
historical development, below

Late Claiming (this index)

CLAIMS—Cont'd

- Law vs. fact. Central vs. peripheral claiming, above
- Legislation, **4:77, 4:81, 4:87**
- Legislature, **4:6**
- Licenses, **4:63**
- Lighting Ballast Control LLC v. Philips Electronic North America Corp., **4:17.50**
- Limitations and restrictions
 - dominance and subservience, above
 - multiple claims in single patent, **4:103**
 - policy justification and historical development, **4:2**
- Lingual meaning, **4:1**
- Literal infringement, **4:71**
- Lower courts, **4:6, 4:80**
- Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, **4:73, 4:78, 4:89, 4:93**
- Markman v. Westview Instruments, **4:6, 4:16, 4:17.50, 4:17.75**
- Markush groupings (Ex parte Markush), **4:100**
- Mathematical formulae, **4:79**
- Meaning, lingual, **4:1**
- Means expressions
 - generally, **4:7, 4:83-4:93**
 - boundary with non-means expressions, **4:89**
 - central vs. peripheral claiming, **4:8**
 - combinations, generally, **4:83-4:93**
 - commentary, **4:90**
 - corresponding structure, determination of, **4:91**
 - Federal Circuit courts, **4:88, 4:91, 4:93**
 - historical development
 - generally, **4:84-4:88**
 - judicial reaction under peripheral claiming practice, **4:86**
 - recent developments, **4:88**
 - retention after 1870, **4:85**
 - statutory treatment in 1952 Patent Act, **4:87**
 - Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) practice, **4:93**

CLAIMS—Cont'd

- Means expressions—Cont'd
 - peripheral claiming, generally, **4:83-4:93**
 - policy justification and historical development, **4:2, 4:5**
 - section 112, generally, **4:83**
 - U.S.C.A. Title 35, generally, **4:83**
- Mechanical arts, **4:65**
- Mechanical equivalents, **4:84, 4:86, 4:92**
- Method of use, **4:80**
- Mixed questions of law and fact, **4:14**
- Molecular physics, **4:65**
- Multiple claims, **4:101-4:103**
- Multiple dependent claims, **4:103**
- Multiply dependent claims, **4:5**
- National Institutes of Health, **4:66**
- Natural laws, **4:79**
- 19th century, **4:2**
- Non-Obviousness (this index)
- Nonspecialist district court, **4:6**
- Notice and knowledge
 - generally, **4:7, 4:9, 4:94**
 - central vs. peripheral claiming, **4:9**
 - definiteness and notice, **4:94**
 - hybrid claim presentations and nonlimiting recitations, **4:71, 4:72, 4:74**
 - means expressions, **4:92**
 - policy justification and historical development, **4:2-4:4, 4:6**
- Novelty, **4:72**
- Objection, **4:2**
- Objectionable, **4:66**
- Objectionable per se, **4:5**
- Open formats, **4:98**
- O'Reilly v. Morse, **4:9**
- Partially closed claim format, **4:98**
- Patentability, **4:62, 4:67, 4:70, 4:72**
- Patentable per se, **4:76**
- Patent Act of 1836, **4:2, 4:94**
- Patent Act of 1870, **4:94**
- Patent Act of 1952, **4:5, 4:87, 4:93**
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), generally, **4:3**
- Patent Cooperation Treaty, **4:103**

INDEX

CLAIMS—Cont'd

- Patent Department of the Department of State, **4:2**
- Patent law judges, **4:63**
- Pending claims, **4:1**
- Peripheral claiming
 - generally, **4:1, 7:5, 7:6**
 - adequate disclosure, **7:24, 7:26, 7:42**
 - central vs. peripheral claiming, above
 - designs, **5:46**
 - dominance and subservience, **4:64**
 - historical development and policy justification, **1:21-1:25, 4:3, 4:4, 4:86**
 - hybrid claim presentations and nonlimiting recitations, **4:80**
 - indirect infringement, **15:5**
 - joint inventorship, **10:31**
 - means expressions, above
 - non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:50, 5:52, 5:55**
 - policy justification and historical development, generally, **4:2-4:6**
 - processes, **5:21, 5:24**
 - statutory subject matter, **5:22**
- Technological Scope of Infringement (this index)
- Per se rule, **4:78, 4:80**
- Phillips v. AWH, **4:39**
- Physics, **4:65**
- Policy justification and historical development
 - generally, **4:2-4:6**
 - peripheral claiming, 1870-1880, **4:3**
 - peripheral claiming, 1880-1952, **4:4**
 - statutes, 1952-1982, **4:5**
 - structural revision of judiciary, 1982-present, **4:6**
- Practical utility, **4:66**
- Practicing patent community, **4:89**
- Pragmatic meaning, **4:55-4:57**
- Preamble, **4:96, 4:99**
- Preclusion of issue, **4:20**
- Presumptions, **4:89**

CLAIMS—Cont'd

- Prima facie case, **4:93**
- Printed matter, some forms of, **4:79**
- Prior art structure, **4:93**
- Priority
 - generally, **8:125**
 - central vs. peripheral claiming, **4:9**
 - claimed invention, **8:253**
 - claim language, **8:47-8:49, 8:57**
- Process, products defined by, **4:74**
- Product-and-method, **4:63**
- Product-by-process, **4:73, 4:74, 4:82, 4:102**
- Product method, **4:66**
- Profit from research, **4:63**
- Prosecution, **4:93**
- Prosecution history, **4:45**
- Publications, administrative, **4:2**
- Public Law No. 104-41, **4:77**
- Questions of fact. Central vs. peripheral claiming, above
- Questions of law
 - central vs. peripheral claiming, above
 - means expressions, **4:91**
- Quid pro quo, **4:91**
- Reasonable notice, **4:2**
- Reasonable people, **4:3**
- Reasonably clear, **4:94**
- Rebuttal, **4:93**
- Recital, **4:5**
- Recitations
 - alternative, **4:100**
 - dominance and subservience, above
 - means expressions, **4:91**
- Reexamination, **4:88**
- Reissuance, **4:4, 4:9, 16:26-16:29, 16:75-16:80**
- Rejection of application
 - generally, **4:1**
 - alternative recitations and markush groupings, **4:100**
 - definiteness and notice, **4:94**
 - dominance and subservience, **4:69**
 - hybrid claim presentations and nonlimiting recitations, **4:72, 4:77**

CLAIMS—Cont'd

Remand, **4:74**
 Research and development, **4:63, 4:77**
 Retention after 1870, **4:85**
 Revisions in statutes, **4:2**
 Scripps Clinic & Research Foundation v. Genentech, **4:74**
 Sealing insert, **4:97**
 Section 101, **4:66-4:68, 4:70, 4:73, 4:79**
 Section 102, **4:102**
 Section 103
 amendment of statute, **4:75-4:78**
 hybrid claim presentations and nonlimiting recitations, **4:75, 4:77**
 multiple claims in single patent, **4:102**
 policy justification and historical development, **4:6**
 Section 112, generally, **4:1**
 Section 271(a), **4:66**
 Section 282, **4:101**
 Semantic meaning, **4:55-4:57**
 Single means claims, **4:87**
 Skilled in the art, **4:2, 4:91, 4:92**
 Special sub-rules. Central vs. peripheral claiming, above
 Specification, **4:44**
 Stare decisis, **4:20**
 State Department, **4:2**
 Static physical configurations, **5:8**
 Statutes, generally, **4:1**
 Statutory subject matter, generally, **4:2**
 Structural equivalents, **4:92**
 Subcombination, **4:63, 4:64**
 Subject matter jurisdiction, **4:6**
 Subsequent developments, **4:40**
 Subservience. Dominance and subservience, above
 Substantially as described, **4:2**
 Supreme Court
 generally, **4:3, 4:80**
 Atlantic Thermoplastics Co. v. Faytex Corp., **4:74**
 Bain v. Morse, **4:9**

CLAIMS—Cont'd

Supreme Court—Cont'd
 Evans v. Eaton, **4:2**
 Halliburton Oil Well Cementing Co. v. Walker, **4:86**
 Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc., **4:6**
 means expressions, **4:86**
 O'Reilly v. Morse, **4:9**
 Scripps Clinic & Research Foundation v. Genentech, **4:74**
 Tropix Inc. v. Lumigen Inc., **4:74**
 Warner Jenkinson v. Hilton Davis, **4:6**
 Target meaning. Central vs. peripheral claiming, above
 Technical disclosure, **4:8**
 Technological configuration, **4:65, 4:71, 4:94**
 Technological Scope of Infringement (this index)
 Temporal scope, **11:22-11:24**
 Tests, **4:74, 4:92**
 Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc., **4:17.50**
 Texas Digital Instruments v. Telegenix, **4:38**
 Theory, generally, **4:7-4:93**
 35 USCS, generally. See lines throughout this index topic
 Title and ownership, **4:2, 4:6, 4:73**
 Toro v. White Consol. Industries, **4:37**
 Transitional phrase, **4:96, 4:98, 4:99**
 Trials
 hybrid claim presentations and nonlimiting recitations, **4:80**
 judgment, policy justification and historical development, **4:2**
 Tripartite form of individual claims, **4:96-4:99**
 Tropix Inc. v. Lumigen Inc., **4:74**
 Tubular body, **4:97, 4:98**
 Useful, **4:66**
 Validity, **4:49, 4:62**
 Venn diagram, **4:63**
 Verdicts. Central vs. peripheral claiming, above

INDEX

CLAIMS—Cont'd

Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.,
4:34

Warner Jenkinson v. Hilton Davis,
4:6

CLAIM THEORY

Technological Scope of Infringement
(this index)

CLASSICAL ESTOPPEL

Technological scope, **13:89**

CLAUDE NEON LIGHTS v. E. MACHLETT & SON

Technological scope, **13:71**

CLAYTON ANTITRUST ACT

Indirect infringement, **15:6**

CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE

Adequate utility, **6:14**

CLEAR AND PARTICULAR

Non-obviousness, **9:66**

CLERK OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:20

CLINTON ADMINISTRATION

Claims, **4:77**

CLONING

Adequate utility, **6:5**

CLOSED FORMATS

Claims, **4:98**

CLOSED LETTERS (LITTERAE CLAUSAE)

History, **1:1**

CLOSED LIST

Non-obviousness, **9:55**

CLOSELY RELATED INFORMATION

Adequate utility, **7:1**

CLOSE REPLICAS

Adequate utility, **7:5**

CLS v. ALICE

Processes, business methods, **5:32.50**

CLUM v. BREWER

Joint inventorship, **10:49, 10:50**

COCHRAN v. DEENER

Processes, **5:22**
Statutory subject matter, **5:22**

CODE OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS (CFR)

Claims, **4:73**

CO-EMPLOYEES

Non-obviousness, **9:26**

CO-INVENTION

Joint inventorship, **10:29**

CO-INVENTORS

Anticipation, lack of, **8:5**
Joint inventorship, **10:47**

COLEMAN v. DINES

Priority, **8:45**

COLLABORATION

Inventorship, **10:15, 10:18**
Joint Inventorship (this index)
Non-Obviousness (this index)

COLLECTIONS

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:50**

COLONIAL PERIOD

Generally, **1:9**

COLORFUL LANGUAGE

Non-obviousness, **9:4**

COMBINATIONS

Adequate utility, **6:6, 7:24**
Anticipation, lack of, **8:12**
Claims (this index)
Indirect infringement, **15:5**
Non-obviousness, **9:3, 9:7, 9:86**
Non-Statutory Hybrid Inventions
(this index)
Priority, **8:47**
Static physical configurations, **5:8,**
5:9
Temporal scope, **11:49**

COMMENTARY

Correction of inventorship, **10:64**
Means expressions, **4:90**
Technological Scope of Infringement
(this index)

COMMERCE CLAUSE

History, **1:15**

COMMERCIAL EMBODIMENTS

Adequate disclosure, **7:52, 7:53**

COMMERCIAL EXPLOITATION

Adequate utility, **7:5, 7:10**
Anticipation, lack of, **8:20**
Policy justification, **1:38**

**COMMERCIAL FIELD
LIMITATIONS**

Misuse of patent, **18:34**

COMMERCIAL IMPORTANCE

Static physical configurations, **5:13**

COMMERCIAL INFORMATION

Non-obviousness, **9:53**

COMMERCIALITY

Adequate Commerciality (this index)
Temporal scope, **11:6**

COMMERCIALIZATION

Adequate utility, **6:4**
Correction of inventorship, **10:67, 10:68**
History, **1:3**
Non-obviousness, **9:22**
Policy justification, **1:39, 1:41**
Priority, **8:67**
Statutory subject matter, **5:4, 5:5**

COMMERCIALLY SALABLE

Adequate utility, **6:8, 6:11**

COMMERCIAL MANUFACTURE

Processes, **5:39**

COMMERCIAL PROCESSES

Processes, **5:37**

COMMERCIAL SUCCESS

Non-obviousness, **9:6, 9:51, 9:61-9:64, 9:76**

COMMERCIAL USE

Inventorship, **10:14**
Prior inventor, prior-user rights,
22:21, 22:22

COMMISSIONED WORKS

Inventorship, **10:16**

**COMMISSIONER IN UNITED
STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR DISTRICT OF
COLUMBIA**

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:38

**COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS
AND TRADEMARKS**

Generally, **2:7 et seq.**
Adequate utility, **6:6, 7:9**
Examination of Original Application
(this index)
History, **1:19, 1:21**
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:83**
Report of Decisions of Commissioner
of Patents, **2:20**

**COMMISSION FOR THE
PROMOTION OF THE
USEFUL ARTS**

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:15

**COMMISSION ON THE USEFUL
ARTS**

Generally, **2:20**
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:31

COMMON ASSIGNMENT

Correction, **10:66-10:68**
Correction of inventorship, **10:59, 10:60, 10:66**

COMMON ENTERPRISE

Joint inventorship, **10:39**

COMMON KNOWLEDGE

Adequate utility, **7:15, 7:18**
Non-obviousness, **9:43**

COMMON LAW

Adequate commerciality, **14:51**
Claims, **4:5, 4:77, 4:78**

INDEX

COMMON LAW—Cont'd

Federal common law, historical origins, **1:13.20**
History, **1:3, 1:5, 1:7, 1:17**
Invalidity defense, **17:7**
Inventorship, **10:14, 10:17, 10:47**
Joint inventorship, **10:47**
Noninfringement defense, **17:7**
Non-obviousness, **9:4, 9:5**
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:59**
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:6, 2:13, 2:43**
Processes, **5:24**

COMMON OWNERSHIP

Joint inventorship, **10:37**
Non-Obviousness (this index)

COMMON USAGE

History, **1:15**

COMMUNICATION

Static physical configurations, **5:11**

COMMUNITY PATENT

CONVENTION

Adequate commerciality, **14:46**
Indirect infringement, **15:14**

COMPCO CORP. V. DAY BRITE LIGHTING, INC.

Historical origins of patent grant, **1:13.50**

COMPENSATION

Priority, **8:36**

COMPETENCE

Priority, **8:72**

COMPETITION

Adequate Commerciality (this index)
Adequate disclosure, **7:2, 7:5, 7:10, 7:11, 7:22**
Adequate utility, **6:19**
Claims, **4:2**
Examination of Original Application (this index)
History, **1:4, 1:7, 1:14**
Non-obviousness, **9:11, 9:47, 9:60**
Policy justification, **1:32, 1:38, 1:39, 1:43**

COMPETITION—Cont'd

Preemption of state law, **1:13.10**
Priority, **8:38, 8:103**
Processes, **5:39**
Statutory subject matter, **5:4, 5:5**

COMPILATIONS

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:55**
Static physical configurations, **5:11**

COMPLAINTS

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:22**
Six-year limitation, date of filing, **21:1**

COMPLETENESS

Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)
Joint inventorship, **10:31**
Priority, **8:47-8:49, 8:57, 8:253**
Static physical configurations, **5:17**

COMPOSITION OF MATTER

Statutory Subject Matter (this index)

COMPOSITIONS

Adequate utility, **7:7**
Anticipation, lack of, **8:28**
Processes, **5:39**
Static physical configurations, **5:7, 5:8, 5:17**
Statutory subject matter, **5:9**

COMPOUNDS

Adequate utility, **6:18**
Static physical configurations, **5:9**

COMPRISING

Claims, **4:98**

COMPROMISE

Non-obviousness, **9:14-9:16**
Processes, **5:39**

COMPULSORY LICENSE

Claims, **4:63**

COMPUTER-RELATED INVENTIONS

Generally, **5:40-4:45**
Abstract ideas, **5:44**
Adequate utility, **7:9**
Apparatus, **5:2**

COMPUTER-RELATED

INVENTIONS—Cont'd

Appeal and review, **5:42**
 Arrhythmia Research Technology, Inc. v. Corazonix Corp., **5:44**
 Article of manufacture, software as, **5:42**
 AT&T Corp. v. Excel Communications, Inc., **5:44**
 Binary-coded decimals (BCD), **5:44**
 Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (BPAI), **5:42**
 Circuits (hardware), **5:41**
 Claims, **4:81**
 Computer-implemented methods, generally, **5:40-4:45**
 Computer science, **5:2**
 Configuration, **5:42**
 Conversions, **5:44**
 Court of Customs and Patent Appeals (CCPA), **5:53**
 Data structure, computer-accessible, **5:42**
 Definition of software, **5:41**
 Economic factors, **5:41**
 Examiner, **5:53**
 Exceptions, **5:42**
 Exemptions, **5:45**
 Federal Circuit, **5:42-5:44**
 Gottschalk v. Benson, **5:44**
 Hardware, generally, **5:40-4:45**
 Human-readable languages, **5:41**
 Inherent to processes, **5:53**
 In re Abrams, **5:45**
 In re Bernhart, **5:53**
 In re Lowry, **5:42**
 Instructions, **5:41**
 Interference, **5:42**
 Literary expressions, **5:42**
 Manufacture, articles of, generally, **5:40-4:45**
 Mathematical algorithms, **5:41, 5:44**
 Mental steps, **5:45**
 Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:54, 5:78**
 Non-statutory subject matter, **5:41, 5:44, 5:45**
 Patentability, **5:53**

COMPUTER-RELATED

INVENTIONS—Cont'd

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **5:44**
 Physical transformation, **5:53**
 Policy discussion, **5:41**
 Printed matter and factual compilations, **5:41, 5:42**
 Prior art, **5:42**
 Process, software as, **5:43-5:45**
 Processes, **5:24, 5:26, 5:38**
 Programs, generally, **5:40-4:45**
 Rejection of application, **5:42, 5:44, 5:45**
 Research, **5:44**
 Reversal, **5:42**
 Software, generally, **5:1**
 Static physical configurations, **5:8, 5:10**
 Statutory subject matter, generally
 Storage media, generally, **5:40-4:45**
 Supreme Court, **5:44**

CONCEALMENT

Adequate disclosure, **7:57**
 Adequate utility, **7:51**
 Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)
 Inventorship, **10:3**
 Non-obviousness, **9:28, 9:29, 9:34, 9:39**
 Priority (this index)

CONCEPTION

Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)
 Inventorship (this index)
 Joint Inventorship (this index)
 Priority (this index)

CONDITIONS

History, **1:4**

CONDUCT

Estoppel, historical development, **24:6**

CONFIDENTIALITY

Non-obviousness, **9:28**

CONFIGURATION

Adequate disclosure, generally, **7:1**
 Anticipation, lack of, **8:25**

INDEX

CONFIGURATION—Cont'd

- Claims, **4:87, 4:94**
- Computer-related inventions, **5:42**
- Inventorship, **10:12**
- Joint inventorship, **10:47**
- Non-Obviousness (this index)
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:1**
- Priority, **8:49, 8:57**
- Statutory subject matter, **5:1**

CONGRESS

- Generally, **2:1-2:18**
- Adequate disclosure, **7:45**
- Adequate utility, **6:9**
- Administration of initial grant
 - generally, **2:12-2:18**
 - examination under Act of 1836, **2:17**
 - historical developments in U.S., **2:14-2:17**
 - Patent Act of 1790, **2:15**
 - Patent Act of 1793, **2:16**
 - Patent Act of 1836, **2:17**
 - registration under Act of 1793, **2:16**
 - subsequent developments, **2:18**
- Anticipation, lack of, **8:8**
- Claims
 - definiteness and notice, **4:94**
 - hybrid claim presentations and nonlimiting recitations, **4:75, 4:80**
 - means expressions, **4:87, 4:88, 4:93**
 - multiple claims in single patent, **4:103**
 - policy justification and historical development, **4:5, 4:6**
- Correction of inventorship, **10:57, 10:58, 10:65**
- Doubt, rule of, **2:9**
- European patent systems, **2:11**
- Examination of Original Application (this index)
- Examination under Act of 1836, **2:17**
- Executive authority. Judicial v. executive authority, below
- General acts, **2:3, 2:5**

CONGRESS—Cont'd

- History, generally, **1:12-1:25, 2:14-2:17**
- Inventorship, **10:2, 10:6, 10:7, 10:14**
- Joint inventorship, **10:39-10:41, 10:45**
- Judicial v. executive authority
 - generally, **2:6-2:11**
 - doubt, rule of, **2:9**
 - European patent systems, **2:11**
 - general supremacy of judiciary, **2:8**
 - reexamination, **2:10**
 - relative law-making authority, **2:9**
 - separate delegations, **2:7**
- Non-Obviousness (this index)
- Patent Act of 1790, **2:15**
- Patent Act of 1793, **2:16**
- Patent Act of 1836, **2:17**
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), generally, **2:1**
- Policy justification, **1:31**
- Processes, **5:30**
- Registration under Act of 1793, **2:16**
- Separate delegations, **2:7**
- Specific acts, **2:3, 2:4**
- Static physical configurations, **5:8, 5:14, 5:15, 5:17**
- Statutes, **2:15-2:17**
- Statutory Subject Matter (this index)

CONNER PERIPHERALS, INC. v. WESTERN DIGITAL CORP.

- Adequate commerciality, **14:27**

CONSENT

- Correction, **10:61**
- History, **1:14**
- Inventorship, **10:14**
- Joint Inventorship (this index)
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:22**

CONSENT DECREES

- Invalidity, **17:41**

CONSENT ORDERS

- Processes, **5:39**

CONSIDERATION

- Invalidity, **17:20**

CONSIDERED PER SE

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:84**

CONSISTING ESSENTIALLY OF

Claims, **4:98**

CONSISTING OF

Claims, **4:98**

CONSOLIDATED NOTICES

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:27

CONSOLIDATION

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:37

CONSTITUTIONAL LAW

Adequate utility, **6:2, 6:5, 6:9**

Anticipation, lack of, **8:1**

Congress (this index)

History (this index)

Inventorship, **10:2, 10:7**

Non-obviousness, **9:9**

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:1, 2:4, 2:21, 2:44

Reexamination (this index)

Static physical configurations, **5:17**

Statutory subject matter, **5:2**

**CONSTRUCTION AND
INTERPRETATION**

Adequate commerciality, **14:65,
14:69, 14:70, 14:79**

Adequate utility, **6:3, 6:14, 6:16**

Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)

Claims (this index)

Correction of inventorship, **10:59**

Disclosure (this index)

History, generally, **1:7**

Indirect infringement, **15:2, 15:4**

Inventorship, **10:12**

Joint inventorship, **10:37, 10:41**

Non-Obviousness (this index)

Non-statutory hybrid inventions,
5:59, 5:80

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
generally, **2:3, 2:4**

Priority, **8:63, 8:151, 8:259**

Processes, **5:21, 5:23, 5:27**

CONSTRUCTION AND

INTERPRETATION—Cont'd

Static physical configurations, **5:8,
5:14, 5:15, 5:18**

Statutory subject matter, **5:1 et seq.**

Utility requirement, **6:18, 6:19**

CONSTRUCTION OF WORK

Joint inventorship, **10:23, 10:31**

CONSTRUCTIVE PUBLICATION

Non-obviousness, **9:33**

Priority, **8:141**

**CONSTRUCTIVE REDUCTION TO
PRACTICE**

Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)

Priority (this index)

**CONSUMER PRODUCTS SAFETY
COMMISSION**

Adequate utility, **6:5**

CONSUMERS

Adequate utility, **6:5, 6:15**

Policy justification, **1:33**

Processes, **5:39**

CONTEST

Anticipation, lack of, **8:6**

Correction of inventorship, **10:61**

Inventorship, **10:7, 10:25, 10:52**

Joint inventorship, **10:25, 10:52**

Priority, **8:38, 8:39, 8:46, 8:129**

Statutory subject matter, **5:1**

CONTEXT MISTAKES

Technological scope, **13:57, 13:58**

**CONTINENTAL COATINGS
CORPORATION v. METRO,
INC.**

Estoppel, **24:12**

CONTINENTAL CONGRESS

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:4

CONTINUATION APPLICATION

Adequate disclosure, **7:56**

Disclosure. Examination of original
application, below

Joint inventorship, **10:45, 10:46**

INDEX

CONTINUATION APPLICATION —Cont'd

Priority (this index)
Reissue of patent, **16:83**
Validity. Examination of original
application, above

CONTINUATION-IN-PART APPLICATION

Adequate disclosure, **7:56**
Examination of Original Application
(this index)
Joint inventorship, **10:46**
Priority, **8:147**

CONTINUITY, STANDARD OF Priority, **8:66**

CONTINUOUS EFFORT Inventorship, **10:18**

CONTRACTS AND AGREEMENTS

Adequate Commerciality (this index)
Adequate disclosure, **7:54**
Claims, **4:28, 4:52, 4:53**
Dominance and subservience, **4:63**
History, **1:16, 1:25**
Indirect infringement, **15:14**
Inventorship (this index)
Justification, **1:38, 1:39**
Licenses and Permits (this index)
Non-obviousness, **9:47**
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:13
Policy justification, **1:38, 1:39**
Priority (this index)
Processes, **5:29**
Six-year limitation, contractual
agreements, **21:24**

CONTRA PROFERENTUM Claims, **4:48**

CONTRIBUTION

Adequate disclosure, **7:43**
Anticipation, lack of, **8:5, 8:23, 8:26**
Claims, **4:9, 4:64, 4:83**
Geographic Scope of Infringement
(this index)
History, **1:23**
Inventorship, **10:11, 10:17**

CONTRIBUTION—Cont'd

Joint Inventorship (this index)
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:61**
Processes, **5:21**

CONTRIBUTORY INFRINGEMENT

Indirect Infringement (this index)

CONTROLLED SPACES

Geographic scope, **12:12**

CONVERSION

Computer-related inventions, **5:44**
Correction (this index)
Joint inventorship, **10:49**
Processes, **5:30**

CONVEYANCE OF TITLE

Adequate commerciality, **14:18**
Inventorship, **10:7, 10:14**

COOPERATIVE ENTERPRISE Correction of inventorship, **10:60**

COOPERATIVE INVENTORS Joint Inventorship (this index)

COOPERATIVE RESEARCH Inventorship, **10:18** Non-obviousness, **9:46**

COOPERATIVE RESEARCH AND TECHNOLOGY ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 2004 Nonobviousness, secret prior art, **9:48.1**

COOPERATIVE WORK Joint inventorship, **10:26**

CO-OWNERSHIP Joint Inventorship (this index)

COPENDING APPLICATIONS Priority, **8:69**

COPIES AND DUPLICATES Adequate disclosure, **7:41** Anticipation, lack of, **8:9** Examination of Original Application (this index) Non-obviousness, **9:51, 9:60** Static physical configurations, **5:14**

COPYRIGHT

Adequate commerciality, **14:15**
 History, **1:10, 1:11, 1:15**
 Inventorship, **10:6, 10:16-10:18, 10:53**
 Joint inventorship, **10:53**
 Non-obviousness, **9:47**
 Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:29**
 Policy justification, **1:29**
 Processes, **5:38**
 Static physical configurations, **5:11**
 Statutory subject matter, **5:4**
 Useful arts, **1:11**

CORNETTA v. U.S.

Laches, **23:15**

CORNING v. BURDEN

Processes, **5:21**
 Static physical configurations, **5:8**

COROLLARIES

Adequate disclosure, **7:56**
 Inventorship, **10:6, 10:7, 10:13**
 Non-obviousness, **9:55**

CORPORATIONS

History, **1:4**
 Indirect infringement, **15:19**
 Joint inventorship, **10:39**

CORPOREAL PROPERTY

Priority, **8:39**

CORRECTION

Abandonment, **10:67, 10:68**
 Accountability, **10:61**
 Adequate disclosure, **7:31**
 A.F. Stoddard & Co. v. Dann, **10:64**
 Appeal and review, **10:64**
 Application, **10:56**
 Application, amendment of, **10:57, 10:58**
 Assignment, **10:59-10:61, 10:66-10:68**
 Bemis v. Chevron Research Co., **10:64**
 Bona fide original inventive entity, **10:60**

CORRECTION—Cont'd

Checkpoint Systems, Inc. v. U.S. Intern. Trade Com'n., **10:67**
 Clarity, **10:56, 10:60**
 Commentary, **10:64**
 Commercialization, **10:67, 10:68**
 Common assignment, **10:59, 10:60, 10:66-10:68**
 Congress, **10:57, 10:58, 10:65**
 Consent, **10:61**
 Construction and interpretation, **10:59**
 Contest, **10:61**
 Conversions
 generally, **10:64**
 inventorship, correction of, below
 Cooperative enterprise, **10:60**
 Court of Appeals for District of Columbia, **10:64**
 Deceptive intent, **10:57, 10:60**
 Defenses, **10:58**
 Delay, **10:59**
 Diligence, **10:62**
 Director of Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **10:61**
 Disclosure, **10:68**
 District of Columbia, **10:64**
 Donation to public, **10:67**
 Employment, **10:59, 10:67**
 Error without deceptive intent, **10:60**
 Evidence, **10:58, 10:60**
 Examination
 generally, **10:58**
 Exceptions, **10:61**
 Federal Circuit, **10:67, 10:68**
 First inventor, **10:67**
 First-to-file, **22:4**
 Foreclosure of rights, **10:67**
 Fraud, **10:57**
 Historical development, **10:55-10:58**
 Improvements, **10:68**
 Inadvertent error, **10:67**
 Inadvertent mistake, **10:57**
 Infringement, **10:58**
 Intent, **10:57, 10:60, 10:65**
 Inventive entity, **10:55**
 Inventorship, correction of
 generally, **10:54-10:68**

INDEX

CORRECTION—Cont'd

Inventorship, correction of—Cont'd
amendments of 1982, **10:58**
consent, **10:61**
conversions. Sole-to-sole conversions, below in this group
diligence, **10:62**
error without deceptive intent, **10:60**
historical development, **10:55-10:58**
Patent Act of 1952, **10:57**
policy justification, **10:59**
pre-1952 law, **10:56**
section 116, generally, **10:57-10:67**
section 256, generally, **10:59-10:67**
sole-to-sole conversions
generally, **10:63-10:68**
amendments of 1982, **10:65**
common vs. non-common assignment, **10:66-10:68**
first inventorship, **10:67**
limits, conflicts with, **10:66-10:68**
novelty, lack of, **10:68**
Patent Act of 1952, **10:64**
Inventorship, correction of inventorship of
consent, **10:54**
diligence, **10:54**
issued patents, generally, **10:54**
name, generally, **10:54**
omissions, generally, **10:54**
pending applications, generally, **10:54**
sole-to-sole transfers, **10:54**
validity, generally, **10:54**
Joinder, **10:57**
Joint inventors, **10:20, 10:25, 10:40, 10:65**
Justification, **10:59**
Laches, **10:61**
Licenses and permits, **10:61**
Limitations and restrictions
error without deceptive intent, **10:60**

CORRECTION—Cont'd

Limitations and restrictions—Cont'd
history, **10:59**
sole-to-sole conversions, **10:64, 10:66-10:68**
Misjoinder, **10:57**
Misnaming, **10:65**
Motivation, **10:66**
Name. Inventorship, correction of, above
Non-joinder, **10:57**
Non-obviousness, **9:77**
Notice and knowledge, **10:68**
Novelty, **10:59, 10:68**
Original inventive entity, **10:60**
Originally named inventor, **10:60**
Participants, **10:60**
Patent Act Amendment of 1982, **10:59, 10:63**
Patent Act of 1952, **10:57, 10:64**
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **10:58-10:61, 10:64**
Pending applications. Inventorship, correction of, above
Policy justification, **10:59**
Prior art, **10:67**
Prior inventor, prior-user rights, **22:4**
Priority, **8:82**
Prosecution of application, **10:56**
Public, **10:61, 10:67**
Public domain, **10:68**
Public in due course, **10:67**
Public use and on sale, **10:68**
Reference, **10:65, 10:66, 10:68**
Relevant participants, **10:60**
Relevant parties, **10:61**
Research and development, **10:64**
Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Company, Ltd., **10:68**
Section 102(a), **10:67**
Section 102(b), **10:63, 10:68**
Section 102(e), **10:67**
Section 102(f), **10:60**
Section 102(g), **10:67**
Section 116, generally, **10:57-10:67**
Section 256, generally, **10:57-10:67**
Single inventive act, **10:66**

CORRECTION—Cont'd

Sole-to-sole conversions. Inventorship, correction of, above
State of mind, **10:60**
Statutes, amendment of, **10:58, 10:63, 10:65**
Timeliness, **10:62**
Trade secrets, **10:68**
Transfers, **10:61, 10:64, 10:68**
True inventors, **10:60, 10:66**
Unnamed inventor, **10:62**
Validity. Inventorship, correction of, above
Void rights, **10:56**
Writing of application, **10:56**

CORRECTNESS

Adequate utility, **6:13**

CORROBORATION

Priority (this index)

COSTS AND EXPENSES

Adequate disclosure, **7:24**
Adequate utility, **6:4, 6:10**
Claims, **4:63, 4:73, 4:83, 4:94**
Examination of Original Application (this index)
History, **1:3, 1:7**
Inventorship, **10:17**
Non-obviousness, **9:10, 9:77, 9:82**
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:13, 2:22**
Policy justification, **1:30, 1:31, 1:42**
Processes, **5:39**
Social Cost (this index)
Static physical configurations, **5:14**
Statutory subject matter, **5:5**

CO-TENANCY

Joint inventorship, **10:47, 10:51**

COTTON

Static physical configurations, **5:14**

COUNTERFEIT GOODS

TRIPs, **14:10**

COUPONS

Processes, **5:29**

COURT OF APPEALS

Claims, **4:76**

**COURT OF APPEALS FOR
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

Correction of inventorship, **10:64**

**COURT OF APPEALS FOR
FEDERAL CIRCUIT (CAFC)**

Claims, **4:6, 4:80, 4:88, 4:93**
History, **1:25**
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:37, 2:38, 2:43**

COURT OF CLAIMS

Adequate commerciality, **14:51, 14:55**

**COURT OF CUSTOMS AND
PATENT APPEALS (CCPA)**

Adequate disclosure, **7:9, 7:18, 7:30, 7:57**

Adequate utility. Utility Requirement (this index)

Anticipation, lack of, **8:7, 8:22**

Claims, **4:76, 4:93**

Computer-related inventions, **5:53**

History, **1:24**

Joint inventorship, **10:38**

Non-Obviousness (this index)

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:74, 5:76**

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:21, 2:36**

Priority, **8:46, 8:62**

Processes, **5:26, 5:27, 5:30**

Static physical configurations, **5:9, 5:12, 5:17**

Utility Requirement (this index)

**COVENANT NOT TO DEAL IN
COMPETING GOODS**

Misuse of patent, **18:36**

CPR

Processes, **5:39**

**CREATIVE MENTAL ACTS AND
PROCESSES**

Anticipation, lack of, **8:5, 8:6**

Non-obviousness, **9:43**

Processes, **5:26**

INDEX

CREDIBILITY

Priority, **8:73**

CRITICAL DATE

Priority, **8:219**

CROPS

Static physical configurations, **5:14**

CROSS-BORDER TRANSACTIONS

Geographic Scope of Infringement
(this index)

CROSS-EXAMINATION

Priority, **8:75**

CROSS LICENSES

Claims, **4:63**

Non-obviousness, **9:11**

CULTIVATED SPORES

Static physical configurations, **5:14**

CURIOSITY, SATISFACTION OF

Adequate commerciality, **14:12**

CUSTOMERS

Misuse of patent, **18:34**

Non-obviousness, **9:62**

Processes, **5:28**

DAMAGES

Adequate commerciality, **14:19,**
14:78

Claims, **4:80**

Indirect infringement, **15:15, 15:16,**
15:22

Inventorship, **10:8**

Processes, **5:39**

DANGEROUS

Adequate utility, **6:12**

DANN AMENDMENTS

Reissue of patent, **16:64**

DARCY v. ALLEN

History, **1:4, 1:5**

DATABASE

Static physical configurations, **5:11**

DATA PER SE

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:69**

DAUGHTERS OF CONFEDERACY

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:4

DAWSON CHEMICAL CO. v. ROHM AND HAAS CO.

Indirect infringement, **15:12, 15:13**

Misuse of patent, **18:21**

DEATH

Inventorship, **10:8**

DECEIT

Adequate disclosure, **7:1**

Adequate utility, **6:15**

Correction of inventorship, **10:57,**
10:60

Joint inventorship, **10:40**

Reissue of patent, **16:98**

DECLARATION

Adequate discovery, **7:28**

DECLARATORY JUDGMENT

Adequate commerciality, **14:80**

DECLARATORY JUDGMENTS ACT OF 1934

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:18

DECLARATORY RELIEF

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:18

DEEPSOUTH PACKING CO. v. LAITRAM CORP.

Adequate Commerciality (this index)
Geographic scope, **12:7, 12:28**

DE FACTO CONTROL

Adequate discovery, **7:44**

Anticipation, lack of, **8:20**

DEFECTS

Claims, **4:2**

Reissue of Patent (this index)

DEFEND TRADE SECRETS ACT OF 2016

History and policy justification,
1:13.90

DEFENSES

Adequate discovery, **7:45**
 Application to patent statute, **17:9-17:13**
 Common law pleading, **17:7**
 Correction of inventorship, **10:58**
 Current statute, **17:2-17:13**
 Estoppel (this index)
 Examination of Original Application (this index)
 Federal code pleading, **17:8**
 General pleading theory and current statute, **17:2-17:13**
 Invalidity (this index)
 Joint inventorship, **10:25**
 Laches (this index)
 Licenses and Permits (this index)
 Modern pleading, **17:8**
 Negation vs. avoidance, **17:6**
 Noninfringement (this index)
 Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:7, 2:17**
 Pleading, generally, **17:4-17:8, 23:39**
 Prior art notice, **17:14**
 Priority, **8:43**
 Prior statutes, **17:3, 17:10**
 Processes, **5:23**
 Section 273. Prior Inventor, Prior-User Rights (this index)
 Section 282, **17:11**
 Section 286. Six-Year Limitation (this index)
 Section 287(c). Medical and Diagnostic Procedures (this index)
 Statutory subject matter, **5:5**
 Technological Scope of Infringement (this index)

DEFENSIVE ACTS AND MATTERS

Adequate utility, **6:7**
 Priority, **8:53, 8:108, 8:118**

DEFINITENESS

Joint inventorship, **10:31**
 Non-obviousness, **9:3**
 Priority, **8:171**
 Processes, **5:26**

DEFINITENESS—Cont'd

Reissue of patent, eligibility, changes to improve definiteness, **16:80**

DEFINITIONAL ACCURACY

Central vs. peripheral claiming, **4:9**
 Technological scope, **13:54**

DEFINITIONS

Generally, **1:1**
 Adequate Commerciality (this index)
 Another, **9:46, 9:47, 10:37**
 Broadening, **16:78**
 Claimed, **13:98**
 Combination of elements, **5:76**
 Commercial use, **22:21, 22:22**
 Derivation, **10:28**
 Disclosed, **13:99**
 Effective filing date, **22:23**
 Estoppel, **24:4**
 In this country, **8:194**
 Initial occupant, **10:4**
 Invent, **8:4**
 Inventive entities, **10:19**
 Inventor (this index)
 Joint Inventorship (this index)
 Limitation to business methods, **22:20**
 Non-profit entity, commercial use by, **22:22**
 Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:55**
 Patented, **8:278**
 Possession, **7:3**
 Printed, **8:177**
 Process, products defined by, **4:74**
 Product, **12:37**
 Products made by process, **12:38**
 Publication, **8:177**
 Reissue of Patent (this index)
 Section 273 defense. Prior Inventor, Prior-User Rights (this index)
 Section 287(c) defense. Medical and Diagnostic Procedures (this index)
 Software, **5:41**
 Static physical configurations, **5:8**

DE GRAFFENRIED v. U.S.

Adequate commerciality, **14:27**

INDEX

DELAY

Adequate commerciality, **14:26**
Adequate disclosure, **7:5**
Correction of inventorship, **10:59**
Estoppel, communication from patent owner, **24:26**
Examination of Original Application (this index)
Non-obviousness, **9:39**
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:13**
Priority, **8:64**

DELIBERATE ACTS AND MATTERS

Non-obviousness, **9:67, 9:68**
Priority, **8:87**

DELIVERY

Adequate commerciality, **14:40**
Static physical configurations, **5:18**

DEMAND

Adequate discovery, **7:14**
Adequate utility, **6:4, 6:10**
History, **1:3**
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:22**
Policy justification, **1:33**
Processes, **5:39**

DE MINIMIS ACTIVITIES

Adequate Commerciality (this index)

DE NOVO REVIEW

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:39**

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:20**
Static physical configurations, **5:14**

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:20**

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:16, 2:20, 2:31**

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

Generally, **4:5, 4:102**

DEPENDENT CLAIMS—Cont'd

Form, **4:5**
Multiple claims in single patent, **4:102, 4:103**

DEPENDENT PATENTS

Adequate utility, **7:24**

DEPOSITS AND DEPOSITORIES

Adequate disclosure, **7:9, 7:11, 7:22, 7:37**

DEPUTY COMMISSIONER

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:22**

DEPUTY DIRECTOR

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:22**

DERIVATION

Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)
Joint inventorship, **10:28**
Non-obviousness, **9:41**

DESCRIPTION

Claims (this index)
Disclosure (this index)
Non-Obviousness (this index)
Priority (this index)
Processes, **5:29**
Technological scope, **13:11**
Utility Requirement (this index)

DESIGNS

Disclosure, **5:46**
Double patenting, **5:46**
Embodiments, **5:46**
Filing date of application, **5:46**
Foreign countries, **5:46**
Infringement, **5:46**
International priority, **5:46**
Manufacture, articles of, **5:46**
Ordinary purchaser, **5:46**
Ornamental exterior appearance of article of manufacture, **5:46**
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **5:46**
Peripheral claiming, **5:46**
Registration, **5:46**
Section 171 et seq., **5:46**
Statutory subject matter, **5:46**

DESIGNS—Cont'd

Trademark law, **5:46**

Utility patents, **5:46**

DEVICES

Anticipation, lack of, **8:28**

Static physical configurations, **5:8**

Statutory Subject Matter (this index)

DIAGNOSTIC PROCEDURES

Processes, **5:39**

DIAGRAMS AND DIAGRAMMING

Claims, **4:63**

Convention of tripartite form of individual claims, **4:97**

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:55**

DIAMOND v. CHAKRABARTY

Static physical configurations, **5:17**

DIAMOND v. DIEHR

Non-statutory hybrid inventions,
5:73-5:75, 5:84, 5:85

DICKENSON v. ZURKO

Generally, **2:43**

DICKINSON v. ZURKO

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:43

DICTA, ASSERTED IN

Processes, **5:21**

DICTIONARIES

Claims, **4:46**

DILIGENCE

Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)

Examination of Original Applications
(this index)

Inventorship, correction of, **10:62**

Priority, **8:44, 8:70, 8:78, 8:79, 8:89**

DIRECTED SUMMARY

JUDGMENT

Processes, **5:30**

DIRECT INFRINGEMENT

Adequate Commerciality (this index)

Indirect infringement, **15:16, 15:17,
15:22, 15:24**

**DIRECTING OR PERMITTING
CONDUCT OF ANOTHER**

Indirect infringement, **15:14**

**DIRECTOR OF PATENT AND
TRADEMARK OFFICE (PTO)**

Generally, **2:7, 2:22**

Adequate utility, **7:11**

Correction of inventorship, **10:61**

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:83**

**DIRECT TECHNOLOGICAL
SCOPE**

Technological Scope of Infringement
(this index)

DISCLAIMER

Claims, **4:2**

History, **1:24**

DISCLOSED

Defined, **13:99**

DISCLOSURE

Generally, **7:1 et seq.**

Abstract acts and matters, **7:6**

Adequate disclosure, generally, **7:1 et
seq.**

Adequate range of embodiments,
7:23-7:26

Administrative law and procedure,
7:5

Amended claims, **7:41**

America Invents Act, **7:32**

Anticipation, lack of, **7:18, 7:29,
8:16, 8:22**

Apparatus, **7:24**

Appeal and review, **7:52, 7:54, 7:57**

Assignee, duty of, **7:54**

Assumption as of filing date, **7:29**

Background knowledge. Single-
embodiment, below

Bad faith, **7:57**

Bayer AG v. Schein Pharmaceuticals,
Inc., **7:52, 7:53**

Best mode

generally, **7:44-7:57**

America Invents Act, **7:32**

continuing applications, **7:56**

enablement distinguished, **7:48**

INDEX

DISCLOSURE—Cont'd

- Best mode—Cont'd
 - historical development and policy justification, **7:45, 7:46**
 - intent, **7:57**
 - policy objectives, **7:46**
 - time frame, **7:56**
 - trade secrets and reverse engineering, **7:50**
 - two-prong test for occurrence of violation, **7:49**
- unsettled issues
 - generally, **7:51-7:55**
 - assignee, duty of, **7:54**
 - commercial embodiments, **7:52, 7:53**
 - discuss objectives opposing disclosure, failure to, generally, **7:51-7:55**
 - employer, duty of, **7:54**
 - production details, **7:52, 7:53**
 - related information, **7:52, 7:53**
 - well-settled issues, **7:47-7:50**
- Biological deposits, **7:22**
- Biological starting materials, **7:11**
- Biotechnological arts, **7:14**
- Brand names, **7:12**
- Breadth of claims, **7:4, 7:23-7:26, 7:33**
- Brenner v. Manson, **7:14**
- Case law, **7:9, 7:25**
- Change and modification, **7:13, 7:22, 7:38**
- Claim breadth, **7:33**
- Claimed configuration, **7:7-7:9**
- Claims (this index)
- Combinations, **7:24**
- Commercial embodiments, **7:52, 7:53**
- Commissioner of Patents, **7:9**
- Compounds, **7:10**
- Concealment, **7:57**
- Congress, **7:45**
- Construction and interpretation, generally, **7:1 et seq.**
- Continuation Application (this index)
- Continuation-in-part application, **7:56**

DISCLOSURE—Cont'd

- Contracts and agreements, **7:54**
- Corollaries, **7:56**
- Correction of inventorship, **10:68**
- Costs and expenses, **7:24**
- Court of Customs and Patent Appeals (CCPA), **7:57**
- Decisions, **7:9**
- Demand, **7:14**
- Deposits, **7:22**
- Description requirement
 - generally, **7:27-7:43**
 - ambiguity, **7:35-7:39**
 - amended claims, **7:41**
 - America Invents Act, **7:32**
 - Ariad Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Eli Lilly and Co., **7:38**
 - case law, **7:37, 7:38**
 - confusion and dissent, **7:35, 7:36**
 - enablement, **7:34-7:39, 7:36**
 - enablement and description distinguished, **7:34-7:39**
 - envisioned inventions, **7:34**
 - examples, **7:37**
 - filing date of application, below first to file under America Invents Act, **7:32**
 - frame of reference, **7:43**
 - in haec verba, **7:42**
 - introducing new inventions, **7:34**
 - inventive configuration, description vs., **7:39**
 - justification. Policy justification, below in this group
 - last theorem of Pierre de Fermat, **7:34**
 - nomenclature, **7:37, 7:38**
 - policy justification
 - generally, **7:28-7:32**
 - America Invents Act, **7:32**
 - assumption as of filing date, **7:29**
 - example, **7:30**
 - first to file, **7:32**
 - inventions already made, **7:32**
 - limitation on claim breadth, **7:33**
 - new-matter prohibition, relation to, **7:31**

DISCLOSURE—Cont'd

Description requirement—Cont'd
 policy justification—Cont'd
 timewise priority criterion, **7:32**
 subjective appreciation, **7:34, 7:39**
 timewise priority criterion, **7:32**
 Designs, **5:46**
 District court, **7:52**
 Dominant-subservient relationships,
 7:24, 7:46
 Duplication, **7:20, 7:22**
 Effective filing date, **7:52**
 Effectively placed on file, **7:56**
 Electrical arts, **7:25**
 Embodiments, generally, **7:1**
 Employer, duty of, **7:54**
 Enablement, generally, **7:2-7:26**
 Evidence
 generally, **7:1**
 adequate disclosure, generally, **7:1**
 best mode, **7:57**
 description requirements, **7:29,**
 7:31, 7:43
 enablement, **7:5, 7:18**
 Examination of Original Applications
 (this index)
 Examples, **7:37**
 Exceptions and exclusions, **7:3, 7:22,**
 7:25
 Existing case law, **7:25**
 Experimentation, **7:20**
 Federal Circuit courts
 best mode, **7:52, 7:56, 7:57**
 description requirements, **7:37**
 enablement, **7:9, 7:20, 7:25**
 File, effectively placed on, **7:56**
 Filing date of application
 generally, **7:1, 7:56**
 best mode, **7:56**
 description requirements
 generally, **7:27**
 enablement distinguished, **7:37**
 In haec verba, **7:42**
 policy justification, **7:29, 7:31**
 enablement, **7:21, 7:22**
 first to file under America Invents
 Act, **7:32**
 Foreign countries, **7:5**

DISCLOSURE—Cont'd

Foreseeability, **7:26, 7:53**
 Frame of reference, **7:43**
 Future Acts and Matters (this index)
 Genetics, **7:14**
 Germany, **7:24**
 Glaxo Inc. v. Novopharm Ltd., **7:54**
 History
 generally, **7:4, 7:5**
 best mode, **7:45, 7:46, 7:57**
 description, **7:31**
 first to invent changed to first to
 file, **7:32**
 initial statutes and developments
 up to 1836, **1:18**
 Incorporation by reference, **7:19**
 Indirect infringement, **15:4**
 In haec verba, **7:42**
 In re Sherwood, **7:57**
 Intent
 generally, **7:1**
 description requirement, **7:31**
 enablement, **7:14**
 Inventive configuration, description
 vs., **7:39**
 Investigation, **7:20**
 Joint inventorship, **10:44, 10:46**
 Judgments, **7:52**
 Justification
 generally, **1:38**
 best mode, **7:45, 7:46**
 description requirement, above
 enablement, **7:4, 7:21**
 historical development and, **7:5**
 Limitations and restrictions
 generally, **7:3**
 best mode, **7:46, 7:51, 7:54, 7:57**
 description, **7:33**
 description requirements, **7:38**
 enablement, **7:3, 7:18, 7:23, 7:26**
 Lower courts, **7:45**
 Mechanical arts, **7:9, 7:24, 7:25**
 Method of making, **7:10-7:12**
 Mode. Best mode, above
 New-matter prohibition, relation to,
 7:31
 Nomenclature, **7:37, 7:38**

INDEX

DISCLOSURE—Cont'd

- Non-obviousness
 - generally, **7:18**
 - Graham v. John Deere, **9:19**
 - secondary considerations, **9:51, 9:54**
 - timeliness, Section 102, **9:22**
- Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:80**
- Notice and knowledge
 - generally, **7:54, 7:56**
 - single-embodiment, below
- Ordinary skill in the art, **7:52**
- Original application, **7:24**
- Over-breadth, **7:24**
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) (this index)
- Policy justification
 - description requirement, above
 - public disclosure, **1:37, 1:38**
- Possession, generally, **7:2**
- Priority (this index)
- Private knowledge, **7:17**
- Processes, **5:19, 5:21**
- Production details, **7:52, 7:53**
- Qualifications, **7:14, 7:18**
- Real party in interest, **7:54**
- Reasonable vs. undue experimentation, **7:20**
- Reference
 - best mode, **7:52**
 - description requirements, **7:37, 7:43**
 - enablement, **7:12, 7:18**
- Reissue of patent, **16:81**
- Rejection of application, **7:1, 7:9, 7:14, 7:25**
- Related information, **7:52, 7:53**
- Research and development, **7:5**
- Reversal, **7:14**
- Reverse engineering, **7:50**
- Routine details, **7:52**
- Secrecy, **7:55**
- Section 103, **7:18, 7:25**
- Section 119, **7:56**
- Section 120, **7:56**
- Single-embodiment
 - generally, **7:6-7:22**
 - adequate utility, relation to, **7:14**

DISCLOSURE—Cont'd

- Single-embodiment—Cont'd
 - background knowledge
 - generally, **7:15-7:19**
 - incorporation by reference, **7:19**
 - private knowledge, **7:17**
 - Section 103, relation to, **7:18**
 - target audience, **7:16**
 - biological deposits, **7:22**
 - biological starting materials, **7:11**
 - brand names, **7:12**
 - case decisions, claimed configuration, **7:9**
 - claimed configuration, **7:7-7:9**
 - knowledge. Background knowledge, above in this group
 - method of making, **7:10-7:12**
 - reasonable vs. undue experimentation, **7:20**
 - statutory basis, claimed configuration, **7:8**
 - time frame, **7:21, 7:22**
 - trademarks, **7:12**
 - use, **7:13, 7:14**
- Skill in the art
 - generally, **7:1**
 - best mode, **7:49**
 - description requirements, **7:37, 7:43**
 - enablement, **7:10, 7:15, 7:18, 7:25**
- Static physical configurations, **5:12, 5:14**
- Statutory basis, claimed configuration, **7:8**
- Statutory subject matter, **5:1**
- Subjective appreciation, **7:34, 7:39**
- Summary judgment, **7:52**
- Supreme Court, **7:14**
- Target audience, **7:16**
- Teaching (this index)
- Technological Scope of Infringement (this index)
- Teleflex, Inc. v. Ficos North America Corp., **7:52, 7:53**
- Tests and experiments
 - generally, **7:4**
 - adequate range of embodiment, **7:25**

DISCLOSURE—Cont'd

Tests and experiments—Cont'd
 best mode, **7:49**
 description requirements, **7:37**
 enablement, generally, **7:2, 7:4**
 single-embodiment, **7:9, 7:11, 7:20**
 Time and date, **7:29, 7:52, 7:56**
 Time frame, **7:21, 7:22, 7:56**
 Trademarks, **7:12**
 Trade Secrets (this index)
 Transco Products Inc. v. Performance
 Contracting, Inc., **7:56**
 Two-prong test for occurrence of
 violation, **7:49**
 Undue experimentation, **7:20**
 Unsettled issues. Best mode, above
 Use, **7:13, 7:14**
 Utility Requirement (this index)
 Well-settled issues, **7:47-7:50**

**DISCONTINUED SUBJECT
 MATTER**

Priority, **8:146**

DISCOVERY

Adequate utility, **6:18**
 Non-obviousness, **9:9, 9:39, 9:77**
 Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:61**
 Priority, **8:44, 8:109**
 Processes, **5:24**
 Technological scope, **13:56**

DISCRETION

Claims, **4:2**
 Non-statutory hybrid inventions,
5:49, 5:64
 Policy Justification (this index)
 Processes, **5:27**

DISCRIMINATION

Misuse of patent, **18:31**

**DISDAINFUL AMUSEMENT
 DEVICES**

Adequate utility, **6:15**

DISTRIBUTION OF OWNERSHIP

Joint inventorship, **10:29, 10:32**

DISTRICT COURT

Adequate disclosure, **7:52**

DISTRICT COURT—Cont'd

Appeal and review of PTO decisions
 consolidation in federal circuit,
2:37
 Court of Customs and Patent
 Appeals (CCPA), **2:36**
 Patent Act of 1839, **2:33**
 Claims (this index)
 History, **1:25**
 Non-obviousness, **9:3, 9:33**
 Priority, **8:66, 8:75**
 Processes, **5:30**

**DISTRICT COURT FOR DISTRICT
 OF COLUMBIA**

Non-obviousness, **9:33**
 Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:33

**DISTRICT COURT OF DISTRICT
 OF COLUMBIA**

Chief justice, **2:33**

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Circuit Court for District of Colum-
 bia Circuit, **9:33**
 Court of Appeals for District of
 Columbia, **10:64**
 District Court for District of Colum-
 bia, **9:33**
 District Court of District of Colum-
 bia, **2:33**
 Reforms of 1870, **2:34**

DNA SEQUENCES

Claims, **4:66**

DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS

Adequate commerciality, **14:17,**
14:29
 Claims (this index)
 History, **1:20, 1:22**
 Technological Scope of Infringement
 (this index)

**DOCTRINE OF INHERENT
 ANTICIPATION**

Non-obviousness, **9:77**

DOCTRINE OF LOST COUNTS

Non-obviousness, **9:35, 9:37**

INDEX

DOCTRINE OF OVERCLAIMING

Dominance and subservience, **4:64**

DOCTRINE OF SHOP RIGHT

Inventorship, **10:14, 10:17**

DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:72**

Priority, **8:73**

DOING BUSINESS

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:78**

Statutory subject matter, **5:2, 5:6**

DOLBEAR v. AMERICAN BELL TELEPHONE CO.

Processes, **5:24**

DOMESTIC APPLICATION

Geographic scope, **12:40**

DOMESTIC INFRINGEMENT

Geographic scope, **12:43**

DOMESTIC PRIORITY

Temporal scope, **11:23**

DOMESTIC SALE

Geographic scope, **12:21**

DOMINANCE

Adequate disclosure, **7:24, 7:46**

Adequate utility, **6:6**

Claims (this index)

Non-obviousness, **9:73**

DONATION TO PUBLIC

Correction of inventorship, **10:67**

DOUBLE PATENTING

Anticipation, lack of, **8:28**

Designs, **5:46**

History, **1:24**

Non-obviousness, **9:36, 9:83**

DOUBT, RULE OF

Congress, **2:9**

DOUGLAS v. U.S.

Adequate commerciality, **14:55**

DRAWINGS

Adequate utility, **7:5, 7:9**

Claims, **4:2**

DRAWINGS—Cont'd

Examination of Original Application
(this index)

Non-obviousness, **9:42**

Priority, **8:74**

DRUG PRICE COMPETITION AND PRICE RESTORATION ACT OF 1984

Adequate Commerciality (this index)

DRUG PRODUCTS

Temporal scope, **11:46-11:49**

DRUGS

Processes, **5:39**

DUAL USE

Indirect infringement, **15:18**

DUE COURSE

Non-obviousness, **9:28, 9:29**

DUE PROCESS

Priority, **8:73**

Reexamination, **16:127**

DUPLICATE APPLICATIONS

Joint inventorship, **10:45**

DUPLICATE RESEARCH

Policy justification, **1:42**

DUPLICATES

Copies and Duplicates (this index)

DUPLICATING

Adequate utility, **7:20, 7:22**

DUPLICATION

Adequate utility, **6:3**

DWIGHT & LLOYD SINTERING CO. v. GREENWALT

Estoppel, defense to patent infringement,
24:11

DYNACORE HOLDINGS CORP. v. U.S. PHILIPS CORP.

Indirect infringement, **15:16**

EARLY CATEGORIES OF ESTOPPELS

Generally, **24:5**

ECOLOGY

Static physical configurations, **5:18**

ECONOMIC COSTS

Adequate utility, **6:4, 6:10**

ECONOMIC JUSTIFICATIONS

Temporal scope, **11:18**

ECONOMICS

Computer-related inventions, **5:41**

History, **1:2, 1:18**

Inventorship, **10:3, 10:14**

Joint inventorship, **10:52**

Non-obviousness, **9:10, 9:38, 9:39, 9:43**

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:83, 5:84**

Policy Justification (this index)

Priority, **8:36**

Processes, **5:38**

Static physical configurations, **5:14, 5:15, 5:18**

Utility requirement, **6:2, 6:10**

EDUCATION LEVEL

Non-obviousness, **9:50**

EFFECTIVE ABANDONMENT

Joint inventorship, **10:52**

EFFECTIVE CONTROL

Adequate utility, **7:3**

EFFECTIVE FILING DATE

Adequate disclosure, **7:52**

Anticipation, lack of, **8:22**

Non-obviousness, **9:83**

Prior inventor, prior-user rights, **22:23**

Priority, **8:176**

Temporal scope, **11:30, 11:35**

EFFECTIVELY PLACED ON FILE

Adequate disclosure, **7:56**

EFFECTIVENESS

Adequate utility, **6:12**

E.I. DUPONT DE NEMOURS AND CO. v. MONSANTO CO.

Adequate commerciality, **14:36**

18-MONTH PUBLICATION

Temporal Scope of Infringement (this index)

1883 TEXT OF PARIS CONVENTION

Prior inventor, prior-user rights, **22:9**

ELECTION

Non-obviousness, **9:78**

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:35**

ELECTRICAL ARTS

Adequate utility, **6:19, 7:25**

Claims, **4:65**

Non-obviousness, **9:70, 9:76**

Priority, **8:48**

Processes, **5:21**

Static physical configurations, **5:8**

ELECTRIC STORAGE BATTERY CO. v. SHIMADZU

Priority, **8:102**

ELECTRONICS INDUSTRY

Claims, **4:81**

Static physical configurations, **5:8**

ELEMENT-BY-ELEMENT INQUIRY

Technological scope, **13:73**

ELEMENTS OF EQUITABLE ESTOPPEL

Generally, **24:7**

ELEMENTS PER SE

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:74**

ELEVENTH AMENDMENT

History, **1:14**

ELI LILLY AND CO. v. MEDTRONIC, INC.

Adequate commerciality, **14:65, 14:69-14:71**

EMBODIMENTS

Adequate commerciality, **14:42**

Adequate disclosure. Disclosure (this index)

Adequate utility, **6:14**

Anticipation, lack of, **8:13**

INDEX

EMBODIMENTS—Cont'd

- Claims (this index)
- Designs, **5:46**
- Disclosure (this index)
- Geographic scope, **12:24, 12:44**
- Inventorship, **10:12**
- Joint inventorship, **10:40**
- Priority, **8:44, 8:55**
- Processes, **5:21, 5:22**
- Reissue of patent, **16:119**

EMBREX, INC. v. SERVICE ENGINEERING CORP.

- Adequate commerciality, **14:59**

EMOTIONAL THOUGHT

- Processes, **5:26**

EMPLOYMENT

- Adequate disclosure, **7:54**
- Adequate utility, **7:51**
- Contracts and agreements, **1:16**
- Correction of inventorship, **10:59, 10:67**
- History, **1:16, 1:19**
- Inventorship (this index)
- Joint inventorship, **10:25, 10:39**
- Non-Obviousness (this index)
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:22**
- Policy justification, **1:34**
- Priority, **8:67, 8:71**

ENABLEMENT

- Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)
- Description requirement, **7:34-7:39**
- Disclosure (this index)

EN BANC

- Claims, **4:74, 4:93**
- Non-obviousness, **9:74, 9:85**
- Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:76**
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:36, 2:43**
- Technological scope, **13:31-13:33**

ENCOMPASSED TERRITORY

- Geographic scope, **12:11-12:14**

ENERCON GMBH v.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COM'N

- Adequate commerciality, **14:39, 14:40**

ENFORCEMENT

- Adequate utility, **6:19**
- History, **1:14, 1:18, 1:24**
- Inventorship, **10:17**
- Joint inventorship, **10:29**
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:7, 2:13, 2:21**
- Policy justification, **1:31**
- Processes, **5:39**

ENGINEERING PROCESSES

- Static physical configurations, **5:14**

ENGINES

- Statutory Subject Matter (this index)

ENGLISH LAW AND DOCTRINES

- Adequate disclosure, **7:46**
- Claims, **4:2**
- History (this index)
- Inventorship, **10:2**
- Joint inventorship, **10:53**
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:1, 2:4, 2:7, 2:16**
- Processes, **5:21**
- Static physical configurations, **5:9**

ENTREPRENEURS

- Inventorship, **10:14**

ENVISIONED INVENTIONS

- Adequate disclosure, **7:34**

ENZO BIOCHEM, INC. v. GEN-PROBE INC.

- Adequate utility, **7:9, 7:37, 7:39**

EQUIPMENT

- Policy justification, **1:34, 1:39**

EQUITABLE ESTOPPEL

- Elements, **24:7**
- Historical development, **24:6**

EQUITABLE LIMITATIONS

- History, **1:22**

EQUITY

Technological scope, **13:20, 13:61**

EQUIVALENTS, DOCTRINE OF

Doctrine of Equivalents (this index)

ERIE RAILROAD V. TOMPKINS

Historical origins of patent grant,
1:13.30

ERROR

Mistake and Error (this index)

ESCROW

Invalidity, **17:40**

ESTERS

Temporal scope, **11:47**

ESTOPPEL

Generally, **24:1-24:32**

A.C. Aukerman Co. v. R.I. Chaides
Const. Co., **24:17**

Advanced Hydraulics, Inc. v. Otis
Elevator Co., **24:13**

Basic definition, **24:4**

Basic rule, **24:23**

Case law

A.C. Aukerman Co. v. R.I. Chaides
Const. Co., **24:17**

Advanced Hydraulics, Inc. v. Otis
Elevator co., defense to patent
infringement, **24:13**

Continental Coatings Corporation
v. Metco, Inc., defense to
patent infringement, **24:12**

Dwight & Lloyd Sintering Co. v.
Greenwalt, defense to patent
infringement, **24:11**

examples of court decisions in
1982, **24:10-24:14**

Wyeth v. Stone, early law, **24:9**

Categories of estoppels, **24:5**

Communication from patent owner
generally, **24:25**

delay, **24:26**

litigation, **24:27**

silence, **24:26**

threat, **24:26**

Conduct, historical development,
24:6

ESTOPPEL—Cont'd

Continental Coatings Corporation v.
Metco, Inc., **24:12**

Court decisions in 1982, examples,
24:10-24:14

Defense to patent infringement
generally, **24:8**

Advanced Hydraulics, Inc. v. Otis
Elevator co., **24:13**

Continental Coatings Corporation
v. Metco, Inc., **24:12**

court decisions in 1982, examples,
24:10-24:14

Dwight & Lloyd Sintering Co. v.
Greenwalt, **24:11**

early law, **24:9**

Federal Circuit developments,
24:15-24:18

historical development, **24:8-24:18**

Wyeth v. Stone, **24:9**

Definition, **24:4**

Delay, communication from patent
owner, **24:26**

Dwight & Lloyd Sintering Co. v.
Greenwalt, defense to patent
infringement, **24:11**

Early categories of estoppels, **24:5**

Elements of equitable estoppel, **24:7**

Equitable estoppel

elements, **24:7**

historical development, **24:6**

Estoppels in pais, **24:5**

Federal Circuit developments

A.C. Aukerman Co. v. R.I. Chaides
Const. Co., **24:17**

defense to patent infringement,
24:15-24:18

early decisions, **24:16**

subsequent developments, **24:18**

Fraud distinguished, **24:22**

Historical development

conduct, **24:6**

defense to patent infringement,
24:8-24:18

early categories of estoppels, **24:5**

equitable estoppel, **24:6**

Federal Circuit developments,
24:15-24:18

In pais estoppels, **24:5**

INDEX

ESTOPPEL—Cont'd

- Invalidity (this index)
- Laches distinguished, **24:21**
- Litigation, communication from patent owner, **24:27**
- Material prejudice, **24:29**
- Patent infringement, defense, **24:8-24:18**
- Policy justification
 - generally, **24:20**
 - fraud distinguished, **24:22**
 - laches distinguished, **24:21**
- Priority, **8:86**
- Reexamination, **16:127, 16:135**
- Reliance, **24:28**
- Remedies, impact of estoppel, **24:32**
- Silence, communication from patent owner, **24:26**
- Specific issues
 - communication from patent owner, **24:25-24:27**
 - impact on remedies, **24:32**
 - material prejudice, **24:29**
 - proof issues, **24:30**
 - reliance, **24:28**
 - unclean hands, **24:31**
- Technological Scope of Infringement (this index)
- Threat, communication from patent owner, **24:26**
- Unclean hands, **24:31**
- Wyeth v. Stone, defense to patent infringement, **24:9**

ESTOPPELS IN PAIS

- Early categories of estoppels, **24:5**

ETHICAL ISSUES

- Static physical configurations, **5:18**

EUROPE

- Claims, **4:80**
- History, **1:2**
- Non-obviousness, **9:5**
- Policy justification, **1:43**

EUROPEAN PATENT CONVENTION (EPC)

- Adequate utility, **6:3**
- Claims, **4:73**

EUROPEAN PATENT

CONVENTION (EPC)—Cont'd

- Inventorship, **10:17**
- Non-obviousness, **9:38**
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:11, 2:13**
- Processes, **5:39**
- Statutory subject matter, **5:4**

EUROPEAN PATENT OFFICE

- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:11**

EUROPEAN PATENT SYSTEMS

- Congress, **2:11**

EUROPEAN UNION

- Static physical configurations, **5:18**

EVANS v. EATON

- Claims, **4:2**

EVIDENCE

- Adequate commerciality, **14:6, 14:15, 14:16**
- Adequate disclosure. Disclosure (this index)
- Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)
- Claims (this index)
- Correction of inventorship, **10:58, 10:60**
- Examination of Original Application (this index)
- Indirect Infringement (this index)
- Inventorship, **10:14**
- Non-Obviousness (this index)
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:28, 2:39, 2:43**
- Presumptions (this index)
- Priority (this index)
- Static physical configurations, **5:17**
- Utility Requirement (this index)

EXACT CLAIM LANGUAGE

- Priority, **8:259**

EXAMINATION

- Application
 - Examination of Application (this index)
 - Examination of Original Application (this index)

EXAMINATION—Cont'd

- Claims (this index)
- Correction (this index)
- Ex Parte Examination (this index)
- Original application. Examination of Original Application (this index)
- Patent Act of 1836, **2:17**
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), generally, **2:2**
- Reexamination (this index)

EXAMINATION OF APPLICATION

- Claims, **4:3**
- Correction of inventorship, **10:58**
- Initial examination, **2:10**
- Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:69, 5:85**
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), generally, **2:27**

EXAMINATION OF ORIGINAL APPLICATION

- Amendment of application
 - response and reexamination, below
- Claims
 - response and reexamination, below
- Continuation Application (this index)
- Continuation-In-Part-Application (this index)
- Disclosure
 - Continuation Application (this index)
 - response and reexamination, below
- Fees
 - filing fee, below
- Issuance of Patent (this index)
- Late-Claiming (this index)
- Merits of application, examination of.
 - Examination of original applications, above
- Modification. Change and modification, above
- New matter
 - response and reexamination, below
- Parent application
 - Continuation Practice (this index)
- Pending applications
 - adequate utility, **7:28**
 - Continuance Practice (this index)

EXAMINATION OF ORIGINAL APPLICATION—Cont'd

- Reexamination. Response and reexamination, below
- Reference
 - Continuation Practice (this index)
- Rejection of Application (this index)
- Response and reexamination
 - amendments
 - disclosure, below in this group
 - late claiming, below in this group
 - new matter. Disclosure, below in this group
 - Late-Claiming (this index)
- Same subject matter. Continuation Practice (this index)
- Specification
 - response and reexamination, above
- Validity
 - Continuance Practice (this index)
 - response and reexamination, above

EXAMINATION OF PATENT

- Adequate utility, **6:13**
- Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, generally, **2:26**

EXAMINATION PROCESS

- Processes, **5:30**

EXAMINER

- Adequate disclosure, **7:9**
- Computer-related inventions, **5:53**
- Examination of Original Application (this index) (this index)
- Joint inventorship, **10:46**
- Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:48, 5:64, 5:68**
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:22, 2:26**

EXAMINERS-IN-CHIEF

- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:22**

EXAMINING CLERK

- Generally, **2:20**

EXAMINING CORPS

- Generally, **2:22**

INDEX

EXAMINING CORPS—Cont'd

- Non-obviousness, **9:78**
- Non-statutory hybrid inventions,
5:56, 5:72, 5:83
- Processes, **5:38**

EXCEPTIONS, EXCLUSIONS, AND EXEMPTIONS

- Adequate Commerciality (this index)
- Adequate disclosure, **7:3, 7:22, 7:25**
- Adequate utility, **6:5**
- Anticipation, lack of, **8:1, 8:14, 8:21**
- Claims (this index)
- Computer-related inventions, **5:42, 5:45**
- Correction of inventorship, **10:61**
- History, **1:2, 1:7**
- Inventorship, **10:8**
- Joint inventorship, **10:31, 10:33**
- Medical and diagnostic procedures, section 287(c) defense, **20:21**
- Non-Obviousness (this index)
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:12**
- Priority, **8:34, 8:38, 8:39, 8:54**
- Processes (this index)
- Static Physical Configurations (this index)
- Statutory subject matter, **5:1, 5:4-5:6, 5:12, 5:27**
- Statutory Subject Matter (this index)

EXCESSIVE ROYALTIES

- Misuse of patent, **18:30**

EXCESS OVER STATE OF THE ART

- Joint inventorship, **10:33**

EXCLUSIVE CONTROL

- Adequate utility, **7:20**
- Priority, **8:242-8:244**

EXCLUSIVE POWER

- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:7**
- Processes, **5:21**

EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS

- Adequate commerciality, **14:42**
- Adequate disclosure, **7:22**

EXCLUSIVE RIGHTS—Cont'd

- History, **1:2**
- Indirect infringement, **15:7, 15:18**
- Inventorship, **10:2**
- Non-obviousness, **9:60**
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:1**
- Static physical configurations, **5:15**

EXCLUSIVITY

- Adequate commerciality, **14:12**
- Policy justification, **1:38**

EXCUSE

- Justification (this index)

EXECUTIVE AUTHORITY

- Congress (this index)

EXECUTIVE BRANCH

- History, **1:18, 1:25**
- Non-obviousness, **9:82**
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) (this index)
- Priority, **8:34**

EXHAUSTION

- Implied-in-law license compared, **19:33**
- Prior inventor, prior-user rights, extension by exhaustion, **22:26**

EXPANDED POST-GRANT REVIEW

- Processes, **5:35**

EX PARTE ALLEN

- Static physical configurations, **5:17**

EX PARTE CONTEXT

- Adequate utility, **7:20**

EX PARTE DESORMEAUX

- Joint inventorship, **10:46**

EX PARTE DETERMINATION

- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:29, 2:34**

EX PARTE EXAMINATION

- Generally, **2:12, 2:18, 2:38**
- Adequate disclosure, **7:21, 7:31**
- Claims, **4:94**
- Static physical configurations, **5:17**

EX PARTE GILDERDALE

Joint inventorship, **10:46**

EX PARTE MARKUSH

Claims, **4:100**

EX PARTE McNABB

Processes, **5:27**

EX PARTE NATURE

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:6

EX PARTE PROCEEDINGS

Examination of Original Application
(this index)

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:13, 2:17, 2:18

Priority, **8:69**

Reexamination, **16:123**

EX PARTE PROSECUTION

Adequate disclosure, **7:41**

Claims, **4:87, 4:89**

Priority, **8:73**

EX PARTE READ

Processes, **5:27**

EX PARTE REJECTION

Non-obviousness, **9:37**

EX PARTE ROBBINS

Non-obviousness, **9:36, 9:37**

EXPECTATIONS

Adequate utility, **6:19**

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:61**

Policy justification, **1:37, 1:39**

Statutory subject matter, **5:4**

EXPERIENCE

Non-obviousness, **9:50**

EXPERIMENTS

Adequate Commerciality (this index)

Tests and Experiments (this index)

EXPERTS

Claims, **4:47**

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:37, 2:39

Priority, **8:58, 8:69**

EXPIRATION

Adequate commerciality, **14:61**

Adequate disclosure, **7:5**

Reissue of patent, **16:114**

EXPRESS CONTRACT

Inventorship, **10:17**

**EXPRESS INSTRUCTIONS OR
ADVICE**

Non-obviousness, **9:66**

EXPRESSIONS

Claims (this index)

EXPRESS LICENSE

Licenses and Permits (this index)

EXPRESS WAIVER

History, **1:14**

EXTENSION

Examination of Original Application
(this index)

Priority, **8:242-8:244**

Temporal Scope of Infringement (this
index)

EXTENSION BY EXHAUSTION

Prior inventor, prior-user rights,
22:26

EXTREME POVERTY

Priority, **8:67**

EXTRINSIC SOURCES

Claims (this index)

FACSIMILE MACHINES

Processes, **5:24**

FACT-FINDING

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:39

FACT-INTENSIVE INQUIRY

Adequate utility, **7:11**

FACTS

Claims (this index)

Technological scope, **13:29**

FACTUAL COMPILATIONS

Static physical configurations, **5:11**

Statutory subject matter, **5:42**

INDEX

FACTUAL DATA

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:55**

Static physical configurations, **5:11**

FACTUAL DETERMINATION

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:19

FACTUAL EQUIVALENCY

Technological Scope of Infringement
(this index)

FACTUAL STATEMENTS

Adequate utility, **6:13**

FAIRNESS, LACK OF

Non-obviousness, **9:28**

FALSE ASSERTIONS

Adequate utility, **6:13**

FALSE SCHEME

Adequate utility, **6:15**

FAMILY AND RELATIVES

Priority, **8:71**

FAR EAST

History, **1:2**

Policy justification, **1:43**

FARMERS AND FARMING

Static physical configurations, **5:14**,
5:18

FAROUDJA LABORATORIES, INC. v. DWIN ELECTRONICS, INC.

Adequate commerciality, **14:36**

FEDERAL CIRCUIT

AUTHORITIES PRIOR TO 1995

Non-obviousness, biotechnical
processes, Section 103(B), **9:80**

FEDERAL CIRCUIT COURTS

Adequate Commerciality (this index)

Adequate utility, **6:18**, **6:19**

Anticipation, lack of, **8:10**, **8:29**,
8:31

Claims (this index)

Computer-related inventions, **5:42**,
5:44, **5:53**

FEDERAL CIRCUIT COURTS

—Cont'd

Correction of inventorship, **10:67**,
10:68

Court of Customs and Patent Appeals
(CCPA) for Federal Circuit,
2:21

Defenses, express and implied licenses,
19:24

Disclosure (this index)

Estoppel (this index)

Examination of Original Application
(this index)

History, **1:25**

Inventorship, **10:7**, **10:11**

Joint inventorship, **10:27**

Misuse of patent, **18:22**, **18:24**

Non-Obviousness (this index)

Non-Statutory Hybrid Inventions
(this index)

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO)
(this index)

Priority, **8:62**, **8:66**, **8:69**

Processes, **5:30**

Reissue of patent, **16:93-16:96**

Static physical configurations, **5:11**,
5:15

Technological Scope of Infringement
(this index)

Utility Requirement (this index)

FEDERAL CODE

Defenses, **17:8**

FEDERAL COURTS

History, **1:14**

Inventorship, **10:6**

FEDERAL JUDICIARY

See also specific Courts in the index

Policy justification, **1:31**

FEDERAL JURISDICTION

History, **1:14**

FEDERAL REGISTER

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:27, **2:28**

**FEDERAL RULES OF APPELLATE
PROCEDURE (FRAP)**

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:39

**FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL
PROCEDURE (FRCP)**

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:38, 2:39

**FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE
(FRE)**

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:38, 2:39

**FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION
(FTC)**

Adequate commerciality, **14:58**
Adequate utility, **6:5**

**FEDERAL TRADEMARK
REGISTRATION**

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:20

FEDERAL TRIAL COURTS

Claims, **4:80**
History, **1:25**
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:43

FEES

Examination of Original Application
(this index)
Processes, **5:39**

**FESTO CORP. v. SHOKETSU
KINZOKU KOGYO
KABUSHIKI CO., LTD.**

Technological Scope of Infringement
(this index)

FIERS v. REVEL

Adequate utility, **7:9**

FILING APPLICATION

Anticipation, lack of, **8:21**
Disclosure (this index)
Effective Filing Date (this index)
History, **1:14, 1:19, 1:25**
Inventorship (this index)
Joint Inventorship (this index)
Non-Obviousness (this index)

FILING APPLICATION—Cont'd

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
generally, **2:13**
Priority (this index)
Static physical configurations, **5:17**
Temporal Scope of Infringement (this
index)

FILING CIVIL ACTION

Processes, **5:39**

FILING DATE OF APPLICATION

America Invents Act, first to file,
7:32
Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)
Designs, **5:46**
Examination of Original Application
(this index)
History, **1:19**
Joint inventorship, **10:40**
Non-Obviousness (this index)
Utility Requirement (this index)

FILING FEES

Examination of Original Application
(this index)

FILING FOREIGN APPLICATIONS

Adequate utility, **7:18**

FILING JOINT APPLICATION

Joint inventorship, **10:21, 10:35,**
10:36, 10:41

**FILING LATER DUPLICATE
APPLICATION**

Joint inventorship, **10:45**

FILING PETITION

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:33

FILING SUITS

History, **1:14**
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:7

FINAL DETERMINATION

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:7, 2:29

FINALITY

Claims, **4:19**

INDEX

FINANCIAL DATA

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:83**

FINANCIAL REVENUE

Processes, **5:39**

FINANCIAL REWARDS

Processes, **5:39**

FINE ARTS

Statutory subject matter, **5:1**

FIRST APPLICATION

Examination of Original Application
(this index)

Joint inventorship, **10:40, 10:46**

Priority, **8:126**

FIRST CIRCUIT

Non-obviousness, **9:60**

FIRST CONGRESS

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:4

FIRST-GENERATION HYBRIDS

Static physical configurations, **5:14**

FIRST-IN-RIGHT

Priority, **8:33**

FIRST INVENTOR

Adequate utility, **7:28**

Correction of inventorship, **10:67**

History, **1:18**

Joint inventorship, **10:19**

Priority, **8:41, 8:64**

FIRST INVENTORSHIP

Correction, **10:67**

FIRST POSSESSOR

Inventorship, **10:4**

FIRST SALE

Defenses, implied-in-law licenses,
19:38-19:40

FIRST-TO-FILE

Adequate disclosure, **7:32**

America Invents Act, **7:32**

Non-obviousness, **9:38**

Prior inventor, prior-user rights, cor-
rection, **22:4**

FIRST-TO-FILE—Cont'd

Priority, **8:35, 8:36**

FIRST-TO-INVENT

Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)

Inventorship, **10:11, 10:12**

Priority, **8:35, 8:36, 8:56**

FIXED CONDITIONS

History, **1:4**

FIXED PRICES

History, **1:4**

FIXED STANDARD

Utility requirement, **6:18**

FIXED TERMS

History, **1:4**

FLORIDA PREPAID

POSTSECONDARY

EDUCATION EXPENSE BD., v.

COLLEGE SAVINGS BANK

Generally, **1:14**

FOLLOW-ON DEVELOPMENTS

Non-obviousness, **9:46**

FOLLOW-ON PATENTS

Non-obviousness, **9:11**

FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT (FDCA)

Adequate Commerciality (this index)

FOOD AND DRUG

ADMINISTRATION (FDA)

Adequate Commerciality (this index)

Adequate utility, **6:5, 6:12**

Processes, **5:39**

FOODSTUFFS

Statutory Subject Matter (this index)

FORECLOSURE OF RIGHTS

Correction of inventorship, **10:67**

FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Generally, **8:273-8:280**

Adequate commerciality, **14:33**

Adequate utility

generally, **6:5, 7:5**

filing application, **7:18**

FOREIGN COUNTRIES—Cont'd

Adequate utility—Cont'd
 Germany, **6:3, 6:6**
 Anticipation, lack of, **8:1**
 Applications
 adequate utility, **7:18**
 identical or related applicants, **8:277**
 Priority (this index)
 Claims, **4:8, 4:9, 4:63**
 Definitions, **8:278**
 Designs, **5:46**
 Disparate onset, generally, **8:273-8:280**
 Examination of Original Application (this index)
 Geographic Scope of Infringement (this index)
 Historical development, **8:275**
 History, **1:2, 1:14, 1:25**
 Identical or related applicants, **8:277**
 Inventorship, **10:7, 10:17**
 Modern law, **8:276-8:279**
 National effect, **8:280**
 Non-obviousness
 generally, **9:11**
 secret prior art, **9:28, 9:38, 9:42**
 timeliness, Section 102, **9:38**
 Office of Legislative and International Affairs (OLIA), **2:22**
 Paragraph 102(d), generally, **8:273-8:280**
 Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:1, 2:11, 2:13, 2:22**
 Patented defined, **8:278**
 Policy justification, **1:29, 1:32, 1:43, 8:274**
 Priority (this index)
 Prior-user rights internationally, **22:7-22:12**
 Processes, **5:39**
 Related applicants, **8:277**
 Same invention, **8:279**
 Static physical configurations, **5:18**
 Statutory subject matter, **5:4, 5:5**

FORENSICS

Adequate utility, **6:18, 6:19**

FORESEEABILITY

Adequate disclosure, **7:26, 7:53**
 Adequate utility, **6:1, 6:6, 6:16**

FORMAL REJECTIONS AND RESTRICTIONS

Technological scope, **13:107**

FORMAL RULEMAKING

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:28**

FORMAL STATEMENT

Claims, **4:2**

FORMULAE

Statutory subject matter, **5:24**

FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT

Adequate utility, **6:5**
 History, **1:14**
 Static physical configurations, **5:17**

FRAME OF REFERENCE

Adequate disclosure, **7:43**

FRANCE

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), generally, **2:13**

FRAUD

Adequate utility, **6:5, 6:15**
 Correction of inventorship, **10:57**
 Estoppel distinguished, **24:22**
 Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:16**

FRCP

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (FRCP) (this index)

FRE

Federal Rules of Evidence (FRE) (this index)

FREE ACCESS

Non-obviousness, **9:9**

FREE COMMERCE

History, **1:3**

FREEDOM OF ACTION OF LICENSEE

Misuse of Patent (this index)

INDEX

FREEDOM OF CONTRACT

Defenses, express and implied licenses, **19:31**

FREEMAN-WALTER-ABELE TEST

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:81**

FREE TRADE

History, **1:7**

FRIVOLOUS

Adequate utility, **6:15**

FULL AND FAIR OPPORTUNITY TO LITIGATE

Invalidity, **17:31**

FUNCTION, WAY, RESULT

Technological scope, **13:66**

FUNCTIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

Statutory subject matter, **5:12**

FUNCTIONAL SIMILARITY

Non-obviousness, **9:73**

FUNDS AND FUNDING

Policy justification, **1:34**

FUNGI

Static physical configurations, **5:14**

FUTURE ACTS AND MATTERS

Adequate disclosure
generally, **7:5, 7:14**
best mode, **7:53**
combinations, control of, **7:24**
research, **6:6**
species, **7:24**
technology, **6:19**
use-based view, **6:20**
Inventorship, **10:7**
Justification, **1:35**
Policy justification, **1:42**
Statutory subject matter, **5:5**
Utility Requirement (this index)

GAMBLING

Adequate utility, **6:5, 6:15**

GANSKE/FRISK COMPROMISE

Processes, **5:39**

GARDINER v. HOWE

Geographic scope, **12:4**

GASES

Static physical configurations, **5:9**

GATT

General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) (this index)

GELS

Static physical configurations, **5:9**

GENERAL AGREEMENT

Processes, **5:29**

GENERAL AGREEMENT ON TARIFFS AND TRADE (GATT)

Adequate commerciality, **14:10, 14:33, 14:46**
Prior inventor, prior-user rights, **22:11**
Priority, **8:107**

GENERAL CONFIGURATION

Non-obviousness, **9:67**

GENERAL PATENT ACT OF 1870

Processes, **5:21**

GENERIC CLAIMING

Adequate utility, **7:26**

GENERIC INVENTIONS

Adequate utility, **7:23**
Priority, **8:48, 8:53**

GENERIC PHARMACEUTICALS

Adequate commerciality, **14:63, 14:64**
Indirect infringement, **15:18**

GENE SEQUENCING, ART OF

Adequate utility, **7:14**

GENE THERAPY TREATMENTS

Processes, **5:39**

GENETICALLY MODIFIED HUMANS

Adequate utility, **6:5**

GENETIC ENGINEERING

Static physical configurations, **5:17**

GENETIC STRUCTURE

Adequate utility, **6:6**

GENOME STRUCTURE

Adequate commerciality, **14:58**

GENOMIC INVENTIONS

Adequate commerciality, **14:51**

Adequate utility, **6:19**

GENOMIC MATERIAL

Adequate commerciality, **14:58**

GENUS AND SPECIE

Adequate disclosure, **7:24, 7:26**

Adequate utility, **6:6**

Anticipation, lack of, **8:13**

Claims, **4:4, 4:63, 4:65**

Priority, **8:47, 8:80**

GEOGRAPHIC LIMITATIONS

Priority (this index)

**GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE OF
INFRINGEMENT**

Generally, **12:1 et seq.**

Accused activity. Situs of accused activity, below

Amendments, **12:29, 12:36-12:38**

Apparatus, **12:25, 12:33**

Applications, **12:40**

Asserted patent, **12:41**

Brown v. Duchesne, **12:4**

Case law

Brown v. Duchesne, **12:4**

Deepsouth Packing Co. v. Laitram Corp., **12:7, 12:28**

early cases, **12:27**

Gardiner v. Howe, **12:4**

Claimed embodiments, export of, **12:24**

Claimed process, **12:25**

Contributing to practice of invention.

Cross-border transactions, below

Controlled spaces, **12:12**

Cross-border transactions

generally, **12:22-12:43**

exports. Outgoing transactions, below this group

incoming transactions

generally, **12:31-12:43**

**GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE OF
INFRINGEMENT—Cont'd**

Cross-border transactions—Cont'd

incoming transactions—Cont'd
foreign inducement of infringing acts inside United States, **12:43**

products made by patented apparatus, **12:33**

products made by patented process

generally, **12:34-12:42**

domestic application, special issues, **12:40**

history, **12:35**

issue date of asserted patent, relation to, **12:41**

presumption as to making, **12:42**

Process Patents Amendment

Act of 1988, **12:36-**

12:38

product defined, **12:37**

products made by process defined, **12:38**

Section 271(g), generally, **12:34-12:42**

special issues, **12:39-12:41**

products produced with patented materials, **12:32**

Section 271(g). Products made by patented process, above this subgroup

outgoing transactions

generally, **12:23-12:30**

apparatus to perform claimed process, export of, **12:25**

claimed embodiments, export of, **12:24**

contributing to foreign practice of invention, Section 271(f), generally, **12:26-12:30**

Deepsouth Packing Co. v. Laitram Corp., **12:28**

early cases, **12:27**

foreign practice of invention, inducing and contributing to, Section 271(f), generally, **12:26-12:30**

INDEX

GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE OF INFRINGEMENT—Cont'd

Cross-border transactions—Cont'd
outgoing transactions—Cont'd
inducing and contributing to
foreign practice of invention,
Section 271(f), generally,
12:26-12:30
Patent Law Amendments Act of
1984, **12:29**
Section 271(f), generally, **12:26-
12:30**
special issues, **12:30**
products made by patented process.
Incoming transactions, above
this group
Section 271(g). Incoming transactions,
above this group
Decisions, **12:3, 12:5**
Deepsouth Packing Co. v. Laitram
Corp., **12:7, 12:28**
Definitions
product, **12:37**
products made by process, **12:38**
Domestic application, **12:40**
Domestic infringement, **12:43**
Domestic sale, requirement of, **12:21**
Early cases, **12:27**
Embodiments, **12:24, 12:44**
Encompassed territory, **12:11-12:14**
Exports. Cross-border transactions,
above
Foreign inducement of infringing acts
inside United States, **12:43**
Foreign practice of invention, inducing
and contributing to, Section
271(f). Cross-border transactions,
above
Gardiner v. Howe, **12:4**
Historical development
generally, **12:2-12:9**
Brown v. Duchesne, **12:4**
controlled spaces, **12:12**
cross-border transactions, **12:35**
Deepsouth Packing Co. v. Laitram
Corp., **12:7**
early decisions, **12:3**
early statutes, **12:3**

GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE OF INFRINGEMENT—Cont'd

Historical development—Cont'd
encompassed territory, **12:11-
12:14**
Gardiner v. Howe, **12:4**
outer space, **12:9, 12:14**
Patent Act of 1870 and subsequent
decisions, **12:5**
Patent Act of 1952 and subsequent
developments, **12:6-12:9**
policy justification, **12:10**
registered vessels, **12:13**
section 105, **12:9**
Section 271(f), **12:7**
Section 271(g), **12:8**
Incoming transactions. Cross-border
transactions, above
Inducement. Cross-border transactions,
above
Infringement, **12:43**
Issue date of asserted patent, relation
to, **12:41**
Justification of policy, **12:10**
Offer, situs of, **12:20**
Offer for sale, **12:19-12:21**
Outer space, **12:9, 12:14**
Outgoing transactions. Cross-border
transactions, above
Patent Act of 1870 and subsequent
decisions, **12:5**
Patent Act of 1952 and subsequent
developments, **12:6-12:9**
Patent Law Amendments Act of
1984, **12:29**
Performance, **12:25**
Policy justification, **12:10**
Presumption as to making, **12:42**
Process, claimed, **12:25**
Process Patents Amendment Act of
1988, **12:36-12:38**
Product defined, **12:37**
Production, **12:32**
Products made by patented process.
Cross-border transactions, above
Registered vessels, **12:13**
Sale, **12:19-12:21**
Section 105, **12:9**

**GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE OF
INFRINGEMENT—Cont'd**

- Section 271(f)
 - cross-border transactions, above
 - historical development, **12:7**
- Section 271(g)
 - cross-border transactions, above
 - historical development, **12:8**
- Situs of accused activity
 - generally, **12:15-12:21**
 - domestic sale, requirement of, **12:21**
 - making, **12:16**
 - offer, situs of, **12:20**
 - offer for sale, **12:19-12:21**
 - sale, **12:18-12:21**
 - using, **12:17**
- Special issues, **12:30, 12:39-12:41**
- Statutes
 - early statutes, **12:3**
 - Patent Act of 1870 and subsequent decisions, **12:5**
 - Patent Law Amendments Act of 1984, **12:29**
 - Process Patents Amendment Act of 1988, **12:36-12:38**
- Temporal scope, **11:4**
- Time, **12:41**
- Transitory embodiments, **12:44**
- Vessels, **12:13**

GERMANY

- Adequate utility, **6:3, 6:6, 7:24**
- Anticipation, lack of, **8:22**
- Claims, **4:8**
- History, **1:2**

**GIANT POWDER CO. v.
CALIFORNIA POWDER
WORKS**

- Reissue of patent, **16:24**

GILLMAN v. STERN

- Anticipation, lack of, **8:21**

**GLAXO INC. v. NOVOPHARM
LTD.**

- Adequate disclosure, **7:54**

**GOLDEN BLOUNT, INC. v.
ROBERT H. PETERSON CO.**

- Indirect infringement, **15:22**

GOOD FAITH

- Adequate disclosure, **7:57**

GOOD POLICY

- Adequate utility, **6:15**

GOODYEAR v. DAY

- Reissue of patent, **16:23**

GOTTSCHALK v. BENSON

- Computer-related inventions, **5:44**
- Processes, **5:24**

GRACE PERIOD

- Examination of Original Application (this index)
- History, **1:19**
- Priority (this index)

GRAFTING

- Static physical configurations, **5:14**

GRAHAM v. JOHN DEERE

- Non-Obviousness (this index)

GRAMMATICAL STRUCTURE

- Claims, **4:87**

GRANT-BACK CLAUSES

- Misuse of patent, **18:39**

GRANT v. RAYMOND

- Adequate utility, **7:31**
- Reissue of patent, **16:5**

GRAPHICAL ILLUSTRATION

- Technological scope, **13:78**

**GRAVER TANK & MFG. CO. v.
LINDE AIR PRODUCTS CO.**

- Technological scope, **13:12**

GREAT BRITAIN

- Anticipation, lack of, **8:1**

GREAT SEAL

- History, **1:1**

GREECE

- History, **1:2**

INDEX

GROUP RESEARCH

Joint inventorship, **10:39, 10:40**

GUNTER v. STREAM

Priority, **8:45**

HALLIBURTON OIL WELL

CEMENTING CO. v. WALKER

Claims, **4:86**

Processes, **5:27**

HANDLING APPLICATIONS

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:19

HANSEATIC LEAGUE, MERCHANTS OF

History, **1:4**

HARDWARE

Computer-Related Inventions (this
index)

HARMFUL

Adequate utility, **6:15**

HARMONIZATION

Priority, **8:36**

HASS-HENZE DOCTRINE

Non-obviousness, **9:73**

HATCH-WAXMAN ACT

Adequate Commerciality (this index)

HAZELTINE RESEARCH INC. v. BRENNER

Non-obviousness, **9:33, 9:37, 9:38**

HEALTH CARE

Processes, **5:39**

Static physical configurations, **5:18**

HEARING

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:21, 2:28

HEARSAY

Non-obviousness, **9:59**

HEATON-PENINSULAR

BUTTON-FASTENER CO. v.

EUREKA SPECIALTY CO.

Indirect infringement, **15:5**

Misuse of patent, **18:10**

HEIMLICH MANEUVER

Processes, **5:39**

HENRY III

History, **1:4**

HENRY v. A.B. DICK

Indirect infringement, **15:5-15:7,
15:10**

Misuse of patent, **18:11**

HIGH TECH MEDICAL

INSTRUMENTATION, INC. v. NEW IMAGE INDUSTRIES, INC.

Adequate commerciality, **14:30**

HILTON DAVIS CHEMICAL CO. v. WARNER-JENKINSON CO., INC.

Technological Scope of Infringement
(this index)

HISTORY

Generally, **1:2-1:25**

Abandonment, **1:20, 1:21, 8:267-
8:269**

Adequate Commerciality (this index)

Adequate disclosure, **7:4, 7:5, 7:31,
7:36, 7:57**

Adequate utility, **6:15**

Administrative law, **1:17, 1:25**

Amendment of application, **1:18**

Amendment of statutes, **1:14, 1:20,
1:25**

America Invents Act, **1:26**

Anticipation, **1:22**

Antitrusts, **1:7**

Appeal and review, **1:19, 1:21, 1:24**

Application, **1:18**

Aristotle, **1:2**

Article I, Section 8, clause 8, **1:10**

Assignment, **1:16**

Associations, **1:4**

Athenaeus, **1:2**

Authors, **1:11**

Best mode requirement as defense,
1:26

Bifurcated treatment, **1:5**

Case law, **1:5, 1:17, 1:20, 1:21**

Causes of action, **1:14**

HISTORY—Cont'd

Central claiming, **1:21, 1:23**
 Change and modification, **1:16, 1:23, 1:25**
 Circuit courts, **1:24**
 Claims (this index)
 Closed letters (*litterae clausae*), **1:1**
 Colonial period, **1:9**
 Commerce Clause, **1:15**
 Commercialization, **1:3**
 Commissioners, **1:19, 1:21**
 Common law, **1:3, 1:5, 1:7, 1:17**
 Common usage, withdrawal from, **1:15**
 Competition, **1:4, 1:7, 1:14**
 Conditions, fixed, **1:4**
 Congress (this index)
 Consent, **1:14**
 Constitutional period, generally, **1:16-1:25**
 Constitutional provision, generally, **1:10-1:15**
 Construction and interpretation, generally, **1:7**
 Contracts and agreements, **1:16, 1:25**
 Contributory infringement, **1:23**
 Copyright, **1:10, 1:11, 1:15**
 Corporations, **1:4**
 Correction, **10:55-10:58**
 Costs and expenses, **1:3, 1:7**
 Court of Appeals for Federal Circuit (CAFC), **1:25**
 Court of Customs and Patent Appeals (CCPA), **1:24**
 Courts, generally, **1:18**
 Darcy v. Allen, **1:4, 1:5**
 Demand, **1:3**
 Disclaimers, **1:24**
 Disclosure, **1:18**
 District court, **1:25**
 Doctrine of Equivalents, **1:20, 1:22**
 Double patenting, **1:24**
 Early English precedents, generally, **1:3-1:7**
 Economics, **1:2, 1:18**
 1870, developments up to, **1:20**
 Eleventh amendment, **1:14**
 Eligibility, **1:18**

HISTORY—Cont'd

Employment, **1:19**
 Employment agreements, **1:16**
 Enforcement, **1:14, 1:18, 1:24**
 England, generally, **1:1**
 Equitable limitations, **1:22**
 Europe, **1:2**
 Examination of Original Applications (this index)
 Exceptions, **1:2, 1:7**
 Exclusive rights, **1:2**
 Executive Branch, **1:18, 1:25**
 Express waiver, **1:14**
 Far East, **1:2**
 Federal Circuit Court, **1:25**
 Federal courts, generally, **1:14**
 Federal jurisdiction, **1:14**
 Federal trial courts, **1:25**
 Filing application, **1:14, 1:19, 1:25**
 Filing date of application, **1:19**
 Filing suits, **1:14**
 First inventor, **1:18**
 Fixed prices, terms, and conditions, **1:4**
 Florida Prepaid Postsecondary Education Expense Bd., v. College Savings Bank, **1:14**
 Foreign countries, **1:2, 1:14, 1:25, 8:275**
 Fourteenth amendment, **1:14**
 Free commerce, **1:3**
 Free trade, **1:7**
 Geographic Scope of Infringement (this index)
 Germany, **1:2**
 Grace period, **1:19**
 Grant of rights, generally, **1:1**
 Great Seal, **1:1**
 Greece, **1:2**
 Hanseatic League, merchants of, **1:4**
 Henry III, **1:4**
 House of Commons, **1:6**
 House of Lords, **1:6**
 Hume, **1:4**
 Immunity, **1:7**
 Implied waiver, **1:14**
 Incentives, **1:18**
 Indirect Infringement (this index)

INDEX

HISTORY—Cont'd

- Individuals, **1:4**
- Industrial development, **1:25**
- Infringement (this index)
- Initial statutes and development up to 1836, **1:18**
- Interference, **1:18, 1:20**
- International agreements, **1:26**
- International trade agreements, **1:25**
- Invalidity, **17:35**
- Inventorship, **10:2-10:4, 10:14**
- Issuance of letters patent, **1:4**
- Issuance of patent, **1:18, 1:25**
- Joint inventorship, **10:38-10:40, 10:48**
- Judicial remedies, **1:18**
- Judicial review, **1:19**
- Judiciary, **1:17**
- Jurisdiction, **1:14**
- Laches, **1:21**
- Land patent, **1:1**
- Law-making sources in U.S. patent laws, **1:17**
- Letters patent, **1:1, 1:3-1:5, 1:7**
- Licenses and permits, **1:4**
- Limitations and restrictions, generally, **1:1**
- Literal meaning, **1:21**
- Litterae clausae, **1:1**
- Litterae patentēs, **1:1**
- Lord Coke, **1:5**
- Lower courts, **1:20**
- Macaulay, **1:4**
- Magna Carta, **1:4**
- Manufacturing, **1:6**
- Means for claim language, **1:23**
- Medical and Diagnostic Procedures (this index)
- Misuse of Patent (this index)
- Monopoly, **1:4, 1:7**
- Municipalities, **1:4**
- Negotiators, **1:14**
- New, control of, **1:18**
- New arts, **1:5**
- New enterprises, **1:4**
- New matter, **1:20**
- 1952, subsequent developments to, generally, **1:22**

HISTORY—Cont'd

- 1982, subsequent developments to, generally, **1:24**
- Non-Obviousness (this index)
- Non-Statutory Hybrid Inventions (this index)
- Not before known or used, **1:18**
- Notice and knowledge, **1:18, 1:19**
- Novelty, **1:19**
- Official pronouncements, **1:1**
- Open communications, **1:1**
- Open letters (litterae patentēs), **1:1**
- Open sovereign letters, **1:1**
- Ordinary skill in the art, **1:23**
- Original inventors, **1:18**
- Parallel structure, **1:11**
- Pareden v. Terminal Railway of Alabama State Docks Dept., **1:14**
- Parliament, **1:4**
- Patentability, **1:18, 1:19, 1:24**
- Patent Act of 1790 (this index)
- Patent Act of 1793, **1:18, 1:19**
- Patent Act of 1836, **1:19, 1:20**
- Patent Act of 1839, **1:19, 1:20**
- Patent Act of 1870, **1:15**
- Patent Act of 1870 and related events, **1:21**
- Patent Act of 1952, **1:23, 1:24**
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), generally, **1:17**
- Patent Department of Department of State, **1:18**
- Patent document, **1:1**
- Patent instrument, **1:1**
- Patent Remedy Act, **1:14**
- Peripheral claiming, **1:21, 1:22, 1:25**
- Petitions, **1:5**
- Pre-emption, **1:13**
- Preemption of state competition laws, **1:13.10**
- Pre-existing technology, **1:7**
- Price control, **1:3**
- Prior Inventor, Prior-User Rights (this index)
- Priority (this index)
- Private communications, **1:1**
- Private remedies, **1:18**
- Privileges, **1:4, 1:12**

HISTORY—Cont'd

- Privy seal, **1:1**
- Processes, **5:30**
- Public, **1:18**
- Public domain, **1:15**
- Qualifications, **1:21**
- Regional federal circuit courts of appeal, **1:24**
- Registration, **1:18, 1:19**
- Reissuance of application, **1:18**
- Reissue of Patent (this index)
- Royal letters patent, **1:4, 1:5**
- Royal signet, **1:1**
- Science, **1:11**
- Sealed, **1:1**
- Section 102 timewise priority, **1:26**
- Services, special, **1:4**
- 1623, inventions prior to, **1:5**
- Six Year Limitation (this index)
- Sole license, **1:4**
- South Carolina, **1:9**
- Sovereign immunity of state, **1:14**
- Special privileges, **1:4**
- Special services, **1:4**
- State acts, **1:9, 1:13**
- State courts, **1:14**
- State-owned entities, **1:14**
- Static physical configurations, **5:14, 5:15**
- Statute of Monopolies, **1:6**
- Statutes, generally, **1:8, 1:13.80, 1:14**
- Statutory Subject Matter (this index)
- Subjective abandonment, **1:21**
- Subject matter jurisdiction, **1:14**
- Subsequent developments, **1:13.80**
- Suppression, and concealment, **1:20**
- Supreme Court, generally, **1:14-1:24**
- Symbols, **1:15**
- Taxation, **1:3**
- Technological Scope of Infringement (this index)
- Temporal Scope of Infringement (this index)
- Terminal disclaimers, **1:24**
- The Clothworkers of Ipswich, **1:5**
- 35 USC, **1:23**
- 37 CFR, **1:20**
- Time and date, **1:5, 1:18**

HISTORY—Cont'd

- Title, assignment of, **1:16**
- Title to land, **1:1**
- Towns, **1:4**
- Trademarks, **1:14, 1:15**
- Trade secrets, **1:15**
- Underlying purpose, **1:12**
- Unfair competition, **1:14**
- United States, developments in, generally, **1:8-1:25**
- Useful arts, **1:12**
- Utility Requirement (this index)
- Validity, **1:5, 1:18, 1:24**
- Void, **1:4, 1:5**
- Voluntary waiver, **1:14**
- Waiver of sovereign immunity, **1:14**
- Withdrawal, **1:4, 1:15**
- Written communications, generally, **1:1**

HOFFHEINS v. BRAND

- Reissue of patent, **16:16**

HOFFMAN-LA-ROCHE, INC. v. ZENITH LABORATORIES, INC.

- Adequate commerciality, **14:62**

HOLDING

- Adequate commerciality, **14:23**

HOTCHKISS v. GREENWOOD

- Non-obviousness, **9:3, 9:15**

HOUSE OF COMMONS

- History, **1:6**

HOUSE OF LORDS

- History, **1:6**

HOW-TO-MAKE

- Adequate utility, **7:10**

HOW-TO-USE

- Adequate utility, **7:14**
- Anticipation, lack of, **8:22**

HUGHES AIRCRAFT CO. v. U.S.

- Adequate commerciality, **14:27**

INDEX

HUGHES AIRCRAFT CO. v.NATIONAL SEMICONDUCTOR CORP.

Six-year limitation, section 286
defense, **21:15**

HUMANS

Computer-related inventions, **5:41**
Processes, **5:24, 5:25, 5:27**
Static physical configurations, **5:11, 5:12**

HUME

History, **1:4**

HYBRID CLAIMING

Claims (this index)

HYBRID COMBINATIONS

Static physical configurations, **5:8**

HYBRIDS

Non-obviousness, **9:77**
Non-Statutory Hybrid Inventions
(this index)
Static physical configurations, **5:11, 5:14**
Statutory subject matter, **5:1**

HYPOTHETICAL CLAIM

Technological scope, **13:83**

I CLAIM

Policy justification and historical
development, **4:4**

IDEAS OF OTHERS

Inventorship, **10:11**

IDENTICAL APPLICANTS

Foreign countries, **8:277**

IDENTICAL DESCRIPTION

Non-Obviousness (this index)

IDENTICAL SUBJECT MATTER

Adequate commerciality, **14:12**

IDENTICAL TO TECHNOLOGICAL CONFIGURATION

Claims, **4:71**

IDENTITY AND IDENTIFICATION

Claims (this index)

IDENTITY AND IDENTIFICATION —Cont'd

Temporal scope, **11:46-11:49**

ILLUSTRATIONS

Priority, **8:39**

ILLUSTRATIVE DIAGRAM

Claims, **4:57, 4:59**
Technological scope, **13:72**

IMAGINATIVE THOUGHT

Processes, **5:26**

IMMATERIAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Joint inventorship, **10:32**

IMMUNITY

Adequate commerciality, **14:7, 14:68, 14:72**
History, **1:7, 1:14**
Medical and diagnostic procedures,
section 287(c) defense, **20:19, 20:20**
Processes, **5:30**

IMPLICIT

Anticipation, lack of, **8:23**

IMPLIED LICENSE

Licenses and Permits (this index)

IMPLIED TRANSFERS

Joint inventorship, **10:25**

IMPLIED WAIVER

History, **1:14**

IMPORTS AND EXPORTS

Adequate commerciality, **14:23, 14:24**
Defenses, implied-in-law licenses,
19:44
Geographic Scope of Infringement
(this index)
Static physical configurations, **5:14**

IMPROVEMENTS

Adequate utility, **7:5**
Claims, **4:2**
Correction of inventorship, **10:68**
Joint inventorship, **10:25, 10:31**
Non-obviousness, **9:3, 9:59**
Priority, **8:236**

IMPROVEMENTS—Cont'd

Processes, **5:21**
Statutory Subject Matter (this index)
Technological scope, **13:74**

INACTIVITY

Priority, **8:67**

INADVERTENT MISTAKE AND ERROR

Correction of inventorship, **10:57, 10:67**
Reissue of patent, **16:25**
Technological scope, **13:57, 13:58**

INCENTIVE

Adequate utility, **6:19**
History, **1:18**
Justification, **1:39, 1:41**
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:61, 5:74**
Policy justification, **1:35, 1:41**
Processes, **5:39**
Static physical configurations, **5:14**
Statutory subject matter, **5:4, 5:5**

INCHOATE RIGHTS

Inventorship, **10:7, 10:8**

INCOMING TRANSACTIONS

Geographic Scope of Infringement (this index)

INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

Adequate disclosure, **7:19**
Claims, **4:102**

INCORPORATION OF OUTSIDE SOURCES

Anticipation, lack of, **8:30-8:32**

IND

Investigational New Drug (IND) (this index)

INDEMNIFICATION

Indirect infringement, **15:17**

INDEPENDENT CLAIMS

Multiple claims in single patent, **4:102**

INDEPENDENT INVENTIONS

Adequate commerciality, **14:11, 14:15**

INDEPENDENT WORK

Joint inventorship, **10:23**

INDETERMINATE EVENTS

Priority, **8:127-8:129**

INDIRECT INFRINGEMENT

Generally, **15:1 et seq.**
Actively induces infringement, **15:15**
Aiding and abetting, **15:17**
Appeal and review, **15:8, 15:9, 15:12, 15:22**
Aro Mfg. Co. v. Convertible Top Replacement Co., **15:11, 15:12, 15:20, 15:24**
Bauer v. O'Donnell, **15:6, 15:7**
Blake v. Smith, **15:4**
Carbice Corporation of America v. American Patents Development Corporation, **15:8-15:10**
Circumstantial evidence, **15:15, 15:16, 15:22, 15:24**
Circumstantial inference, **15:15**
Clayton Antitrust Act, **15:6**
Combination claims, **15:5**
Community Patent Convention, **15:14**
Construction and interpretation, **15:2, 15:4**
Contract limitations, **15:14**
Contributory infringement
generally, **15:1 et seq., 15:21-15:24**
historical development, generally, **15:2**
Patent Act of 1952, **15:10**
policy justification, **15:14**
section 271(b), **15:17, 15:18**
section 271(c), **15:21-15:24**
Corporate officers and directors, **15:19**
Damages, **15:15, 15:16, 15:22**
Dawson Chemical Co. v. Rohm and Haas Co., **15:12, 15:13**
Direct infringement, **15:16, 15:17, 15:22, 15:24**

INDEX

INDIRECT INFRINGEMENT

—Cont'd

- Directing or permitting conduct of another, **15:14**
- Disclosure, **15:4**
- Dual use, **15:18**
- Dynacore Holdings Corp. v. U.S. Philips Corp., **15:16**
- Evidence
 - generally, **15:4**
 - circumstantial evidence, **15:24**
 - circumstantial proof, **15:15, 15:22**
 - direct infringement, **15:16, 15:22**
 - inducing infringement, section 271(b), **15:16**
- Exceptions, **15:4**
- Exclusive rights, **15:7, 15:18**
- Generic pharmaceuticals, **15:18**
- Golden Blount, Inc. v. Robert H. Peterson Co., **15:22**
- Heaton-Peninsular Button-Fastener Co. v. Eureka Specialty Co., **15:5, 18:10**
- Henry v. A.B. Dick, **15:5-15:7, 15:10, 18:11**
- Historical development
 - generally, **15:2-15:13**
 - Aro Mfg. Co. v. Convertible Top Replacement Co., **15:11**
 - Blake v. Smith, **15:4**
 - Carbice Corporation of America v. American Patents Development Corporation, **15:8**
 - Dawson Chemical Co. v. Rohm and Haas Co., **15:12**
 - early history, **15:3**
 - Henry v. A.B. Dick, **15:5**
 - judicial reaction, **15:6-15:9**
 - license restrictions, **15:5**
 - Mercoid Corp. v. Mid-Continent Inv. Co., **15:9**
 - misuse, development of, **15:6**
 - Motion Picture Patents Co. v. Universal Film Mfg. Co., **15:7**
 - Patent Act of 1952, **15:10**
 - Patent Misuse Reform Act of 1988, **15:13**
 - section 271(b), (c), (d) of Patent Act of 1952, **15:10**

INDIRECT INFRINGEMENT

—Cont'd

- Historical development—Cont'd
 - unpatented supplies, **15:5**
 - Wallace v. Holmes, **15:4**
- Indemnification, **15:17**
- Inducing infringement
 - generally, **15:1 et seq., 15:15-15:20**
 - adequate commerciality, **14:79**
 - dual use, **15:18**
 - evidence of direct infringement, **15:16**
 - intent requirement, **15:20**
 - knowledge requirement, **15:20**
 - Patent Act of 1952, **15:10**
 - policy justification, **15:14**
 - required knowledge and intent, **15:20**
 - required relationship to direct infringement, **15:17, 15:19**
 - sale of materials suited to dual use, **15:18**
 - section 271(b), generally, **15:15-15:20**
- Inferences, **15:22, 15:23**
- Injunctions, **15:18**
- Intent, **15:15, 15:17, 15:20, 15:24**
- Joint tortfeasors, generally, **15:1 et seq.**
- Judgments, policy, **15:23**
- Judicial interpretation, **15:2**
- Judicial reaction, **15:6-15:9**
- Jury trial, **15:4**
- Keplinger v. DeYoung, **15:3**
- Knowledge requirement, **15:24**
- Leeds & Catlin Co. v. Victor Talking Machine Co., **15:5, 15:9**
- License restrictions, **15:5**
- Limitations and restrictions
 - generally, **15:1**
 - historical development, **15:5-15:7, 15:10**
 - inducing infringement, **15:17**
 - policy justification, **15:14**
- Making, generally, **15:1 et seq.**
- Mercoid Corp. v. Mid-Continent Inv. Co., **15:9-15:12, 15:24**

INDIRECT INFRINGEMENT

—Cont'd

- Method claims, **15:5**
- Misuse of patent, **18:4-18:6, 18:8-18:11**
- Morgan Envelope Co. v. Albany Perforated Wrapping Paper Co., **15:6, 15:8, 18:6**
- Motion Picture Patents Co. v. Universal Film Mfg. Co., **15:7, 15:8**
- New trial, **15:4**
- Notice and knowledge, **15:15, 15:20, 15:24**
- Offers to sell, generally, **15:1 et seq.**
- Patent Act of 1952, **15:2, 15:10, 15:11**
- Patent Misuse Reform Act of 1988, **15:13**
- Peripheral claim theory, **15:5**
- Perishables, **15:6**
- Persons acting in concert, **15:14**
- Pharmaceuticals, **15:18**
- Policy judgments, **15:23**
- Policy justification, **15:14**
- Price, **15:6**
- Raising questions, **15:24**
- Restatement of Torts, 2nd, **15:14**
- Sales, generally, **15:1 et seq.**
- Section 271(a), generally, **15:1 et seq.**
- Section 271(b)
 - generally, **15:10**
 - inducing infringement, above
- Section 271(c), **15:10, 15:21-15:24**
- Section 271(d), **15:10**
- Six-year limitation, section 286 defense, **21:22**
- Staple versus non-staple article of commerce, **15:23**
- Stockholders, **15:19**
- Supplies, unpatented, **15:5**
- Third persons, **15:14**
- Use, generally, **15:1 et seq.**
- Wallace v. Holmes, **15:4, 15:16, 18:5**

INDIVIDUALS

- Generally, **1:4**

INDIVIDUAL SPECIMENS

- Static physical configurations, **5:17**

INDUCEMENT

- Geographic Scope of Infringement (this index)
- Indirect Infringement (this index)

INDUSTRIAL APPARATUS

- Static physical configurations, **5:8**

INDUSTRIAL APPLICATION

- Adequate utility, **6:8**

INDUSTRIAL COMMERCE

- Inventorship, **10:15**

INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT

- History, **1:25**

INDUSTRIAL KNOWLEDGE

- Priority, **8:33**

INDUSTRIAL PROCESSES

- Generally, **5:19**
- Statutory subject matter, **5:20-5:23**

INDUSTRIAL SOPHISTICATION

- Priority, **8:44**

INDUSTRY LIMITATIONS

- Misuse of patent, **18:34**

INFERENCE

- Adequate disclosure, **7:1**
- Anticipation, lack of, **8:16, 8:32**
- Indirect infringement, **15:22, 15:23**
- Non-Obviousness (this index)
- Priority, **8:65**

INFERIOR

- Adequate utility, **6:3**

INFERIOR PARTY

- Priority, **8:34**

INFORMAL RULEMAKING

- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:28**

INFORMATION TECHNOLOGIES

- Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:81**

INFRINGEMENT

- Adequate Commerciality (this index)

INDEX

INFRINGEMENT—Cont'd

- Anticipation, lack of, **8:18, 8:29**
- Claims (this index)
- Correction of inventorship, **10:58**
- Defense of noninfringement.
 - Noninfringement (this index)
- Designs, **5:46**
- Determinations, **4:73**
- Estoppel as defense to patent infringement, **24:8-24:18**
- Examination of Original Application (this index)
- Geographic scope. Geographic Scope of Infringement (this index)
- History, generally, **1:7**
- Indirect Infringement (this index)
- Joint inventorship, **10:29, 10:32, 10:49, 10:52**
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), generally, **2:6**
- Policy justification, **1:29, 1:38**
- Prior Inventor, Prior-User Rights (this index)
- Priority, **8:44, 8:65**
- Processes, **5:23, 5:26, 5:30, 5:39**
- Six-Year Limitation (this index)
- Static physical configurations, **5:7**
- Statutory subject matter, **5:5**
- Technological scope. Technological Scope of Infringement (this index)
- Temporal scope. Temporal Scope of Infringement (this index)
- Utility Requirement (this index)

INHERENCY

- Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)
- Computer-related inventions, **5:53**
- Inventorship, **10:4**
- Non-Obviousness (this index)
- Priority, **8:49, 8:230**

IN HAEC VERBA

- Adequate disclosure, **7:42**

IN IPSIS VERBIS

- Adequate utility, **7:37**

IN LIGHT OF ALL THE CIRCUMSTANCES

- Non-obviousness, **9:58**

IN PAIS ESTOPPELS

- Early categories of estoppels, **24:5**

IN PARI MATERIA

- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:3**

IN PUBLIC USE

- Priority (this index)

IN RE ABELE

- Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:76, 5:81**

IN RE ABRAMS

- Computer-related inventions, **5:45**

IN RE ALAPPAT

- Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:76, 5:85**

IN RE ALBRECHT

- Non-obviousness, **9:75**

IN RE AMOS

- Reissue of patent, **16:96**

IN RE BARKER

- Adequate utility, **7:30, 7:31**
- Subjective appreciation, **7:34**

IN RE BARTFELD

- Non-obviousness, **9:48**

IN RE BASS

- Non-obviousness, **9:37, 9:38**

IN RE BERNHART

- Computer-related inventions, **5:53**

IN RE BORST

- Priority, **8:165**

IN RE BRANDSTADTLER

- Adequate utility, **7:9**

IN RE BRESLOW

- Static physical configurations, **5:9**

IN RE BROUWER

- Claims, **4:77, 4:78, 4:80**
- Non-obviousness, **9:85**

IN RE DILLON

- Non-obviousness, **9:74, 9:76**

IN RE DONALDSON CO.

Claims, **4:6, 4:80, 4:93**

IN RE DURDEN

Claims, **4:76-4:78, 4:80, 4:81**

Non-obviousness, **9:80, 9:82, 9:84, 9:85**

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:84**

IN RE FOSTER

Non-obviousness, **9:26, 9:27**

IN RE FREEMAN

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:76, 5:81**

IN RE GAY

Adequate utility, **7:9**

IN RE GLASS

Adequate utility, **7:18**

IN RE HAFNER

Anticipation, lack of, **8:22**

IN RE HASS

Non-obviousness, **9:73**

IN RE HENZE

Non-obviousness, **9:73**

IN RE HERITAGE

Processes, **5:27**

IN RE HILMER

Priority, **8:121, 8:153**

IN RE HOUNSFIELDE

Reissue of patent, **16:94**

IN RE HOWARTH

Adequate utility, **7:18**

IN RE JOLY

Adequate utility, **6:17**

IN RE KIRK

Adequate utility, **6:17**

IN RE KUEHL

Non-obviousness, **9:79, 9:80**

IN RE LARSON

Non-obviousness, **9:79, 9:80, 9:82, 9:84-9:86**

IN RE LOWRY

Computer-related inventions, **5:42**

Static physical configurations, **5:11**

IN RE MILLER

Static physical configurations, **5:12**

IN RE MUSGRAVE

Processes, **5:26**

IN RE NOMIYA

Non-obviousness, **9:42**

IN RE OCHIAI

Claims, **4:77, 4:78, 4:80**

Non-obviousness, **9:85**

IN RE PALMQUIST

Non-obviousness, **9:25, 9:26**

IN RE PAPESCH

Claims, **4:82**

Non-obviousness, **9:73, 9:76**

IN RE PLEUDEMANN

Claims, **4:77**

Non-obviousness, **9:80, 9:85**

IN RE PRATER

Processes, **5:26**

IN RE SCHRADER

Processes, **5:30**

IN RE SHERWOOD

Adequate disclosure, **7:57**

IN RE SMITH

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:84**

IN RE SPONNOBLE

Non-obviousness, **9:68**

IN RE WALTER

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:76, 5:81**

IN RE WANDS

Adequate utility, **7:20**

IN RE WARMERDAM

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:78, 5:80**

Processes, **5:23**

INDEX

IN RE WEILER

Reissue of patent, **16:95**

IN RE WOOD

Non-obviousness, **9:18**

IN RE WRIGHT

Adequate utility, **7:25**

Non-obviousness, **9:66, 9:74**

IN RE ZIEGLER

Adequate utility, **6:18**

IN RE ZURKO

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:43

IN SITU PRODUCTION

Static physical configurations, **5:9**

IN THIS COUNTRY

Defined, **8:194**

IN VITRO

Adequate utility, **6:18**

INITIAL APPLICATION

Examination of Original Application
(this index)

Joint inventorship, **10:40**

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:13

INITIAL DETERMINATION

Priority, **8:44**

INITIAL EXAMINATION

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:10

INITIAL EXAMINATION OF APPLICATION

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:22

INITIAL FILING

Adequate utility, **7:41**

INITIAL INVENTION

Priority, **8:236**

INITIAL OCCUPANT

Defined, **10:4**

INITIAL PANEL DECISIONS

Laches, Federal Circuit decisions,
23:18

INITIAL PARTICIPANT

Joint inventorship, **10:34**

INITIAL PATENT

Non-obviousness, **9:11**

INITIAL REJECTION OF APPLICATION

Adequate utility, **6:13**

INITIAL TITLE

Inventorship (this index)

INJUNCTIONS

Adequate commerciality, **14:78**

Indirect infringement, **15:18**

Processes, **5:39**

INNOVATION

Justification, **1:40, 1:41**

INOPERATIVE DISCLOSURE

Anticipation, lack of, **8:22**

Non-obviousness, **9:19**

INSANITY

Priority, **8:67**

INSERT

Claims, **4:98**

INSPECTION

Adequate utility, **7:10, 7:11, 7:18**

Technological configuration, **9:71**

INSPIRATION

Non-obviousness, **9:41**

INSTRUCTIONS

Computer-related inventions, **5:41**

Non-obviousness, **9:66**

INSTRUCTIONS OF COMMISSIONER

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:26

INSTRUCTIONS TO JURY

Anticipation, lack of, **8:7**

Claims (this index)

Non-obviousness, **9:3**

INTELLECTUAL CREATOR

Inventorship, **10:14**

INTELLECTUAL PART

Inventorship, **10:12**

INTELLECTUAL POSSESSION

Adequate utility, **7:38**

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY AND COMMUNICATIONS OMNIBUS REFORM ACT OF 1999

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:22**

INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW AND RIGHTS

Adequate commerciality, **14:42**
Statutory subject matter, **5:5**

INTENT

Adequate commerciality, **14:14-14:17, 14:29, 14:79**
Claims, **4:2, 4:3, 4:31, 4:87**
Correction, **10:60**
Disclosure (this index)
Examination of Original Application (this index)
Indirect infringement, **15:15, 15:17, 15:20, 15:24**
Inventorship (this index)
Non-obviousness, **9:46**
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:20, 2:48**
Priority, **8:55, 8:58, 8:59, 8:254**
Processes, **5:30, 5:37**
Static physical configurations, **5:14, 5:15, 5:17**
Statutory subject matter, **5:1, 5:4, 5:6**
Utility Requirement (this index)

INTERESTED THIRD PARTIES

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:13**

INTERFERENCE

Generally, **2:29, 2:33**
Adequate utility, **7:41**
Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)
Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (BPAI) (this index)

INTERFERENCE—Cont'd

Claims, **4:9**
Computer-related inventions, **5:42**
Examination of Original Application (this index)
History, **1:18, 1:20**
Inventorship, **10:7**
Non-obviousness, **9:11, 9:35, 9:36**
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:83**
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), generally, **2:22**
Priority, **8:34, 8:38, 8:42, 8:48, 8:60, 8:65, 8:73**

INTERIM EXTENSIONS

Temporal scope, **11:44**

INTERIM SUPPLEMENTAL GUIDELINES

Claims, **4:89**

INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL

Static physical configurations, **5:15**

INTERNAL PROCEDURES

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:1, 2:19**
Processes, **5:29, 5:30**

INTERNAL SECRET PRIOR ART

Non-obviousness, **9:47**

INTERNATIONAL ACTS AND MATTERS

See also Foreign Countries (this index)
Adequate commerciality, **14:10, 14:46**
Anticipation, lack of, **8:1**
Defense, implied-in-law license, **19:44**
Designs, **5:46**
Examination of Original Application (this index)
General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) (this index)
History, **1:25, 1:26**
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:13, 2:22**
Policy justification, **1:29**
Priority (this index)
Static physical configurations, **5:18**

INDEX

INTERNATIONAL ACTS AND MATTERS—Cont'd

Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, Agreement on (TRIPs) (this index)

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR PROTECTION OF NEW VARIETIES OF PLANTS

Static physical configurations, **5:14**

INTERNATIONAL RECTIFIER CORP. v. IXYS CORP.

Technological scope, **13:59**

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION (ITC)

Adequate commerciality, **14:39, 14:40**

INTER PARTES ACTS AND MATTERS

Adequate utility, **7:20**

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:11, 2:13**

Priority, **8:34, 8:38**

Reexamination. Inter Partes Reexamination (this index)

INTER PARTES REEXAMINATION

Generally, **16:124**

Effect, **16:135**

Reissue of patent, **16:66**

INTERPRETIVE JUDGMENT

Processes, **5:26**

INTERPRETIVE MENTAL ACTS

Processes, **5:27**

INTERPRETIVE RULES

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:28, 2:48**

INTERRELATED COMPONENT PARTS

Static physical configurations, **5:8**

INTERVENTION

Adequate utility, **6:4, 6:10**

Examination of Original Application (this index)

Processes, **5:24**

INTERVENTION—Cont'd

Reexamination, **16:134**

Reissue of Patent (this index)

Statutory subject matter, **5:4**

INTRANSIGENT

Inventorship, **10:8**

INTRINSIC SOURCES

Claims (this index)

INVALIDITY

Generally, **17:1, 17:15-17:43**

Assignee estoppel, **17:42**

Assignor estoppel, **17:43**

Avoidance defense, **17:6**

Blonder-Tongue Laboratories, Inc. v. University of Illinois Foundation, **17:28-17:31**

Breach, licensee estoppel, **17:40**

Burdens of proof, **17:17**

Cardinal Chemical Co. v. Morton International, Inc., **17:24, 17:25**

Case law

estoppel by transfer of ownership, **17:36, 17:37**

mootness and order of resolution, **17:24, 17:25, 17:28-17:31**

Supreme Court decisions in early developments, **17:22**

Common law pleading, **17:7**

Consent decrees, prior, **17:41**

Considerations, mootness and order of resolution, **17:20**

Current statute, pleading under, **17:2-17:13**

Defenses, generally, **17:4-17:8, 17:15-17:43**

Early developments, mootness and order of resolution, **17:21-17:23**

Early history, licensee estoppel, **17:35**

Escrow, licensee estoppel, **17:40**

Estoppel by transfer of ownership generally, **17:33**

assignee estoppel, **17:42**

assignor estoppel, **17:43**

breach, **17:40**

consent decrees, prior, **17:41**

INVALIDITY—Cont'd

Estoppel by transfer of ownership
—Cont'd
early history, licensee estoppel, **17:35**
escrow, **17:40**
holding in *Lear, Inc. v. Adkins*, **17:37**
Lear, Inc. v. Adkins, **17:36, 17:37**
licensee estoppel, **17:34-17:41**
modern rule, **17:38-17:40**
prior consent decrees and settlements, **17:41**
recovery of royalties paid, **17:39**
settlements, prior, **17:41**
Federal code pleading, **17:8**
Full and fair opportunity to litigate, **17:31**
General pleading theory and current statute, **17:2-17:13**
Infringement actions, generally, **17:4**
Issue preclusion
generally, **17:26**
Blonder-Tongue Laboratories, Inc. v. University of Illinois Foundation, **17:28-17:31**
facts in case, **17:29**
full and fair opportunity to litigate, **17:31**
holding, **17:30**
subsequent decisions, **17:32**
traditional rule, **17:27**
Lear, Inc. v. Adkins, **17:36, 17:37**
Licensee estoppel, **17:34-17:41**
Lower court decisions, **17:23**
Modern pleading, **17:8**
Modern rule, estoppel by transfer of ownership, **17:38-17:40**
Mootness and order of resolution
generally, **17:19**
Cardinal Chemical Co. v. Morton International, Inc., **17:24**
considerations, **17:20**
early developments, **17:21-17:23**
issue preclusion, above
lower court decisions prior to 1982, **17:23**
subsequent developments, **17:25**

INVALIDITY—Cont'd

Mootness and order of resolution
—Cont'd
Supreme Court decisions in early developments, **17:22**
Negation defense, **17:6**
Orders. Mootness and order of resolution, above
Pleading
application to patent statute, **17:9-17:13**
common law pleading, **17:7**
current statute, **17:2-17:13**
defenses, generally, **17:4-17:8**
federal code pleading, **17:8**
general pleading theory and current statute, **17:2-17:13**
infringement actions, generally, **17:4**
modern pleading, **17:8**
negation vs. avoidance, **17:6**
prior art notice, **17:14**
prior statutes, **17:3, 17:10**
section 282, **17:11**
Presumption of validity
burdens of proof, **17:17**
defenses, generally, **17:16**
standard of proof, **17:18**
Prior art notice as defense, **17:14**
Prior consent decrees and settlements, **17:41**
Prior statutes, general pleading theory, **17:3, 17:10**
Recovery of royalties paid, **17:39**
Resolution. Mootness and order of resolution, above
Section 282, **17:11**
Settlements, prior, **17:41**
Standard of proof, **17:18**
Subsequent to *Blonder-Tongue Laboratories, Inc. v. University of Illinois Foundation*, **17:32**
Supreme Court decisions, early developments, **17:22**
Traditional rule, issue preclusion, **17:27**
Transfer. Estoppel by transfer of ownership, above

INDEX

INVENTIVE CONCEPT

Technological scope, **13:69**

INVENTIVE CONFIGURATION

Adequate disclosure, **7:39**

Inventorship, **10:12**

INVENTIVE CONTRIBUTION

Joint Inventorship (this index)

INVENTIVE ENTITIES

Correction of inventorship, **10:55**

Joint Inventorship (this index)

INVENTOR

Inventorship (this index)

INVENTORSHIP

Generally, **10:1 et seq.**

Abstract business entities, **10:9, 10:13, 10:17**

Adjustments, **10:18**

Age, **10:7**

Agents and agency, **10:13, 10:14, 10:17**

Application filing, **10:8, 10:10, 10:14, 10:17**

Assignment

generally, **10:7**

correction of inventorship, **10:59-10:61, 10:66, 10:67**

joint inventorship, **10:25, 10:39, 10:40**

proper inventorship rule, **10:8**

Author, **10:6, 10:16**

Blackstone's Commentaries, **10:4**

Bona fide disputes, **10:7**

Business entities, **10:1, 10:9, 10:13**

Business entities and employed inventors. Definition of inventor, below

Capital expenditures, **10:17**

Capital resources, **10:17**

Case law, **10:6, 10:7, 10:11**

Change and modification, **10:7, 10:14, 10:18, 10:45**

Collaborative research, **10:1, 10:15, 10:18**

Commercial use, **10:14**

Commissioned works, **10:16**

Common law, **10:14, 10:17, 10:47**

INVENTORSHIP—Cont'd

Concealment, **10:3**

Conception. Definition of inventor, below

Configuration, **10:12**

Congress, **10:2, 10:6, 10:7, 10:14**

Consent, **10:14**

Constitutional law, **10:2, 10:7**

Construction and interpretation, **10:12**

Contested cases, **10:7**

Continuous effort, **10:18**

Contracts and agreements, generally, **10:1**

Contribution, **10:11, 10:17**

Conveyance of title, **10:7, 10:14**

Cooperative research effort, **10:18**

Copyright, **10:6, 10:16-10:18, 10:53**

Corollaries, **10:6, 10:7, 10:13**

Correction (this index)

Costs and expenses, **10:17**

Damages, **10:8**

Death, **10:8**

Definition of invention, **10:11**

Definition of inventor

generally, **10:10-10:18**

business entities and employed inventors

generally, **10:13-10:18**

copyright contrasted, **10:16**

historical development, **10:14**

modern collaborative research, conflicts with, **10:15**

recent legislative adjustments, **10:18**

conception, generally, **10:11**

copyright, **10:16-10:18**

employed inventors. Business entities and employed inventors. above in this group

first-to-invent priority, partial analogy to, **10:11, 10:12**

initial title, generally, **10:11**

performance of act of invention, generally, **10:11**

Definitions

initial occupant, **10:4**

inventor, **10:16**

INVENTORSHIP—Cont'd

Doctrine of shop right, **10:14, 10:17**
 Economic justification, **10:3**
 Economic use, **10:14**
 Embodiment, **10:12**
 Employment
 generally, **10:7, 10:9**
 definition of inventor, **10:13**
 definition of inventor, above
 Enforcement, **10:17**
 English law, **10:2**
 Entrepreneurs, **10:14**
 European Patent Convention, **10:17**
 Evidence, **10:14**
 Exceptions, **10:8**
 Exclusive rights, **10:2**
 Express contract, **10:17**
 Federal Circuit, **10:7, 10:11**
 Federal courts, generally, **10:6**
 Filing application
 generally, **10:1, 10:8**
 definition of inventor, **10:10, 10:14, 10:17**
 First possessor, **10:4**
 First-to-invent priority, partial analogy to, **10:11, 10:12**
 Foreign countries, **10:7, 10:17**
 Future acts and matters, **10:7**
 Historical development, **10:14**
 History, **10:2-10:4**
 Ideas of others, **10:11**
 Implied license, **10:17**
 Inchoate patent rights, **10:7, 10:8**
 Industrial commerce, **10:15**
 Inherency, **10:4**
 Initial occupant defined, **10:4**
 Initial title
 generally, **10:4**
 definition of inventor, **10:14, 10:15**
 definition of inventor, above
 Intellectual creator, **10:14**
 Intellectual part, **10:12**
 Intent
 generally, **10:6**
 correction of inventorship, **10:57, 10:60, 10:65**
 inventorship, **10:6**

INVENTORSHIP—Cont'd

Intent—Cont'd
 joint inventorship, **10:25, 10:33, 10:40, 10:45**
 Interference, **10:7**
 Intransigent, **10:8**
 Inventive configuration, **10:12**
 Inventor. Definition of inventor, above
 Investments, **10:14**
 Irreparable damage, **10:8**
 Issuance of patent, **10:7**
 Joint Inventorship (this index)
 Joint ownership, **10:17**
 Justification, **10:2-10:4**
 Large business entities, **10:1**
 Legal ability, lack of, **10:8**
 Legislation, **10:18**
 Licenses and permits, **10:7, 10:17**
 Limitations and restrictions
 generally, **10:1, 10:2, 10:7, 10:8**
 definition of inventor, **10:11, 10:14**
 Majority, legal age of, **10:7**
 Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, **10:7**
 Marriage, **10:7**
 Mental acts and matters
 capacity, **10:7**
 creativity, **10:12, 10:13, 10:16, 10:17**
 definition of inventor, **10:12, 10:13, 10:16, 10:17**
 Mistake and error, **10:1**
 Modern collaborative research, conflicts with, **10:15**
 Multiple persons. Joint Inventorship (this index)
 Name and misnaming, **10:1**
 Named individual inventors, **10:18**
 Negotiations, **10:17**
 New creation, **10:4**
 Notice and knowledge, **10:12**
 Novelty, **10:14**
 Omissions, **10:12**
 Operation of law, generally, **10:1**
 Original inventor, **10:7, 10:9, 10:10**
 Partnerships, **10:14**
 Patentability, **10:7**

INDEX

INVENTORSHIP—Cont'd

- Patent Act of 1839, **10:14**
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
10:7, 10:8
- Payments, **10:14**
- Perfection, **10:8, 10:11**
- Personal property, **10:7**
- Policy justification, **10:2-10:4**
- Possession, **10:4**
- Preserving rights of parties, **10:8**
- Prior Inventor, Prior-User Rights (this index)
- Priority, **10:4, 10:11, 10:12**
- Prior user right, **10:14**
- Prior work, **10:18**
- Proper inventorship rule
 - generally, **10:5-10:9**
 - assignee, perfection of patent rights by, **10:8**
 - copyright compared, **10:6**
 - corollary rules, **10:7**
- Proper ownership, question of, **10:7**
- Property, general law of, **10:4**
- Property, law of, **10:14**
- Public, **10:3**
- Public use or on sale, **10:14**
- Qualifications
 - generally, **10:7, 10:8**
 - definition of inventor, **10:10, 10:16, 10:17**
- Receipt of title, **10:14, 10:17**
- Recent legislative adjustments, **10:18**
- Reduction to practice. Definition of invention, above
- Reissue of patent, **16:84**
- Research and development, **10:1, 10:15, 10:17, 10:18**
- Royalty payments, **10:14**
- Sanity, **10:7**
- Section 273 defense. Prior Inventor, Prior-User Rights (this index)
- Section 102, **10:18**
- Section 102(b), **10:14**
- Section 116, **10:18**
- Section 117, **10:8**
- Services, use of, **10:13**
- Services of others, **10:11**
- Setting aside, **10:7**

INVENTORSHIP—Cont'd

- 17 USC, Section 201(a), **10:6**
- Single-source profits, **10:3**
- Skills of the art, **10:12**
- Sole inventorship, **10:9**
- State law, **10:6**
- Superior priority of title, **10:4**
- Supreme Court, **10:7**
- Third persons, **10:11, 10:13, 10:18**
- 35 USC, Section 18, **10:8**
- 35 USC, Section 100, **10:10**
- 35 USC, Section 101, **10:7**
- 35 USC, Section 102(f), **10:7**
- 35 USC, Section 115, **10:7**
- 35 USC, Section 116, **10:10**
- 35 USC, Section 117, **10:8**
- 35 USC, Section 261, **10:7**
- Title and ownership, generally, **10:1**
- Trade secrets, **10:3**
- Transfers of Rights and Title (this index)
- Treatises, **10:2**
- Useful art, **10:2**
- Useful arts, **10:7**
- Validity, **10:1, 10:7, 10:10**
- Vesting of title, generally, **10:1**
- Women, **10:7**
- Work-for-hire, **10:16, 10:17**

INVESTIGATION

- Adequate utility, **6:18, 7:20**
- Examination of Original Application (this index)
- Non-obviousness, **9:6, 9:54, 9:60**
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:22
- Priority, **8:54**

INVESTIGATIONAL NEW DRUG (IND)

- Adequate commerciality, **14:67, 14:73**

INVESTMENTS

- Inventorship, **10:14**

IPSIS VERBIS

- Adequate utility, **7:42**

IRREPARABLE DAMAGE

Inventorship, **10:8**

ISSUANCE OF LETTERS PATENT

History, **1:4**

ISSUANCE OF PATENT

Generally, **2:10, 2:16**

Adequate disclosure, **7:1, 7:18**

Claims, **4:6**

Examination of Original Application
(this index)

Geographic scope, **12:41**

History, **1:18, 1:25**

Inventorship, **10:7**

Joint inventorship, **10:25**

Non-obviousness, **9:37**

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:63**

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
generally, **2:8**

Priority, **8:69**

Processes, **5:21, 5:39**

Reissuance of Patent (this index)

Temporal Scope of Infringement (this
index)

Utility Requirement (this index)

ISSUE PRECLUSION

Claims, **4:20**

Invalidity (this index)

JAPAN

Non-obviousness, **9:11, 9:42**

Policy justification, **1:43**

Statutory subject matter, **5:4**

JEPSON-STYLE CLAIMS

Generally, **4:99**

JOHNSON & JOHNSTON

**ASSOCIATES INC. v. R.E.
SERVICE CO., INC.**

Technological scope, **13:38, 13:97**

JOHNSON WORLDWIDE v.

ZEBCO

Claims, **4:36**

JOINDER

Correction of inventorship, **10:57**

JOINT APPLICANTS

Joint Inventorship (this index)

JOINT EMPLOYMENT

Non-obviousness, **9:33, 9:37**

JOINT INVENTION

Joint Inventorship (this index)

JOINT INVENTORS

Joint Inventorship (this index)

JOINT INVENTORSHIP

Generally, **10:19-10:53**

Abandonment, **10:52**

Abstract business entities, **10:52**

Accountability, **10:50-10:53**

Agency, **10:25**

All-claims rule, **10:38-10:41**

Amendments. Patent Act amend-
ments of 1984, below

Another

definition of another, below

prior work performed by, **10:42**

Anticipation, lack of, **8:8, 10:42**

Anticipatory event, **10:33**

Appeal and review, **10:38, 10:46,
10:51**

Application

generally, **10:27, 10:38**

filing application, below

initial application, **10:40**

joint applicants, **10:21, 10:36-
10:38**

Assignment, **10:25, 10:39, 10:40**

Blackledge v. Weir & Craig Mfg.
Co., **10:51**

Board of Patent Appeals and Interfer-
ences, **10:46**

Business entities, **10:52**

Carter rule, **10:53**

Case law

generally, **10:19**

Clum v. Brewer, **10:49, 10:50**

inventive contribution versus sug-
gestion, **10:31, 10:33**

prior limits on correcting inventor-
ship, **10:25**

tenancy in common, **10:49**

INDEX

JOINT INVENTORSHIP—Cont'd

- Change and modification, **10:45, 10:50**
- Clum v. Brewer, **10:49, 10:50**
- Co-invention, **10:29**
- Co-inventors, **10:47**
- Collaboration, generally, **10:23**
- Common enterprise, **10:39**
- Common law, **10:47**
- Common ownership, **10:37**
- Complete or definite conception, **10:31**
- Conception, generally, **10:23-10:33**
- Configuration, **10:47**
- Congress, **10:39-10:41, 10:45**
- Consent
 - definition of joint invention, **10:26, 10:29, 10:34**
 - rights and obligations, **10:47, 10:49-10:51, 10:53**
- Construction and interpretation, **10:37, 10:41**
- Construction of work, **10:23, 10:31**
- Contest, **10:25, 10:52**
- Continuation application, **10:45, 10:46**
- Continuations-in-part, **10:46**
- Contribution
 - generally, **10:24, 10:28, 10:37**
 - definition of joint invention, below
- Conversion, **10:49**
- Cooperating inventors
 - generally, **10:22, 10:40**
 - joint applicants, below
- Cooperative work, **10:26**
- Co-ownership
 - definition of joint invention, **10:29, 10:30, 10:32, 10:33**
 - rights and obligations, **10:47**
- Copyright law contrasted, **10:53**
- Corporations, **10:39**
- Correction of inventorship, **10:20, 10:25, 10:40, 10:65**
- Co-tenancy, **10:47, 10:51**
- Court, generally, **10:40**
- Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, **10:38**

JOINT INVENTORSHIP—Cont'd

- Current interpretation of 1984 amendments, **10:41**
- Deceptive intent, **10:40**
- Defenses, **10:25**
- Definite conception, **10:31**
- Definition of another
 - generally, **10:37, 10:42-10:46**
 - amendments of 1984, effect of, **10:45**
 - examples of current rule applied, **10:46**
 - joint inventors, **10:44**
 - sole inventors, **10:43**
- Definition of joint invention
 - generally, **10:22-10:34**
 - amendments of 1984, effect of, **10:27**
 - basic rule, **10:26**
 - contribution. Inventive contribution versus suggestion, below in this group
 - examples of basic rule applied, **10:28**
 - general evaluation, **10:24**
 - inventive contribution versus suggestion
 - generally, **10:29-10:34**
 - complete or definite conception, **10:31**
 - consent, **10:34**
 - excess over state of the art, **10:33**
 - materiality, **10:32**
 - specific tests identified and critiqued, generally, **10:30-10:34**
 - tests, generally, **10:30-10:34**
 - prior limits on correcting inventorship, **10:25**
 - suggestion. Inventive contribution versus suggestion, above in this group
 - tests. Inventive contribution versus suggestion, above in this group
- Definitions
 - another. Definition of another, above

JOINT INVENTORSHIP—Cont'd

Definitions—Cont'd
 derivation, **10:28**
 inventive entities, **10:19**
 joint inventorship. Definition of joint invention, above
 Derivation, **10:28**
 Disclosure, **10:44, 10:46**
 Distribution of ownership, **10:29, 10:32**
 Duplicate application, **10:45**
 Economic value, **10:52**
 Effective abandonment, **10:52**
 Embodiment, **10:40**
 Employment, **10:25, 10:39**
 Enforcement, **10:29**
 English doctrine, **10:53**
 Examiner, **10:46**
 Excess over state of the art, **10:33**
 Exclusions, **10:31, 10:33**
 Ex parte DesOrmeaux, **10:46**
 Ex parte Gilderdale, **10:46**
 Experiments, **10:31**
 Exploitation, **10:29, 10:47, 10:53**
 Federal Circuit, **10:27**
 Filing application, **10:38, 10:40**
 generally, **10:46**
 date, **10:40**
 definition of joint invention, **10:27, 10:34**
 first application, **10:46**
 joint application, generally, **10:21, 10:35-10:41**
 joint filing, **10:35, 10:36**
 later duplicate application, **10:45**
 1984 amendments to Patent Act, generally, **10:35-10:41**
 First application, **10:40, 10:46**
 First inventor, **10:19**
 Group research, **10:39, 10:40**
 History, **10:38-10:40, 10:48**
 Immaterial contributions, **10:32**
 Implied transfers, **10:25**
 Improvements, **10:25, 10:31**
 Independent work, **10:23**
 Infringement, **10:29, 10:32, 10:49, 10:52**
 Initial application, **10:40**

JOINT INVENTORSHIP—Cont'd

Initial participant, **10:34**
 Intent, **10:25, 10:33, 10:40, 10:45**
 Inventive contribution versus suggestion. Definition of joint invention, above
 Inventive entities, generally, **10:19**
 Issuance, correction of inventorships after, **10:25**
 Joint applicants
 generally, **10:35-10:41**
 all-claims rule and modern group research, conflict between, **10:39**
 amendments of 1984, generally, **10:35-10:41**
 application by joint inventors, **10:36**
 cooperating inventors and 1984 amendments to Section 116, generally, **10:35-10:41**
 current interpretation of 1984 amendments, **10:41**
 distinguished, **10:21**
 historical background, **10:38-10:40**
 joint applications by cooperating inventors, **10:37**
 joint inventors, application by, **10:36**
 legislative purpose of 1984 amendments, **10:40**
 Section 116 amendments of 1984, generally, **10:35-10:41**
 Joint application
 cooperating inventors, **10:37**
 distinguished, **10:22**
 filing, **10:36, 10:41**
 filing application, above
 non-obviousness, **9:36**
 Joint invention defined. Definition of joint invention, above
 Joint inventors
 definition of another, **10:44**
 joint applicants, **10:36**
 obligation. Rights and obligation, below in this group
 rights and obligation
 generally, **10:47-10:53**
 copyright law contrasted, **10:53**

INDEX

JOINT INVENTORSHIP—Cont'd

- Joint inventors—Cont'd
 - rights and obligation—Cont'd
 - early history, **10:48**
 - effective abandonment, **10:52**
 - modern rule and rationale, **10:51**
 - modifications, **10:50**
 - tenancy in common, initial analogy of, **10:49**
- Later application, **10:40, 10:45**
- Later inventive entity, **10:44**
- Later participants, **10:30-10:33**
- Legislation, **10:41**
- Legislative purpose of 1984 amendments, **10:40**
- Licenses and permits, generally, **10:47-10:53**
- Limitations and restrictions
 - definition of joint invention, **10:25, 10:30, 10:31**
 - joint applicants, **10:38, 10:40**
 - rights and obligations, **10:52**
- Lost patent rights, **10:20**
- Materiality, **10:32**
- Mental creativity, **10:29**
- Mistake and error, **10:25, 10:45**
- Modern group research, **10:39**
- Monsanto Co. v. Kamp, **10:40**
- Multiple inventions, **10:37**
- Multiple inventive entities, **10:44**
- Named inventors, **10:41**
- 1984 amendments. Patent Act amendments of 1984, below
- Non-obviousness, **9:37, 9:46, 10:42**
- Notice and knowledge
 - definition of another, **10:43, 10:44**
 - definition of joint invention, **10:26, 10:28, 10:33**
 - joint applicants, **10:39, 10:41**
- Oath as false, **10:40**
- Objections, **10:34, 10:49**
- Obligation. Joint inventors, above
- Omissions, **10:19**
- Ordinary artisan, **10:31**
- Original applicant, **10:34**
- Original application, **10:45**
- Original inventor, **10:19**
- Pannu v. Iolab, **10:33**

JOINT INVENTORSHIP—Cont'd

- Parent application, **10:46**
- Participant, **10:34**
- Participation, **10:28-10:30**
- Patentability, **10:42**
- Patent Act amendments of 1984
 - generally, **10:22, 10:27**
 - current interpretation, **10:41**
 - definition of another, **10:45**
 - definition of joint invention, **10:27**
 - history, **10:38**
 - joint applicants, below
 - legislative purpose, **10:40**
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **10:38, 10:40, 10:46**
- Perfection of conception, **10:26**
- Peripheral claiming, **10:31**
- Pitts v. Hall, **10:49, 10:50**
- Political justifications, **10:25**
- Post hoc, **10:32**
- Prior art, **10:33, 10:38, 10:40, 10:46**
- Priority, law of, **10:31**
- Prior limits on correcting inventorship, **10:25**
- Prior work of others, **10:42**
- Profits, **10:53**
- Proper inventorship, **10:20-10:22**
- Public accessibility, **10:51**
- Qualifications
 - another defined, **10:46**
 - definition, **10:23, 10:26, 10:30**
 - later participants, **10:30**
 - proper inventorship, **10:20, 10:21**
- Qualitatively too small, **10:32**
- Qualitative small contribution, **10:23, 10:29**
- Real property or chattel, **10:49**
- Reduction-to-practice, **10:28**
- References, **10:46**
- Rejection, **10:36, 10:38, 10:39, 10:51**
- Relevant disclosure, **10:44, 10:46**
- Relevant knowledge, **10:33**
- Research and development, **10:39, 10:40**
- Rights and obligation. Joint inventors, above
- Royalties, **10:52**

JOINT INVENTORSHIP—Cont'd

SAB Industri AB v. Bendix Corp.,
10:40

Sanctions, 10:25

Section 102, 10:33, 10:42

Section 102(e), 10:46

Section 102(f), 10:28, 10:38

Section 103, 10:33, 10:38, 10:42

Section 116, 10:19, 10:27

Section 120, 10:45, 10:46

Section 262, 10:47, 10:51

Seventh Circuit, 10:51

Sole inventors, 10:43

State of the art, 10:33

Suggestions. Definition of joint
invention, above

Supreme Court, 10:33

Technical disclosure, 10:44

Technological knowledge, 10:33

Tenancy in common, 10:49, 10:50

Tests and testing

definition of another, 10:42-10:45

definition of joint invention, 10:23

definition of joint invention, above

Third parties, 10:29, 10:51

Third persons, 10:28, 10:42, 10:47,
10:49

Transfer of title, 10:25

Treatises, 10:24

Unilateral action, 10:52

Validity

definition of joint invention, 10:25,
10:29

joint applicants, 10:37, 10:41

proper inventorship, 10:20

Value, 10:47, 10:50, 10:52

Void patent, 10:19

Vose v. Singer, 10:50

JOINT OWNERSHIP

Definition of inventor, 10:17

JOINT TORTFEASORS

Indirect Infringement (this index)

JOINT VENTURES

Non-obviousness, 9:47

**JOY TECHNOLOGIES, INC. v.
FLAKT, INC.**

Adequate commerciality, 14:27,
14:28, 14:43

JUDGES

Administrative patent judges (APJ),
2:22

Claims (this index)

JUDGMENTS

Adequate commerciality, 14:80

Adequate disclosure, 7:52

Claims, 4:2

Indirect infringement, 15:23

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:85

Processes, 5:26, 5:30

JUDICIAL ACTS AND MATTERS

Adequate disclosure, 7:5, 7:49

Claims, 4:73, 4:87, 4:91, 4:92

Congress (this index)

History, 1:17, 1:18

Indirect infringement, 15:2, 15:6-
15:9

Non-obviousness, 9:2, 9:4, 9:16

Non-statutory hybrid inventions,
5:81, 5:83

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO)
generally, 2:1, 2:2, 2:7

decisions, review of. Judicial
Review (this index)

deference, 2:19

notice, 2:25

opposition, 2:18

power to review, 2:21

Peripheral claiming practice, 4:86

Policy justification, 1:31

Processes, 5:19, 5:37

Static physical configurations, 5:10,
5:16, 5:17

Statutory subject matter, 5:4, 5:6

Structural revision, 1982-present, 4:6

JUDICIAL ESTOPPEL

Technological scope, 13:91

JUDICIAL REVIEW

See also Appeal and Review (this
index)

INDEX

JUDICIAL REVIEW—Cont'd

- APA, review under
 - application to USPTO review, **2:42, 2:43**
 - arbitrary, capricious or abuse of discretion, **2:41**
 - deference, **2:41**
 - Dickenson v. Zurko, **2:43**
 - facts, review, **2:41-2:43**
 - law determinations, **2:44 et seq.**
 - reasonableness, **2:41**
 - substantial evidence, **2:41**
- Application, **2:43**
- Determinations of fact
 - generally, **2:40**
 - case-specific nature of substantial evidence standard, **2:43**
 - common law, **2:43**
 - deference, **2:41**
 - reasonableness, **2:41**
 - substantial evidence, **2:41, 2:42**
- Determinations of law
 - generally, **2:44**
 - application to legal rules of USPTO, **2:49-2:51**
 - interpretative rules, **2:48, 2:51**
 - legal rules under APA, generally, **2:45**
 - procedural versus nonprocedural rules, **2:46**
 - substantive/legislative rulemaking authority of USPTO, **2:50**
 - substantive/legislative rules, **2:47**
- History, **1:19**
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO)
 - generally, **2:8, 2:29-2:51**
 - administrative law. Standards of review, below in this group
 - Administrative Procedures Act, review of facts, **2:41-2:43**
 - arbitrary, capricious or abuse of discretion, **2:41**
 - case-specific nature of substantial evidence standard, **2:43**
 - consolidation in federal circuit, **2:37**
 - court of customs and patent appeals, creation of, **2:36**
 - current mechanisms, **2:38**

JUDICIAL REVIEW—Cont'd

- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO)
 - Cont'd
 - deference, **2:41**
 - determinations of fact
 - generally, **2:40**
 - application to review, **2:42, 2:43**
 - case-specific nature of substantial evidence standard, **2:43**
 - clear error, **2:42**
 - common law, **2:42, 2:43**
 - deference, **2:41**
 - Dickenson v. Zurko, **2:43**
 - reasonableness, **2:41**
 - review under APA, **2:41**
 - substantial evidence, **2:41, 2:42**
 - determinations of law
 - generally, **2:44**
 - application to legal rules of USPTO, **2:49-2:51**
 - interpretative rules, **2:48, 2:51**
 - legal rules under APA, generally, **2:45**
 - procedural versus nonprocedural rules, **2:46**
 - substantive/legislative rulemaking authority of USPTO, **2:50**
 - substantive/legislative rules, **2:47**
 - history, generally, **2:30-2:37**
 - Patent Act of 1790, **2:31**
 - Patent Act of 1793, **2:31**
 - Patent Act of 1836, **2:32**
 - Patent Act of 1839, **2:33**
 - Patent Act of 1927, required election under, **2:35**
 - reasonableness, **2:41**
 - Reforms of 1870, **2:34**
 - standards of review
 - generally, **2:39**
 - administrative law, generally, **2:48**
 - determinations of fact, **2:43**
 - determinations of fact, generally, **2:40**
 - determinations of law, generally, **2:44-2:51**

JUDICIAL REVIEW—Cont'd

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO)
—Cont'd
standards of review—Cont'd
interpretive rules, **2:48, 2:51**
legislative rules, **2:41**
substantial evidence standard,
2:41, 2:42
Reexamination, **16:126**

JURISDICTION

Adequate commerciality, **14:47**
Adequate utility, **6:12**
Claims, **4:6**
History, **1:14**
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:36, 2:37

JURY

Adequate utility, **6:9**
Claims (this index)
Indirect infringement, **15:4**
Priority, **8:34**
Reexamination, **16:126**

JUSTIFICATION

Adequate disclosure, **7:1, 7:4, 7:21, 7:33**
Correction, **10:59**
Examination of Original Application
(this index)
Inventorship, **10:2-10:4**
Misuse of patent, **18:25**
Non-Obviousness (this index)
Policy Justification (this index)
Priority, **8:56, 8:61, 8:67**
Utility Requirement (this index)

KEPLINGER v. DE YOUNG

Adequate commerciality, **14:3**
Indirect infringement, **15:3**

KEWANEE OIL CO. V. BICRON CORP.

Historical origins of patent grant,
1:13.60

KITS

Static physical configurations, **5:8**

KNOW-HOW

Adequate disclosure, **7:17**

KNOWLEDGE

Notice and Knowledge (this index)

KNOWLEDGEABLE IN THE ART

Anticipation, lack of, **8:22**
Non-obviousness, **9:57**

KNOWN ART

Adequate utility, **6:8**

KNOWN INTERCHANGEABILITY

Technological scope, **13:75, 13:76**

KNOWN PHYSICAL RULES

Adequate utility, **6:8**

KNOWN TO THE ART

Adequate utility, **6:4**

LACHES

Generally, **23:1-23:45**
Application to actions for patent
infringement, **23:6-23:20**
Aukerman v. Chaides, **23:16**
Burdens of proof and pleading, **23:39**
Campbell v. City of Haverhill, **23:8**
Cornetta v. U.S., **23:15**
Correction of inventorship, **10:61**
Defendant's unclean hands, **23:41**
Economic prejudice from unreasonable
delay, **23:37**
En banc decision, **23:19**
Estoppel distinguished, **24:21**
Evidentiary prejudice from unreasonable
delay, **23:38**
Examination of Original Application
(this index)
Excuses, unreasonable delay, **23:29-23:35**
Federal Circuit decisions
Aukerman v. Chaides, **23:16**
Cornetta v. U.S., **23:15**
en banc decision, **23:19**
facts, **23:17**
initial panel decision, **23:18**
patent infringement actions, **23:14-23:20**
subsequent decisions, **23:20**
Forms distinguished, **23:2**
General rule, **23:22**

INDEX

LACHES—Cont'd

- Historical development
 - generally, **1:21, 23:3**
 - laches vs. statutes of limitation, **23:5**
 - law vs. equity, generally, **23:4, 23:5**
 - patent infringement actions, **23:6-23:20**
- Initial panel decision, Federal Circuit decisions, **23:18**
- Insecure title, unreasonable delay, **23:31**
- Justification of policy, **23:21**
- Lack of counsel, unreasonable delay, **23:34**
- Law and Equity Act of 1915, **23:11**
- Law vs. equity, generally, **23:4, 23:5**
- License negotiations, unreasonable delay, **23:32**
- Ongoing license negotiations, unreasonable delay, **23:32**
- Onset of period, unreasonable delay, **23:25-23:35**
- Patent Act of 1897, Section 6, **23:9**
- Patent Act of 1946, **23:12**
- Patent infringement
 - application, **23:6-23:20**
 - Campbell v. City of Haverhill, **23:8**
 - court decisions, 1895-1915, **23:10**
 - early period, **23:7**
 - Federal Circuit decisions, **23:14-23:20**
 - historical development, **23:6-23:20**
 - Law and Equity Act of 1915, **23:11**
 - Patent Act of 1897, Section 6, **23:9**
 - Patent Act of 1946, **23:12**
- Pleading, **23:39**
- Policy justification, **23:21**
- Poverty, unreasonable delay, **23:33**
- Prejudice
 - defendant, prejudice to, **23:36**
 - economic prejudice from unreasonable delay, **23:37**
 - evidentiary prejudice from unreasonable delay, **23:38**
- Priority, **8:86**

LACHES—Cont'd

- Prior minimal infringement, unreasonable delay, **23:35**
- Remedies, effect on, **23:42**
- Six-year presumption, unreasonable delay, **23:40**
- Special issues, **23:23-23:45**
- Statutes of limitation, **23:5**
- Supreme Court cases, **23:43**
 - Petrella v. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Inc., **23:44**
 - SCA Hygiene Products Aktiebolag v. First Quality Baby Products, LLC., **23:45**
- Unclean hands of defendant, **23:41**
- Unreasonable delay
 - generally, **23:24**
 - economic prejudice, **23:37**
 - evidentiary prejudice, **23:38**
 - excuses, **23:29-23:35**
 - insecure title, **23:31**
 - lack of counsel, **23:34**
 - license negotiations, **23:32**
 - ongoing license negotiations, **23:32**
 - onset of period, **23:25-23:35**
 - other litigation, **23:30**
 - poverty, **23:33**
 - prior minimal infringement, **23:35**
 - six-year presumption, **23:40**
 - subsequent decisions, **23:28**
 - Wanlass v. Fedders, **23:27**
 - Wanlass v. General Elec. Co., **23:26**
- Wanlass v. Fedders, unreasonable delay, **23:27**
- Wanlass v. General Elec. Co., unreasonable delay, **23:26**

LACK OF COUNSEL

- Laches, unreasonable delay, **23:34**

LAND PATENT

- History, **1:1**

LANGUAGE ISSUES

- Technological Scope of Infringement (this index)

LAPSED TIME

Priority, **8:65**

LARGE BUSINESS ENTITIES

Inventorship, **10:1**

LAST THEOREM OF PIERRE DE FERMAT

Adequate disclosure, **7:34**

LATERAL CONTRACTS

Policy justification, **1:38**

LATER APPLICATION

Joint inventorship, **10:40, 10:45**

LATER-CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Adequate disclosure, **7:42**

LATER-DISCOVERED TECHNOLOGY

Technological scope, **13:56**

LATER-INVENTED METHOD

Adequate disclosure, **7:14**

LATER INVENTIVE ENTITY

Joint inventorship, **10:44**

LATER PARTICIPANTS

Joint inventorship, **10:30-10:32**

LATER PARTICIPATIONS

Joint inventorship, **10:33**

LAUDATORY STATEMENTS

Non-obviousness, **9:57, 9:59, 9:62**

LAW AND EQUITY ACT OF 1915

Laches, **23:11**

LAW VS. EQUITY

Laches, **23:4, 23:5**

LEAR, INC. v. ADKINS

Invalidity, **17:36, 17:37**

LEARNED HAND

Technological scope, **13:11**

LEDGER SHEETS

Processes, **5:29**

LEEDS & CATLIN CO. v. VICTOR TALKING MACHINE CO.

Indirect infringement, **15:5, 15:9**

LEGAL ABILITY, LACK OF

Inventorship, **10:8**

LEGAL DEFENSES

Technological Scope of Infringement
(this index)

LEGISLATION

Claims, **4:77, 4:81, 4:87**

Inventorship, **10:18**

Joint inventorship, **10:40, 10:41**

Non-obviousness, **9:5, 9:82**

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:83**

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:41

Prior inventor, prior-user rights,
proposed legislation, 1992-1997,
22:14

Processes, **5:28, 5:39**

Static physical configurations, **5:14, 5:15**

LE ROY v. TATHAM

Processes, **5:21**

LETTER PATENT

History, **1:1, 1:3-1:5, 1:7**

LICENSED HEALTH PROFESSIONALS

Processes, **5:39**

LICENSEE ESTOPPEL

Invalidity, **17:34-17:41**

LICENSES AND PERMITS

Actions in patent versus actions in
contract, **19:32**

Adequate commerciality, **14:41**

Adequate disclosure, **7:14**

Case law, defenses

Bauer & Cie v. O'Donnell, **19:19**

express limitations by patent
owner. Keppell v. Bailey,
below

Heaton-Peninsular Button-Fastener
Col v. Eureka Specialty Co.,
19:15, 19:16

INDEX

LICENSES AND PERMITS—Cont'd

Case law, defenses—Cont'd

Henry v. A.B. Dick Co., **19:16**

Miles Medical Co. v. John D. Park
& Sons Co., **19:18**

restrictions on division of title,
19:18-19:20

Supreme Court decisions, below
Chattel, prohibition of restraints on,
19:31

Claims, **4:63**

Correction of inventorship, **10:61**

Defenses

generally, **19:1-19:44**

actions in patent versus actions in
contract, **19:32**

chattel, prohibition of restraints on,
19:31

express licenses, below

Federal Circuit decisions, **19:24**

freedom of contract, **19:31**

historical development

generally, **19:2**

express licenses, **19:3**

express limitations by patent
owner, **19:9-19:23**

implied licenses, **19:4-19:6,**
19:8

implied licenses, below

policy justification, **19:28-19:33**

restraints on chattel, prohibition,
19:31

Supreme Court decisions, below

Dispute framing, **19:12-19:16**

Exhaustion and implied-in-law licen-
ses compared, **19:33**

Express licenses

generally, **19:34**

historical development, **19:3**

policy justification, express versus
implied, **19:29**

Express limitations by patent owner
case law. Keppell v. Bailey, below
contractual powers limited, **19:22,**
19:23

dispute framing, **19:12-19:16**

early expansion, **19:11**

extent of limitation of contractual
powers, **19:23**

LICENSES AND PERMITS—Cont'd

Express limitations by patent owner
—Cont'd

historical development, **19:9-19:23**

initial recognition, **19:10**

restrictions on division of title,
below

subsequent developments, **19:21-**
19:23

Federal Circuit decisions, express and
implied licenses, **19:24**

First sale doctrine, implied-in-law
licenses, **19:38-19:40**

Freedom of contract, **19:31**

History, **1:4, 19:2-19:27**

Implied licenses

generally, **19:35**

exhaustion and implied-in-law
licenses compared, **19:33**

express versus implied, **19:29**

historical development, **19:4-19:6,**
19:8

implied-in-fact

generally, **19:36**

comparison to implied-in-law,
19:30

implied-in-law

generally, **19:37**

applicability of doctrine, **19:40**

comparison to implied-in-fact,
19:30

contract limitation, **19:39**

embodiments, **19:40**

first sale doctrine, **19:38-19:40**

importation, **19:44**

international sales, **19:44**

involuntary sales, **19:41**

parallel importation, **19:44**

reconstruction, **19:42**

recovered infringements, **19:43**

repair, **19:42**

unrestricted sales, **19:39**

infringement, **19:6**

inventorship, **10:17**

policy justification, **19:29, 19:30,**
19:33

purchase and license to use, **19:5**

recovered infringements, **19:6**

LICENSES AND PERMITS—Cont'd

Implied licenses—Cont'd
 reissue of patent, **16:119**
 restraints on chattel, prohibition,
19:31
 subsequent developments, **19:7,**
19:8
 use following purchase, **19:5**
 Importation, implied-in-law licenses,
19:44
 Indirect infringement, **15:5**
 Infringement, defense of implied
 license, **19:6**
 International sales, implied-in-law
 licenses, **19:44**
 Inventorship, **10:7, 10:17**
 Involuntary sales, implied-in-law
 licenses, **19:41**
 Joint Inventorship (this index)
 Keppell v. Bailey, express limitations
 by patent owner
 ascendancy of property, **19:14**
 dispute framing, **19:12-19:16**
 early indecision, **19:13**
 Heaton-Peninsular Button-Fastener
 Col v. Eureka Specialty Co.,
19:15, 19:16
 Henry v. A.B. Dick Co., **19:16**
 Laches, unreasonable delay due to
 license negotiations, **23:32**
 Limitations and restrictions
 contractual power limitations,
19:22, 19:23
 division of title. Restrictions on
 division of title, below
 express limitations by patent
 owner, above
 Misuse of Patent (this index)
 Parallel importation, implied-in-law
 licenses, **19:44**
 Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:13, 2:21
 Policy justification, **1:31, 19:28-**
19:33
 Processes, licensing fees, **5:39**
 Purchase and license to use, **19:5**
 Reconstruction, implied-in-law licen-
 ses, **19:42**

LICENSES AND PERMITS—Cont'd

Recovered infringements
 implied-in-law licenses, **19:43**
 implied license, **19:6**
 Repair, implied-in-law licenses,
19:42
 Restraints on chattel, prohibition,
19:31
 Restrictions on division of title
 Bauer & Cie v. O'Donnell, **19:19**
 express limitations by patent
 owner, **19:17-19:20**
 Miles Medical Co. v. John D. Park
 & Sons Co., **19:18**
 Supreme Court decision of 1917,
19:20
 Static physical configurations, **5:15**
 Supreme Court decisions
 Leegin Creative Leather Products,
 Inc. v. PSKS, Inc., **19:26**
 Quanta Computer, Inc. v. LG
 Electronics, Inc., **19:27**
 restrictions on division of title,
 1917 decisions, **19:20**
 Unrestricted sales, implied-in-law
 licenses, **19:39**
 Use following purchase, implied
 license defense, **19:5**

LIGHTING BALLAST CONTROL LLC v. PHILLIPS ELECTRONIC NORTH AMERICA CORP.

Claims, **4:17.50**

LIMITATION OF ACTIONS

Examination of Original Application
 (this index)
 Laches, **23:5**
 Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:1
 Section 286 defense. Six Year Limita-
 tion (this index)

LIMITATIONS AND RESTRICTIONS

Adequate Commerciality (this index)
 Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)
 Claims (this index)
 Correction (this index)

INDEX

LIMITATIONS AND RESTRICTIONS—Cont'd

Disclosure (this index)
Examination of Original Application
(this index)
History (this index)
Indirect Infringement (this index)
Inventorship (this index)
Joint inventorship
Misuse of Patent (this index)
Non-Obviousness (this index)
Non-Statutory Hybrid Inventions
(this index)
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO)
(this index)
Policy justification, **1:32, 1:39, 1:43**
Prior inventor, prior-user rights,
limitation of section 273
defense, **22:25**
Priority (this index)
Processes (this index)
Reissue of Patent (this index)
Static physical configuration, **5:8,**
5:11, 5:14-5:17
Statutory Subject Matter (this index)
Technological scope, **13:107**
Temporal scope, **11:28, 11:34**
Utility Requirement (this index)

LIMITATION TO BUSINESS METHODS

Defined, **22:20**

LINGUAL DESCRIPTION

Adequate disclosure, **7:6**

LINGUAL MEANING

Claims, **4:1**

LINGUAL SCHEDULE

Claims (this index)

LIQUIDS

Static physical configurations, **5:9**

LITERAL INFRINGEMENT

Claims, **4:71**

LITERAL LANGUAGE

Non-obviousness, **9:24, 9:25**

LITERAL MEANING

History, **1:21**

LITERARY EXPRESSIONS AND WORKS

Computer-related inventions, **5:42**
Static physical configurations, **5:11**

LITIGATION

Estoppel, communication from patent
owner, **24:27**

LITTERAE CLAUSAE

History, **1:1**

LITTERAE PATENTES

History, **1:1**

LIVING ORGANISMS

Adequate utility, **6:6**
Static physical configurations, **5:7,**
5:16

LOCAL PRIORITY

Public possession prior to patentee's
date of invention, paragraph
102(a), **8:193**

LOCAL RULES

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:39

LOCKEAN THEORY

Policy justification, **1:29**

LOGARITHMIC SCALES

Processes, **5:27**

LOGICAL DELIBERATE ACT

Non-obviousness, **9:67**

LORD COKE

History, **1:5**

LOST PATENT RIGHTS

Joint inventorship, **10:20**

LOWELL v. LEWIS

Adequate utility, **6:9, 6:10**

LOWER COURTS

Adequate disclosure, **7:45**
Adequate utility, **6:16, 6:17**
Claims, **4:6, 4:80**
History, **1:20**

LOWER COURTS—Cont'd

Invalidity, **17:23**
Non-obviousness, **9:33**

LUXEMBOURG

Adequate utility, **7:18**

MACAULAY

History, **1:4**

MACHINE-READABLE DATA

Static physical configurations, **5:11**

MACHINES

Adequate utility, **7:10**
Static physical configurations, **5:7, 5:8**
Statutory Subject Matter (this index)

MADEY v. DUKE UNIVERSITY

Adequate commerciality, **14:59**

MAGNA CARTA

History, **1:4**

MAHN v. HARWOOD

Reissue of patent, **16:103**

MAJORITY, AGE OF

Inventorship, **10:7**

MAKING

Adequate Commerciality (this index)
Indirect Infringement (this index)

MANIPULATION AND

MANIPULATIVE STEPS

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:55**
Processes, **5:27, 5:36**

MANUAL OF PATENT

**EXAMINING PROCEDURE
(MPEP)**

Adequate utility, **7:12**
Claims, **4:73, 4:78, 4:89, 4:93**
Examination of Original Applications
(this index)
Inventorship, **10:7**
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:83**
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:24, 2:26
Processes, **5:30**

MANUAL PROCEDURES

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:28
Processes, **5:30**

MANUFACTURE, ARTICLE OF

Adequate disclosure, **7:7**
Computer-Related Inventions (this
index)
Designs, **5:46**
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:55**
Static physical configurations, **5:7, 5:8, 5:11, 5:17**
Statutory Subject Matter (this index)

MANUFACTURING

History, **1:6**
Statutory Subject Matter (this index)

MARKET FORCES

Utility requirement, **6:4**

**MARKETING REGULATION OF
FDA**

Adequate commerciality, **14:7**

MARKETPLACE

Non-obviousness, **9:54**

MARKING

Adequate utility, **6:19**

**MARKMAN v. WESTVIEW
INSTRUMENTS**

Claims, **4:16, 4:17.50, 4:17.75**

MARKUSH GROUPING

Adequate disclosure, **7:41**
Claims, **4:100**

MARRIAGE

Inventorship, **10:7**

MASS COMMUNICATION

Adequate disclosure, **7:5**

MATERIAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Joint inventorship, **10:32**

MATERIALITY

Joint inventorship, **10:32**

MATERIAL PREJUDICE

Estoppel, **24:29**

INDEX

MATHEMATICAL ALGORITHMS

- Computer-related inventions, **5:41**
- Non-statutory hybrid inventions,
5:78, 5:81
- Processes, **5:30**
- Statutory subject matter, **5:44**

MATHEMATICAL CALCULATIONS

- Non-statutory hybrid inventions,
5:55, 5:78

MATHEMATICAL DEMANDS

- Static physical configurations, **5:12**

MATHEMATICAL FORMULAE

- Claims, **4:79**
- Non-statutory hybrid inventions,
5:74, 5:76
- Processes, **5:22**
- Statutory subject matter, **5:6, 5:24**

MATHEMATICS

- Statutory Subject Matter (this index)

MAXWELL v. J. BAKER, INC.

- Technological scope, **13:95**

MEANINGFUL PATENT PROTECTION

- Non-obviousness, **9:77**

MEANS EXPRESSIONS

- Claims (this index)
- Reexamination, **4:88**
- Technological scope, **13:114**

MEANS FOR CLAIM LANGUAGE

- History, **1:23**

MECHANICAL ARTS

- Adequate disclosure, **7:9, 7:24, 7:25**
- Adequate utility, **6:19**
- Claims, **4:65**
- Non-obviousness, **9:76**
- Priority, **8:48**

MECHANICAL DEVICES

- Static physical configurations, **5:8**

MECHANICAL EQUIVALENTS

- Claims, **4:84, 4:86, 4:92**

MECHANICAL FIELD

- Non-obviousness, **9:70**

MEDICAL AND DIAGNOSTIC PROCEDURES

- Affected subject matter, medical
activity, **20:17**
- Case law, *Pallin v. Singer*, section
287(c) defense, **20:5**
- Defenses, section 287(c)
generally, **20:1**
basic rule, **20:15**
case law, **20:5**
definitions, **20:16-20:20**
effective date, **20:22**
exceptions, **20:21**
historical development of section
287(c) defense, below
patenting medical technology gen-
erally, **20:3**
policy justification, **20:14**
- Definitions
generally, **20:16**
affected subject matter, **20:17**
immunized persons, **20:19, 20:20**
medical activity as affected subject
matter, **20:17**
medical practitioner, immunized
person, **20:19**
related health-care entity, immu-
nized person, **20:20**
- Effective date, section 287(c)
defense, **20:22**
- Historical development of section
287(c) defense
generally, **20:2-20:13**
case law, **20:5**
developments subsequent to Public
Law 104-208, **20:13**
final legislation, **20:12**
HR 1127, **20:7**
HR 3610 and HR 4278, **20:11**
HR 3814, **20:9**
legislation proposed, **20:7-20:11**
Pallin v. Singer, section 287(c)
defense, **20:5**
patenting medical technology gen-
erally, **20:3**
prior examples, **20:4, 20:5**

**MEDICAL AND DIAGNOSTIC
PROCEDURES—Cont'd**

Historical development of section
287(c) defense—Cont'd
Public Law 104-208, **20:12**
responses proposed, **20:6-20:11**
S 1334, **20:8**
S 2105, **20:10**
Justification, section 287(c) defense,
20:14
Legislation, section 287(c) defense
proposed, **20:7-20:11**
Public Law 104-208, **20:12**
subsequent to Public Law 104-208,
20:13
Medical activity as affected subject
matter, **20:17**
Medical practitioner, immunized
person, **20:19**
Pallin v. Singer, section 287(c)
defense, **20:5**
Patenting medical technology gener-
ally, **20:3**
Related health-care entity, immu-
nized person, **20:20**
Statutory subject matter, **5:39**

**MEDICAL DEVICE, EQUIPMENT,
OR MACHINE**

Adequate commerciality, **14:69**,
14:71
Processes, **5:39**

MEDICAL INFORMATION

Processes, **5:39**

MEDICAL PROFESSIONALS

Processes, **5:39**
Section 287(c) defense, immunity,
20:19, 20:20

**MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION
DRUG, IMPROVEMENT, AND
MODERNIZATION ACT**

Adequate Commerciality (this index)

MEDICINE

Static physical configurations, **5:18**

MENTAL ACTS AND MATTERS

Adequate disclosure, **7:3**
Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)

**MENTAL ACTS AND MATTERS
—Cont'd**

Inventorship (this index)
Joint inventorship, **10:29**
Priority, **8:44**
Processes, **5:25, 5:27**
Static physical configurations, **5:10**

MENTAL STEPS

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:55**
Processes, **5:22**
Static physical configurations, **5:12**
Statutory subject matter, **5:6, 5:25-
5:27, 5:45**

**MERCK KGAA v. INTEGRA
LIFESCIENCES I, LTD.**

Adequate commerciality, **14:67**,
14:73, 14:74

**MERCOID CORP. v.
MID-CONTINENT INV. CO.**

Indirect infringement, **15:9-15:12**,
15:24
Misuse of patent, **18:16**

MERGER DOCTRINE

Processes, **5:38**

METABOLITES

Temporal scope, **11:48**

**METALLIZING ENGINEERING
CO. v. KENYON BEARING &
AUTO PARTS CO.**

Anticipation, lack of, **8:21**
Priority, **8:243**

**METHOD CLAIMS AND
INVENTIONS**

Adequate Commerciality (this index)
Indirect infringement, **15:5**

METHODS

Adequate commerciality, **14:49**
Claims, **4:80**
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:80**
Statutory subject matter, **5:2**

**MILES MEDICAL CO. v. JOHN D.
PARK & SONS CO.**

Express and implied licenses, **19:18**

INDEX

MILLER v. BRIDGEPORT BRASS CO.

Reissue of patent, **16:42-16:46**

MINISTERIAL ACTS

Processes, **5:25**

Statutory subject matter, **5:27**

MISCHIEVOUS

Adequate utility, **6:15**

MISJOINDER

Correction of inventorship, **10:57**

MISLEADING

Adequate disclosure, **7:45, 7:48**

MISTAKE AND ERROR

Correction (this index)

Examination of Original Application
(this index)

Inventorship (this index)

Joint inventorship, **10:25, 10:45**

Non-Obviousness (this index)

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:16, 2:39

Reissue of Patent (this index)

Static physical configurations, **5:15**

Technological scope, **13:57, 13:58**

MISUSE OF PATENT

Generally, **18:1 et seq.**

Actions required of licensee

generally, **18:37**

grant-back clauses, **18:39**

post-expiration royalties, **18:40**

royalty based in unpatented subject
matter, **18:38**

tying arrangements, **18:41**

unpatented subject matter as basis
of royalty, **18:38**

Bauer & Cie v. O'Donnell, **18:13**

Carbice Corporation of America v.
American Patents Development
Corporation, **18:15**

Case law. Historical development,
below

Commercial field limitations, **18:34**

Covenant not to deal in competing
goods, **18:36**

Customer limitations, **18:34**

MISUSE OF PATENT—Cont'd

Dawson Chemical Co. v. Rohm and
Haas Co., **18:21**

Discriminatory royalties, **18:31**

Excessive royalties, **18:30**

Federal Circuit decisions, **18:22,**
18:24

Grant-back clauses, **18:39**

Heaton-Peninsular Button-Fastener
Co. v. Eureka Specialty Co.,
18:10

Henry v. A.B. Dick Co., **18:11**

Historical development

generally, **1:23**

case law

Federal Circuit decisions, **18:22,**
18:24

pre 1913, **18:3-18:6**

1913 to 1952, **18:13-18:15**

1952 to present, **18:20, 18:21**

Supreme Court decisions prior
to 1982, **18:19-18:21**

Federal Circuit decisions, **18:22,**
18:24

pre 1913, **18:3-18:6**

1913 to 1952, **18:12-18:15**

1952 to present, **18:18-18:24**

Patent Misuse Reform Act of 1988,
18:23

Supreme Court decisions prior to
1982, **18:19-18:21**

Indirect infringement, **18:4-18:6,**
18:8-18:11

Industry limitations, **18:34**

Justification of policy, **18:25**

Licensee and licensing

commercial field limitations, **18:34**

covenant not to deal in competing
goods, **18:36**

customer limitations, **18:34**

industry limitations, **18:34**

price fixing, **18:35**

refusal to license, **18:29**

resale restrictions, **18:35**

restrictions on licensee's freedom
of action, **18:32-18:36**

territorial limitations, **18:33**

MISUSE OF PATENT—Cont'd

- Limitations on licensee's freedom of action. Licensee and licensing, above
- Market participation. Refusal of patent owner to participate in market, below
- Mercoid Corp. v. Mid-Continent Inv. Co.*, **18:16**
- Morgan Envelope Co. v. Albany Perforated Wrapping Paper Co.*, **18:6**
- Motion Picture Patents Co. v. Universal Film Mfg. Co.*, **18:14**
- 1952 Patent Act, **18:18**
- 1988 Patent Misuse Reform Act, **18:23**
- Para 271(b), 1952 Patent Act, **18:18**
- Para 271(c), 1952 Patent Act, **18:18**
- Para 271(d), 1952 Patent Act, **18:18**
- Participation in market. Refusal of patent owner to participate in market, below
- Patent Act of 1952, **18:18**
- Patent Misuse Reform Act of 1988, **18:23**
- Patent rights as property, **18:8**
- Post-expiration royalties, **18:40**
- Price fixing, **18:35**
- Refusal of patent owner to participate in market
 - generally, **18:27**
 - discriminatory royalties, **18:31**
 - excessive royalties, **18:30**
 - licensing, **18:29**
 - royalties, **18:30, 18:31**
 - suppression, **18:28**
- Resale restrictions, **18:35**
- Restrictive covenants in patented inventions, **18:9**
- Restrictive licensing, **18:7**
- Royalties
 - actions required of licensee, **18:38, 18:40**
 - refusal of patent owner to participate in market, **18:30, 18:31**
 - unpatented subject matter, **18:38**

MISUSE OF PATENT—Cont'd

- Statutory regulation
 - Mercoid Corp. v. Mid-Continent Inv. Co.*, **18:16**
 - para 271(b), 1952 Patent Act, **18:18**
 - para 271(c), 1952 Patent Act, **18:18**
 - para 271(d), 1952 Patent Act, **18:18**
 - Patent Act of 1952, **18:18**
 - Patent Misuse Reform Act, **18:23**
- Suppression, **18:28**
- Supreme Court decisions prior to 1982, **18:19, 18:19-18:21**
- Territorial limitations, **18:33**
- Tying arrangements, **18:41**
- Unpatented subject matter as basis of royalty, **18:38**
- Wallace v. Holmes*, **18:5**
- Zenith Radio Corp. v. Hazeltine Research, Inc.*, **18:20**

MITCHELL v. TIGHELMAN

- Anticipation, lack of, **8:27**

MIXED PURPOSES

- Priority, **8:255**

MIXED QUESTIONS OF LAW AND FACT

- Claims, **4:14**

MIXTURES

- Static physical configurations, **5:9, 5:17**

MODE

- Adequate Disclosure (this index)

MODELS

- Reissue of patent, **16:39**

MODIFICATION

- Change and Modification (this index)

MOLECULAR PHYSICS

- Claims, **4:65**

MONETARY RELIEF

- Adequate commerciality, **14:78**

INDEX

MONOPOLIES

History, **1:4, 1:6, 1:7**
Processes, **5:21**

MONOPOLY OF KNOWLEDGE

Adequate utility, **6:6, 6:17, 6:19**

MONSANTO CO. v. KAMP

Joint inventorship, **10:40**

MOOTNESS

Invalidity (this index)

MORALITY

Utility Requirement (this index)

MORGAN ENVELOPE CO. v. ALBANY PERFORATED WRAPPING PAPER CO.

Indirect infringement, **15:6, 15:8**
Misuse of patent, **18:6**

MOTION PICTURE PATENTS CO. v. UNIVERSAL FILM MFG. CO.

Indirect infringement, **15:7, 15:8**
Misuse of patent, **18:14**

MOTIVATION

Adequate utility, **6:13**
Correction of inventorship, **10:66**
Non-obviousness, **9:66, 9:74**
Policy justification, **1:32**
Priority, **8:71**
Processes, **5:21**

MULTICELLULAR ANIMALS

Static physical configurations, **5:8, 5:16**

MULTIPLE CAPABILITIES

Adequate commerciality, **14:31**

MULTIPLE CLAIMS

Dependent claims, **4:103**
Foreign priority claims, **8:125**
Policy justification and historical development, **4:5**
Single patent, **4:101-4:103**

MULTIPLE DISCLOSURES

Non-obviousness, **9:41**

MULTIPLE INVENTIONS

Joint inventorship, **10:37**

MULTIPLE INVENTIVE ENTITIES

Joint inventorship, **10:44**

MULTIPLE-PARTY CONTESTS

Priority, **8:129**

MULTIPLE PERSONS

Non-obviousness, **9:58**
Priority, **8:39**

MULTIPLE PRIOR APPLICATIONS

Non-obviousness, **9:37**

MULTIPLY DEPENDENT

Claims, **4:5**

MUNICIPALITIES

History, **1:4**

MUSIC

Static physical configurations, **5:11**

MUSICAL DATA

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:83**

MUTANTS

Static physical configurations, **5:14**

NAFTA

Priority, **8:106**

NAME AND MISNAMING

Correction (this index)
Definition of inventor, **10:18**
Inventorship, **10:1**
Joint inventorship, **10:41**
Priority, **8:71**

NAME-BRAND DRUGS

Adequate commerciality, **14:63**

NARROWING CLAIMS

Reissue of Patent (this index)

NATIONAL ARCHIVES

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:20

NATIONAL COURTS

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:11

NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

Adequate utility, **6:18**
Claims, **4:66**

NATURAL CONTROL

Adequate utility, **6:5**

NATURAL LAWS

Claims, **4:79**
Justification, **1:29**

NATURALLY OCCURRING SUBSTANCES

Static physical configurations, **5:9, 5:17**

NATURAL PHENOMENA

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:78**
Statutory subject matter, **5:24**

NATURAL RIGHT

Temporal scope, **11:17**

NATURAL STATE

Processes, **5:24**
Static physical configurations, **5:9**

NATURE, POWER OF

Processes, **5:21**

NATURE, PRODUCTS OF

Static physical configurations, **5:17**

NEAREST PRIOR ART

Non-obviousness, **9:59**

NEAREST PRIOR TECHNOLOGY

Non-Obviousness (this index)

NEEDED EXPERIMENTATION

Priority, **8:54**

NEGATION

Defenses, **17:6**

NEGATIVE RULES

Non-obviousness, **9:4, 9:15**

NEGOTIATIONS

History, **1:14**
Inventorship, **10:17**
Policy justification, **1:29**
Statutory subject matter, **5:5**

NETWORK PRINTERS

Processes, **5:24**

NEW, CONTROL OF

History, **1:18**

“NEW”

Reexamination, substantial new question of patentability, **16:130**

NEW AND USEFUL

Statutory subject matter, **5:2**

NEW APPLICATION

Static physical configurations, **5:8**

NEW ARTS

History, **1:5**

NEW CREATION

Inventorship, **10:4**

NEW DEVELOPMENT

Non-obviousness, **9:77**

NEW-DRUG APPLICATION (NDA)

Adequate Commerciality (this index)

NEW ENTERPRISES

History, **1:4**

NEW LIVING ORGANISM

Static physical configurations, **5:17**

NEWLY ADDED RIGHTS

Reissue of patent, **16:112-16:114**

NEWLY DISCOVERED PROPERTIES

Non-obviousness, **9:77**

NEWLY FOUND SEEDLINGS

Static physical configurations, **5:14**

NEWLY UNDERSTOOD TECHNICAL DETAILS

Non-obviousness, **9:77**

NEW MATTER

Adequate disclosure, **7:1, 7:31**
Examination of Original Application (this index)
History, **1:20**
Reissue of Patent (this index)

INDEX

NEW MEDICAL PROCEDURE

Processes, **5:39**

NEW SONG ENCODED ON PLAYER PIANO ROLL

Static physical configurations, **5:11**

NEW TECHNOLOGICAL FIELDS

Statutory subject matter, **5:2**

NEW TRIAL

Indirect infringement, **15:4**

NEXUS

Non-obviousness, **9:60, 9:61, 9:64**

NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS

Processes, **5:27**

“NO-DEFECT” REISSUE PRACTICE

Generally, **16:64**

NOMENCLATURE

Adequate disclosure, **7:2, 7:37, 7:38**

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:55**

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:25

Priority, **8:42**

NONINFRINGEMENT

Avoidance defenses, **17:6**

Common law pleading, **17:7**

Current statute, pleading under,
17:12, 17:13

Defenses, generally, **17:1-17:14**

Federal code, pleading, **17:8**

General pleading theory and current
statute, **17:2-17:13**

Implied license defense, **19:6**

Modern pleading, **17:8**

Negation defenses, **17:6**

Notice of prior art, **17:14**

Pleading
application to patent statute, **17:9-
17:13**

common law pleading, **17:7**

current statute, **17:2-17:13**

defenses, generally, **17:4-17:8**

federal code pleading, **17:8**

NONINFRINGEMENT—Cont’d

Pleading—Cont’d

general pleading theory and cur-
rent statute, **17:2-17:13**

infringement actions, generally,
17:4

modern pleading, **17:8**

negation vs. avoidance, **17:6**

prior art notice, **17:14**

prior statutes, **17:3, 17:10**

section 282, **17:11**

Prior art notice, **17:14**

Prior statutes, **17:3, 17:10**

Section 282, **17:11**

NON-JOINDER

Correction of inventorship, **10:57**

NON-LIMITING RECITATIONS

Anticipation, lack of, **8:14**

NON-OBVIOUSNESS

Generally, **9:1 et seq.**

Abandonment, **9:28, 9:29, 9:34, 9:39**

Adequacy of applicant’s subjective
insight, **9:41-9:43**

Adequate disclosure, **7:18**

Adequate suggestion, **9:66**

Adequate utility, **6:7**

Administrative efficiency, **9:14-9:16**

Administrative matters, **9:16**

Admissibility of out-of-court state-
ments, **9:59**

Admissions, **9:42**

Advance-over-the-art, generally, **9:31**

Advice, **9:66**

Affidavits, **9:25, 9:36, 9:37, 9:73**

Alexander Milburn Co. v. Davis
Bournonville Co., **9:33**

Ambiguity, generally, **9:7**

Amendments

generally, **9:1**

biotechnological process, Section
103(b), **9:81, 9:85**

secret prior art, **9:41, 9:45**

starting and ending materials, **9:78**

timeliness, Section 102, **9:45, 9:48**

Analogousness, **9:18, 9:19**

Another defined, **9:46, 9:47**

Anticipation, generally, **9:1**

NON-OBVIOUSNESS—Cont'd

Appeal and review
 generally, **9:3**
 biotechnological process, Section 103(b), **9:85**
 Court of Customs and Patent Appeals, **9:42, 9:66**
 determination of obviousness, **9:68**
 rule 131 affidavits, **9:36**
 secret prior art, **9:33, 9:41, 9:46**
 starting and ending materials, **9:79, 9:80**
 structures accompanied by properties or uses, **9:73**
 timeliness, Section 102, **9:25**
 Application
 prior application, **9:31, 9:38**
 secret prior art, **9:28, 9:31, 9:36-9:38, 9:43**
 starting and ending materials, **9:79**
 timeliness, Section 102, **9:30-9:33**
 As a whole, **9:1, 9:5, 9:6**
 Graham v. John Deere, **9:12**
 Assignment of invention, **9:47**
 Assignment of rights, **9:46**
 At time invention was made, **9:21**
 At time invention was made, **9:21, 9:24, 9:32**
 Background, **9:17, 9:19, 9:74**
 Bass, **9:37**
 Biotechnical processes, Section 103(B)
 generally, **9:78-9:86**
 case law developments after 1995, **9:85**
 construction and interpretation, **9:86**
 federal circuit authorities prior to 1995, **9:80**
 historical development, **9:82**
 older authorities, **9:79**
 overall effect, **9:84**
 specific statutory provisions, **9:83**
 Biotechnological Process Patent Amendment Act of 1995, **9:1, 9:82, 9:83**
 Board of Useful arts, **9:2**
 Burden of proof, **9:75**

NON-OBVIOUSNESS—Cont'd

Case law
 Bass, **9:37**
 biotechnical processes, Section 103(B), **9:85**
 Foster, **9:26**
 Graham v. John Deere, **9:6**
 Hazeltine Research Inc. v. Brenner, **9:33**
 Hotchkiss v. Greenwood, **9:3**
 Palmquist, **9:25**
 Robbins, **9:36**
 secret prior art, **9:39**
 Certiorari, **9:33**
 Change and modification
 generally, **9:5**
 determination of obviousness, generally, **9:65-9:69**
 Graham v. John Deere, **9:14, 9:18, 9:19, 9:50**
 secondary considerations, **9:57**
 secret prior art, **9:46**
 simply changing form or proportion, **9:2**
 structures accompanied by properties or uses, **9:74, 9:77**
 timeliness, Section 102, **9:26**
 Chemical composition, **9:26, 9:72-9:75**
 Chemical method, **9:77, 9:78**
 Chemical process, **9:1, 9:36, 9:79, 9:81-9:84**
 Chemical properties, **9:76**
 Chemistry, **9:70**
 Circumstantial evidence
 generally, **9:6**
 secondary considerations, **9:54, 9:60-9:64**
 Claims, **4:2, 4:72, 4:78**
 Clear and particular, **9:66**
 Closed list, **9:55**
 Co-employees, **9:26**
 Collaboratives
 groups, generally, **9:46**
 inventors, **9:28**
 research, **9:1, 9:47, 9:83**
 researchers, **9:48**
 Colorful language, **9:4**

INDEX

NON-OBVIOUSNESS—Cont'd

- Combinations, **9:3, 9:7, 9:86**
- Commercial information, **9:53**
- Commercialization, **9:22**
- Commercial success, **9:6, 9:51, 9:61-9:64, 9:76**
- Common knowledge, **9:43**
- Common law, **9:4, 9:5**
- Common ownership
 - biotechnological process, Section 103(b), **9:83**
 - secret prior art, **9:44, 9:47**
 - timeliness, Section 102, below
- Competition, **9:11, 9:47, 9:60**
- Compromise for administrative efficiency, **9:14-9:16**
- Concealment, **9:28, 9:29, 9:34, 9:39**
- Confidentiality, **9:28**
- Configurations
 - determination of obviousness, **9:66, 9:67**
 - structures accompanied by properties or uses, **9:70, 9:77**
 - technological configuration, **9:19**
 - timeliness, Section 102, **9:27**
- Congress
 - generally, **9:2, 9:5, 9:9**
 - biotechnological process, Section 103(b), **9:85**
 - Graham v. John Deere, **9:16**
 - secret prior art, **9:32, 9:41, 9:45-9:48**
 - starting and ending materials, **9:78**
 - structures accompanied by properties or uses, **9:73**
 - timeliness, Section 102, **9:26**
- Consequences, **9:63, 9:64**
- Constitutional law, **9:9**
- Construction and interpretation, generally, **9:1**
- Constructive publication, **9:33**
- Content of prior art. Graham v. John Deere, below
- Contracts and agreements, **9:47**
- Cooperative research, **9:46**
- Cooperative Research and Technology Enhancement Act of 2004, **9:48.1**

NON-OBVIOUSNESS—Cont'd

- Copies and copying, **9:51, 9:60**
- Copyrights, **9:47**
- Corollaries, **9:55**
- Corrective provisions, **9:77**
- Costs and expenses, **9:10, 9:77, 9:82**
- Court of Customs and Patent Appeals (CCPA)
 - biotechnological process, Section 103(b), **9:85, 9:86**
 - determination of obviousness, **9:66, 9:68**
 - secret prior art, **9:37, 9:42**
 - starting and ending materials, **9:79**
 - structures accompanied by properties or uses, **9:73**
 - timeliness, Section 102, **9:25-9:27**
- Courts, generally, **9:5**
- Creativity of applicant, **9:43**
- Cross-licenses, **9:11**
- Customers, **9:62**
- Definiteness, lack of, **9:3**
- Definition of another, **9:46, 9:47**
- Delay, **9:39**
- Deliberate, **9:67, 9:68**
- Derived from another under Section 102(f), **9:41**
- Description as identical, generally, **9:1**
- Determination of obviousness
 - Graham v. John Deere, below
 - ordinary skill in the art, generally, **9:65**
- Differences between prior art and claimed invention, **9:49**
- Disclosure (this index)
- Discovery, **9:9, 9:39, 9:77**
- District court, **9:3**
 - secret prior art, **9:33**
- District courts, **9:33**
- District of Columbia, **9:33**
- Doctrine of inherent anticipation, **9:77**
- Doctrine of lost counts, **9:35, 9:37**
- Dominant authority, **9:73**
- Double patenting, **9:36, 9:83**
- Drawings, **9:42**
- Due course, **9:28, 9:29**

NON-OBVIOUSNESS—Cont'd

- Early history, **9:53**
- Economics, **9:38, 9:39, 9:43**
- Education level, **9:50**
- Effective filing date, **9:83**
- Efficiency, **9:14-9:16**
- Election, **9:78**
- Electrical arts, **9:76**
- Electrical field, **9:70**
- Employment
 - biotechnological process, Section 103(b), **9:83**
 - collaborative employed researchers, **9:48**
 - collaborative groups of employed inventors, **9:28**
 - joint employment, **9:37**
 - jointly employed inventors, **9:33**
 - researchers, **9:46**
 - secret prior art, **9:28, 9:33, 9:37, 9:46, 9:47**
 - structures accompanied by properties or uses, **9:73**
 - timeliness, Section 102, **9:26**
- En banc court, **9:85**
- En banc decision, **9:74**
- Europe, **9:5**
- European Patent Convention, **9:38**
- Evidence, generally, **9:3**
- Examining Corps, **9:78**
- Exceed established art, **9:9**
- Exceeding the art or existing technology, generally, **9:1**
- Exceptions and exclusions
 - Cooperative Research and Technology Enhancement Act of 2004, **9:48.1**
 - Graham v. John Deere, below structures accompanied by properties or uses, **9:73**
 - timeliness, Section 102, below
- Exclusive rights, **9:60**
- Executive Branch, **9:82**
- Existing public domain, **9:9**
- Ex parte rejection, **9:37**
- Ex parte Robbins, **9:36, 9:37**
- Experience, **9:50**
- Experiments, **9:67**

NON-OBVIOUSNESS—Cont'd

- Express instructions or advice, **9:66**
- Fairness, lack of, **9:28**
- Federal Circuit
 - biotechnological process, Section 103(b), **9:85**
 - determination of obviousness, **9:66, 9:67**
 - Graham v. John Deere, **9:50**
 - secret prior art, **9:41, 9:48**
 - starting and ending materials, **9:80**
 - structures accompanied by properties or uses, **9:74**
- Filing application
 - secret prior art, **9:33, 9:38, 9:39, 9:42, 9:48**
 - timeliness, Section 102, **9:22**
- Filing date of application
 - biotechnological process, Section 103(b), **9:83**
 - Rule 131 affidavits, **9:36**
 - secret prior art, **9:28, 9:32, 9:33, 9:36**
 - timeliness, Section 102, **9:24-9:26**
- Finding, failure to make, **9:50**
- First Circuit, **9:60**
- First-to-file priority, **9:38**
- Follow-on developments, **9:46**
- Follow-on patents, **9:11**
- Foreign Countries (this index)
- Foster, **9:26**
- Free access, **9:9**
- Functional similarity, **9:73**
- General configuration, **9:67**
- Graham v. John Deere
 - generally, **9:6, 9:9, 9:12-9:16**
 - compromise for administrative efficiency, **9:14-9:16**
 - content. Scope and content of prior art, below in this group
 - determination of obviousness, **9:65**
 - generally, **9:65-9:69**
 - adequate suggestion, **9:66**
 - inherent anticipation, relation to, **9:69**
 - obvious to try, **9:67**
 - small differences, **9:68**

INDEX

NON-OBVIOUSNESS—Cont'd

Graham v. John Deere—Cont'd
determination of obviousness, **9:65**
—Cont'd
unpredictable arts and optimization, **9:67**
differences between prior art and claimed invention, **9:12, 9:49**
exceptions and exclusions
generally, **9:17**
secondary considerations, **9:60**
secret prior art, **9:32, 9:33, 9:37, 9:47**
history, **9:6, 9:15**
ordinarily skilled artisan, **9:50**
ordinary artisan in art, level of skill of, **9:12**
Patent Act of 1952, **9:16**
scope and content of prior art
generally, **9:12, 9:17-9:48**
analogousness, **9:18, 9:19**
inoperative disclosures, **9:19**
Section 102. Timeliness, Section 102, below
technological field, relation to, **9:18, 9:19**
timeliness, Section 102, below
secondary considerations
generally, **9:12, 9:51-9:64**
commercial success, **9:61-9:64, 9:62**
consequences, **9:63, 9:64**
copying, **9:60**
corollaries, **9:55**
early history, **9:53**
Graham v. John Deere, treatment in, **9:52**
laudatory statements, **9:59**
long-felt need, **9:57**
nexus, **9:64**
simultaneous invention, **9:58**
underlying policy, **9:54, 9:55**
underlying rationale of commercial success, **9:62-9:64**
Section 102. Timeliness, Section 102, below
simultaneous invention, **9:58**
statements, **9:59**

NON-OBVIOUSNESS—Cont'd

Graham v. John Deere—Cont'd
structures accompanied by properties or uses, **9:76**
subjectiveness, **9:7**
subsequent developments up to 1952, **9:4**
success, **9:61-9:64, 9:62**
underlying policy, **9:54, 9:55**
underlying rationale of commercial success, **9:62-9:64**
Hass-Henze doctrine, **9:73**
Hazeltine Research Inc. v. Brenner, **9:33, 9:37, 9:38**
Hearsay, **9:59**
History
generally, **1:22-1:24, 9:2-9:7**
biotechnical processes, Section 103(B), **9:82**
Graham v. John Deere, **9:6, 9:15**
Hotchkiss v. Greenwood, **9:3**
Patent Act of 1952, **9:5, 9:6**
secondary considerations, **9:51, 9:53**
structures accompanied by properties or uses, **9:73**
subjectiveness, **9:7**
subsequent developments up to 1952, **9:4**
Hotchkiss v. Greenwood, **9:3, 9:15**
Hybrid claiming, relation to limits on, **9:77**
Identical description, generally, **9:1**
Improvements, **9:3, 9:59**
Increments, **9:9-9:11, 9:21, 9:31, 9:43**
Inferences, generally, **9:51-9:60**
Inherency
generally, **9:1**
Graham v. John Deere, **9:69**
structures accompanied by properties or uses, **9:70, 9:72, 9:77**
In light of all the circumstances, **9:58**
In re Albrecht
structures accompanied by properties or uses, **9:75**
In re Bartfeld
secret prior art, **9:48**

NON-OBVIOUSNESS—Cont'd

- In re Bass
 - secret prior art, **9:37, 9:38**
- In re Brouwer
 - biotechnological process, Section 103(b), **9:85**
- In re Dillon
 - structures accompanied by properties or uses, **9:74, 9:76**
- In re Durden
 - biotechnological process, Section 103(b), **9:82, 9:84, 9:85**
 - starting and ending materials, **9:80**
- In re Foster
 - timeliness, Section 102, **9:26, 9:27**
- In re Hass
 - structures accompanied by properties or uses, **9:73**
- In re Henze
 - structures accompanied by properties or uses, **9:73**
- In re Kuehl
 - starting and ending materials, **9:79, 9:80**
- In re Larsen
 - starting and ending materials, **9:79**
- In re Larson
 - biotechnological process, Section 103(b), **9:82, 9:84-9:86**
 - starting and ending materials, **9:80**
- In re Nomiya
 - secret prior art, **9:42**
- In re Ochiai
 - biotechnological process, Section 103(b), **9:85**
- In re Palmquist
 - timeliness, Section 102, **9:25, 9:26**
- In re Papesch
 - structures accompanied by properties or uses, **9:73, 9:76**
- In re Pleuddemann
 - biotechnological process, Section 103(b), **9:85**
 - starting and ending materials, **9:80**
- In re Sponnoble
 - determination of obviousness, **9:68**
- In re Wood
 - Graham v. John Deere, **9:18**

NON-OBVIOUSNESS—Cont'd

- In re Wright
 - determination of obviousness, **9:66**
 - structures accompanied by properties or uses, **9:74**
- Initial patent, **9:11**
- Inoperative disclosure, **9:19**
- Inspiration, **9:41**
- Instructions, **9:66**
- Instructions to jury, **9:3**
- Intent, **9:46**
- Interference, **9:11, 9:35, 9:36**
- Internal secret prior art, **9:47**
- Inventors, **9:1, 9:48**
- Investigation, **9:6, 9:54, 9:60**
- Issued patents, **9:37**
- Japan, **9:11, 9:42**
- Joint application, **9:36**
- Joint employment, **9:37**
- Joint invention, **9:46**
- Joint inventors, **9:37**
- Joint inventorship, **10:42**
- Jointly employed inventors, **9:33**
- Joint ventures, **9:47**
- Judicial decisions, **9:2**
- Judicial interpretation, **9:4, 9:16**
- Justification
 - policy justification, **9:8-9:11**
 - timeliness, Section 102, below
- Knowledgeable in art, **9:57**
- Laudatory statements, **9:57, 9:59, 9:62**
- Law prior to 1952, **9:31**
- Legislation, **9:5, 9:82**
- Limitations and restrictions, **9:1, 9:9**
 - biotechnological process, Section 103(b), **9:81, 9:84, 9:86**
 - determination of obviousness, **9:66**
 - Graham v. John Deere, **9:18, 9:19**
 - secret prior art, generally, **9:28-9:47**
 - structures accompanied by properties or uses, **9:77**
 - timeliness, Section 102, **9:24**
- Literal language, **9:24, 9:25**
- Logical deliberate act, **9:67**
- Lower court, **9:33**
- Marketplace, **9:54**

INDEX

NON-OBVIOUSNESS—Cont'd

- Meaningful patent protection, **9:77**
- Mechanical arts, **9:76**
- Mechanical field, **9:70**
- Minor variations, **9:1, 9:2**
- Mistake and error
 - Graham v. John Deere, **9:49**
 - reversible error, **9:7**
 - secondary considerations, **9:51, 9:54, 9:62**
- Motivation, **9:66, 9:74**
- Multiple disclosures, **9:41**
- Multiple persons working independent of each other, **9:58**
- Multiple prior applications, **9:37**
- Nearest prior art, **9:59**
- Nearest prior technology, generally, **9:1**
- Negative rules, **9:4, 9:15**
- New development, **9:77**
- Newly discovered properties, **9:77**
- Newly understood technical details, **9:77**
- Nexus, **9:60, 9:61, 9:64**
- Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:53, 5:71, 5:74, 5:84**
- Notice and knowledge
 - generally, **9:9**
 - determination of obviousness, **9:65, 9:67, 9:69**
 - Graham v. John Deere, **9:15, 9:18, 9:21, 9:49**
 - secondary considerations, **9:57**
 - secret prior art, below
 - secret prior art, generally, **9:38-9:43**
 - skill and level of background knowledge in the art, **9:74**
 - structures accompanied by properties or uses, **9:73, 9:74, 9:77**
 - timeliness, Section 102, **9:20, 9:21, 9:27**
- Novelty
 - biotechnological process, Section 103(b), **9:83**
 - Graham v. John Deere, **9:15**
 - starting and ending materials, **9:79**
 - structures accompanied by properties or uses, **9:73, 9:77**

NON-OBVIOUSNESS—Cont'd

- Novelty—Cont'd
 - timeliness, Section 102, **9:23, 9:26**
- Objective considerations, **9:54**
- Obvious to try, **9:67**
- Oddz On Products, Inc. v. Just Toys, Inc., **9:41, 9:43**
- Optimization, **9:67**
- Ordinarily skilled artisan, **9:50**
- Ordinary artisan, **9:54**
- Ordinary artisan, skill of, **9:6, 9:78**
- Ordinary mechanic, **9:15**
- Ordinary mechanic acquainted with business, **9:3**
- Ordinary skill, **9:12, 9:75**
- Ordinary skill in the art, generally, **9:1**
- Out-of-court statements, **9:59**
- Palmquist, **9:25**
- Patentability, generally, **9:1**
- Patent Act amendments of 1984, **9:45**
- Patent Act amendments of 1999 and Section 102(e), **9:48**
- Patent Act of 1790, **9:2**
- Patent Act of 1793, **9:2**
- Patent Act of 1952 (this index)
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO)
 - biotechnological process, Section 103(b), **9:84, 9:85**
 - determination of obviousness, **9:68**
 - secret prior art, **9:33, 9:35-9:37, 9:42**
 - starting and ending materials, **9:78, 9:80**
 - structures accompanied by properties or uses, **9:73, 9:74**
 - timeliness, Section 102, **9:25**
- Patent-driven inventions, **9:10**
- Pending applications, **9:30, 9:33, 9:36-9:38, 9:42**
- Per curiam, **9:33**
- Per se risks, **9:77**
- Per se structure, **9:77**
- Personal knowledge, **9:43**
- Pipeline justifications. Timeliness, Section 102, below
- Policy justification, **9:8-9:11, 9:27, 9:39**

NON-OBVIOUSNESS—Cont'd

Possession, **9:27, 9:39, 9:70, 9:77**
 Possession in due course, **9:39**
 Post hoc obligations, **9:47**
 Precision, lack of, **9:3**
 Predictability, lack of, **9:3**
 Preexisting technology, **9:23**
 Preservation of existing public-domain, Section 102(B). Timeliness, Section 102, below
 Presumptions, **9:57**
 Prima facie, properties of chemical compositions, **9:74**
 Prima facie case, **9:7, 9:72, 9:75**
 Prima facie showing
 secondary considerations, **9:61, 9:64**
 structures accompanied by properties or uses, **9:72, 9:74, 9:76**
 Printed publication, description in, **9:21**
 Prior art, see lines throughout this index topic
 Prior-filed applications under Section 102(e), contents of, **9:30-9:33**
 Prior Inventive Acts under Section 102(g), **9:34-9:37**
 Priority, **8:136, 9:38**
 Prior technology, nearest, generally, **9:1**
 Private information, **9:46**
 Privately known information, **9:43**
 Pro forma, **9:84**
 Promoting progress, **9:9**
 Publication
 constructive publication, **9:33**
 secret prior art, **9:28, 9:30, 9:38**
 structures accompanied by properties or uses, **9:73**
 timeliness, Section 102, **9:21, 9:25, 9:26**
 Public disclosure, **9:22, 9:42, 9:51**
 Public domain
 generally, **9:10**
 determination of obviousness, **9:65**
 existing public domain, **9:9**
 secret prior art, **9:28, 9:29, 9:43**
 structures accompanied by properties or uses, **9:77**

NON-OBVIOUSNESS—Cont'd

Public domain—Cont'd
 timeliness, Section 102, **9:27**
 Public events. Timeliness, Section 102, below
 Public in due course, **9:28, 9:29**
 Public knowledge, **9:21, 9:38**
 Publicly available patent, **9:21**
 Publicly known, **9:39, 9:41**
 Publicly observable uses, **9:21**
 Public policy, **9:28**
 Public possession, **9:77**
 Public use, **9:39, 9:43**
 Qualifications
 secret prior art, generally, **9:37-9:48**
 timeliness, Section 102, generally, **9:20-9:27**
 Qualitative advance, **9:16**
 Qualitative differences, **9:23, 9:62**
 Qualitative increments, **9:8**
 Quality of invention, lack of, **9:4**
 Reasonably pertinent to particular problem, **9:18**
 Reasons, **9:66**
 Rebuttal, **9:7, 9:74**
 Rebuttal showings, **9:75**
 Recited starting and/or ending materials, **9:1**
 Reexamination, **9:26**
 Reference
 determination of obviousness, **9:66**
 Graham v. John Deere, **9:19**
 secret prior art, generally, **9:33-9:48**
 structures accompanied by properties or uses, **9:73, 9:74**
 timeliness, Section 102, **9:20, 9:21, 9:26**
 Rejection of Application (this index)
 Relevant art, **9:51**
 Remand, **9:50**
 Research and development
 generally, **9:10**
 biotechnological process, Section 103(b), **9:82**
 collaborative employed researchers, **9:48**

INDEX

NON-OBVIOUSNESS—Cont'd

Research and development—Cont'd
collaborative research, **9:1, 9:47, 9:83**

employed researchers, **9:46**

Researchers, **9:46, 9:48**

Reversal

determination of obviousness, **9:68**

secret prior art, **9:36**

structures accompanied by properties or uses, **9:73**

timeliness, Section 102, **9:25, 9:26**

Reversible error, **9:7, 9:51**

Robbins, **9:36**

Rule 131 affidavit, **9:25, 9:36, 9:37**

Sampling, **9:9**

Secondary considerations

generally, **9:6**

Graham v. John Deere, above
structures accompanied by properties or uses, **9:76**

Secret prior art

generally, **9:46, 9:48**

Cooperative Research and
Technology Enhancement Act
of 2004, **9:48.1**

secondary considerations. Graham
v. John Deere, above

timeliness, Section 102, below

Section 102, generally, **9:1**

Section 103, generally, **9:1**

Showings, **9:75**

Simply changing form or proportion,
9:2

Skill

generally, **9:4**

Graham v. John Deere, **9:15, 9:50**

ordinary artisan's level of skill, **9:6**

starting and ending materials, **9:78**

structures accompanied by properties or uses, **9:74, 9:75**

Small differences, **9:68**

Sophistication of technology, **9:50**

Spontaneous statements, **9:59**

Starting and ending materials

generally, **9:1**

biotechnical processes, Section
103(B), above

NON-OBVIOUSNESS—Cont'd

State of mind, **9:43, 9:59**

State of the art, **9:28, 9:38, 9:58**

Static physical configurations, **5:9, 5:12, 5:16**

Statutory subject matter, **5:1**

Structural similarities, **9:73, 9:74**

Structures accompanied by properties
or uses

generally, **9:70-9:77**

chemical compositions, properties
of, **9:72-9:75**

historical development, properties
of chemical compositions,
9:73

hybrid claiming, relation to limits
on, **9:77**

prima facie, properties of chemical
compositions, **9:74**

rebuttal showings, properties of
chemical compositions, **9:75**

unexpected results, **9:76**

Subjective creativity, **9:20**

Subjective insight, **9:41-9:43**

Subjective judgments, **9:54**

Subjective state of mind, **9:43**

Substantial logic, **9:43**

Suggestion, **9:66, 9:77**

Superior property or advantage, **9:75**

Suppression, **9:28, 9:29, 9:34, 9:39**

Supreme Court

generally, **9:3, 9:6**

Graham v. John Deere, **9:49, 9:50**

secondary considerations, **9:52, 9:53**

secret prior art, **9:33, 9:37**

supreme court assignment of interpretation, **9:1**

Technical community, **9:54**

Technical details, **9:77**

Technical disclosures, **9:54**

Technological configuration, **9:19, 9:65, 9:77**

Technological field, **9:17-9:19**

Technological scope, **13:81, 13:82**

Tests and experiments

generally, **9:3**

determination of obviousness, **9:67**

NON-OBVIOUSNESS—Cont'd

Tests and experiments—Cont'd
 Graham v. John Deere, **9:14, 9:16**
 structures accompanied by proper-
 ties or uses, **9:74**
 timeliness, Section 102, **9:23**
 Third parties, **9:59**
 Third persons, **9:28, 9:29, 9:40, 9:41**
 Timeliness, Section 102
 generally, **9:20-9:48**
 at time invention was made, **9:21**
 common ownership. Secret prior
 art, below in this group
 exceptions for common ownership.
 Secret prior art, below in this
 group
 justifications. Secret prior art,
 below in this group
 law prior to 1952, **9:31**
 pipeline justifications. Secret prior
 art, below in this group
 preservation of existing public-
 domain, Section 102(B)
 generally, **9:22-9:27**
 Foster, **9:26**
 law prior to 1952, **9:23**
 Palmquist, **9:25**
 Patent Act of 1952, **9:24-9:26**
 policy justification, **9:27**
 public events, generally, **9:22-9:27**
 public events. Preservation of
 existing public-domain, Sec-
 tion 102(B), above in this
 group
 public knowledge under Section
 102(A), **9:21**
 secret prior art
 generally, **9:28-9:48**
 adequacy of applicant's subjec-
 tive insight, **9:41-9:43**
 admissions, **9:42**
 Bass, **9:37**
 common ownership, exceptions
 for, generally, **9:44-9:48**
 derived from another under Sec-
 tion 102(f), **9:41**
 early law, Prior Inventive Acts
 under Section 102(g), **9:35**

NON-OBVIOUSNESS—Cont'd

Timeliness, Section 102—Cont'd
 secret prior art—Cont'd
 examples, Section 103(c), **9:47**
 exceptions for common owner-
 ship, generally, **9:44-9:48**
 foreign systems, contract with,
 9:38
 Hazeltine Research Inc. v.
 Brenner, **9:33**
 law prior to 1952, **9:31**
 Patent Act of 1952, **9:32, 9:33**
 patent law amendments of 1984,
 9:45
 patent law amendments of 1999
 and Section 102(e), **9:48**
 pipeline justifications, generally,
 9:29-9:39
 policy justification, **9:39**
 policy rationale, **9:43**
 prior-filed applications under
 Section 102(e), contents of,
 9:30-9:33
 Prior Inventive Acts under Sec-
 tion 102(g), **9:34-9:37**
 Robbins, **9:36**
 Section 103(c), generally, **9:44-9:48**
 title and ownership, exceptions
 for common ownership,
 generally, **9:44-9:48**
 underlying policy, **9:46**
 title and ownership. Secret prior
 art, above in this group
 Time-wise priority, **9:38**
 Timing, **9:17**
 Title and ownership
 generally, **9:3, 9:5**
 common ownership
 biotechnological process, Sec-
 tion 103(b), **9:83**
 secret prior art, **9:44, 9:47**
 timeliness, Section 102, **9:20**
 secondary considerations, **9:64**
 secret prior art, **9:44, 9:46, 9:47**
 timeliness, Section 102, above
 Torpharm, Inc. v. Ranbaxy
 Pharmaceuticals, Inc., **9:85**
 Trial court, generally, **9:3**

INDEX

NON-OBVIOUSNESS—Cont'd

- Underlying policy, **9:46**
- Undue delay, **9:39**
- Unexpected properties, **9:77**
- Unexpected results, **9:76**
- Universities, **9:47**
- Unpredictable arts and optimization, **9:67**
- Useful arts, **9:9**
- Usefulness, **9:2**
- Useful property, **9:77**
- Uses. Structures accompanied by properties or uses, above
- Validity
 - generally, **9:3, 9:9**
 - biotechnological process, Section 103(b), **9:83**
 - secondary considerations, **9:59, 9:60**
 - secret prior art, **9:37**
 - structures accompanied by properties or uses, **9:72**
 - timeliness, Section 102, **9:23**
- Verdict, **9:3**
- Worst case scenario, **9:65**
- Written acts and matters, **9:2**

NON-PROFIT ENTITY

- Prior inventor, prior-user rights, **22:22**

NONSPECIALIST DISTRICT COURT

- Claims, **4:6**

NON-STATUTORY HYBRID INVENTIONS

- Generally, **5:1, 5:47-5:85**
- Abele v., **5:76**
- Abstract idea, **5:78**
- Administrative decisions, **5:81**
- Administrative law, **5:59, 5:83**
- Advance, **5:71**
- Aggregation of elements, invention as, **5:51**
- Alappat v., **5:76**
- Algorithm, **5:80**
- Anticipation, **5:53, 5:74, 5:84**
- Anticipation (Section 102), **5:71**
- Apparatus vs. method, **5:80**

NON-STATUTORY HYBRID INVENTIONS—Cont'd

- Appeal and review
 - Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, **5:83**
 - Court of Customs and Patent Appeals (CCPA), **5:68, 5:76**
 - current law, **5:53, 5:81**
 - history, **5:70, 5:72, 5:75**
- Application of technology, generally, **5:47-5:85**
- Applied technology, **5:61**
- Art-based inquiry, **5:63**
- As a whole, **5:48, 5:56**
- Binary classification, **5:58**
- Blue-pencil rule
 - generally, **5:67-5:72**
 - current law, generally, **5:78-5:85**
 - documentation, lack of, **5:72**
 - historical development, **5:68**
 - nontrivial, statutory element as, **5:70**
- Sections 102 and 103, **5:71**
- Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, **5:83**
- Bona fides, **5:74**
- Bubble hierarchies, **5:78**
- Business method, **5:80**
- Calculated quantity, **5:83**
- Calculational steps, **5:81**
- Case law, **5:53**
- Change and modification, **5:68, 5:81**
- Claimed inventions, generally, **5:48**
- Clarity, **5:80**
- Collections of smaller, included elements, **5:50**
- Combinations
 - generally, **5:50, 5:51**
 - calculational steps, **5:81**
 - elements, **5:68, 5:76**
 - statutory and non-statutory elements, **5:52**
- Commissioner of Patents, **5:83**
- Common law, **5:59**
- Compilations, **5:55**
- Computers, **5:54, 5:78**
- Considered per se, **5:84**

**NON-STATUTORY HYBRID
INVENTIONS—Cont'd**

Construction and interpretation, **5:59, 5:80**
 Contribution to discovery, **5:61**
 Court decisions, **5:83**
 Court of Customs and Patent Appeals (CCPA), **5:74, 5:76**
 Courts, generally, **5:54**
 Current law, generally, **5:76-5:83**
 Data per se, **5:69**
 Data structure, **5:78**
 Decisions, **5:73-5:75**
 Definitions, **5:55, 5:76**
 Detailed rule, implementation of, **5:64**
 Diagramming patent claims, **5:55**
 Diamond v. Diehr, **5:73-5:75, 5:84, 5:85**
 Director of Patents, **5:83**
 Disclosure, **5:80**
 Discovery, **5:61**
 Discretionary standard, **5:49**
 Discretion of examiners, **5:64**
 Discretion of individual decision maker, **5:64**
 Documentation, lack of, **5:72**
 Doing business, **5:78**
 Economically significant, **5:84**
 Economic importance, **5:83**
 Elements per se, **5:74**
 En banc decision, **5:76**
 Examination, **5:69, 5:85**
 Examiners, **5:48, 5:64, 5:68**
 Examining corps, **5:56, 5:72, 5:83**
 Expectation of enhanced profits, **5:61**
 Factual data, **5:55**
 Federal Circuit
 generally, **5:76-5:83**
 apparatus vs. method, **5:80**
 computer-related examples, **5:78**
 In re Warmerdam, **5:78**
 non-computer related inventions, **5:82**
 process requirements and information technologies, **5:81**
 State Street Bank, **5:79**
 Financial data, **5:83**

**NON-STATUTORY HYBRID
INVENTIONS—Cont'd**

Freeman-Walter-Abele test, **5:81**
 Fundamental issue of binary classification, **5:58**
 History, **5:65-5:75**
 Hybrids, **5:81**
 Incentives, **5:61, 5:74**
 Information technologies, **5:81**
 In re Abele, **5:81**
 In re Alappat, **5:76, 5:85**
 In re Durden, **5:84**
 In re Freeman, **5:76, 5:81**
 In re Smith, **5:84**
 In re Walter, **5:81**
 In re Warmerdam, **5:78**
 Interferences, **5:83**
 Issuance of patent, **5:63**
 Judgments, **5:85**
 Judicial decisions, **5:81, 5:83**
 Legislation, **5:83**
 Limitations and restrictions
 current laws, **5:76, 5:78**
 history, **5:70, 5:74**
 policy objections, **5:63, 5:64**
 section 102, **5:84**
 section 103, **5:84**
 standards vs. rules, **5:49**
 Manipulative steps, **5:55**
 Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 2106, **5:83**
 Manufacture, articles of, **5:55**
 Mathematical algorithm, **5:78, 5:81**
 Mathematical calculations, **5:55, 5:78**
 Mathematical formula, **5:74, 5:76**
 Mental steps, **5:55**
 Method, apparatus vs., **5:80**
 Musical data, **5:83**
 Natural phenomena, **5:78**
 Nomenclature convention, **5:55**
 Non-computer related inventions, **5:82**
 Non-obviousness, Section 103, **5:53, 5:71, 5:74, 5:84**
 Nontrivial, statutory element as, **5:70**
 Notice and knowledge, **5:62, 5:72, 5:74**

INDEX

NON-STATUTORY HYBRID INVENTIONS—Cont'd

Novelty (this index)
Numerical calculations, **5:81, 5:82**
Official statements, **5:83**
Overall policy objectives, **5:60-5:64**
Parker v. Flook, **5:74, 5:85**
Patentability, generally, **5:50**
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
generally, **5:53**
Peripheral claiming, **5:50**
Peripheral claims, **5:55**
Peripherally claimed, **5:52**
Per se statutory subject matter, **5:69**
Physical manipulations, **5:78, 5:81**
Physical structure, **5:53**
Physical transformation, **5:81**
Poem per se, **5:62**
Point of novelty, **5:66**
Policy judgments, **5:85**
Policy objectives, generally, **5:56-5:66**
Possibly patentable, **5:84**
Practical importance, **5:57**
Predictability, **5:64**
Preemption, **5:75, 5:81**
Printed matter, **5:55, 5:82**
Prior art, **5:63, 5:72**
Prior knowledge, **5:62, 5:74**
Prior state of the art, absence of
inquiry into, **5:62**
Process requirements and information
technologies, **5:81**
Profits, **5:61**
Programmed computer, **5:78**
Proper placement of non-statutory
adjudication, **5:63**
Qualifications, **5:74**
Rejection of application
current law, **5:53, 5:80**
history, **5:75**
policy objectives, **5:57, 5:63**
Research and development, **5:61**
Robotic environment, **5:78**
Rules, standards vs., **5:49, 5:50**
Scholarship notes, **5:49**
Section 101, generally, **5:47-5:85**
Section 102, generally, **5:53-5:85**

NON-STATUTORY HYBRID INVENTIONS—Cont'd

Section 103, generally, **5:48-5:85**
Specification, **5:80**
Standards vs. rules, **5:49, 5:50**
Stare decisis, **5:75, 5:76**
State of the art, **5:62, 5:69, 5:85**
State Street Bank & Trust Co. v.
Signature Financial Group, Inc.,
5:79
Statutory provision, **5:59**
Statutory steps, **5:81**
Subcombinations per se, **5:50**
Subjective outlook, **5:49**
Subsequent developments, generally,
5:76-5:83
Supervisory procedure, **5:83**
Supreme Court, **5:53, 5:72, 5:73-5:75, 5:83-5:85**
Supreme Court decisions, **5:73-5:75**
Tests, **5:64, 5:74, 5:78, 5:81**
Textual data, **5:83**
37 CFR, **5:83**
Training materials, **5:83**
Transferring funds, **5:83**
Trial court, **5:78**
Uniformity, **5:64**
Validity, **5:76**
Value, **5:49**
Viewed per se, **5:83**
Walter v., **5:76**

NON-STATUTORY SUBJECT MATTER

Generally, **5:1, 5:3**
Computer-related inventions, **5:41, 5:44, 5:45**
Non-Statutory Hybrid Inventions
(this index)
Processes (this index)
Static physical configurations, **5:10, 5:11, 5:17**

NONTRIVIAL STATUTORY ELEMENT

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:70**

NOT BEFORE KNOWN OR USED

History, **1:18**

NOTICE AND KNOWLEDGE

Adequate commerciality, **14:14, 14:53, 14:61, 14:76**
 Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)
 Claims (this index)
 Correction of inventorship, **10:68**
 Disclosure (this index)
 Examination of Original Application (this index)
 History, **1:18, 1:19**
 Indirect infringement, **15:15, 15:20, 15:24**
 Inventorship, **10:12**
 Joint Inventorship (this index)
 Noninfringement defenses, **17:14**
 Non-obviousness (this index)
 Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:62, 5:72, 5:74**
 Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), generally, **2:13**
 Policy justification, **1:28, 1:35, 1:38, 1:39**
 Priority (this index)
 Processes, **5:21, 5:24**
 Technological configuration, **9:71**
 Technological scope, **13:54, 13:75, 13:76**
 Utility Requirement (this index)

NOVELTY

Abandonment, **8:268**
 Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)
 Blue-pencil rule, **5:67-5:72, 5:71**
 Claims, **4:72**
 Correction, **10:59, 10:68**
 Diamond v. Diehr, **5:75**
 Examination of Original Application (this index)
 History, **1:19**
 Inventorship, **10:14**
 Non-obviousness
 biotechnological process, Section 103(b), **9:83**
 Graham v. John Deere, **9:15**
 starting and ending materials, **9:79**
 structures accompanied by properties or uses, **9:73, 9:77**
 timeliness, Section 102, **9:23, 9:26**
 Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:66**

NOVELTY—Cont'd

Parker v. Flook, **5:73, 5:74**
 Policy justification, **1:29**
 Priority (this index)
 Processes, **5:21**
 Static physical configurations, **5:14**
 Technological scope, **13:90**

NOXIOUS BEHAVIOR

Adequate utility, **6:5, 6:15**

NOXIOUS OR OTHERWISE HARMFUL

Adequate utility, **6:15**

NTP, INC. v. RESEARCH IN MOTION, LTD.

Adequate commerciality, **14:28**

NULLITY

Processes, **5:24**

NUMERICAL CALCULATIONS

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:81, 5:82**
 Processes, **5:30**

NUMERICAL CONSTRUCT

Processes, **5:23**

OATH

Adequate disclosure, **7:28**
 Joint inventorship, **10:40**
 Reissue of patent, **16:108**

OBJECTION

Claims, **4:2**
 Joint inventorship, **10:49**
 Processes, **5:26, 5:29**

OBJECTIONABLE

Claims, **4:66**

OBJECTIONABLE PER SE

Claims, **4:5**

OBJECTIVE CIRCUMSTANCES

Priority, **8:254**

OBJECTIVE CONSIDERATIONS

Non-obviousness, **9:54**

OBSERVATIONS

Statutory subject matter, **5:36-5:38**

INDEX

OBVIOUSNESS

Non-Obviousness (this index)

ODDZ ON PRODUCTS, INC. v. JUST TOYS, INC.

Non-obviousness, **9:41, 9:43**

OFFENSIVE INVENTION

Priority, **8:53, 8:108**

OFFENSIVE USES

Priority, **8:118**

OFFER FOR SALE

Adequate Commerciality (this index)

Geographic scope, **12:19-12:21**

Indirect Infringement (this index)

OFFERS

Priority, **8:228**

OFFICE OF ENROLLMENT AND DISCIPLINE (OED)

Generally, **2:22**

OFFICE OF LEGISLATIVE AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS (OLIA)

Generally, **2:22**

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:22

OFFICERS

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:22

OFFICIAL GAZETTE

Generally, **2:20, 2:24, 2:27, 2:28**

OFFICIAL NOTICES

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:24

OFFICIAL PRONOUNCEMENTS

History, **1:1**

OFFICIAL STATEMENTS

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:83**

OLIVER EVANS

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:4

OMISSIONS

Correction (this index)

Inventorship, **10:12**

Joint inventorship, **10:19**

ONGOING LICENSE

NEGOTIATIONS

Laches, unreasonable delay, **23:32**

ON SALE

Anticipation, lack of, **8:20**

Priority (this index)

ONSET OF PERIOD

Laches, unreasonable delay, **23:25-23:35**

OPEN COMMUNICATIONS

History, **1:1**

OPEN FORMATS

Claims, **4:98**

OPEN LETTERS (LITTERAE PATENTES)

History, **1:1**

OPEN SOVEREIGN LETTERS

History, **1:1**

OPERABILITY

Utility Requirement (this index)

OPERATIONAL COSTS

Policy justification, **1:31**

OPERATION OF LAW

Inventorship (this index)

OPERATIVE DISCLOSURE

Adequate disclosure, **7:18**

OPERATIVE MEANS

Adequate utility, **7:2**

OPERATIVE METHOD

Adequate disclosure, **7:1, 7:13**

OPTIMIZATION

Non-obviousness, **9:67**

ORAL HEARING

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:28

ORAL STATEMENTS

Priority, **8:71**

ORAL TESTIMONY

Priority, **8:74**

ORDER

Invalidity (this index)
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:7, 2:26
Processes, **5:39**
Utility requirement, **6:15**

ORDERS OF COMMISSIONER

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:26

ORDINARY ARTISAN

Joint inventorship, **10:31**
Non-obviousness, **9:6, 9:54, 9:78**

**ORDINARY COURSE OF
PROSECUTION**

Anticipation, lack of, **8:22**

ORDINARY MECHANIC

Non-obviousness, **9:15**

**ORDINARY MECHANIC
ACQUAINTED WITH
BUSINESS**

Non-obviousness, **9:3**

ORDINARY PERSONALTY

Priority, **8:39**

ORDINARY PURCHASER

Designs, **5:46**

ORDINARY SKILL

Adequate disclosure, **7:52**
Adequate utility, **7:9, 7:18**
Anticipation, lack of, **8:29, 8:31**
History, **1:23**
Non-obviousness, **9:12, 9:75**
Non-Obviousness (this index)
Priority, **8:58**

O'REILLY v. MORSE

Claims, **4:9**
Processes, **5:24**

**O'REILLY v. MORSEILLY V.
MORSE**

Reissue of patent, **16:27**

**ORGANISMS, GENE
SEQUENCING**

Adequate utility, **7:14**

ORIGINAL APPLICANT

Joint inventorship, **10:34**

ORIGINAL APPLICATION

Adequate disclosure, **7:56**
Anticipation, lack of, **8:22**
Examination of Original Applications
(this index)
Joint inventorship, **10:45**

ORIGINAL FILING DATE

Adequate disclosure, **7:29, 7:31, 7:42**

ORIGINAL INVENTIVE ENTITY

Correction of inventorship, **10:60**

ORIGINAL INVENTOR

History, **1:18**
Inventorship, **10:7, 10:9, 10:10**
Joint inventorship, **10:19**

ORIGINALITY

Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)

ORIGINALLY NAMED INVENTOR

Correction of inventorship, **10:60**

ORIGINAL RIGHTS

Reissue of patent, **16:111**

**ORNAMENTAL EXTERIOR
APPEARANCE OF ARTICLE
OF MANUFACTURE**

Designs, **5:46**

OUTER SPACE

Geographic scope, **12:9, 12:14**

OUTGOING TRANSACTIONS

Geographic Scope of Infringement
(this index)

OUT-OF-COURT STATEMENTS

Non-obviousness, **9:59**

OUTSIDE SOURCES

Anticipation, lack of, **8:30-8:32**

INDEX

OVER-BREADTH

Adequate disclosure, **7:24**

OWNERSHIP

Title and Ownership (this index)

PAGE v. FERRY

Adequate utility, **7:45, 7:48**

PAINTING

Static physical configurations, **5:8**

PALLIN v. SINGER

Medical and diagnostic procedures,
section 287(c) defense, **20:5**

PALMQUIST

Non-obviousness, **9:25**

PANAMA

Adequate utility, **7:18**

PANNU v. IOLAB

Joint inventorship, **10:33**

PAPER ACCOUNTING FORMS

Processes, **5:38**

PAPER CONVERTING MACHINE CO. v. MAGNA-GRAPHICS CORP.

Adequate Commerciality (this index)

PARALLEL IMPORTATION

Defenses, implied-in-law licenses,
19:44

PARALLEL PROSECUTION

Reexamination, stay of proceedings,
16:131

PARALLEL STRUCTURE

History, **1:11**

PAREDEN v. TERMINAL RAILWAY OF ALABAMA STATE DOCKS DEPT.

History, **1:14**

PARENT APPLICATION

Examination of Original Application
(this index)

Joint inventorship, **10:46**

PARIS CONVENTION

Prior inventor, prior-user rights, **22:8-22:10**

PARKER v. FLOOK

Non-statutory hybrid inventions,
5:74, 5:85

PARKER & WHIPPLE CO. v. YALE CLOCK CO.

Reissue of patent, **16:89**

PARLIAMENT

History, **1:4**

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:7

PAROL EVIDENCE

Reissue of patent, **16:33, 16:34**

PARTIAL ACTS AND MATTERS

Closed formats, **4:98**

Continuation in part, **8:147**

PARTIALLY CLOSED CLAIM FORMAT

Claims, **4:98**

PARTICIPANTS AND PARTICIPATION

Correction of inventorship, **10:60**

Joint inventorship, **10:28-10:30**

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:12, 2:13, 2:18

Processes, **5:30**

PARTIES

Correction of inventorship, **10:61**

Priority, **8:129, 8:232, 8:256**

PARTNERSHIPS

Inventorship, **10:14**

PATENTABILITY

Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)

Claims, **4:62, 4:67, 4:70, 4:72**

Computer-related inventions, **5:53**

Examination of Original Application
(this index)

History, **1:18, 1:19, 1:24**

Inventorship, **10:7**

Joint inventorship, **10:42**

Non-Obviousness (this index)

PATENTABILITY—Cont'd

- Non-Statutory Hybrid Inventions (this index)
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) (this index)
- Policy Justification (this index)
- Priority, **8:97**
- Processes, **5:22, 5:25, 5:36**
- Static Physical Configurations (this index)
- Statutory subject matter, **5:4**
- Substantial new question of patentability. Reexamination (this index)

PATENTABLE PER SE

- Claims, **4:76**

PATENT ACT

- Adequate Commerciality (this index)

PATENT ACT AMENDMENT OF 1982

- Correction of inventorship, **10:59, 10:63**

PATENT ACT AMENDMENT OF 1984

- Joint inventorship, **10:38**

PATENT ACT OF 1790

- Adequate disclosure, **7:45**
- Anticipation, lack of, **8:1**
- History, **1:18**
- Judicial review of US Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) decisions, **2:31**
- Non-obviousness, **9:2**
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:7, 2:15, 2:16, 2:20**
- Priority, **8:209**
- Processes, **5:21**
- Statutory subject matter, **5:2**
- Utility requirement, **6:1**

PATENT ACT OF 1793

- Adequate commerciality, **14:32**
- Adequate disclosure, **7:45**
- History, **1:18, 1:19**
- Judicial review of PTO decisions, **2:31**
- Non-obviousness, **9:2**

PATENT ACT OF 1793—Cont'd

- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:17, 2:25**
- Priority, **8:202, 8:209**
- Registration, **2:16**
- Static physical configurations, **5:8, 5:9**
- Statutory subject matter, **5:2**
- Utility requirement, **6:1**

PATENT ACT OF 1832

- Adequate disclosure, **7:31**
- Reissue of patent, **16:7**

PATENT ACT OF 1836

- Adequate commerciality, **14:4, 14:5**
- Adequate disclosure, **7:45**
- Adequate utility, **6:1**
- Anticipation, lack of, **8:1**
- Claims, **4:2, 4:94**
- Examination, **2:17**
- History, **1:19, 1:20**
- Judicial review of PTO decisions, **2:32**
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:18, 2:20**
- Priority, **8:64, 8:203, 8:209**
- Reissue of Patent (this index)
- Statutory subject matter, **5:2**

PATENT ACT OF 1839

- History, **1:19, 1:20**
- Inventorship, **10:14**
- Judicial review PTO decisions, **2:33**
- Priority, **8:210, 8:249**

PATENT ACT OF 1863

- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:34**

PATENT ACT OF 1870

- Adequate commerciality, **14:4**
- Adequate utility, **6:1**
- Claims, **4:94**
- Geographic scope, **12:5**
- History, **1:15, 1:21**
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:18**
- Priority, **8:206**
- Reissue of patent, **16:9, 16:36**
- Statutory subject matter, **5:2**

INDEX

PATENT ACT OF 1897

Laches, Section 6, **23:9**

Six-year limitation, **21:7**

PATENT ACT OF 1927

Judicial review of PTO decisions,
2:35

PATENT ACT OF 1939

Priority, **8:212**

PATENT ACT OF 1946

Laches, **23:12**

PATENT ACT OF 1952

Adequate commerciality, **14:5, 14:42**

Adequate disclosure, **7:45**

Claims, **4:5, 4:87, 4:93**

Correction, **10:57, 10:64**

Geographic scope, **12:6-12:9**

History, **1:23, 1:24, 4:87**

Indirect infringement, **15:2, 15:10,**
15:11

Non-Obviousness (this index)

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:36

Priority, **8:63**

Processes, **5:30**

Reissue of patent, **1:23, 16:91**

Six-year limitation, **21:11**

Static physical configurations, **5:14**

Statutory subject matter, **5:2, 5:6**

Technological scope, **13:19**

PATENT ACT OF 1977

Adequate commerciality, **14:35,**
14:49

PATENT ACT OF 1980

Reissue of patent, reexamination,
16:65

PATENT ACT OF 1984

Joint inventorship, **10:27**

PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (PTO)

Generally, **2:19-2:28**

Adequate disclosure. Disclosure,
below

Adequate utility. Utility requirement,
below

PATENT AND TRADEMARK

OFFICE (PTO)—Cont'd

Ad hoc process, **2:31**

Administrative law, generally, **2:7**

Administrative opposition, **2:18**

Administrative patent judges, **2:22**

Administrative post-grant proceed-
ings, **2:10**

Administrative Procedure Act (APA),
2:21, 2:26, 2:28, 2:41 et seq.

Advice, **2:22**

Advisory Committee, **2:22**

Agency action, **2:43**

Agents, **2:22**

Allocations, **2:22**

Ambiguity, **2:40**

Amendment of statutes, **2:18**

Annual Report to Congress, **2:20**

Anticipation, **2:3**

Anticipation, lack of, **8:14, 8:21**

Appeal and Review (this index)

Applications (this index)

Appointment to office, **2:22**

Article I, **2:1**

Articles of Confederation, **2:4**

Assistant Commissioners, **2:22**

Assistant Judge of Circuit Court,
2:33

Assistant Secretary of Commerce,
2:22

Attorney General, **2:15, 2:20**

Attorneys, **2:22**

Board of Examiners, **2:32, 2:33**

Board of Patent Appeals and Interfer-
ences (BPAI) (this index)

Burden of determining entitlement,
2:13

Case law, **2:20, 2:26, 2:28**

Case-specific nature of substantial
evidence standard, **2:43**

Certiorari, **2:34**

Challenges, **2:15**

Change and Modification (this index)

Chevron U.S.A., Inc. v. Natural
Resources Defense Council,
2:48

Chief Clerk, **2:20**

Chief Justice, **2:33**

**PATENT AND TRADEMARK
OFFICE (PTO)—Cont'd**

Chief Justice of District Court of
District of Columbia, **2:33**
Circuit Courts, **2:33**
Civil actions, **2:7, 2:38**
Claims (this index)
Clerk of Department of State, **2:20**
Codified rules, **2:25**
Commissioner, generally, **2:7**
Commissioner for Patents, **2:20, 2:22**
Commissioner for Trademarks, **2:22**
Commissioner in United States
District Court for District of
Columbia, **2:38**
Commission for the Promotion of the
Useful Arts, **2:15**
Commission of Useful Arts, **2:31**
Commission on the Useful Arts, **2:20**
Common law, **2:6, 2:13, 2:43**
Complaints, **2:22**
Computer-related inventions, **5:44**
Configuration, **2:1**
Congress
generally, **2:1, 2:37**
Annual Report to Congress, **2:20**
Continental Congress, **2:4**
Manual of Patent Examining Pro-
cedure (MPEP), **2:26**
Serial Set of Congressional Docu-
ments, **2:4**
Consent, **2:22**
Consolidated notices, **2:27**
Consolidation in federal circuit, **2:37**
Constitutional law, **2:1, 2:4, 2:21,**
2:44
Construction and Interpretation (this
index)
Continental Congress, **2:4**
Contracts and agreements, **2:13**
Copyright, **2:29**
Correction of inventorship, **10:58-**
10:61, 10:64
Costs and expenses, **2:13, 2:22**
Court of Appeals for Federal Circuit,
2:37, 2:38, 2:43
Court of Customs and Patent Appeals
(CCPA) (this index)

**PATENT AND TRADEMARK
OFFICE (PTO)—Cont'd**

Court proceeding, generally, **2:28**
Daughters of Confederacy, **2:4**
Decisions, review of. Judicial Review
(this index)
Declaratory Judgments Act of 1934,
2:18
Declaratory relief, **2:18**
Defenses, **2:7, 2:17**
Delay, **2:13**
Demands, **2:22**
De novo, **2:18**
De novo review on appeal, **2:39**
Department of Agriculture, **2:20**
Department of Interior, **2:20**
Department of State, **2:16, 2:20, 2:31**
Deputy Commissioner, **2:22**
Deputy Director, **2:22**
Designs, **5:46**
Determination, **2:7, 2:34**
Dickenson v. Zurko, **2:43**
Dickinson v. Zurko, **2:43**
Director of Patent and Trademarks,
2:7
Directors, **2:22**
Disclosure
adequate disclosure, generally, **2:3**
administration of initial grant, **2:13**
background knowledge, **7:18, 7:19**
claimed configuration, **7:8, 7:9**
description requirements, **7:28,**
7:29
history, **7:5**
how to use, **7:14**
range of embodiment, **7:25**
time frame, **7:21, 7:22**
Disseminating official notices, **2:20**
District Court (this index)
Election, **2:35**
Employment, **2:22**
En banc, **2:36, 2:43**
Enforcement, **2:7, 2:13, 2:21**
English, **2:1, 2:4, 2:7, 2:16**
Entitlement, **2:13**
European Patent Convention (EPC),
2:11, 2:13
European Patent Office, **2:11**

INDEX

PATENT AND TRADEMARK

OFFICE (PTO)—Cont'd

Evidence, **2:28, 2:39, 2:43**
Examination (this index)
Examination of Application (this index)
Examination of Original Application (this index)
Examiners, **2:22**
Examiners-in-Chief, **2:22**
Examining Clerk, **2:20**
Examining corps, **2:22**
Exclusive power, **2:7**
Exclusive rights, **2:1**
Executive Branch, generally, **2:3**
Ex parte
 generally, **2:13, 2:17, 2:18**
 determination, **2:29, 2:34**
 examination, **2:12, 2:18, 2:38**
 nature, **2:6**
Experiment, **2:2**
Experts, **2:37, 2:39**
Fact, determinations of, **2:43**
Fact finding, **2:39**
Factual determination, **2:19**
Federal Circuit
 administration of initial grant, **2:18**
 consolidation, **2:37**
 Court of Customs and Patent Appeals (CCPA) for Federal Circuit, **2:21**
 reexamination, **2:10**
 standard of review, **2:43**
Federal Register, **2:27, 2:28**
Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure (FRAP), **2:39**
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure (FRCP), **2:38, 2:39**
Federal Rules of Evidence (FRE), **2:38, 2:39**
Federal trademark registration, **2:20**
Filing Applications (this index)
Filing petition, **2:33**
Filing suit, **2:7**
Final determination, **2:7, 2:29**
First Congress, **2:4**
Foreign countries, **2:1, 2:11, 2:13, 2:22**

PATENT AND TRADEMARK

OFFICE (PTO)—Cont'd

Formal rulemaking, **2:28**
France, **2:13**
Fraud, **2:16**
General supremacy of judiciary, **2:8**
Handling applications, generally, **2:1**
Hearings, **2:21, 2:28**
History, generally, **1:17**
Hybrid claim presentations and nonlimiting recitations, **4:78**
Informal rulemaking, **2:28**
Infringement
In pari materia, **2:3**
In re Zurko, **2:43**
Initial application, **2:13**
Initial examination, **2:10**
Initial examination of application, **2:22**
Instructions of Commissioner, **2:26**
Intellectual Property and Communications Omnibus Reform Act of 1999, **2:22**
Intent, **2:20, 2:48**
Interested third parties, **2:13**
Interference (this index)
Internal procedures, **2:1**
Internal structures, **2:19, 2:22**
International affairs, **2:13, 2:22**
Inter partes configuration, **2:13**
Inter partes proceeding, **2:11**
Interpretive rules, **2:28, 2:48, 2:51**
Inventorship, **10:7, 10:8**
Investigation, **2:22**
Issuance of Patent (this index)
Joint inventorship, **10:38, 10:40, 10:46**
Judges, **2:22**
Judicial Acts and Matters (this index)
Judicial Review (this index)
Jurisdiction, **2:36, 2:37**
Legislative rules, **2:45**
Licenses and permits, **2:13, 2:21**
Limitation of actions, **2:1**
Limitations and restrictions
 generally, **2:1, 2:21**
 administration of initial grant, **2:18**
 judicial review, **2:26, 2:38**

**PATENT AND TRADEMARK
OFFICE (PTO)—Cont'd**

Limitations and restrictions—Cont'd
judicial v. executive authority, **2:7**
Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), **2:26**
Local rules, **2:39**
Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), **2:24, 2:26, 2:28**
Means expressions, **4:93**
Mistake and error, **2:16, 2:39**
National Archives, **2:20**
National courts, **2:11**
Nomenclature, **2:25**
Non-Statutory Hybrid Inventions (this index)
Notice and Knowledge (this index)
Office of Enrollment and Discipline (OED), **2:22**
Office of Legislative and International Affairs (OLIA), **2:22**
Office of the Solicitor, **2:22**
Officers, **2:22**
Official Gazette, **2:20, 2:24, 2:27, 2:28**
Official notices, **2:24**
Oliver Evans, **2:4**
Oral hearings, **2:28**
Orders, **2:7, 2:26**
Orders of Commissioner, **2:26**
Parliament, **2:7**
Participation, **2:12, 2:13, 2:18**
Patentability, generally, **2:8**
Patent Act of 1790, **2:7, 2:15, 2:16, 2:20, 2:31**
Patent Act of 1793, **2:17, 2:25, 2:31**
Patent Act of 1836, **2:18, 2:20, 2:32**
Patent Act of 1839, **2:33**
Patent Act of 1863, **2:34**
Patent Act of 1870, **2:18**
Patent Act of 1927, **2:35**
Patent Act of 1952, **2:36**
Patent and Trademark Office Efficiency Act, **2:22**
Patent Bureau, **2:20**
Patent Department, **2:25**

**PATENT AND TRADEMARK
OFFICE (PTO)—Cont'd**

Patent Rules of Practice of Title 37, **2:26**
Payment, **2:22**
Pending Applications (this index)
Petitions, **2:4, 2:33**
Policy Justification (this index)
President, **2:22**
Prior inventor, **2:16**
Priority, **8:75**
Private act, **2:2, 2:4**
Private action, **2:18**
Private corporations, **2:22**
Private parties, **2:17**
Processes (this index)
Prosecution of complaints, **2:22**
Public Advisory Committees, **2:22**
Publication, **2:20, 2:24**
Public domain, **2:4**
Public participation, **2:13**
Reexamination, **2:18, 2:26**
Reforms of 1870, **2:34**
Regional circuit courts, **2:37**
Registration
generally, **2:2**
administration of initial grant, **2:16, 2:17**
Federal trademark registration, **2:20**
history, **2:20**
internal structures and personnel, **2:22**
judicial review, **2:31**
permits, **2:13**
Rehearings, **2:22**
Rehearing sua sponte, **2:22**
Rejection of Application (this index)
Report of Decisions of Commissioner of Patents, **2:20**
Reprints, **2:27**
Revisions, **2:28**
Revocation, **2:8, 2:21**
Rule-making activities, generally, **2:23-2:28**
Rules of Practice in Patent Cases, **2:25**
Scire facias, **2:16**

INDEX

PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (PTO)—Cont'd

Secretary of Commerce, **2:22**
Secretary of State, **2:15, 2:20**
Secretary of War, **2:15, 2:20**
Section 101, **2:7**
Section 102, **2:7**
Section 103, **2:7**
Section 112, **2:7**
Section 131, **2:7, 2:22**
Section 132, **2:22**
Section 141, **2:38**
Section 145, **2:38**
Section 281, **2:7**
Section 282, **2:7**
Section 303, **2:10**
Senate, **2:22**
Senior Executive Service, **2:22**
Serial Set of Congressional Documents, **2:4**
Sources of rule, **2:24-2:27**
Special acts, **2:2**
Static physical configurations, **5:9, 5:11, 5:14-5:17**
Statutory subject matter, **2:3, 5:2**
Sua sponte patents, **2:10**
Subject matter jurisdiction, **2:37**
Substantial evidence, **2:39, 2:43**
Substantive rule-making, **2:21**
Superintendent of Patents, **2:20, 2:31**
Supreme Court, **2:34, 2:43, 2:48**
Supreme Court of District of Columbia (SCDC), **2:34, 2:36**
Term, **2:22**
Third parties, **2:12, 2:13, 2:18**
Third-party participation, **2:13**
35 USCA, generally, **2:3**
37 CFR, **2:25, 2:27, 2:28**
Time and date, **2:1**
37 CFR, **2:24**
Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property, **2:22**
Useful arts, **2:15, 2:20**
Utility requirement
 history, **6:4, 6:6**
 operability, **6:10, 6:13, 6:14**
Validity, generally, **2:7**
Vice President, **2:22**

PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (PTO)—Cont'd

Weight of evidence, **2:39**

PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE EFFICIENCY ACT

Generally, **2:22**

PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (PTO)JUDICIAL REVIEW

Determinations of law, generally,
2:44 et seq.

PATENT BUREAU

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:20

PATENT CLAIMS

Claims (this index)

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

Claims, **4:103**
Priority, **8:154**

PATENT DEPARTMENT

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:25

PATENT DEPARTMENT OF DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Claims, **4:2**
History, **1:18**

PATENT DOCUMENT

History, **1:1**

PATENT-DRIVEN INVENTIONS

Non-obviousness, **9:10**

PATENTED

Defined, **8:278**
Priority, **8:224**

PATENT INSTRUMENT

History, **1:1**

PATENT LAW AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1984

Adequate commerciality, **14:24**
Geographic scope, **12:29**

PATENT LAW JUDGES

Claims, **4:63**

PATENT LAW TREATY

Prior inventor, prior-user rights,
22:12

**PATENT MISUSE REFORM ACT
OF 1988**

Indirect infringement, **15:13**

PATENT REMEDY ACT

History, **1:14**

PATIENT PRIVACY

Processes, **5:39**

PAULIK v. RIZKALLA

Priority, **8:130**

PAYMENT

Examination of Original Application
(this index)
Inventorship, **10:14**
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:22

**PEERLESS ROLL LEAF CO. v. H.
GRIFFIN & SONS**

Anticipation, lack of, **8:21**

PENDING APPLICATIONS

Adequate disclosure, **7:1, 7:18, 7:19,
7:28**
Correction (this index)
Examination of Original Application
(this index)
Non-obviousness, **9:30-9:33, 9:36-
9:38, 9:42**
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
generally, **2:13**
Priority, **8:69**

PENDING CIVIL ACTION

Adequate commerciality, **14:80**

PENDING CLAIMS

Generally, **4:1**

PENNOCK v. DIALOGUE

Priority, **8:203**

PER CURIAM

Non-obviousness, **9:33**

PERFECTION

Inventorship, **10:8, 10:11**

PERFECTION—Cont'd

Joint inventorship, **10:26**

PERFORMANCE

Adequate commerciality, **14:36**
Geographic scope, **12:25**
Inventorship, **10:11**
Priority, **8:57**
Processes, **5:25, 5:26, 5:30**
Static physical configurations, **5:8**
Statutory subject matter, **5:1**

PERIPHERAL CLAIMING

Claims (this index)

PERISHABLES

Indirect infringement, **15:6**

PERJURY

Priority, **8:69**

PERSONAL JURISDICTION

Adequate commerciality, **14:47**

PERSONAL KNOWLEDGE

Non-obviousness, **9:43**
Priority, **8:35, 8:37**

PERSONAL PROPERTY

Inventorship, **10:7**
Prohibition of restraints on chattel,
implied license defense, **19:31**

PERSONS ACTING IN CONCERT

Indirect infringement, **15:14**

PERTINENT ART

Adequate utility, **6:3**

PETERS v. HANGER

Six-year limitation, **21:9**

PETITION

Adequate disclosure, **7:9**
History, **1:5**
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:4, 2:33
Static physical configurations, **5:17**

PFAFF v. WELLS ELECTRONICS

Priority, **8:234**

INDEX

PFIZER v. INTERNATIONAL RECTIFIER

Adequate commerciality, **14:63**

PHARMACEUTICAL ARTS

Anticipation, lack of, **8:29**

Processes, **5:39**

PHARMACEUTICALS

Adequate Commerciality (this index)

Indirect infringement, **15:18**

PHILLIPS v. AWH

Claims, **4:39**

PHILOSOPHICAL GRATIFICATION

Adequate commerciality, **14:63**

PHILOSOPHICAL INQUIRY

Adequate commerciality, **14:12**

PHYSICAL ASPECTS

Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)

PHYSICAL CONFIGURATIONS

Generally, **9:71**

PHYSICAL CONSTRUCTION

Priority, **8:59**

PHYSICAL EMBODIMENT

Priority, **8:44**

PHYSICAL MANIPULATIONS

Non-statutory hybrid inventions,
5:78, 5:81

PHYSICAL OBJECTS

Processes, **5:19, 5:30**

PHYSICAL PROXIMITY

Static physical configurations, **5:9**

PHYSICAL STRUCTURE

Generally, **5:6**

Adequate utility, **7:14**

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:53**

PHYSICAL TRANSFORMATION

Generally, **5:37, 5:53**

Computer-related inventions, **5:53**

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:81**

Processes, **5:23, 5:26**

PHYSICIANS

Processes, **5:39**

PHYSICS

Claims, **4:65**

PIONEER HI-BRED V J.E.G. AG SUPPLY

Static physical configurations, **5:15**

Statutory subject matter, **5:15**

PIONEER INVENTIONS

Technological scope, **13:74**

PIPELINE JUSTIFICATIONS

Non-Obviousness (this index)

PITTS v. HALL

Joint inventorship, **10:49, 10:50**

PLANT BREEDING

Static physical configurations, **5:15**

PLANT PATENT ACT (PPA)

Static physical configurations, **5:13,**
5:15, 5:17

PLANTS

Generally, **5:13-5:15**

Sexually reproduced plants, **5:8**

PLANT VARIETY PROTECTION ACT

Static physical configurations, **5:13**

PLEADING

Defenses (this index)

PLEUEDEMANN

Claims, **4:78, 4:80**

POEM PER SE

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:62**

POETIC LICENSE

Adequate utility, **7:14**

POLICY DISCUSSIONS

Priority, **8:158**

POLICY JUDGMENTS

Indirect infringement, **15:23**

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:85**

POLICY JUSTIFICATION

Generally, **1:27-1:43**

POLICY JUSTIFICATION—Cont'd

Adequate Commerciality (this index)
 Adequate disclosure, 7:4
 Adequate price, 1:38
 Anticipation, lack of, 8:18, 8:21, 8:26-8:28
 Applications, 1:38
 Bilateral contract analogy, 1:38
 Claims (this index)
 Commercialization and commercial exploitation, 1:38, 1:39, 1:41
 Competition, 1:32, 1:38, 1:39, 1:43
 Congress, 1:31
 Consumers, 1:33
 Contracts and agreements, 1:38, 1:39
 Copyright, 1:29
 Correction, 10:59
 Costs and expenses, 1:30, 1:31, 1:42
 Decreased supply, 1:33
 Demand, 1:33
 Disclosure (this index)
 Discretion, economic, generally, 1:30-1:43
 Disseminating knowledge, 1:38
 Duplicate research, 1:42
 Economic discretion, generally, 1:30-1:43
 Employment, 1:34
 Enforcement, 1:31
 Equipment, 1:34, 1:39
 Estoppel, 24:20-24:20
 Europe, 1:43
 Exclusivity, 1:38
 Expectations, 1:37, 1:39
 Far East, 1:43
 Federal judiciary, 1:31
 Foreign countries, 1:29, 1:32, 1:43, 8:274
 Funds, 1:34
 Future invention activity, decreased rate of, 1:35
 Future research, 1:42
 Geographic scope, 12:10
 Incentives, 1:35, 1:39, 1:41
 Indirect infringement, 15:14
 Infringement, 1:29, 1:38
 Innovation, 1:40, 1:41
 International trade, 1:29

POLICY JUSTIFICATION—Cont'd

Inventorship, 10:2-10:4
 Japan, 1:43
 Judiciary, federal judiciary, 1:31
 Laches, 23:21
 Lateral contracts, 1:38
 Licenses and permits, 1:31
 Limitations and restrictions, 1:32, 1:39, 1:43
 Lockean theory, 1:29
 Motivation, 1:32
 Natural law, 1:29
 Negotiations, 1:29
 Non-obviousness, 9:8-9:11, 9:27, 9:39
 Notice and knowledge, 1:28, 1:35, 1:38, 1:39
 Novelty, 1:29
 Operational costs, 1:31
 Orderly control of economic prospects, 1:42
 Patentability, generally, 1:39
 Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), generally, 1:31
 Possession, 1:28
 Predictability, 1:42
 Price, 1:38
 Prior inventor, prior-user rights, 22:17
 Priority (this index)
 Private entities, 1:39
 Processes, 5:26, 5:29
 Profits, 1:34, 1:39, 1:41
 Property, invention as form of, 1:28
 Prospects, 1:40, 1:42
 Public, generally, 1:27
 Public funds, 1:39
 Public knowledge, 1:38
 Raw materials, 1:39
 Reissue of Patent (this index)
 Research and development, 1:39, 1:41, 1:42
 Saleable product, 1:41
 Scarcity, 1:34
 Secrecy, 1:38
 Single-source control, impact of, 1:32
 Six-year limitation, 21:16

INDEX

POLICY JUSTIFICATION—Cont'd

- Social benefits of patenting
 - generally, **1:37-1:43**
 - bilateral contract analogy, **1:38**
 - disclosure, exchange of control for, **1:38**
 - incentive to innovate, **1:41**
 - incentive to invent, **1:39**
 - innovation, **1:40, 1:41**
 - orderly control of economic prospects, **1:42**
 - prospects, **1:40, 1:42**
 - unilateral contract analogy, **1:39**
- Social costs of patenting
 - generally, **1:31-1:36**
 - decreased supply, **1:33**
 - future invention activity, decreased rate of, **1:35**
 - overall balance, **1:36**
 - resource scarcity, **1:34**
 - single-source control, impact of, **1:32**
- Specification, **1:38**
- Statutory Subject Matter (this index)
- Supply, decreased, **1:33**
- Supreme Court, **1:29**
- Technological Scope of Infringement (this index)
- Temporal Scope of Infringement (this index)
- Temporary National Emergency Committee (TNEC), **1:29**
- Third parties, **1:29**
- Title and ownership, **1:28**
- Trade secrets, **1:38**
- Unilateral contract analogy, **1:39**
- Utility Requirement (this index)
- Value, **1:39**

POLITICAL INTEREST

- Static physical configurations, **5:15**

POLITICAL JUSTIFICATIONS

- Joint inventorship, **10:25**

POLLEN v. FORD INSTRUMENTS CO.

- Six-year limitation, **21:10**

POSSESSION

- Adequate commerciality, **14:32, 14:41**
- Anticipation, lack of, **8:10, 8:18-8:20, 8:30**
- Disclosure (this index)
- Inventorship, **10:4**
- Non-obviousness, **9:27, 9:39, 9:70, 9:77**
- Policy justification, **1:28**
- Priority (this index)
- Static physical configurations, **5:7**

POSSESSION IN DUE COURSE

- Non-obviousness, **9:39**

POSSIBLY PATENTABLE

- Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:84**

POST-EXPIRATION ROYALTIES

- Misuse of patent, **18:40**

POST-GRANT REVIEW

- Processes, **5:35**

POST HOC OBLIGATIONS

- Joint inventorship, **10:32**
- Non-obviousness, **9:47**

POTENTIAL CONFLICTS

- Anticipation, lack of, **8:29**

POTENTIAL INTERPRETATIONS

- Priority, **8:151**

POTENTIALLY DANGEROUS PRODUCTS OR SUBSTANCES

- Adequate utility, **6:12**

POTENTIAL USES

- Utility requirement, **6:19**

POVERTY

- Laches, unreasonable delay, **23:33**

POWDERS

- Static physical configurations, **5:9**

PRACTICAL APPLICATION

- Processes, **5:21**

PRACTICAL UTILITY

- Generally, **6:16-6:19**
- Adequate utility, **6:19**

PRACTICAL UTILITY—Cont'd

Anticipation, lack of, **8:22**

Claims, **4:66**

Priority, **8:50, 8:51**

**PRACTICING PATENT
COMMUNITY**

Claims, **4:89**

PRAGMATIC MEANINGS

Claims, **4:55-4:57**

PREAMBLE

Claims, **4:96, 4:99**

PRECISION, LACK OF

Non-obviousness, **9:3**

PRECLUSION OF ISSUE

Claims, **4:20**

Invalidity (this index)

PREDICTABILITY

Adequate disclosure, **7:20, 7:23,
7:25, 7:26**

Non-obviousness, **9:3**

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:64**

Policy justification, **1:42**

Priority, **8:54**

PREEMPTION

History, **1:13**

Non-statutory hybrid inventions,
5:75, 5:81

State competition laws, **1:13.10**

PREJUDICE

Estoppel, material prejudice, **24:29**

PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION

Adequate commerciality, **14:31**

**PRE-MARKET REGULATORY
APPROVAL**

Adequate Commerciality (this index)

PREPONDERANCE OF EVIDENCE

Priority, **8:68, 8:69**

**PRESERVATION OF EXISTING
PUBLIC-DOMAIN**

Non-Obviousness (this index)

**PRESERVATION OF RIGHTS OF
PARTIES**

Inventorship, **10:8**

PRESIDENT

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:22

PRESUMPTIONS

Adequate disclosure, **7:43**

Adequate utility, **6:14**

Claims, **4:89**

Geographic scope, **12:42**

Non-obviousness, **9:57**

Priority, **8:109**

Validity, **17:16-17:18**

PRICE

Adequate Commerciality (this index)

Indirect infringement, **15:6**

Policy justification, **1:38**

Processes, **5:39**

PRICE CONTROL

History, **1:3**

PRICE FIXING

Misuse of patent, **18:35**

PRIMA FACIE CASE

Claims, **4:93**

Non-obviousness, **9:7, 9:72, 9:74,
9:75**

PRIMA FACIE SHOWING

Non-obviousness, **9:64, 9:72, 9:74,
9:76**

PRINTED

Defined, **8:177**

PRINTED MATTER

Claims, **4:79**

Computer-related inventions, **5:41**

Non-statutory hybrid inventions,
5:55, 5:82

Static physical configurations, **5:7**

Statutory subject matter, **5:4, 5:6,
5:10-5:12, 5:42**

PRINTED PUBLICATION

Adequate disclosure, **7:18**

Anticipation, lack of, **8:19**

INDEX

PRINTED PUBLICATION—Cont'd

Non-obviousness, **9:21**

Priority (this index)

PRINTERS

Processes, **5:24**

PRINTING

Processes, **5:29**

PRIOR ACTS AND MATTERS

Adequate disclosure, **7:18, 7:22**

Adequate utility, **6:7**

Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)

Inventorship, **10:14, 10:18**

Joint inventorship, **10:25, 10:42**

Non-Obviousness (this index)

Non-statutory hybrid inventions,
5:62, 5:74

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:16

Priority (this index)

Section 273 defense. Prior Inventor,
Prior-User Rights (this index)

Static physical configurations, **5:17**

PRIOR ART

Adequate disclosure, **7:20**

Anticipation, lack of, **8:7, 8:24**

Claims, **4:93**

Computer-related inventions, **5:42**

Correction of inventorship, **10:67**

Invalidity, **17:14**

Joint inventorship, **10:33, 10:38,**
10:40, 10:46

Noninfringement, **17:14**

Non-Obviousness (this index)

Non-statutory hybrid inventions,
5:63, 5:72

Processes, **5:30**

Technological Scope of Infringement
(this index)

PRIOR INVENTOR, PRIOR-USER RIGHTS

Generally, **22:1-22:26**

Amendments to Paris Convention,
22:10

American Inventors Protection Act of
1999, **22:15**

Basic rule of law, **22:18**

PRIOR INVENTOR, PRIOR-USER RIGHTS—Cont'd

Case law decisions, prior-user rights
in United States, **22:16**

Commercial use defined, **22:21,**
22:22

Defenses, section 273

generally, **22:1**

basic rule, **22:18**

definitions, **22:19-22:23**

extension by exhaustion, **22:26**

historical development of section
273 defense, below

limitation to particular uses, **22:25**

policy justification, **22:17**

scope of defense, **22:24-22:26**

Definitions

commercial use, **22:21, 22:22**

defenses, section 273, **22:19-22:23**

effective filing date, **22:23**

limitation to business methods,
22:20

non-profit entity, commercial use
by, **22:22**

section 273 defense, **22:19-22:23**

Domestic prior-user rights

generally, **22:13**

American Inventors Protection Act
of 1999, **22:15**

case law decisions, **22:16**

historical development of section
273 defense, **22:13-22:16**

prior inventor defense, **22:15**

proposed legislation, 1992-1997,
22:14

Effective filing date, defined, **22:23**

1883 text of Paris Convention, **22:9**

Extension by exhaustion, **22:26**

First-to-file, correction, **22:4**

GATT/TRIPs, **22:11**

Historical development of section
273 defense

generally, **22:2**

prior-user rights, generally, **22:3-**
22:6

prior-user rights internationally,
22:7-22:12

prior-user rights in United States,
22:13-22:16

PRIOR INVENTOR, PRIOR-USER RIGHTS—Cont'd

International prior-user rights
generally, **22:7**
amendments to Paris Convention, **22:10**
1883 text of Paris Convention, **22:9**
GATT/TRIPs, **22:11**
historical development of section 273 defense, **22:7-22:12**
Paris Convention, **22:8-22:10**
Patent Law Treaty, **22:12**
Justification of policy, **22:17**
Limitation of defense to particular uses, **22:25**
Limitation to business methods, defined, **22:20**
Non-profit entity, commercial use by, defined, **22:22**
Paris Convention, **22:8-22:10**
Patent Law Treaty, **22:12**
Policy justification, **22:17**
Prior inventor defense in United States, **22:15**
Prior-user rights, section 273 defense
generally, **22:3-22:6**
domestic prior-user rights, above
first-to-file, correction, **22:4**
historical development of defense, **22:3-22:16**
internationally, **22:7-22:12**
international prior-user rights, above
protectionism, **22:5**
shelter for trade secret user, **22:6**
United States, **22:13-22:16**
Proposed United States legislation, 1992-1997, **22:14**
Protectionism, **22:5**
Scope of section 273 defense, **22:24-22:26**
Shelter for trade secret user, **22:6**
United States. Domestic prior user rights, above

PRIORITY

Generally, **8:33-8:198**

PRIORITY—Cont'd

Abandonment
conceptual inconsistencies, **8:94**
description in previously filed patent, paragraph 102(e), **8:143**
first-to-invent priority, Section 102(g), below
novelty in relation to filing date of application, Paragraph 102(b), **8:204, 8:210**
public possession prior to patentee's date of invention, paragraph 102(a), **8:168, 8:189**
Absolute novelty. Novelty, Paragraph 102(b), below
Accidental discovery, **8:44**
Actual reduction to practice, impact on, **8:96**
Adams v. Edwards, **8:44**
Added subject matter, **8:147**
Adequate diligence, **8:78**
Adequate disclosure
generally, **8:48**
description requirements, **7:27, 7:38**
time-wise priority, **7:5**
Adequate evidence of experimentation, **8:260**
Adequate justification, **8:67**
Administrative justification, **8:192**
Affidavits under Rule 131. Date of invention in paragraphs 102(a) and (e), below
Alexander Milburn Co. v. Davis-Bournonville Co., **8:140**
All-elements rule, **8:57**
Amended foreign application, **8:124**
American Standard, Inc. v. Pfizer Inc., **8:66**
Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical Co., Ltd., **8:45**
Analogy to obviousness standard under section 103, **8:136**
Andrews v. Hovey, **8:206, 8:251**
Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)
Appeal and review, **8:46, 8:60**

INDEX

PRIORITY—Cont'd

Application

conceptual inconsistencies, **8:94, 8:124, 8:126**

description in previously filed patent, paragraph 102(e), below

novelty, Paragraph 102(b), below

public possession prior to patentee's date of invention, paragraph 102(a), **8:162, 8:168**

Appreciation, **8:46, 8:58**

Bain v. Morse, **8:101, 8:197**

Beyond a reasonable doubt, **8:68, 8:69**

Bigham v. Godtfredsen, **8:66**

Biotechnology, **8:50**

Board of Appeals, **8:46**

Board of Patent Interferences, **8:66**

Brenner v. Manson, **8:50, 8:53, 8:57**

Case law, **8:56, 8:63**

Charge to jury, **8:44**

Chemical structure, **8:46**

Chemical subject matter, **8:48**

Chemistry, **8:50**

Circumstantial evidence. Public possession prior to patentee's date of invention, paragraph 102(a), below

City of Elizabeth v. Nicholson Pavement Co., **8:250**

Civil cases, **8:68**

Claimed invention, **8:253**

Claim language, relation to, **8:47-8:49, 8:57**

Claims (this index)

Classical abandonment, **8:85**

Coleman v. Dines, **8:45**

Combination, **8:47**

Commercialization, **8:67**

Compensation, **8:36**

Competence, **8:72**

Competition, **8:38, 8:103**

Completeness, **8:47-8:49, 8:57**

Completion of claimed invention, **8:253**

PRIORITY—Cont'd

Concealment

description in previously filed patent, paragraph 102(e), **8:143**

first-to-invent priority, Section 102(g), below

Conception, generally, **8:44-8:70**

Conceptual inconsistencies

generally, **8:90-8:130**

constructive reduction to practice generally, **8:91-8:97**

actual reduction to practice, impact on, **8:96**

inconsistencies with patentability, **8:97**

justification by issuance of patent, **8:93-8:95**

prior abandoned applications, **8:94**

prior issued patent, **8:95**

theoretical justification, **8:92**

evidence of prior invention,

foreign activities as. Foreign countries, Section 104, below in this group

foreign countries, Section 104

generally, **8:98-8:109**

Bain v. Morse, **8:101**

discovery presumption, **8:109**

Electric Storage Battery Co. v. Shimadzu, **8:102**

evidence of prior invention, foreign activities as

generally, **8:104-8:108**

GATT/TRIPs, **8:107**

law prior to 1993, **8:105**

NAFTA, **8:106**

offensive vs. defensive invention, **8:108**

history and policy justifications, generally, **8:99-8:103**

international competitiveness, **8:103**

justifications, generally, **8:99-8:103**

policy justifications, generally, **8:99-8:103**

symmetry arguments, **8:100**

PRIORITY—Cont'd

Conceptual inconsistencies—Cont'd
 foreign filing, Section 119
 generally, **8:110-8:126**
 amended foreign application,
 8:124
 claims, same invention, **8:114**
 counter-arguments, **8:119**
 current law, **8:122**
 disclosure, same invention,
 8:115
 eligible countries, **8:112**
 first and subsequent foreign
 applications, **8:126**
 history and policy justifications,
 8:111, 8:120
 in re Hilmer, **8:121**
 multiple foreign priority claims,
 8:125
 novelty requirement under
 102(b), interaction with,
 8:116
 offensive vs. defensive uses,
 8:118
 paragraph 102(e), generally,
 8:117-8:122
 same invention, **8:113-8:115**
 12-month period, computation
 of, **8:123**
 history and policy justification
 foreign countries, Section 104,
 above in this group
 foreign filing, Section 119,
 8:111, 8:120
 indeterminate events, **8:127-8:129**
 justifications. History and policy
 justification, above in this
 group
 multiple-party contests, **8:129**
 paragraph 102(e). Foreign filing,
 Section 119, above in this
 group
 Paulik v. Rizkalla, **8:130**
 prior invention, foreign activities
 as. Foreign countries, Section
 104, above in this group
 renewed activity, **8:130**
 Section 104. Foreign countries,
 Section 104, above in this
 group

PRIORITY—Cont'd

Conceptual inconsistencies—Cont'd
 simultaneous events, **8:128**
 Configuration, **8:49, 8:57**
 Conflicting authorities, **8:183**
 Conflicting policy arguments, **8:152**
 Construction and interpretation, **8:63,**
 8:151, 8:259
 Constructive publication, **8:141**
 Constructive reduction to practice.
 Conceptual inconsistencies,
 above
 Contests, **8:38, 8:39, 8:46, 8:129**
 Continuations in part, **8:147**
 Continuing applications
 description in previously filed
 patent, paragraph 102(e),
 below
 novelty in relation to filing date of
 application, Paragraph 102(b),
 8:215
 Continuity, standard of, **8:66**
 Contracts and agreements. Descrip-
 tion in previously filed patent,
 paragraph 102(e), below
 Contribution, **8:56**
 Copending applications, **8:69**
 Corporeal property, **8:39**
 Correction for otherwise private acts,
 8:82
 Corroboration. First-to-invent prior-
 ity, Section 102(g), below
 Corroboration and proof, **8:245.50**
 Counter-arguments, **8:119**
 Court of Customs and Patent Appeals
 (CCPA), **8:46, 8:62**
 Court proceedings, **8:75**
 Credibility substitute, **8:73**
 Critical date, information known as
 of, **8:219**
 Cross examination, **8:75**
 Current law, **8:122**
 Date of invention in paragraphs
 102(a) and (e)
 generally, **8:131-8:137**
 affidavits under Rule 131, gener-
 ally, **8:131-8:137**
 analogy to obviousness standard
 under section 103, **8:136**

INDEX

PRIORITY—Cont'd

- Date of invention in paragraphs 102(a) and (e)—Cont'd
 - anomalies, **8:134-8:136**
 - basic rule, **8:132**
 - procedure, **8:133**
 - Rule 131, generally, **8:131-8:137**
 - technical content of showing, required, **8:135**
- Defenses, **8:43**
- Defensive invention, **8:53, 8:108**
- Defensive uses, **8:118**
- Definiteness, **8:171**
- Definitions, **8:177, 8:194**
- Delay, **8:64**
- Deliberate secrecy, **8:87**
- Described in patent, **8:178-8:181**
- Description in previously filed patent, paragraph 102(e)
 - generally, **8:138-8:155**
 - applications. Continuing applications and requirement of description, below in this group
 - continuing applications and requirement of description generally, **8:145-8:149**
 - added subject matter, **8:147**
 - continuations in part, **8:147**
 - discontinued subject matter, **8:146**
 - provisional and published applications, **8:149**
 - reference, importance of subject matter claimed in, **8:148**
 - contracts and agreements. Foreign applications, above in this group
 - foreign applications
 - generally, **8:150-8:155**
 - conflicting policy arguments, **8:152**
 - in re Hilmer, **8:153**
 - international agreements, generally, **8:150-8:155**
 - patent cooperation treaty, **8:154**
 - potential interpretations of statutory language, **8:151**
 - provisional applications, **8:155**

PRIORITY—Cont'd

- Description in previously filed patent, paragraph 102(e)—Cont'd
 - historical development and policy justification
 - generally, **8:139-8:144**
 - abandoned, suppressed or concealed, relationship to, **8:143**
 - Alexander Milburn Co. v. Davis-Bournonville Co., **8:140**
 - constructive publication, **8:141**
 - evidence of superior priority, **8:142**
 - published applications, **8:144**
 - international agreements. Foreign applications, above in this group
 - justification. Historical development and policy justification, below in this group
 - policy justification. Historical development and policy justification, above in this group
- Description in printed publication, **8:220-8:223**
- Designs, **5:46**
- Difficulties and unsettled issues, **8:257-8:260**
- Diffusion, speed of, **8:194**
- Diligence
 - generally, **8:44, 8:70**
 - first-to-invent priority, Section 102(g), below
- Disclosure, **8:115, 8:159**
- Discontinued subject matter, **8:146**
- Discovery, **8:44**
- Discovery presumption, **8:109**
- District courts, **8:66, 8:75**
- Documentary evidence, **8:73**
- Drawing, **8:74**
- Due process, **8:73**
- Economics, **8:36**
- Effective date of publication, **8:176**
- Electrical arts, **8:48**
- Electric Storage Battery Co. v. Shimadzu, **8:102**

PRIORITY—Cont'd

- Eligible countries, **8:112**
- Embodiment, **8:44, 8:55**
- Employment, **8:67, 8:71**
- Estoppel, **8:86**
- Evidence
 - conception, **8:48, 8:49**
 - conceptual inconsistencies, above
 - description in previously filed patent, paragraph 102(e), **8:142**
 - diligence, **8:65, 8:66**
 - first-to-invent priority, Section 102(g), below
 - nomenclature, **8:42**
 - novelty in relation to filing date of application, Paragraph 102(b), **8:260**
 - public possession prior to patentee's date of invention, paragraph 102(a), below
 - reduction-to-practice, **8:56**
- Exact claim language, **8:259**
- Examination of Original Application (this index)
- Exclude, right to, **8:38**
- Exclusions, **8:34, 8:39, 8:54**
- Exclusive control, **8:242-8:244**
- Excuses for inactivity, **8:67**
- Executive Branch, **8:34**
- Existing authorities, synthesis of.
 - Public possession prior to patentee's date of invention, paragraph 102(a), below
- Ex parte proceeding, **8:69**
- Ex parte prosecution, **8:73**
- Experimental use. Novelty, Paragraph 102(b), below
- Experiments, **8:54, 8:64, 8:189**
- Expert, **8:58, 8:69**
- Extensions, **8:242-8:244**
- Extreme poverty, **8:67**
- Fact, law vs., **8:261**
- Family and relatives, **8:71**
- Federal Circuit, **8:62, 8:66, 8:69**
- First and subsequent foreign applications, **8:126**
- First-in-right, **8:33, 8:34**
- First-in-time, **8:33, 8:34**

PRIORITY—Cont'd

- First inventor, **8:41, 8:64**
- First-to-file, **8:35, 8:36**
- First-to-invent priority, Section 102(g)
 - generally, **8:44-8:137**
 - abandoned, suppressed, and concealed
 - generally, **8:81-8:89**
 - classical abandonment, **8:85**
 - correction for otherwise private acts, **8:82**
 - deliberate secrecy, **8:87**
 - diligence, relation to, **8:89**
 - evidence, **8:88**
 - historical development, **8:83**
 - laches or estoppel, **8:86**
 - underlying rationales, **8:84-8:87**
 - adequate diligence, **8:78**
 - appreciation, **8:46, 8:58**
 - basic rule, generally, **8:76-8:80**
 - claim language, relation to, **8:47-8:49, 8:57**
 - completeness, **8:47-8:49, 8:57**
 - concealed. Abandoned, suppress, and concealed, above in this group
 - conceptual inconsistencies, above
 - corroboration. Evidence, below in this group
 - diligence
 - generally, **8:63-8:67**
 - continuity, standard of, **8:66**
 - excuses for inactivity, **8:67**
 - historical development, **8:64**
 - modern law, **8:65**
 - evidence
 - generally, **8:68-8:75**
 - corroboration, generally, **8:70-8:75**
 - credibility substitute, **8:73**
 - quantified probativeness, **8:72**
 - reason, rule of, **8:74**
 - standard of evidence, **8:69**
 - traditional justification, **8:71**
 - US Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) vs. court proceedings, **8:75**

INDEX

PRIORITY—Cont'd

- First-to-invent priority, Section 102(g)—Cont'd
 - first-to-file distinguished, **8:35, 8:36**
 - generic inventions, **8:48**
 - genus and specie, **8:80**
 - inherency, **8:49**
 - knowledge, implementing, **8:50-8:53**
 - mental aspects, generally, **8:45-8:54**
 - needed experimentation, **8:54**
 - offensive vs. defensive invention, **8:53**
 - physical aspects, generally, **8:55-8:62**
 - policy rationale, **8:56**
 - practical utility, **8:51**
 - race of diligence, **8:79**
 - resolution, **8:62**
 - suppressed. Abandoned, suppress, and concealed, above in this group
 - testing required, degree of, **8:59-8:62**
 - tripartite analysis, **8:60**
 - unexpected properties, **8:52**
 - unified standard, **8:61**
- Foreign countries
 - generally, **8:276**
 - applications, **8:215**
 - conceptual inconsistencies, above
 - description in previously filed patent, paragraph 102(e), above
 - temporal scope, **11:23**
- GATT/TRIPs, **8:107**
- General absence of policy discussions, **8:158**
- Generic inventions, **8:48, 8:53**
- Genus and specie, **8:80**
- Geographic limitations
 - novelty in relation to filing date of application, Paragraph 102(b), **8:262-8:265**
 - public possession prior to patentee's date of invention, paragraph 102(a), below

PRIORITY—Cont'd

- Grace period. Novelty, Paragraph 102(b), below
- Gunter v. Stream, **8:45**
- Harmonization, **8:36**
- Historical development and policy justification
 - generally, **8:33**
 - conceptual inconsistencies, below
 - description in previously filed patent, paragraph 102(e), above
- first-to-invent priority, Section 102(g), **8:64, 8:83**
- novelty, Paragraph 102(b), below
- priority of title, **1:18**
- public possession prior to patentee's date of invention, paragraph 102(a), below
- Illustrations, **8:39**
- Improper analogies to paragraph 102(b), **8:184**
- Improvement inventions, **8:236**
- Inactivity, **8:67**
- Inconsistencies with paragraph 102(g), **8:163**
- Inconsistencies with patentability, **8:97**
- Indeterminate events, **8:127-8:129**
- Individual uses, **8:187**
- Industrial knowledge, **8:33**
- Industrial sophistication, **8:44**
- Inference, **8:65**
- Inferior party, **8:34**
- Infringement, **8:44, 8:65**
- Inherency, **8:49**
- Inherent anticipation, doctrine of, **8:49**
- Inherent details, **8:230**
- In public use. Novelty, Paragraph 102(b), below
- In re Borst, **8:165**
- In re Hilmer, **8:121, 8:153**
- In this country defined, **8:194**
- Initial and improvement inventions, **8:236**
- Initial determination, **8:44**
- Insanity, **8:67**
- Intent, **8:55, 8:58, 8:59, 8:254**

PRIORITY—Cont'd

Interference, **8:38, 8:60, 8:65, 8:73**
 Interference priority, generally, **8:37-8:43**
 Interference proceedings, **8:48**
 International agreements. Description in previously filed patent, paragraph 102(e), above
 International competitiveness, **8:103**
 Inter partes proceedings, **8:34, 8:38**
 Invention-based priority, **8:36**
 Inventorship, **10:4, 10:11, 10:12**
 Investigation, **8:54**
 Issuance of patent, **8:69**
 Joint inventorship, **10:31**
 Jury, **8:34**
 Justification
 conceptual inconsistencies, above
 description in previously filed patent, paragraph 102(e), above
 diligence, **8:67**
 first-to-invent priority, Section 102(g), **8:71**
 historical development and policy justification, above
 novelty, Paragraph 102(b), below
 public possession prior to patentee's date of invention, paragraph 102(a), below
 reduction-to-practice, **8:56, 8:61**
 Knowledge, implementing, **8:50-8:53**
 Laches, **8:86**
 Laches or estoppel, **8:86**
 Lapse, **8:65**
 Law vs. fact, **8:261**
 Limitations and restrictions
 diligence, **8:64, 8:65**
 evidence, **8:73**
 nomenclature, **8:42**
 novelty in relation to filing date of application, Paragraph 102(b), **8:262-8:265**
 public possession prior to patentee's date of invention, paragraph 102(a), below
 reduction-to-practice, **8:58**
 Local priority, symmetry with, **8:193**

PRIORITY—Cont'd

Low probabilities, acceptance of, **8:170**
 Mechanical arts, **8:48**
 Mental aspect, **8:44**
 Mental aspects. First-to-invent priority, Section 102(g), above
 Metallizing Engineering v. Kenyon Bearing, **8:243**
 Mixed purposes, **8:255**
 Modern law, **8:65**
 Motivation, **8:71**
 Multiple foreign priority claims, **8:125**
 Multiple-party contests, **8:129**
 Multiple persons, **8:39**
 NAFTA, **8:106**
 Named party, **8:71**
 Needed experimentation, **8:54**
 Nomenclature, **8:42**
 Non-obviousness, **9:38**
 Notice and knowledge. Public possession prior to patentee's date of invention, paragraph 102(a), below
 Novelty, Paragraph 102(b)
 generally, **8:116**
 filing date of application
 generally, **8:199-8:265**
 absolute novelty v. grace period
 generally, **8:208-8:216**
 continuing vs. foreign priority applications, **8:215**
 current law, **8:214-8:216**
 modern rationale, **8:213**
 Patent Act of 1790, **8:209**
 Patent Act of 1793, **8:209**
 Patent Act of 1836, **8:209**
 Patent Act of 1839, **8:210**
 Patent Act of 1939, **8:212**
 post-Hovey rationale, **8:211**
 provisional applications, **8:216**
 quantified abandonment, **8:210**
 experimental use
 generally, **8:246-8:261**

INDEX

PRIORITY—Cont'd

- Novelty, Paragraph 102(b)—Cont'd
 - filing date of application—Cont'd
 - experimental use—Cont'd
 - adequate evidence of experimentation, **8:260**
 - Andrews v. Hovey, **8:251**
 - City of Elizabeth v. Nicholson Pavement Co., **8:250**
 - completion of claimed invention, **8:253**
 - difficulties and unsettled issues, **8:257-8:260**
 - early cases, **8:248**
 - historical development, generally, **8:247-8:251**
 - intent of inventor vs. objective circumstances, **8:254**
 - law vs. fact, **8:261**
 - mixed purposes, **8:255**
 - modern rationale and law, generally, **8:252-8:256**
 - Patent Act of 1839, **8:249**
 - reduction to practice, **8:258**
 - reliance on exact claim language, **8:259**
 - third parties, experiments by, **8:256**
- geographic limitations, **8:262-8:265**
- grace period. Absolute novelty v. grace period, above this subgroup
- historical development and policy justification
 - generally, **8:201-8:207, 8:263**
 - abandonment, **8:204**
 - Andrews v. Hovey, **8:206**
 - complications, **8:205**
 - experimental use, above this subgroup
 - modern authorities, **8:207**
 - Patent Act of 1793, **8:202**
 - Patent Act of 1836, **8:203**
 - Patent Act of 1870, **8:206**
 - Pennock v. Dialogue, **8:203**
 - Shaw v. Cooper, **8:203**

PRIORITY—Cont'd

- Novelty, Paragraph 102(b)—Cont'd
 - filing date of application—Cont'd
 - in public use
 - generally, **8:239-8:245**
 - historical development, **8:240**
 - Metallizing Engineering v. Kenyon Bearing, **8:243**
 - time-wise extension of applicant's period of exclusive control, **8:242-8:244**
 - unresolved issues, **8:244**
 - withdrawal of material from public domain, **8:241**
 - justification. Historical development and policy justification, above in this group
 - novelty and priority
 - distinguished, **8:200**
 - on sale
 - generally, **8:225-8:238, 8:265**
 - historical development, **8:226**
 - inherent details, **8:230**
 - initial and improvement inventions, **8:236**
 - modern rationale, generally, **8:227-8:237**
 - onset of bar, generally, **8:233-8:237**
 - patent right, sale of, **8:231**
 - Pfaff v. Wells Electronics, **8:234**
 - prefiling commercialization, generally, **8:225-8:238**
 - private offers for sale, **8:228**
 - ready for patenting, **8:235**
 - records and recording. Prefiling commercialization, above this subgroup
 - settled issues, **8:228-8:231**
 - sufficiency of single offer, **8:229**
 - sufficient commercialization, **8:237**
 - sufficient technological completion, **8:233**
 - third-party offers, **8:232**
 - unsettled issues, **8:232**

PRIORITY—Cont'd

Novelty, Paragraph 102(b)—Cont'd
 filing date of application—Cont'd
 paragraph 102(a), relationship
 to, **8:264**
 policy justification. Historical
 development and policy
 justification, above this
 subgroup
 possession. Prior possession by
 public, below this subgroup
 prior possession by public
 generally, **8:217-8:224**
 critical date, information
 known as of, **8:219**
 description in printed publica-
 tion, **8:220-8:223**
 historical development, **8:222**
 paragraph 102(a), analogy to,
 8:218
 paragraph 102(a), relationship
 to, **8:221**
 patented, **8:224**
 substantive law, **8:223**
 public
 in public use, above this
 subgroup
 prior possession by public,
 below this subgroup
 records and recording. Prefiling
 commercialization, above
 this subgroup
 sales. On sale, above this
 subgroup
 time and date. Absolute novelty
 v. grace period, above this
 subgroup
 Objective circumstances, **8:254**
 Obviousness standard, **8:136**
 Offensive vs. defensive invention,
 8:53, 8:108
 Offensive vs. defensive uses, **8:118**
 Offers, **8:228**
 On sale. Novelty, Paragraph 102(b),
 above
 Oral statements, **8:71**
 Oral testimony, **8:74**
 Ordinary personality, **8:39**
 Ordinary skill, **8:58**

PRIORITY—Cont'd

Paragraph 102(a)
 date of invention in paragraphs
 102(a) and (e), above
 novelty in relation to filing date of
 application, Paragraph 102(b),
 8:218, 8:221, 8:264
 public possession prior to paten-
 tee's date of invention,
 paragraph 102(a), below
 Paragraph 102(b)
 novelty, Paragraph 102(b), above
 public possession prior to paten-
 tee's date of invention,
 paragraph 102(a), **8:184**
 Paragraph 102(d), **8:179**
 Paragraph 102(e)
 conceptual inconsistencies, above
 date of invention in paragraphs
 102(a) and (e), above
 description in previously filed
 patent, paragraph 102(e),
 above
 Paragraph 102(g), **8:163**
 Partial acts and matters, **8:147**
 Parties, **8:129, 8:232, 8:256**
 Patentability, generally, **8:37-8:43**
 Patent Act of 1790, **8:209**
 Patent Act of 1793, **8:202, 8:209**
 Patent Act of 1836, **8:64, 8:203,**
 8:209
 Patent Act of 1839, **8:210, 8:249**
 Patent Act of 1870, **8:206**
 Patent Act of 1939, **8:212**
 Patent Act of 1952, **8:63**
 Patent Cooperation Treaty, **8:154**
 Patented, **8:224**
 Patent right, sale of, **8:231**
 Paulik v. Rizkalla, **8:130**
 Pending applications, **8:69**
 Pennock v. Dialogue, **8:203**
 Performance, **8:57**
 Perjury, **8:69**
 Personal property law, **8:35, 8:37**
 Pfaff v. Wells Electronics, **8:234**
 Physical aspects. First-to-invent
 priority, Section 102(g), above
 Physical construction, **8:59**

INDEX

PRIORITY—Cont'd

- Physical embodiment, **8:44**
- Policy discussions, **8:158**
- Policy justification. Historical development and policy justification, *above*
- Policy rationale, **8:56**
- Possession
 - generally, **8:33**
 - first-to-invent, Section 102(g), **8:46, 8:47, 8:50**
 - first-to-invent vs. first-to-file, **8:35**
 - novelty, Paragraph 102(b), *above*
 - public possession prior to patentee's date of invention, paragraph 102(a), *below*
 - use, rights to, **8:38**
- Potential interpretations of statutory language, **8:151**
- Potential relation to paragraph 102(d), **8:179**
- Practical utility, **8:50, 8:51**
- Predictability, **8:54**
- Preponderance of evidence, **8:68, 8:69**
- Presumptions, **8:109**
- Previously filed patent. Description in previously filed patent, paragraph 102(e), *above*
- Printed defined, **8:177**
- Printed publication
 - novelty in relation to filing date of application, Paragraph 102(b), **8:220-8:223**
 - public possession prior to patentee's date of invention, paragraph 102(a), *below*
- Prior acts and matters
 - conceptual inconsistencies, *above* law, **8:105**
 - novelty, Paragraph 102(b), *above*
 - public possession prior to patentee's date of invention, paragraph 102(a), *below* work, **8:162**
- Private acts and activity, **8:69, 8:82**
- Private laboratory notebooks and drawings, **8:74**
- Private offers for sale, **8:228**

PRIORITY—Cont'd

- Probabilities, **8:170**
- Property-based compensation, **8:36**
- Property law, **8:36, 8:38**
- Provisional application, **8:149, 8:155, 8:216**
- Public. Novelty, Paragraph 102(b), *above*
- Publication
 - description in previously filed patent, paragraph 102(e), **8:141**
 - novelty in relation to filing date of application, Paragraph 102(b), **8:220-8:223**
 - public possession prior to patentee's date of invention, paragraph 102(a), *below*
- Public disclosure, **8:64, 8:159**
- Public domain, **8:36, 8:40**
- Public invention, interference priority vs., **8:43**
- Public knowledge. Public possession prior to patentee's date of invention, paragraph 102(a), *below*
- Public possession prior to patentee's date of invention, paragraph 102(a)
 - generally, **8:156-8:198**
 - circumstantial proof of public knowledge
 - generally, **8:169-8:190**
 - conflicting authorities, **8:183**
 - described in patent, **8:178-8:181**
 - existing authorities, synthesis of generally, **8:186-8:190**
 - abandoned and failed experiments, **8:189**
 - individual uses, **8:187**
 - reduction to practice, relation to, **8:188**
 - secret, noninforming uses, **8:190**
 - improper analogies to paragraph 102(b), **8:184**
 - low probabilities, acceptance of, **8:170**
 - potential relation to paragraph 102(d), **8:179**

PRIORITY—Cont'd

Public possession prior to patentee's date of invention, paragraph 102(a)—Cont'd

circumstantial proof of public knowledge—Cont'd

printed publication

generally, **8:173-8:177**

effective date of publication, **8:176**

historical development, **8:174**

printed defined, **8:177**

prior public knowledge, evidence of, **8:175-8:177**

publication defined, **8:177**

printed publications, relation to, **8:180**

prior use and prior invention, **8:185**

rule-based definiteness, **8:171**

secret patents, **8:181**

social disutility, **8:172**

used, generally, **8:182-8:190**

evidence. Circumstantial proof of public knowledge, above in this group

existing authorities, synthesis of. Circumstantial proof of public knowledge, above in this group

geographic limitations

generally, **8:191-8:198**

administrative justification, **8:192**

Bain v. Morse, **8:197**

diffusion, speed of, **8:194**

historical development, **8:195-8:197**

in this country defined, **8:194**

local priority, symmetry with, **8:193**

Shaw v. Cooper, **8:196**

historical development and policy justification

generally, **8:157-8:163**

evidence of superior priority, **8:160-8:162**

general absence of policy discussions, **8:158**

PRIORITY—Cont'd

Public possession prior to patentee's date of invention, paragraph 102(a)—Cont'd

historical development and policy justification—Cont'd

inconsistencies with paragraph 102(g), **8:163**

knowledge and circumstantial evidence of prior knowledge, **8:161**

public disclosure, **8:159**

status of applicant's own prior work, **8:162**

justification. Historical development and policy justification, above in this group

limitations and restrictions. Geographic limitations, above in this group

notice and knowledge. Public knowledge, below in this group

policy justification. Historical development and policy justification, above in this group

printed publication. Circumstantial proof of public knowledge, above in this group

publication. Circumstantial proof of public knowledge, above in this group

public knowledge

generally, **8:164-8:168**

abandoned applications, **8:168**

circumstantial proof of public knowledge, above in this group

extent of knowledge required, **8:166**

extent of publicness required, **8:167**

In re Borst, **8:165**

Published applications, **8:144, 8:149**

Qualification, **8:57**

Quantified abandonment, **8:210**

Quantified probativeness, **8:72**

Race of diligence, **8:79**

INDEX

PRIORITY—Cont'd

Ready for patenting, **8:235**
Reason, rule of, **8:70, 8:71, 8:74**
Reasonable diligence, **8:65**
Reduction to practice
 generally, **8:44**
 conception, **8:53**
 diligence, **8:63-8:65, 8:67**
 evidence, **8:70**
 experimental use, **8:258**
 novelty, **8:258**
 used, **8:188**
Reed v. Cuter, **8:44**
Reference, **8:36, 8:48, 8:62**
Reference, importance of subject
 matter claimed in, **8:148**
Reissue of patent, **16:82**
Rejection of application, **8:73, 8:74**
Reliance on exact claim language,
 8:259
Renewed activity, **8:130**
Research and development, **8:46**
Resolution, **8:62**
Reversal, **8:46**
Rule 131. Date of invention in
 paragraphs 102(a) and (e), above
Rule-based control, **8:72**
Rule-based definiteness, **8:171**
Sales. Novelty, Paragraph 102(b),
 above
Same invention, **8:113-8:115**
Secrecy, **8:87**
Secret, **8:64, 8:190**
Secret patents, **8:181**
Section 103, **8:136**
Section 104. Conceptual inconsistencies, above
Settled issues, **8:228-8:231**
Shaw v. Cooper, **8:196, 8:203**
Showing, **8:135**
Simultaneous events, **8:128**
Sinko Tool & Mfg. Co. v. Automatic
 Devices Corp., **8:61**
Skilled in the art, **8:46, 8:58**
Skilled person, **8:54**
Social costs, **8:33**
Social disutility, **8:172**
Sophistication, **8:44**

PRIORITY—Cont'd

Species and genus, **8:47**
Spero v. Ringold, **8:46**
Standard of evidence, **8:69**
State of mind, **8:58**
Status of applicant's own prior work,
 8:162
Subcombination of elements, **8:47**
Subjective knowledge, **8:52**
Subjective possession, **8:46**
Subsequent applications, **8:126**
Substantive law, **8:223**
Sufficiency of single offer, **8:229**
Sufficient commercialization, **8:237**
Sufficient technological completion,
 8:233
Superior priority, **8:34, 8:142, 8:160-8:162**
Superior title, **8:40**
Suppression
 description in previously filed
 patent, paragraph 102(e),
 8:143
 first-to-invent priority, Section
 102(g), above
Supreme Court
 generally, **8:50**
 Alexander Milburn Co. v. Davis-
 Bournonville Co., **8:140**
 Andrews v. Hovey, **8:206, 8:251**
 Bain v. Morse, **8:101, 8:197**
 City of Elizabeth v. Nicholson
 Pavement Co., **8:250**
 Electric Storage Battery Co. v.
 Shimadzu, **8:102**
 In re Borst, **8:165**
 In re Hilmer, **8:121, 8:153**
 Metallizing Engineering v. Kenyon
 Bearing, **8:243**
 Paulik v. Rizkalla, **8:130**
 Pennock v. Dialogue, **8:203**
 Pfaff v. Wells Electronics, **8:234**
 Shaw v. Cooper, **8:196, 8:203**
Sydeman v. Thoma, **8:60-8:62**
Symmetry arguments, **8:100**
Technical content of showing,
 required, **8:135**
Technology, **8:233**

PRIORITY—Cont'd

Temporal scope, **11:23**
 Testing required, degree of, **8:59-8:62**
 Tests, **8:55, 8:57, 8:59, 8:60, 8:62, 8:67**
 Theoretical justification, **8:92**
 Third parties, experiments by, **8:256**
 Third-party offers, **8:232**
 Time and date
 conceptual inconsistencies, **8:123**
 date of invention in paragraphs 102(a) and (e), above
 novelty, Paragraph 102(b), above
 public possession prior to patentee's date of invention, paragraph 102(a), above
 Time-wise priority, **8:34**
 Traditional justification, **8:71**
 Treaties, **8:154**
 Tripartite analysis, **8:60**
 12-month period, computation of, **8:123**
 Underlying rationales, **8:84-8:87**
 Unexpected properties, **8:52**
 Unified standard, **8:61**
 Unresolved issues, **8:244**
 Unsettled issues, **8:232, 8:257-8:260**
 Use, right to, **8:38**
 Useful arts, **8:56**
 US Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) vs. court proceedings, **8:75**
 Utility, **8:51**
 Vacations, **8:67**
 Validity, **8:69**
 Value, **8:56**
 Voluntariness, **8:67**
 Weight and sufficiency of evidence, **8:72**
 Withdrawal of material from public domain, **8:241**
 Witnesses
 generally, **8:34, 8:68, 8:69**
 competency of, **8:72**
 corroboration, generally, **8:70-8:75**
 oral testimony, **8:74**
 standard of proof, **8:69**

PRIORITY—Cont'd

Workability, **8:60**
 Written acts and matters, **8:74**

PRIOR MINIMAL INFRINGEMENT

Laches, unreasonable delay, **23:35**

PRIOR STATUTES

Defenses, general pleading theory, **17:3, 17:10**

PRIOR USER RIGHT

Inventorship, **10:14**
 Section 273 defense. Prior Inventor, Prior-User Rights (this index)

PRIVACY

Processes, **5:39**

PRIVATE ACTION

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:18**

PRIVATE ACTS AND ACTIVITIES

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:2, 2:4**
 Priority, **8:69, 8:82**

PRIVATE COMMUNICATIONS

History, **1:1**

PRIVATE CORPORATIONS

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:22**

PRIVATE ENTITIES

Policy justification, **1:39**

PRIVATE INFORMATION

Non-obviousness, **9:46**

PRIVATE KNOWLEDGE

Adequate disclosure, **7:17**

PRIVATE LABORATORY NOTEBOOKS AND DRAWINGS

Priority, **8:74**

PRIVATELY KNOWN INFORMATION

Non-obviousness, **9:43**

INDEX

PRIVATE OFFERS FOR SALE

Priority, **8:228**

PRIVATE PARTIES

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:17

PRIVATE REMEDIES

History, **1:18**

PRIVATE SINGLE-SOURCE CONTROL

Statutory subject matter, **5:5**

PRIVILEGES

History, **1:4, 1:12**

PRIVY SEAL

History, **1:1**

PROBABILITIES

Priority, **8:170**

PROCESS CONTROL CORP. v. HYDRECLAIM CORP.

Adequate utility, **6:19**

PROCESSES

Generally, **5:1 et seq.**

Abandonment, **5:30**

Abstract business entity, **5:39**

Abstract ideals, **5:19**

Abstract method in, **5:26**

Accounting, **5:28**

Adequate differences, **5:29**

Aesthetic thought, **5:26**

Amendment to statute, **5:39**

America Invents Act, **5:33**

American Medical Association
(AMA), **5:39**

Anticipation, lack of, **5:24, 8:28**

Any mental activity, **5:27**

Apparatus

business methods, apparatus-inde-
pendent, **5:23**

descriptions, **5:29**

manipulation of physical appara-
tus, **5:27**

variations of disclosed apparatus,
5:21

Appeal and review, **5:21, 5:26, 5:27,
5:30**

PROCESSES—Cont'd

Application, **5:24, 5:26**

Arts, **5:21**

AT&T v. Excel Communications,
Inc., **5:23, 5:37**

Bilski v. Kappos, **5:32**

Biotech industry, **5:39**

Biotechnology industry, **5:39**

Board of Appeals, **5:27**

Bubble hierarchy, **5:23**

Business methods

generally, **5:28-5:33**

apparatus-independent business
methods, **5:23**

early history, **5:29**

hybrid claiming, **5:38**

modern developments, **5:30**

observations, **5:36-5:38**

physical transformation, adapting
requirement of, **5:37**

Case law, **5:24-5:26**

Central claiming, **5:21**

Challenges, **5:39**

Change and modification, **5:19, 5:24,
5:28, 5:30**

Chemical compositions, **5:39**

Circuit court, **5:27**

Civil action, **5:39**

Clarity, **5:28**

CLS v. Alice, **5:32.50**

Cochran v. Deener, **5:22**

Commercial manufacture, **5:39**

Commercial processes, **5:37**

Common law, **5:24**

Competition, **5:39**

Compositions, **5:39**

Compromise, **5:39**

Computers, **5:24, 5:26, 5:27, 5:30**

Congress, **5:30**

Consent orders, **5:39**

Construction and interpretation, **5:21,
5:23, 5:27**

Consumer, **5:39**

Contracts and agreements, **5:29**

Contribution to the art, **5:21**

Conversion, **5:30**

Copyright, **5:38**

Corning v. Burden, **5:21**

PROCESSES—Cont'd

Costs and expenses, **5:39**
 Coupons, **5:29**
 Court of Customs and Patent Appeals (CCPA), **5:26, 5:27, 5:30**
 CPR, **5:39**
 Creative thought, **5:26**
 Current developments, **5:31**
 Customer records, handling, **5:28**
 Damages, **5:39**
 Data constructs, manipulation of, **5:19**
 Data systems, **5:30**
 Defenses, **5:23**
 Definiteness, **5:26**
 Definition, **5:19**
 Demand, **5:39**
 Descriptions, **5:29**
 Developments, **5:31**
 Diagnostic procedures, **5:39**
 Dicta, asserted in, **5:21**
 Directed summary judgment, **5:30**
 Disclosure, **5:19, 5:21**
 Discovery, **5:24**
 Discretion of human participant, **5:27**
 District court, **5:30**
 Dolbear v. American Bell Telephone Co., **5:24**
 Drugs, **5:39**
 Economic control, **5:38**
 Electricity, **5:21**
 Embodiments, **5:21, 5:22**
 Emotional thought, **5:26**
 End results, **5:24**
 Enforcement, **5:39**
 English law, **5:21**
 European Patent Convention (EPC), **5:39**
 Examination process, **5:30**
 Examining corps, **5:38**
 Exception for Ministerial Acts, **5:27**
 Exceptions, exclusions, and exemptions
 business methods, **5:29, 5:30, 5:39**
 exclusions, generally, **5:22, 5:24, 5:26, 5:29**
 mathematical formulae, scientific principles, natural phenom-

PROCESSES—Cont'd

Exceptions, exclusions, and exemptions—Cont'd
 ena, and end results, **5:24**
 mental steps, **5:26**
 peripheral claiming, **5:22**
 Exclusive power, **5:21**
 Expanded post-grant review, **5:35**
 Ex parte McNabb, **5:27**
 Ex parte Read, **5:27**
 Facsimile machines, **5:24**
 Federal Circuit, **5:30**
 Fees, **5:39**
 Filing civil action, **5:39**
 Financial revenue, **5:39**
 Food and Drug Administration, **5:39**
 Foreign countries, **5:39**
 Ganske/Frisk compromise, **5:39**
 General agreement, **5:29**
 General Patent Act of 1870, **5:21**
 Gene therapy treatments, **5:39**
 Geographic scope, **12:25**
 Gottschalk v. Benson, **5:24**
 Halliburton Oil Well Cementing Co. v. Walker, **5:27**
 Health care entities, **5:39**
 Heimlich maneuver, **5:39**
 Historical developments, industrial processes, **5:21**
 History, **5:30**
 Human interpretive, **5:25**
 Human intervention, **5:24**
 Human participant, **5:25, 5:27**
 Hybrid claims, **4:74, 5:29, 5:36**
 Imaginative thought, **5:26**
 Immunity, **5:30**
 Improvements, **5:21**
 Incentives, **5:39**
 Industrial processes, generally, **5:19-5:23**
 Infringement, **5:23, 5:26, 5:30, 5:39**
 In re Heritage, **5:27**
 In re Musgrave, **5:26**
 In re Prater, **5:26**
 In re Schrader, **5:30**
 In re Warmerdam, **5:23**
 Injunctions, **5:39**
 Intent, **5:30, 5:37**

INDEX

PROCESSES—Cont'd

- Internal decisions of Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **5:29**
- Internal operations of Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **5:30**
- Interpretive judgment, **5:26**
- Interpretive mental acts, **5:27**
- Intervention, **5:24**
- Issuance of patent, **5:21, 5:39**
- Judgments, **5:26, 5:30**
- Judicial decisions, **5:19, 5:37**
- Ledger sheets, **5:29**
- Legislation, **5:28, 5:39**
- Le roy v. Tatham, **5:21**
- Licensed health professionals, **5:39**
- Licensing fees, **5:39**
- Limitations and restrictions
 - generally, **5:19**
 - business methods, **5:29, 5:30, 5:37**
 - industrial processes, **5:21, 5:22**
 - medical and surgical procedures, **5:39**
 - mental steps, **5:26**
- Logarithmic scales, **5:27**
- Manipulation of physical apparatus, **5:27**
- Manipulation of raw, physical materials, **5:36**
- Manual implementation of computer technology, **5:30**
- Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), **5:30**
- Mathematical algorithm, **5:30**
- Mathematical formulae, **5:22, 5:24**
- Medical and surgical procedures, **5:39**
- Medical device or machine, **5:39**
- Medical equipment, **5:39**
- Medical information, **5:39**
- Medical professionals, **5:39**
- Mental activity, **5:25, 5:27**
- Mental acts, **5:27**
- Mental steps, **5:22, 5:25-5:27**
- Merger doctrine, **5:38**
- Ministerial acts, **5:25**
- Modern developments, **5:31**
- Modern developments, industrial processes, **5:23**

PROCESSES—Cont'd

- Monopolies, **5:21**
- Motive, **5:21**
- Natural phenomena, **5:24**
- Natural state, **5:24**
- Nature, power of, **5:21**
- Network printers, **5:24**
- New medical procedure, **5:39**
- Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, **5:27**
- Non-statutory, **5:23, 5:26, 5:29-5:32**
- Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:81**
- Non-statutory subject matter, **5:29**
- Notice and knowledge, **5:21, 5:24**
- Novelty, **5:21**
- Nullity, **5:24**
- Numerical calculation, **5:30**
- Numerical construct, **5:23**
- Objections, **5:26, 5:29**
- Orders, **5:39**
- O'Reilly v. Morse, **5:24**
- Paper accounting forms, **5:38**
- Participation, **5:30**
- Patentability, generally, **5:22**
- Patent Act of 1790, **5:21**
- Patent Act of 1952, **5:30**
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO)
 - business methods, **5:28-5:30**
 - industrial processes, **5:21**
 - internal decisions of Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **5:29**
 - mathematical formulae, scientific principles, natural phenomena, and end results, **5:24**
 - medical and surgical procedures, **5:39**
 - mental steps, **5:26, 5:27**
- Patient privacy, **5:39**
- Performance, **5:25, 5:26, 5:30**
- Peripheral claiming, **5:21, 5:22, 5:24**
- Per se invention, **5:29**
- Per se method, **5:21**
- Per se patentable subject matter, **5:21**
- Per se processes, **5:21**
- Pharmaceuticals, **5:39**
- Physical objects, **5:19, 5:30**
- Physical transformation, **5:23, 5:26**
- Physicians, **5:39**

PROCESSES—Cont'd

- Policy justification, **5:26, 5:29**
- Policy rationales, mental steps, **5:26**
- Post-grant review, **5:35**
- Practical application, **5:21**
- Price, **5:39**
- Printers, **5:24**
- Printing on ledger sheets, **5:29**
- Prior art, **5:30**
- Privacy, **5:39**
- Publication, **5:39**
- Purely manual implementations, **5:26**
- Purely mental acts, **5:22**
- Pure method, **5:22**
- Purity, increase in, **5:24**
- Qualifications, **5:21**
- Qualitative judgment, **5:26**
- Quality of life, **5:39**
- References, **5:22, 5:38**
- Rejection of application
 - business methods, **5:29, 5:30, 5:38**
 - mathematical formulae, scientific principles, natural phenomena, and end results, **5:24**
 - mental steps, **5:26, 5:27**
- Research and development, **5:39**
- Researchers, **5:39**
- Reversal, **5:30**
- Review, **5:35**
- Robotic environment, **5:23**
- Royalties, **5:39**
- Scientific laws and principles, **5:22, 5:24**
- Secrecy, **5:39**
- Section 102, **5:38**
- Section 103, **5:38**
- Section 273, **5:30**
- Section 281, **5:39**
- Section 283, **5:39**
- Section 285, **5:39**
- Section 287(c), **5:39**
- Section 616, **5:39**
- Social cost, **5:39**
- Social underutilization, **5:39**
- Software, **5:43-5:45**
- Specification, **5:19, 5:21, 5:26**

PROCESSES—Cont'd

- State Street Bank & Trust Co. v. Signature Financial Group, Inc., **5:30, 5:38**
- Statute of Monopolies, **5:21**
- Statutes, **5:33-5:35**
- Step-by-step, **5:38**
- Subjective thought to perform, **5:25**
- Summary judgment, **5:30**
- Supreme Court, **5:21, 5:22, 5:24**
- Tax strategies, **5:34**
- Telecommunications industry, **5:23**
- Tilghman v. Mitchell, **5:21**
- Trade secrets, **5:30**
- Transformation, **5:19, 5:22, 5:30**
- Treatises, **5:30**
- Trial court, **5:21**
- True method, **5:27**
- Unassisted human thought, **5:26**
- Validity
 - business methods, **5:28, 5:30**
 - industrial processes, **5:21**
 - medical and surgical procedures, **5:39**
 - mental steps, **5:27**
- Variations of disclosed apparatus, **5:21**
- Void, **5:24**
- Wyeth v. Stone, **5:24**

PROCESS PATENTS

AMENDMENT ACT OF 1988

- Geographic scope, **12:36-12:38**

PRODUCT

- Defined, **12:37**

PRODUCT-AND-METHOD

- Claims, **4:63**

PRODUCT-BY-PROCESS

- Claims, **4:73, 4:74, 4:82, 4:102**

PRODUCTION AND

PRODUCTION PROCESS

- Adequate disclosure, **7:52, 7:53**
- Geographic scope, **12:32**
- Static physical configurations, **5:9**

INDEX

PRODUCTION DETAILS

Adequate disclosure
best mode, **7:52**

PRODUCTIVE KNOWLEDGE

Adequate utility, **7:5**

PRODUCTIVE USE

Adequate utility, **7:1, 7:6**

PRODUCT METHOD

Claims, **4:66**

PRODUCTS MADE BY PATENTED PROCESS

Geographic Scope of Infringement
(this index)

PROFITS

Adequate commerciality, **14:12**
Adequate utility, **6:19, 7:5**
Claims, **4:63**
Joint inventorship, **10:53**
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:61**
Policy justification, **1:34, 1:39, 1:41**
Statutory subject matter, **5:4**

PRO FORMA

Non-obviousness, **9:84**

PROGRAMS

Computer-Related Inventions (this
index)

PROMOTING PROGRESS

Non-obviousness, **9:9**

PROPER INVENTORSHIP

Inventorship (this index)
Joint inventorship, **10:20-10:22**

PROPER OWNERSHIP

Inventorship, **10:7**

PROPER PLACEMENT

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:63**

PROPERTY-BASED COMPENSATION

Priority, **8:36**

PROPERTY LAW

Inventorship, **10:4, 10:14**

PROPERTY LAW—Cont'd

Misuse of patent, patent rights as
property, **18:8**
Priority, **8:36, 8:38**

PROSECUTION

Adequate utility, **6:13**
Claims, **4:93**
Correction of inventorship, **10:56**
Examination of Original Application
(this index)
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:22
Reissue of Patent (this index)

PROSECUTION HISTORY

Claims, **4:45**
Estoppel. Technological Scope of
Infringement (this index)

PROSPECTIVE-USE-BASED VIEW

Adequate utility, **6:19**

PROSPECTS

Justification, **1:40, 1:42**

PROTECTIONISM

Prior inventor, prior-user rights, **22:5**

PROVERIS SCIENTIFIC CORP. v. INNOVASYSTEMS, INC.

Safe harbor, **14:74**

PROVISIONAL APPLICATION

Priority, **8:149, 8:155, 8:216**

PROVISIONAL RIGHTS

Temporal Scope of Infringement (this
index)

PTO

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO)
(this index)

PUBLIC ACCESSIBILITY

Joint inventorship, **10:51**

PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEES

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:22

PUBLICATION

Adequate disclosure, **7:5, 7:18**

PUBLICATION—Cont'd

Anticipation, lack of, **8:31**
Claims, **4:2**
Examination of Original Application
(this index)
Non-Obviousness (this index)
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:20, 2:24
Priority (this index)
Processes, **5:39**
Temporal Scope of Infringement (this
index)

PUBLIC DISCLOSURE

Non-obviousness, **9:22, 9:42, 9:51**
Policy justification, **1:37, 1:38**
Priority, **8:64, 8:159**

PUBLIC DOMAIN

Anticipation, lack of, **8:27-8:29**
Correction of inventorship, **10:68**
Examination of Original Application
(this index)
History, **1:15**
Non-Obviousness (this index)
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:4
Priority, **8:36, 8:40**
Static physical configurations, **5:18**

PUBLIC EVENTS

Non-Obviousness (this index)

PUBLIC FUNDS

Policy justification, **1:39**

PUBLIC IN DUE COURSE

Correction of inventorship, **10:67**
Non-obviousness, **9:28, 9:29**

PUBLIC INSENSITIVITY

Adequate utility, **6:10**

PUBLIC INSPECTION

Adequate utility, **7:18**

PUBLIC INVENTION

Priority, **8:43**

PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE

Adequate commerciality, **14:53**
Non-obviousness, **9:21, 9:38, 9:39,**
9:41

PUBLIC KNOWLEDGE—Cont'd

Policy justification, **1:38**
Priority (this index)

PUBLIC LAW

Claims, **4:77**

PUBLICLY AVAILABLE PATENT

Non-obviousness, **9:21**

PUBLICLY OBSERVABLE USES

Non-obviousness, **9:21**

PUBLIC ORDER

Utility Requirement (this index)

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:13

PUBLIC POLICY

Non-obviousness, **9:28**

PUBLIC POSSESSION

Anticipation, lack of, **8:19, 8:30**
Non-obviousness, **9:77**
Priority (this index)

PUBLIC SALE

Adequate utility, **6:12**

PUBLIC USE

Anticipation, lack of, **8:21**
Correction of inventorship, **10:68**
Examination of Original Application
(this index)
Inventorship, **10:14**
Non-obviousness, **9:39, 9:43**

PUBLIC WELFARE

Static physical configurations, **5:14**

PURCHASE

Defense, license to use, **19:5**

**PURELY MANUAL
IMPLEMENTATIONS**

Processes, **5:26**

PURELY MENTAL ACTS

Processes, **5:27**

**PURE MATHEMATICS, MATTERS
OF**

Statutory subject matter, **5:4**

INDEX

PURE METHOD

Processes, **5:22**

PURE SCIENTIFIC, MATTERS OF

Statutory subject matter, **5:4**

PURITY, ELEVATED LEVELS OF

Static physical configurations, **5:9**

PURITY, INCREASE IN

Processes, **5:24**

PVPA

Static physical configurations, **5:15, 5:17**

QUALIFICATIONS

Adequate disclosure, **7:14, 7:18**

Adequate utility, **6:7, 6:18**

Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)

History, **1:21**

Inventorship (this index)

Joint Inventorship (this index)

Non-Obviousness (this index)

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:74**

Priority, **8:57**

Processes, **5:21**

Static physical configurations, **5:15**

QUESTIONS OF CAPACITY FOR USE

Adequate commerciality, **14:29-14:31**

QUESTIONS OF LAW

Claims (this index)

QUID PRO QUO

Claims, **4:91**

RACE OF DILIGENCE

Priority, **8:79**

RACE-TO-INVENT

Adequate utility, **7:5**

RADIO CORP. OF AMERICA v. ANDREA

Adequate commerciality, **14:21, 14:22, 14:26**

RAISING QUESTIONS

Indirect infringement, **15:24**

RAW MATERIALS

Policy justification, **1:39**

REACTIVE MEASURES

Reissue of patent, **16:17-16:46**

READY FOR PATENTING

Priority, **8:235**

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

Adequate disclosure, **7:54**

REAL PROPERTY OR CHATTEL

Joint inventorship, **10:49**

REASON, RULE OF

Priority, **8:70, 8:71, 8:74**

REASONABLE APPREHENSION

Adequate commerciality, **14:80**

REASONABLE DILIGENCE

Priority, **8:65**

REASONABLE EXPERIMENTATION

Adequate disclosure, **7:20**

REASONABLE MIND

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:43**

REASONABLENESS

Adequate commerciality, **14:72**

Judicial review, **2:41**

REASONABLE NOTICE

Claims, **4:2**

REASONABLE PEOPLE

Claims, **4:3**

REASONABLE RELATIONSHIP

Adequate commerciality, **14:68, 14:73**

REASONABLY CAPABLE OF USE

Adequate commerciality, **14:19**

REASONABLY CLEAR

Claims, **4:94**

REASONABLY CORRELATED

Adequate utility, **7:23**

REASONABLY PERTINENT

Non-obviousness, **9:18**

REASONABLY RELATED USES

Adequate commerciality, **14:72-14:74**

REASONABLY STABLE

Static physical configurations, **5:9**

REASONS

Non-obviousness, **9:66**

REBUTTAL

Claims, **4:93**

Non-obviousness, **9:7, 9:74, 9:75**

RECITAL AND RECITATIONS

Anticipation, lack of, **8:14**

Claims (this index)

Non-obviousness, **9:1**

RECOMMENDATION

Reissue of patent, **16:97**

RECONSTRUCTION

Defenses, implied-in-law licenses, **19:42**

RECOVERY

Invalidity, royalties paid, **17:39**

REDUCTION

Reissues of patents, **16:38**

REDUCTION-TO-PRACTICE

Anticipation, lack of, **8:5, 8:6, 8:8**

Inventorship (this index)

Joint inventorship, **10:28**

Priority (this index)

REED v. CUTER

Priority, **8:44**

REEXAMINATION

Generally, **16:121 et seq.**

Constitutional questions
generally, **16:125**

court review, **16:126**

due process, **16:127**

estoppel, **16:127**

jury trial, **16:126**

retroactivity, **16:126**

Court review, **16:126**

REEXAMINATION—Cont'd

Due process, **16:127**

Effect of reexamination, **16:133-16:135**

Estoppel

constitutional questions, **16:127**

effect of reexamination, **16:135**

Ex parte procedures, **16:123**

Inter partes reexamination

effect of reexamination, **16:135**

overview, **16:124**

Intervening rights, effect of
reexamination, **16:134**

Jury trial, **16:126**

Means expressions, **4:88**

Non-obviousness, **9:26**

Original application. Examination of
Original Application (this index)

Overview of procedures, **16:122-16:124**

Parallel proceedings, stays, **16:131**

Patentability question. Substantial
new question of patentability,
below

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:18, 2:26

Reissue of Patent (this index)

Retroactivity, **16:126**

Review by court, **16:126**

Scope of reexamination, **16:132**

Stay of parallel proceedings, **16:131**

Substantial new question of patent-
ability

generally, **16:128-16:130**

“new,” **16:130**

“substantial,” **16:129**

Success of third-party requester,
16:135

Third-party requester, **16:135**

REFERENCE

Adequate disclosure. Disclosure (this
index)

Adequate utility, **6:7**

Anticipation, lack of, **8:13, 8:22, 8:25**

Correction of inventorship, **10:65, 10:66, 10:68**

Disclosure (this index)

INDEX

REFERENCE—Cont'd

Examination of Original Application
(this index)
Joint inventorship, **10:46**
Non-Obviousness (this index)
Priority, **8:36, 8:48, 8:62, 8:148**
Processes, **5:22, 5:38**

REFORM MOVEMENT

Reissue of patent, **16:41**

REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA v. ELI LILLY & CO.

Adequate disclosure, **7:37, 7:39**

REGIONAL CIRCUIT COURTS

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:37

REGIONAL FEDERAL CIRCUIT COURTS OF APPEAL

History, **1:24**

REGISTRATION

Congress, **2:16**
Designs, **5:46**
Geographic scope, registered vessels,
12:13
History, **1:18, 1:19**
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
generally, **2:2**

REGULAR RESULT

Anticipation, lack of, **8:25**

REHEARINGS

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:22

REHEARING SUA SPONTE

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:22

REISSUE OF PATENT

Generally, **16:1, 16:72**
Accident, mistake or inadvertence,
pre-1882 broadening reissues,
16:25
Amendments, Patent Act of 1852,
16:61
Analysis and recommendation, same
invention, **16:97**

REISSUE OF PATENT—Cont'd

Battin v. Taggart, Patent Act of 1836,
16:21
Broadening changes, defect claims,
16:77-16:79
Broadening defined, requirements for
eligibility, **16:78**
Burr v. Duryee, pre-1882 broadening
reissues, reactive measures,
16:28
Calculation on date of reissue grant,
16:117
Carlton v. Bokee, pre-1882 broaden-
ing reissues, reactive measures,
16:29
Carter v. Braintree, Patent Act of
1836, **16:19**
Causes of action, effect of reissue on
existing, 1882-1952 develop-
ments, **16:48, 16:49**
Claims, **4:4, 4:9**
Continuation status under Section
120, eligibility, **16:83**
Dann amendments, “no-defect” reis-
sue practice, **16:64**
Deceptive intent lacking, **16:98**
Defect
generally, **16:74**
broadening changes claims, **16:77-
16:79**
claims, generally, **16:75-16:80**
continuation status under Section
120, **16:83**
definiteness, changes to improve,
16:80
definition of broadening, broaden-
ing changes claims, **16:78**
disclosure, **16:81**
inventorship changes, **16:84**
narrowing changes claims, **16:76**
new matter prohibition, **16:81**
priority, assertions under Section
119, **16:82**
reexamination, “no-defect” reissue
practice under Dann amend-
ments, **16:64**
Section 119 priority, **16:82**
Section 120 continuation status,
16:83

REISSUE OF PATENT—Cont'd

Defect—Cont'd

two-year time limit, broadening changes claims, **16:79**

Definiteness, changes to improve, eligibility, **16:80**

Definitions

broadening, **16:78**

error, general definition, **16:105-16:107**

Disclosure, eligibility, **16:81**

1846-1884, *Stimpson v. West Chester R Co.* decision as to error, **16:102**

1884-1952, *Mahn v. Harwood* decision as to error, **16:103**

Eligibility. Requirements for eligibility, below

Error, mechanisms to prevent expanded prosecution, **16:99-16:107**

Examination of Original Application (this index)

Existing embodiments, implied license as to, **16:119**

Expiration date of new rights, limitations on remedies, **16:114**

Federal Circuit decisions, same invention, **16:93-16:96**

General claiming requirements, pre-1882 broadening reissues, **16:26-16:29**

Giant Powder Co. v. California Powder Works, pre-1882 broadening reissues, same invention, **16:24**

Goodyear v. Day, pre-1882 broadening reissues, same invention, **16:23**

Grant of reissue, calculation on date, **16:117**

Grant v. Raymond, prestatutory history, **16:5**

Historical development

generally, **16:2, 16:3**

accident, mistake or inadvertence, pre-1882 broadening reissues, **16:25**

amendments, Patent Act of 1852, **16:61**

REISSUE OF PATENT—Cont'd

Historical development—Cont'd

Burr v. Duryee, pre-1882 broadening reissues, reactive measures, **16:28**

Carlton v. Bokee, pre-1882 broadening reissues, reactive measures, **16:29**

causes of action, effect of reissue on existing, 1882-1952 developments, **16:48, 16:49**

court decisions post-1870, pre-1882 broadening reissues, new matter prohibition, **16:37**

developments up to 1882, broadening reissues, **16:5-16:46**

early statutory history, **16:7-16:9**

effect on reissuance practice, *Miller v. Bridgeport Brass Co.*, pre-1882 broadening reissues, **16:46**

1882-1952 developments, **16:47-16:56**

factual setting, *Miller v. Bridgeport Brass Co.*, pre-1882 broadening reissues, **16:43**

general claiming requirements, pre-1882 broadening reissues, **16:26-16:29**

Giant Powder Co. v. California Powder Works, pre-1882 broadening reissues, same invention, **16:24**

Goodyear v. Day, pre-1882 broadening reissues, same invention, **16:23**

Grant v. Raymond, prestatutory history, **16:5**

Hoffheins v. Brand, broadening problem, **16:16**

inadvertence, accident, or mistake, pre-1882 broadening reissues, **16:25**

inclusion of later inventions, **16:13**

intervening rights, 1882-1952 developments, **16:51-16:56**

invalidity, intervening rights, 1882-1915, **16:53**

judicial reactions, pre-1882 broadening reissues, new mat-

INDEX

REISSUE OF PATENT—Cont'd

Historical development—Cont'd
 ter prohibition, **16:35**
 limitations on remedies, intervening rights, **16:116**
 mechanisms to prevent expanded prosecution, error, **16:100-16:104**
 Miller v. Bridgeport Brass Co., pre-1882 broadening reissues, time limit, **16:41-16:46**
 mistake, accident, or inadvertence, pre-1882 broadening reissues, **16:25**
 mistaken reliance, **16:12**
 models as lingering problem, pre-1882 broadening reissues, new matter prohibition, **16:39**
 new matter prohibition, pre-1882 broadening reissues, reactive measures, **16:30-16:39**
 1915-1952, intervening rights, rise of personal defense, **16:54-16:56**
 1952, developments subsequent to, **1:22**
 O'Reilly v. Morse v. Morse, pre-1882 broadening reissues, reactive measures, **16:27**
 parol evidence, pre-1882 broadening reissues, new matter prohibition, **16:33, 16:34**
 Patent Act of 1832, **16:7**
 Patent Act of 1836, below
 Patent Act of 1852, below
 Patent Act of 1870, below
 Patent Act of 1928, effect of reissue on existing causes of action, **16:49**
 Patent Act of 1952, **1:23**
 Patent Act of 1980, reexamination, **16:65**
 Patent Office, pre-1882 broadening reissues
 earliest practices, **16:31**
 new matter prohibition, **16:32**
 post-2002 developments, reexamination, **16:68**
 pre-1882, intervening rights, no defense, **16:52**

REISSUE OF PATENT—Cont'd

Historical development—Cont'd
 pre-1882 developments, broadening reissues, **16:5-16:46**
 prestatutory history, **16:4, 16:5**
 private remedies, **1:18**
 reactive measures, pre-1882 broadening reissues, **16:17-16:46**
 reduction in reissues, pre-1882 broadening reissues, new matter prohibition, **16:38**
 reexamination, below
 reform movement, Miller v. Bridgeport Brass Co., pre-1882 broadening reissues, **16:41**
 rule against recapture, 1882-1952 developments, **16:50**
 same invention, pre-1882 broadening reissues, **16:22-16:24**
 Sontag Chain Stores Co. Limited v. National Nut Co. of California, intervening rights, 1915-1952, rise of personal defense, **16:56**
 speculation, **16:14**
 subsequent acceptance, Miller v. Bridgeport Brass Co., pre-1882 broadening reissues, **16:45**
 Supreme Court decision, Miller v. Bridgeport Brass Co., pre-1882 broadening reissues, **16:44**
 time limit imposition, pre-1882 broadening reissues, **16:40-16:46**
 2002 amendments, reexamination, **16:67**
 Woodworth patents, broadening problem, **16:15**
Hoffheins v. Brand, broadening problem, **16:16**
Implied license as to existing embodiments, **16:119**
Inadvertence, accident, or mistake, pre-1882 broadening reissues, **16:25**

REISSUE OF PATENT—Cont'd

- In re Amos decision in Federal Circuit, same invention, **16:96**
- In re Hounsfielde decision in Federal Circuit, same invention, **16:94**
- In re Weiler decision in Federal Circuit, same invention, **16:95**
- Inter partes reexamination under 1999 amendments, **16:66**
- Intervening rights
 - 1882-1952 developments, **16:51-16:56**
 - limitations on remedies, **16:115-16:120**
- Invalidity, intervening rights, 1882-1915, **16:53**
- Inventorship changes, eligibility, **16:84**
- Judicial reactions, pre-1882 broadening reissues, new matter prohibition, **16:35**
- Limitations on remedies
 - generally, **16:109**
 - calculation on date of reissue grant, **16:117**
 - expiration date of new rights, **16:114**
 - historical development, intervening rights, **16:116**
 - implied license as to existing embodiments, **16:119**
 - intervening rights, **16:115-16:120**
 - narrowing claims, application of intervening rights, **16:118**
 - newly added rights, **16:112-16:114**
 - original rights, **16:111**
 - potential license to continue other utilization, **16:120**
 - starting date of new rights, **16:113**
 - time span, **16:110-16:114**
- Mahn v. Harwood decision as to error, **16:103**
- Mechanisms to prevent expanded prosecution
 - generally, **16:85**
 - analysis and recommendation, same invention, **16:97**
 - court decisions prior to 1952, same invention, **16:88-16:90**

REISSUE OF PATENT—Cont'd

- Mechanisms to prevent expanded prosecution—Cont'd
 - deceptive intent lacking, **16:98**
 - early history, same invention, **16:87**
 - early statutory provisions as to error, **16:101**
 - 1846-1884, Stimpson v. West Chester R Co. decision as to error, **16:102**
 - 1884-1952, Mahn v. Harwood decision as to error, **16:103**
 - error, generally, **16:99-16:107**
 - Federal Circuit decisions, same invention, **16:93-16:96**
 - general definition of error, **16:105-16:107**
 - historical development, error, **16:100-16:104**
 - In re Amos decision in Federal Circuit, same invention, **16:96**
 - In re Hounsfielde decision in Federal Circuit, same invention, **16:94**
 - In re Weiler decision in Federal Circuit, same invention, **16:95**
 - 1952-1982 court decisions, same invention, **16:92**
 - nonelected subject matter, error, **16:106**
 - Parker & Whipple Co. v. Yale Clock Co. decision, same invention, **16:89**
 - Patent Act of 1952, **16:91, 16:104**
 - rule against recapture, error, **16:107**
 - same invention, **16:86-16:97**
 - U.S. Industrial Chemicals v. Carbide & Carbon Chemicals Corporation decision, same invention, **16:90**
- Miller v. bridgeport brass co., **16:42**
- Miller v. Bridgeport Brass Co., pre-1882 broadening reissues, time limit, **16:41-16:46**
- Mistake, accident, or inadvertence, pre-1882 broadening reissues, **16:25**
- Mistaken reliance, **16:12**

INDEX

REISSUE OF PATENT—Cont'd

- Models as lingering problem, pre-1882 broadening reissues, new matter prohibition, **16:39**
- Narrowing claims
 - application of intervening rights, **16:118**
 - intervening rights application, **16:118**
 - requirements for eligibility, **16:76**
- Newly added rights, limitations on remedies, **16:112-16:114**
- New matter prohibition
 - pre-1882 broadening reissues, reactive measures, **16:30-16:39**
 - requirements for eligibility, **16:81**
- 1915-1952, intervening rights, rise of personal defense, **16:54-16:56**
- 1952, developments subsequent to, **1:22**
- “No-defect” reissue practice under Dann amendments, **16:64**
- Nonelected subject matter, error, **16:106**
- Oath, **16:108**
- O'Reilly v. Morse v. Morse, pre-1882 broadening reissues, reactive measures, **16:27**
- Original rights, limitations on remedies, **16:111**
- Other utilization, potential license to continue, **16:120**
- Parker & Whipple Co. v. Yale Clock Co. decision, same invention, **16:89**
- Parol evidence, pre-1882 broadening reissues, new matter prohibition, **16:33, 16:34**
- Patent Act of 1832, **16:7**
- Patent Act of 1836
 - ban on broadening, **16:18-16:21**
 - Battin v. Taggart, allowance of broadening reissues, **16:21**
 - Carter v. Braintree, impact of central claiming, **16:19**
 - developments up to 1870, **1:20**
 - disagreement over statutory interpretation, **16:20**

REISSUE OF PATENT—Cont'd

- Patent Act of 1836—Cont'd
 - early statutory history, **16:8**
- Patent Act of 1852
 - generally, **16:57-16:61**
 - Section 251, **16:58**
 - Section 252, **16:59**
 - Section 253, **16:60**
 - subsequent amendments, **16:61**
- Patent Act of 1870
 - early statutory history, **16:9**
 - pre-1882 broadening reissues, new matter prohibition, **16:36**
- Patent Act of 1928, effect of reissue on existing causes of action, **16:49**
- Patent Act of 1952
 - history, **1:23**
 - mechanisms to prevent expanded prosecution, **16:91, 16:104**
- Patent Act of 1980, reexamination, **16:65**
- Patent Office, pre-1882 broadening reissues
 - earliest practices, **16:31**
 - new matter prohibition, **16:32**
- Policy justification
 - generally, **16:69**
 - reexamination, **16:71**
 - reissue, **16:70**
- Potential license to continue other utilization, limitations on remedies, **16:120**
- Priority under Section 119, eligibility, **16:82**
- Private remedies, historical developments, **1:18**
- Reactive measures, pre-1882 broadening reissues, **16:17-16:46**
- Reduction in reissues, pre-1882 broadening reissues, new matter prohibition, **16:38**
- Reexamination
 - Dann amendments, “no-defect” reissue practice, **16:64**
 - early developments, **16:63**
 - history, generally, **16:62-16:68**

REISSUE OF PATENT—Cont'd

Reexamination—Cont'd

inter partes reexamination under
1999 amendments, **16:66**

“no-defect” reissue practice under
Dann amendments, **16:64**

Patent Act of 1980, **16:65**

policy justification, **16:71**

post-2002 developments, **16:68**

2002 amendments, **16:67**

Reform movement, *Miller v.*

Bridgeport Brass Co., pre-1882
broadening reissues, **16:41**

Reissue oath, **16:108**

Remedies, limitations. Limitations on
remedies, above

Requirements for eligibility

generally, **16:73**

defect, above

mechanisms to prevent expanded
prosecution, above

reissue oath, **16:108**

Rule against recapture

1882-1952 developments, **16:50**
error, **16:107**

Same invention

mechanisms to prevent expanded
prosecution, **16:86-16:97**

pre-1882 broadening reissues,
16:22-16:24

Section 119 priority, eligibility, **16:82**

Section 120 continuation status,
eligibility, **16:83**

Sontag Chain Stores Co. Limited v.
National Nut Co. of California,
intervening rights, 1915-1952,
rise of personal defense, **16:56**

Speculation, historical development,
16:14

Starting date of new rights, limita-
tions on remedies, **16:113**

Stimpson v. West Chester R Co. deci-
sion as to error, **16:102**

Subsequent acceptance, *Miller v.*
Bridgeport Brass Co., pre-1882
broadening reissues, **16:45**

Supreme Court decision, *Miller v.*
Bridgeport Brass Co., pre-1882
broadening reissues, **16:44**

REISSUE OF PATENT—Cont'd

Technological scope, **13:62**

Time limit, pre-1882 broadening re-
issues, **16:40-16:46**

Time span, limitations on remedies,
16:110-16:114

2002 amendments, reexamination
generally, **16:67**

post-2002 developments, **16:68**

Two-year time limit, broadening
changes claims, eligibility,
16:79

U.S. Industrial Chemicals v. Carbide
& Carbon Chemicals Corpora-
tion decision, same invention,
16:90

Woodworth patents, broadening
problem, **16:15**

REJECTION IN PART

Non-obviousness, **9:33**

REJECTION OF APPLICATION

Adequate disclosure, **7:1, 7:9, 7:14,**
7:25

Adequate utility, **6:6, 6:13**

Claims (this index)

Computer-related inventions, **5:42,**
5:44, 5:45

Joint inventorship, **10:36, 10:38,**
10:39, 10:51

Non-obviousness

determination of obviousness, **9:68**

Rule 131 affidavits, **9:36**

secret prior art, **9:36, 9:37, 9:42**

starting and ending materials, **9:79,**
9:80

structures accompanied by proper-
ties or uses, **9:73, 9:77**

timeliness, Section 102, **9:23, 9:25**

Non-statutory hybrid inventions,
5:53, 5:63, 5:75, 5:80

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:32

Priority, **8:73, 8:74**

Processes, **5:24-5:27, 5:29, 5:30,**
5:38

Static physical configurations, **5:9,**
5:17

Technological configuration, **9:71**

INDEX

REJECTION OF APPLICATION —Cont'd

Technological scope, **13:107, 13:108**

RELATED APPLICANTS

Foreign countries, **8:277**

RELATED CLAIMS AND APPLICATIONS

Technological scope, **13:106**

RELATED HEALTH-CARE ENTITY

Medical and diagnostic procedures,
section 287(c) defense, **20:20**

RELATED INFORMATION

Adequate disclosure, **7:52, 7:53**

RELATIVE SKILL

Adequate utility, **7:20**

RELEVANCE OF PROOF

Adequate commerciality, **14:16**

RELEVANT ART

Non-obviousness, **9:51**

RELEVANT DISCLOSURE

Joint inventorship, **10:46**

RELEVANT FIELD

Adequate utility, **7:15**

RELEVANT KNOWLEDGE

Joint inventorship, **10:33**

RELEVANT PARTICIPANTS

Correction of inventorship, **10:60**

RELEVANT PARTIES

Correction of inventorship, **10:61**

RELEVANT TECHNICAL DISCLOSURE

Joint inventorship, **10:44**

RELIANCE

Estoppel, **24:28**

Priority, **8:259**

Reissue of patent, **16:12**

REMAND

Claims, **4:74**

Non-obviousness, **9:50**

REMAND—Cont'd

Technological scope, **13:26, 13:30,
13:35-13:37**

RENEWED ACTIVITY

Priority, **8:130**

REPAIR

Defenses, implied-in-law licenses,
19:42

REPRINTS

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:27

REPRODUCTION

Static physical configurations, **5:14,
5:15**

RESALE RESTRICTIONS

Misuse of patent, **18:35**

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Adequate commerciality, **14:74**

Adequate disclosure, **7:5**

Adequate utility, **6:6, 6:15, 6:17**

Anticipation, lack of, **8:27**

Claims, **4:63, 4:77**

Computer-related inventions, **5:44**

Correction of inventorship, **10:64**

Inventorship, **10:1, 10:15, 10:17,
10:18**

Joint inventorship, **10:39, 10:40**

Non-Obviousness (this index)

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:61**

Policy justification, **1:39, 1:41, 1:42**

Priority, **8:46**

Processes, **5:39**

Static physical configurations, **5:14**

Statutory subject matter, **5:5**

RESOLUTION

Invalidity (this index)

Priority, **8:62**

RESPONSE

Examination of Original Applications
(this index)

RESTATEMENT OF CONTRACTS

Adequate commerciality, **14:47**

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS, 2ND

Indirect infringement, **15:14**

RESTORATION

Temporal Scope of Infringement (this index)

RESTRICTIONS

Limitations and Restrictions (this index)

RESTRICTIVE COVENANTS

Misuse of patent, **18:9**

RETROACTIVITY

Reexamination, **16:126**

REVERSAL

Adequate disclosure, **7:14**

Adequate utility, **6:6**

Non-Obviousness (this index)

Priority, **8:46**

Processes, **5:30**

Static physical configurations, **5:9, 5:11, 5:12**

REVERSE ENGINEERING

Adequate disclosure, **7:50**

REVERSIBLE ERROR

Non-obviousness, **9:7, 9:51**

REVIEW

Appeal and Review (this index)

REVISED STATUTES OF 1874

Six-year limitation, **21:5**

REVOCATION

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **2:8, 2:21**

REX v. ARKWRIGHT

Adequate utility, **7:46**

RHODESIA

Adequate utility, **7:18**

RICHARDSON v. SUZUKI MOTOR COMPANY, LTD.

Correction of inventorship, **10:68**

ROBBINS

Non-obviousness, **9:36**

ROBOTIC ENVIRONMENT

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:78**

Processes, **5:23**

ROCHE PROD. INC. v. BOLAR PHARMACEUTICAL CO., INC.

Adequate Commerciality (this index)

ROTEC INDUS., INC. v. MITSUBISHI CORP.

Adequate commerciality, **14:40, 14:47**

ROUTINE DETAILS

Adequate disclosure, **7:52**

ROYAL LETTERS PATENT

History, **1:4, 1:5**

ROYAL SIGNET

History, **1:1**

ROYALTIES

Invalidity, **17:39**

Inventorship, **10:14**

Joint inventorship, **10:52**

Misuse of Patent (this index)

Processes, **5:39**

RULE 71(B)

Adequate utility, **7:8**

RULE AGAINST RECAPTURE

Reissue of patent, **16:50, 16:107**

RULE 131

Non-obviousness, **9:25, 9:36, 9:37**

Priority (this index)

RULE-BASED CONTROL

Priority, **8:72**

RULE-BASED DEFINITENESS

Priority, **8:171**

RULE-BASED IMPLEMENTATION

Adequate commerciality, **14:13**

RULE-OF-REASON APPROACH

Adequate utility, **7:12**

SAB INDUSTRIAL AB v. BENDIX CORP.

Joint inventorship, **10:40**

INDEX

SAFE AND EFFECTIVE

Adequate utility, **6:12**

SAFE HARBOR

Adequate Commerciality (this index)

SALEABLE PRODUCT

Policy justification, **1:41**

SALES

Adequate Commerciality (this index)

Adequate utility, **6:8**

Anticipation, lack of, **8:20**

Examination of Original Application
(this index)

Geographic scope, **12:18-12:21**

Indirect Infringement (this index)

Misuse of patent, **18:35**

Priority (this index)

Static physical configurations, **5:14,**
5:15

SALTS

Temporal scope, **11:47**

SAME INVENTION

Foreign countries, **8:279**

Priority, **8:113-8:115**

Reissue of Patent (this index)

SAMPLES AND SAMPLING

Adequate utility, **7:11**

Non-obviousness, **9:9**

SANCTIONS

Joint inventorship, **10:25**

SANITARY REFRIGERATOR CO. v. WINTERS

Technological scope, **13:70**

SANITY

Inventorship, **10:7**

SCARCITY

Justification, **1:34**

SCHOLARSHIP NOTES

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:49**

SCIENCE

Adequate utility, **6:5**

History, **1:11**

Statutory subject matter, **5:1, 5:4**

SCIENTIFIC DEVELOPMENT

Adequate utility, **6:19**

SCIENTIFIC LAWS

Processes, **5:22**

SCIENTIFIC PRINCIPLES

Statutory subject matter, **5:24**

SCIRE FACIAS

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:16

SCREENING PROCESS

Adequate utility, **7:22**

SCRIPPS CLINIC & RESEARCH FOUNDATION v. GENENTECH

Claims, **4:74**

SEALS

Claims, **4:97**

History, **1:1**

SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS

Non-Obviousness (this index)

SECOND REMAND

Technological scope, **13:35-13:37**

SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:22

SECRETARY OF STATE

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:15, 2:20

SECRETARY OF WAR

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:15, 2:20

SECRET PRIOR ART

Adequate utility, **7:18**

Non-Obviousness (this index)

SECRETS AND SECRECY

Adequate disclosure, **7:5, 7:18, 7:44,**
7:55

Policy justification, **1:38**

Priority, **8:64, 8:87, 8:181, 8:190**

Processes, **5:39**

SECTION 102

America Invents Act, amendment of
Section 102 timewise priority,
1:26

SECTION 282

Defenses, **17:11**

SECTION 287(C)

Defenses. Medical and Diagnostic
Procedures (this index)
Processes, **5:39**

SEEDS

Static physical configurations, **5:14**,
5:15

SEMANTIC MEANING

Claims, **4:55-4:57**

SENATE

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:22

SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:22

SEPARATE DELEGATIONS

Congress, **2:7**

SERIAL PERFORMANCE

Adequate commerciality, **14:36**

**SERIAL SET OF
CONGRESSIONAL
DOCUMENTS**

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:4

SERIES OF ACTS

Statutory Subject Matter (this index)

SERVICEABLE IN VIVO

Adequate utility, **6:18**

SERVICES

History, **1:4**
Inventorship, **10:11**, **10:13**

SETTING ASIDE

Inventorship, **10:7**

SETTLEMENT

Invalidity, **17:41**

7 USCA §§ 2321 ET SEQ.

Static physical configurations, **5:13**

17 USC, SECTION 201(A)

Inventorship, **10:6**

SEVENTH CIRCUIT

Joint inventorship, **10:51**

**SEXUALLY REPRODUCING
PLANTS**

Static physical configurations, **5:8**,
5:13, **5:15**

SEYMOUR v. OSBOURNE

Anticipation, lack of, **8:18**, **8:31**

SHAW v. COOPER

Priority, **8:196**, **8:203**

**SHELTER FOR TRADE SECRET
USER**

Prior inventor, prior-user rights, **22:6**

SHOWINGS

Non-obviousness, **9:75**
Priority, **8:135**

SILENCE

Estoppel, communication from patent
owner, **24:26**

**SIMULTANEOUS ACTS AND
MATTERS**

Adequate disclosure, **7:51**
Non-obviousness, **9:58**
Priority, **8:128**

**SINGLE-CELLED
MICROORGANISMS**

Static physical configurations, **5:17**

SINGLE-EMBODIMENT

Adequate Disclosure (this index)

SINGLE INVENTIVE ACT

Correction of inventorship, **10:66**

SINGLE MEANS CLAIMS

Generally, **4:87**

SINGLE-SOURCE CONTROL

Adequate commerciality, **14:12**
Anticipation, lack of, **8:20**
Justification, **1:32**

INDEX

SINGLE-SOURCE CONTROL —Cont'd

Statutory subject matter, **5:4, 5:5**

SINGLE-SOURCE PROFITS

Inventorship, **10:3**

SINKO TOOL & MFG. CO. v. AUTOMATIC DEVICES CORP.

Priority, **8:61**

SITUS OF ACCUSED ACTIVITY

Geographic Scope of Infringement
(this index)

SIX-YEAR LIMITATION

Generally, **21:1-21:24**

Accrual, **21:21, 21:22**

Basic rule of law, **21:17**

Burden of pleading, **21:20**

Burden of proof, **21:19**

Campbell v. City of Haverhill, **21:6**

Contractual agreements, **21:24**

Court decisions between 1897 and
1952

historical development of section
286 defense, **21:8-21:10**

Peters v. Hanger, **21:9**

Pollen v. Ford Instrument Co.,
21:10

Court decisions since 1982

historical development of section
286 defense, **21:12-21:15**

Hughes Aircraft Co. v. National
Semiconductor Corp., **21:15**

Standard Oil Co. v. Nippon
Shokubai Kagaku Kogyo Co.,
21:13

Stucki Co. v. Buckeye Steel Cast-
ings Co., **21:14**

Date of filing of complaint or
counterclaim, **21:1**

Defenses, section 286

generally, **21:1**

accrual, **21:21, 21:22**

basic rule, **21:17**

burden of pleading, **21:20**

burden of proof, **21:19**

complaints, **21:20**

contractual agreements, **21:24**

SIX-YEAR LIMITATION—Cont'd

Defenses, section 286—Cont'd

historical development of section
286 defense, below

indirect infringers, **21:22**

pleading, **21:20**

policy justification, **21:16**

subsidiary issues, **21:18-21:24**

tolling, **21:23, 21:24**

Early cases, **21:3**

Historical development of section
286 defense

generally, **21:2**

Campbell v. City of Haverhill,
21:6

court decisions between 1897 and
1952, **21:8-21:10**

court decisions since 1982, **21:12-
21:15**

early cases, **21:3**

Hughes Aircraft Co. v. National
Semiconductor Corp., **21:15**

Patent Act of 1870, **21:4**

Patent Act of 1897, **21:7**

Patent Act of 1952, **21:11**

Peters v. Hanger, cases following
Patent Act of 1897, **21:9**

Pollen v. Ford Instruments Co.,
21:10

Revised Statutes of 1874, **21:5**

Standard Oil Co. v. Nippon
Shokubai Kagaku Kogyo Co.,
21:13

Stucki Co. v. Buckeye Steel Cast-
ings Co., **21:14**

subsequent cases, 1897 to 1952,
21:8-21:10

Hughes Aircraft Co. v. National
Semiconductor Corp., **21:15**

Indirect infringers, **21:22**

Patent Act of 1870, **21:4**

Patent Act of 1897, **21:7**

Patent Act of 1952, **21:11**

Peters v. Hanger, **21:9**

Policy justification, section 286
defense, **21:16**

Pollen v. Ford Instruments Co., **21:10**

Revised Statutes of 1874, **21:5**

SIX-YEAR LIMITATION—Cont'd

Standard Oil Co. v. Nippon Shokubai
Kagaku Kogyo Co., **21:13**
Stucki Co. v. Buckeye Steel Castings
Co., **21:14**
Subsequent cases, 1897 to 1952,
21:8-21:10
Subsidiary issues, **21:18-21:24**
Tolling, **21:23, 21:24**

SIX-YEAR PRESUMPTION

Laches, unreasonable delay, **23:40**

SKILL

Adequate utility, minimal skill, **7:16**
Adequate utility, relative skill, **7:20**
Non-obviousness, **9:4, 9:6, 9:15,**
9:50, 9:74, 9:75
Ordinary artisan
generally, **9:50**
non-obviousness, **9:78**
Priority, skilled person, **8:54**

“SKILL IN THE ART”

Adequate disclosure, **7:34**
Adequate utility, **6:13**
Anticipation, lack of, **8:31**
Claims, **4:2, 4:91, 4:92**
Disclosure (this index)
Inventorship, **10:12**
Priority, **8:46, 8:58**

SOCIAL BENEFITS

Policy Justification (this index)

SOCIAL COST

Adequate utility, **6:2, 6:4, 6:10**
Policy Justification (this index)
Priority, **8:33**
Processes, **5:39**
Statutory subject matter, **5:5**

SOCIAL DISUTILITY

Priority, **8:172**

SOCIAL UNDERUTILIZATION

Processes, **5:39**

SOFTWARE

Computer-Related Inventions (this
index)

SOLE INVENTORS

Generally, **10:9**
Joint inventorship, **10:43**

SOLE LICENSE

History, **1:4**

SOLE-TO-SOLE CONVERSIONS

Correction (this index)

SOLIDS

Static physical configurations, **5:9**

SONTAG CHAIN STORES CO.

LIMITED v. NATIONAL NUT
CO. OF CALIFORNIA

Reissue of patent, **16:56**

SOPHISTICATION

Adequate utility, **7:5, 7:10**
Non-obviousness, **9:50**
Priority, **8:44**

SOUND MORALS

Adequate utility, **6:15**

SOUTH CAROLINA

History, **1:9**

SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY

History, **1:14**

SOYBEANS

Static physical configurations, **5:14**

SPECIAL ACTS

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:2

SPECIAL DAMAGES

Adequate commerciality, **14:78**

SPECIAL PRIVILEGES

History, **1:4**

SPECIAL SERVICES

History, **1:4**

SPECIAL SUB-RULES

Claims (this index)

SPECIES

Genus and Species (this index)

SPECIFICATION

Anticipation, lack of, **8:22**

INDEX

SPECIFICATION—Cont'd

- Claims, **4:44**
- Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:80**
- Policy justification, **1:38**
- Processes, **5:19, 5:21, 5:26**
- Utility Requirement (this index)

SPECIFIC USES

- Adequate utility, **6:18**

SPECIMENS

- Adequate utility, **7:11**

SPECTRA-PHYSICS, INC. v. COHERENT, INC.

- Adequate utility, **7:48**

SPECULATION

- Reissue of patent, **16:14**

SPERO v. RINGOLD

- Priority, **8:46**

SPONTANEOUS STATEMENTS

- Non-obviousness, **9:59**

SPORADIC RESULT

- Anticipation, lack of, **8:25**

STANDARD HAVENS PRODUCTS, INC. v. GENCOR INDUSTRIES, INC.

- Adequate commerciality, **14:27**

STANDARD OF PROOF

- Invalidity, **17:18**

STANDARD OIL CO. v. NIPPON SHOKUBAI KAGAKU KOGYO CO.

- Six-year limitation, **21:13**

STAPLE ARTICLES

- Indirect infringement, **15:23**

STARE DECISIS

- Claims, **4:20**
- Non-statutory hybrid inventions,
5:75, 5:76

STARTING AND ENDING MATERIALS

- Adequate disclosure, **7:10, 7:12**
- Non-Obviousness (this index)

STARTING DATE

- Reissue of patent, **16:113**

STATE ACTS

- History, **1:9**

STATE COURTS

- Generally, **1:14**

STATE DEPARTMENT

- Claims, **4:2**

STATEMENTS

- Non-obviousness, **9:59**

STATE OF MIND

- Adequate commerciality, **14:17**
- Adequate disclosure, **7:49**
- Correction of inventorship, **10:60**
- Non-obviousness, **9:43, 9:59**
- Priority, **8:58**

STATE OF PRIOR ART

- Adequate utility, **7:20**

STATE OF THE ART

- Joint inventorship, **10:33**
- Non-obviousness, **9:28, 9:38, 9:58**
- Non-statutory hybrid inventions,
5:62, 5:69, 5:85

STATE-OWNED ENTITIES

- History, **1:14**

STATES

- Sovereign immunity, **1:14**

STATE STATUTES

- History, **1:13**
- Inventorship, **10:6**

STATE STREET BANK & TRUST CO. v. SIGNATURE

- FINANCIAL GROUP, INC.**
- Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:79**
- Processes, **5:30, 5:38**

STATIC PHYSICAL CONFIGURATION

- Generally, **5:1, 5:7-5:18**
- Abstractions, **5:10**
- Agency decisions, **5:16**
- Alloys, **5:9**
- Amendment to statute, **5:14**

STATIC PHYSICAL

CONFIGURATION—Cont'd

Animal husbandry, **5:18**
 Animals and related biotechnology,
5:8, 5:16-5:18
 Anticipation, lack of, **5:9, 5:16**
 Anti-slavery provisions, **5:17**
 Apparatus, **5:8**
 Appeal and review, **5:9, 5:12, 5:15,**
5:17
 Application, **5:8, 5:9**
 Art, **5:11**
 Article of manufacture, **5:8, 5:11,**
5:17
 Asexually reproduced plants, **5:12**
 Author's control, **5:11**
 Bacteria, **5:14, 5:17**
 Bioengineering, **5:13**
 Biological components, **5:17**
 Biotechnological advances, **5:14**
 Breeding, **5:15, 5:17**
 Budding, **5:14**
 Business forms, **5:10**
 Certificates, **5:14**
 Certification, **5:15**
 Certiorari, **5:17**
 Change and modification, **5:14**
 Chemicals and Chemistry (this index)
 Claims, **5:8**
 Combinations of mechanical powers
 and devices, **5:8**
 Combinations of two or more sub-
 stances, **5:9**
 Commercial importance, **5:13**
 Communication, **5:11**
 Compilations, **5:11**
 Complete living organisms, **5:17**
 Compositions, **5:7-5:9, 5:17**
 Compounds, **5:9**
 Computer-related inventions, **5:8,**
5:10
 Congress, **5:8, 5:14, 5:15, 5:17**
 Constitutional law, **5:17**
 Construction and interpretation, **5:8,**
5:14, 5:15, 5:18
 Control, level of, **5:11**
 Copying, **5:14**
 Copyright, **5:11**

STATIC PHYSICAL

CONFIGURATION—Cont'd

Corning v. Burden, **5:8**
 Costs and expenses, **5:14**
 Cotton, **5:14**
 Court of Customs and Patent Appeals
 (CCPA), **5:9, 5:12, 5:17**
 Courts, generally, **5:10**
 Crops, **5:14**
 Cultivated spores, **5:14**
 Database, **5:11**
 Definition, **5:8**
 Delivery of health care and medicine,
5:18
 Denial, **5:8**
 Department of Agriculture, **5:14**
 Devices, **5:8**
 Diamond v. Chakrabarty, **5:17**
 Disclosure, **5:12, 5:14**
 Ecology, **5:18**
 Economics, **5:14, 5:15, 5:18**
 Electronic field, **5:8**
 Engineering processes, **5:14**
 English law, **5:9**
 Ethical issues, **5:18**
 European Union, **5:18**
 Every article devised by man except
 machinery upon the one side and
 compositions of matter on the
 other, **5:8**
 Evidence, **5:17**
 Examination of application, **5:17**
 Exceptions, exclusions, and exemp-
 tions
 generally, **5:7**
 functional relationships, **5:12**
 judicial exceptions, **5:10, 5:17**
 machines and articles of
 manufacture, **5:8**
 plants, **5:14, 5:17**
 printed matter, **5:11**
 Exclusive rights, **5:15**
 Ex parte Allen, **5:17**
 Ex parte examination, **5:17**
 Factual compilations, **5:11**
 Factual information stored on com-
 puter-readable media, **5:11**
 Farmers and farming, **5:14, 5:18**

INDEX

STATIC PHYSICAL

CONFIGURATION—Cont'd

Federal Circuit, **5:11, 5:15**
Filing, **5:17**
First-generation hybrids, **5:14**
Foodstuffs, production of, **5:18**
Foreign countries, **5:18**
Fourteenth Amendment, **5:17**
Fungi, **5:14**
Gases, **5:9**
Gels, **5:9**
Generating subsequent seed stock,
5:15
Genetically engineered animals, **5:17**
Grafting, **5:14**
Handmade mechanical clock, **5:8**
Health care, **5:18**
History, **5:14, 5:15, 5:17**
Human audience, communication to,
5:11
Human-directed expression, **5:11**
Human manipulation, **5:12**
Human operator, **5:12**
Hybrid combinations, **5:8**
Hybrid for, **5:11**
Hybrids, **5:14**
Imports and exports, **5:14**
Incentives, **5:14**
Individual specimens, **5:17**
Industrial apparatus, **5:8**
Infringement, **5:7**
In re Breslow, **5:9**
In re Lowry, **5:11**
In re Miller, **5:12**
In situ production, **5:9**
Intent, **5:14, 5:15, 5:17**
Interlocutory appeal, **5:15**
International community, **5:18**
International Convention for Protec-
tion of New Varieties of Plants,
5:14
Interrelated component parts, **5:8**
Judicial decisions, **5:16**
Judicial exceptions, **5:10, 5:17**
Kits, **5:8**
Legislation, **5:15**
Legislative history, **5:14, 5:15**
Licenses and permits, **5:15**

STATIC PHYSICAL

CONFIGURATION—Cont'd

Limitations and restrictions, **5:8, 5:11, 5:14-5:17**
Liquids, **5:9**
Literary works, **5:11**
Living organisms, **5:7, 5:16**
Machine-readable data, **5:11**
Machines, **5:7, 5:8**
Manufactures, **5:7**
Mathematical demands, **5:12**
Mechanical devices, **5:8**
Medicine, **5:18**
Mental steps, **5:12**
Mental theories, **5:10**
Mistake and error, **5:15**
Mixture of naturally occurring bacte-
ria, **5:17**
Mixtures, **5:9**
Multicellular animals, **5:8, 5:16**
Music, **5:11**
Mutants, **5:14**
Naturally occurring substances, **5:9, 5:17**
Natural state, **5:9**
Nature, products of, **5:17**
New applications, **5:8**
New living organism, **5:17**
Newly found seedlings, **5:14**
New song encoded on player piano
roll, **5:11**
Non-obviousness, **5:9, 5:12, 5:16**
Non-statutory subject matter, **5:10, 5:11, 5:17**
Novelty, **5:14**
Painting, **5:8**
Patentability, generally, **5:7**
Patent Act of 1793, **5:8, 5:9**
Patent Act of 1952, **5:14**
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
5:9, 5:11, 5:14-5:17
Performance, **5:8**
Petition for certiorari, filing of, **5:17**
Physical proximity, **5:9**
Pioneer Hi-Bred v J.E.G. Ag Supply,
5:15
Plant breeding, **5:15**

STATIC PHYSICAL

CONFIGURATION—Cont'd

Plant Patent Act (PPA), **5:13, 5:15, 5:17**
 Plants, **5:8, 5:13-5:15**
 Plant Variety Protection Act (PVPA), **5:13, 5:15, 5:17**
 Policy, animals and related biotechnology, **5:17**
 Policy justification, **5:11**
 Political interest, **5:15**
 Possession, **5:7**
 Powders, **5:9**
 Primitive living organisms, **5:16**
 Printed matter, **5:7, 5:10-5:12**
 Prior generations, **5:17**
 Production process, **5:9**
 Public domain, **5:18**
 Public welfare, **5:14**
 Purity, elevated levels of, **5:9**
 Qualifications, **5:15**
 Reasonably stable, **5:9**
 Rejection of application, **5:9, 5:17**
 Reproduction, **5:14, 5:15**
 Research and development, **5:14**
 Reversal, **5:9, 5:11, 5:12**
 Sales, **5:14, 5:15**
 Section 12, **5:14**
 Section 102, **5:9**
 Section 103, **5:9**
 Section 161 et seq., **5:13**
 Seeds, **5:15**
 Seed varieties, **5:14**
 7 USCA §§ 2321 et seq., **5:13**
 Sexually reproducing plants, **5:8, 5:13, 5:15**
 Single-celled microorganisms, **5:17**
 Solids, **5:9**
 Soybeans, **5:14**
 Supreme Court, **5:8, 5:15, 5:17**
 Technological methods distinguished, **5:7**
 Title and ownership, **5:18**
 Traditional animal husbandry, **5:17**
 Trial court, **5:15**
 Tuber-propagated plants, **5:14**
 Utility patents, **5:14**
 Validity, **5:8, 5:17**

STATIC PHYSICAL

CONFIGURATION—Cont'd

Value, **5:15**

STATUTE OF MONOPOLIES

Adequate Commerciality (this index)
 History, **1:6**
 Processes, **5:21**

STATUTE OF REPOSE

Section 286 defense. Six Year Limitation (this index)

STATUTES

See also specific statutes throughout this index
 Abandonment, **8:269**
 Adequate disclosure, **7:8**
 Claims, **4:5, 4:27, 4:51**
 Construction and interpretation, **8:151**
 Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016, **1:13.90**
 Federal common law, relationship to, **1:13.20**
 Geographic Scope of Infringement (this index)
 History, **1:8, 1:13.80, 1:14**
 Initial statutes and development up to 1836, **1:18**
 Misuse of Patent (this index)
 Non-obviousness, **9:5, 9:6, 9:16, 9:34-9:37**
 Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:59**
 Preemption of state competition laws, **1:13.10**
 Processes, **5:33-5:35**
 Reforms of 1870, **2:34**
 Six-year limitation, revised statutes of 1874, **21:5**
 Technological scope, **13:19**

STATUTORY STEPS

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:81**

STATUTORY SUBJECT MATTER

Generally, **5:1 et seq.**
 Advances, **5:5**
 Amendment of statute, **5:6**
 Animals and related biotechnology, **5:16-5:18**

INDEX

STATUTORY SUBJECT MATTER

—Cont'd

Anticipation, **5:1**
Any new and useful art, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, generally, **5:2**
Any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, generally, **5:1 et seq.**
Any useful art, manufacture, engine, machine, or device, or any improvement therein, generally, **5:2**
Application of technology, generally, **5:4**
Applied technology, generally, **5:2**
Articles of manufacture, generally, **5:4**
Arts, generally, **5:4**
Biological materials, **5:6**
Biotechnology, **5:1, 5:2, 5:16-5:18**
Bona fide questions, **5:1**
Business methods. Processes (this index)
Change and modification, **5:2**
Chemicals and Chemistry (this index)
Claims (this index)
Cochran v. Deener, industrial processes, **5:22**
Commercialization, **5:4, 5:5**
Competition, **5:4, 5:5**
Composition of matter, generally, **5:1 et seq.**
Computer-Related Inventions (this index)
Configuration, **5:1**
Congressional intent, **5:1 et seq.**
Constitutional law, **5:2**
Construction and interpretation, **5:1 et seq.**
Contests, **5:1**
Copyrights, **5:4**
Costs on society, **5:5**
Courts, generally, **5:1**
Defenses, **5:5**
Designs, **5:46**
Devices, generally, **5:2**
Disclosure, proper, **5:1**

STATUTORY SUBJECT MATTER

—Cont'd

Doing business, methods of, **5:2, 5:6**
End results, **5:24**
Engines, generally, **5:2**
European Patent Convention, **5:4**
Exceptions and exclusions
 generally, **5:1-5:6**
 functional relationships, **5:12**
 ministerial acts, **5:27**
Expectations, **5:4**
Exploitation, **5:4, 5:5**
Factual compilations, **5:42**
Fine arts, **5:1**
Foodstuffs, generally, **5:5**
Foreign countries, **5:4, 5:5**
Formulae, **5:24**
Functional relationships, **5:12**
Future research, **5:5**
Historical development and policy
 justification, generally, **5:2-5:5**
Hybrid claiming, **5:38**
Hybrid inventions. Non-Statutory Hybrid Inventions (this index)
Improvements, generally, **5:2**
Incentives, **5:4, 5:5**
Industrial processes, **5:20-5:23**
Infringement, **5:5**
Intellectual property, generally, **5:2**
Intellectual property law, **5:5**
Intent, **5:1, 5:4, 5:6**
Intervention, **5:4**
Japanese, **5:4**
Judicial decisions, **5:6**
Judicial exceptions, **5:4**
Limitations and restrictions, generally, **5:1**
Machines, generally, **5:1 et seq.**
Manufacturing, generally, **5:1 et seq.**
Mathematics
 generally, **5:1**
 algorithms, **5:44**
 formulae, **5:6, 5:24**
 pure mathematics, matters of, **5:4**
Medical and surgical procedures, **5:39**
Mental steps, **5:6, 5:25-5:27, 5:45**
Methods per se, **5:2**

**STATUTORY SUBJECT MATTER
—Cont'd**

Ministerial acts, **5:27**
 Natural phenomena, **5:24**
 Negotiations, **5:5**
 New and useful, generally, **5:2**
 New technological fields, **5:2**
 Non-obviousness, **5:1**
 Non-Statutory Hybrid Inventions
 (this index)
 Non-Statutory Subject Matter (this
 index)
 Observations, **5:36-5:38**
 Patentability, **5:4**
 Patent Act of 1790, **5:2**
 Patent Act of 1793, **5:2**
 Patent Act of 1836, **5:2**
 Patent Act of 1870, **5:2**
 Patent Act of 1952, **5:2, 5:6**
 Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:3, 5:2
 Performance of sequential acts over
 period of time, **5:1**
 Peripheral claiming, industrial
 processes, **5:22**
 Pharmaceuticals, generally, **5:5**
 Physical structures, generally, **5:1 et seq.**
 Physical transformation, **5:37, 5:53**
 Pioneer hi-bred case, **5:15**
 Plants, **5:13-5:15**
 Policy justification, generally, **5:2-5:5**
 Printed matter, **5:4, 5:6, 5:10-5:12,**
5:42
 Private single-source control, **5:5**
 Processes (this index)
 Profits, **5:4**
 Pure mathematics, matters of, **5:4**
 Pure scientific, matters of, **5:4**
 Quality of life, **5:5**
 Research and development, **5:5**
 Science, **5:1, 5:4**
 Scientific principles, **5:24**
 Section 101, generally, **5:1 et seq.**
 Series of acts or steps of method, **5:1**
et seq.
 Single-source control, **5:4, 5:5**
 Social cost, **5:5**

**STATUTORY SUBJECT MATTER
—Cont'd**

Static Physical Configuration (this
 index)
 Steps of method, **5:1 et seq.**
 Structures, generally, **5:6**
 Surgical methods, generally, **5:5**
 Surgical procedures, **5:39**
 Technical ideas, **5:4**
 Time and date, **5:1, 5:4**
 Undue social cost, **5:5**
 Useful art, generally, **5:2**
 Usefulness, generally, **5:1 et seq.**
 Utility patents, **5:14**
 Validity, **5:4**
 Value, **5:5**

STAY OF PROCEEDINGS

Reexamination, parallel proceedings,
16:131

**STEARNS-ROGER MFG. CO. v.
RUTH**

Adequate commerciality, **14:29**

STEP-BY-STEP

Processes, **5:38**

STEPS OF METHOD

Statutory Subject Matter (this index)

**STIFFEL CO. V. SEARS,
ROEBUCK & CO.**

Historical origins of patent grant,
1:13.40

**STIMPSON v. WEST CHESTER R
CO.**

Reissue of patent, **16:102**

STOCKHOLDERS

Indirect infringement, **15:19**

STORAGE MEDIA

Computer-Related Inventions (this
 index)

STRATEGIES

Processes, **5:34**

STRICT LIABILITY

Adequate commerciality, **14:14**

INDEX

STRUCTURAL EQUIVALENTS

Claims, **4:92**

STRUCTURAL SIMILARITIES

Non-obviousness, **9:73, 9:74**

STRUCTURES ACCOMPANIED BY PROPERTIES OR USES

Non-Obviousness (this index)

STUCKI CO. v. BUCKEYE STEEL CASTINGS CO.

Six-year limitation, **21:14**

STUDIENGESELLSCHAFT KOHLE MBH v. EASTMAN KODAK CO.

Adequate utility, **7:48**

SUA SPONTE ACTS AND MATTERS

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:10

SUBCOMBINATION

Adequate disclosure, **7:24**

Adequate utility, **6:6**

Anticipation, lack of, **8:12**

Claims, **4:63, 4:64**

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:50**

Priority, **8:47**

SUBCOMBINATIONS

Temporal scope, **11:49**

SUB-ISSUE

Adequate utility, **6:7**

SUBJECTIVITY

Abandonment, history, **1:21**

Appreciation

adequate disclosure, **7:34, 7:39**

adequate utility, **7:27**

Creativity, non-obviousness, **9:20**

Insight, non-obviousness, **9:41-9:43**

Judgments, non-obviousness, **9:54**

Knowledge, priority, **8:52**

Non-obviousness, **9:7, 9:20, 9:41-9:43, 9:54**

Outlook, non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:49**

Possession, **7:31, 8:46**

State of mind, non-obviousness, **9:43**

SUBJECTIVITY—Cont'd

Thought to perform, processes, **5:25**

SUBJECT MATTER

Claims (this index)

Medical activity, section 287(c)
defense, **20:17**

SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION

Claims, **4:6**

History, **1:14**

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:37

SUBSEQUENT ACTS AND MATTERS

Adequate commerciality, **14:24,**
14:27, 14:74

Claims, **4:40**

Non-obviousness, **9:4**

Priority, **8:126**

Reissue of patent, **16:45**

Technological scope, **13:39, 13:112**

SUBSERVIENCE

Claims (this index)

SUBSTANTIALITY

Claims, substantially as described,
4:2

Evidence

judicial review, **2:41, 2:42**

Patent and Trademark Office
(PTO), **2:39, 2:43**

Logic, non-obviousness, **9:43**

New question on patentability.

Reexamination (this index)

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:21, 2:39, 2:43

Prior conception, lack of anticipation,
8:7

Reexamination, substantial new ques-
tion of patentability, **16:129**

Rule-making, substantive, **2:21**

Technological scope of infringement,
insubstantial differences, **13:67**

Uses, adequate utility, **6:18**

SUBSTITUTIONS

Technological scope, **13:104**

SUCCESS

Non-obviousness, **9:61-9:64, 9:62**
Reexamination, **16:135**

SUGGESTION

Joint Inventorship (this index)
Non-obviousness, **9:66, 9:77**

SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Adequate commerciality, **14:36, 14:79**
Adequate disclosure, **7:52**
Processes, **5:30**

SUPERINTENDENT OF PATENTS

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:20, 2:31

SUPERVISORY PROCEDURE

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:83**

SUPPLEMENTS

Adequate utility, **7:18**
Anticipation, lack of, **8:31**
Materials, patents, sources, **7:10, 7:18**

SUPPLY

Social costs of patenting, **1:33**

SUPPRESSION

Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)
Misuse of patent, **18:28**
Non-obviousness, **9:28, 9:29, 9:34, 9:39**
Priority, **8:143**

SUPREME COURT

Adequate Commerciality (this index)
Adequate disclosure, **7:14, 7:31, 7:48**
Adequate utility, **6:6, 6:17**
Alexander Milburn Co. v. Davis-Bournonville Co., **8:140**
Andrews v. Hovey, **8:206, 8:251**
Anticipation, lack of, **8:18, 8:22, 8:27**
Bain v. Morse, **8:101, 8:197**
Bilski v. Kappos, **5:32**
City of Elizabeth v. Nicholson Pavement Co., **8:250**
Claims (this index)
CLS v. Alice, **5:32.50**

SUPREME COURT—Cont'd

Computer-related inventions, **5:44**
Electric Storage Battery Co. v. Shimadzu, **8:102**
Estoppel (this index)
Examination of Original Application (this index)
Geographic Scope of Infringement (this index)
History, **1:5, 1:14-1:24**
In re Borst, **8:165**
In re Hilmer, **8:121, 8:153**
Invalidity, early development, **17:22**
Inventorship, **10:6, 10:7, 10:11**
Joint inventorship, **10:33**
Joint Inventorship (this index)
Laches, Supreme Court cases
Petrella v. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Inc., **23:44**
SCA Hygiene Products Aktiebolag v. First Quality Baby Products, LLC., **23:45**
Licenses and Permits (this index)

SUPREME COURT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (SCDC)

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:34, 2:36

SURGICAL METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Statutory Subject Matter (this index)

SYDEMAN v. THOMA

Priority, **8:60-8:62**

SYMBOLS

History, **1:15**

SYMMETRY

Conceptual inconsistencies, **8:100**
Priority, **8:100, 8:193**

SYNTHESIS

Technological Scope of Infringement (this index)

TANGIBLE BENEFIT

Adequate utility, **6:16**

TARGET AUDIENCE

Adequate disclosure, **7:16**

INDEX

TARIFFS

Adequate commerciality, **14:39**
General Agreement on Tariffs and
Trade (GATT) (this index)

TAXATION

History, **1:3**
Processes, **5:34**

TEACHING

Anticipation, lack of, **8:19, 8:31**
Disclosure
background knowledge, **7:15,**
7:16, 7:19
claimed configuration, **7:6, 7:9**
how to use, **7:13**
method of making single-embodi-
ment, **7:10**

TECHNOLOGICAL SCOPE OF INFRINGEMENT

Generally, **13:1 et seq.**
Abandonment, **13:89**
Accuracy, **13:54**
All-elements rule, **13:22, 13:113**
Applications, **13:106**
Arguments, **13:105**
Burden of proof, **13:84**
Cancellations, **13:104**
Case law
Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku
Kogyo Kabushiki Co., Ltd.
generally, **13:111**
Equivalents, Doctrine of, below
Graver Tank & Mfg. Co. v. Linde
Air Products Co., **13:12**
Hilton Davis Chemical Co. v.
Warner-Jenkinson Co., Inc.
Equivalents, Doctrine of,
below
International Rectifier Corp. v.
Ixys Corp., **13:59**
Johnson & Johnston v. R.E. Ser-
vice Co., **13:38**
Maxwell v. J. Baker, Inc., **13:95**
Wilson Sporting Goods case,
13:82
Winans v. Denmead, **13:6**
YBM Magnex, Inc. v. USITC,
13:96

TECHNOLOGICAL SCOPE OF INFRINGEMENT—Cont'd

Central claiming, **13:5-13:7, 13:114**
Claimed defined, **13:98**
Claiming
central claiming and means expres-
sions, **13:114**
Equivalents, Doctrine of, below
peripheral claiming, below
Claim theory, impact of
generally, **13:4-13:8**
central claiming, **13:5-13:7**
peripheral claiming, **13:8**
Winans v. Denmead, **13:6**
Claim theory, role of, **13:42**
Classical estoppel, **13:89**
Claude Neon Lights v. E. Machlett &
Son, **13:71**
Commentary and synthesis.
Equivalents, Doctrine of, below
Concurrences, **13:25, 13:33, 13:37**
Context and inadvertent mistakes,
13:57, 13:58
Decisions. Equivalents, Doctrine of,
below
Defenses. Equivalents, Doctrine of,
below
Definitional accuracy, **13:54**
Definitions
claimed, **13:98**
disclosed, **13:99**
Descriptions by learned hand, **13:11**
Disclosed defined, **13:99**
Disclosure dedication. Equivalents,
Doctrine of, below
Discovery, **13:56**
Dissenting opinions, **13:17, 13:33,**
13:37
Doctrine of Equivalents. Equivalents,
Doctrine of, below
Early Federal Circuit decisions,
13:94-13:96
Early history, **13:3**
Early procedural history, **13:28**
Element-by-element inquiry, **13:73**
En banc decision, **13:31-13:33**
Equity, **13:20, 13:61**

**TECHNOLOGICAL SCOPE OF
INFRINGEMENT—Cont'd**

Equivalents, Doctrine of
generally, **13:52-13:113**
commentary and synthesis. Factual
equivalency, below this group
decisions
early Federal Circuit decisions,
13:94-13:96
en banc decision, **13:31-13:33**
patentee's conduct, subsequent
decisions, **13:112**
peripheral claiming, below this
group
defenses. Legal defenses, below
this group
disclosure dedication. Patentee's
conduct, below this group
estoppel
generally, **13:23**
patentee's conduct, below this
group
factual equivalency
generally, **13:63-13:76**
Claude Neon Lights v. E.
Machlett & Son, **13:71**
commentary and synthesis, gen-
erally, **13:68-13:72**
element-by-element inquiry,
13:73
formulation of test, generally,
13:65-13:71
function, way, result, **13:66**
history, **13:64**
illustrative diagram, **13:72**
insubstantial differences, **13:67**
inventive concept, **13:69**
known interchangeability,
13:75, 13:76
peripheral claiming, **13:21**
pioneer inventions versus
improvements, **13:74**
policy justification, **13:64**
Sanitary Refrigerator Co. v.
Winters, **13:70**
synthesis, generally, **13:68-
13:72**
test, formulation of, generally,
13:65-13:71

**TECHNOLOGICAL SCOPE OF
INFRINGEMENT—Cont'd**

Equivalents, Doctrine of—Cont'd
factual equivalency—Cont'd
time frame, **13:76**
Federal Circuit
generally, **13:94-13:96**
peripheral claiming, below this
group
Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku
Kogyo Kabushiki Co., Ltd.
generally, **13:111**
peripheral claiming, below this
group
formulation of test. Factual
equivalency, above this group
Graver Tank & Mfg. Co. v. Linde
Air Products Co., **13:12**
Hilton Davis Chemical Co. v.
Warner-Jenkinson Co., Inc.
Peripheral claiming, below
this group
history. Patentee's conduct, below
this group
Johnson & Johnston v. R.E. Ser-
vice Co., **13:38**
language issues. Policy justifica-
tion, below this group
legal defenses
generally, **13:77-13:113**
all-elements rule, **13:113**
graphical illustration, **13:78**
patentee's conduct, below this
group
prior art, below this group
1950, developments to, **13:10,
13:11**
1994, developments to, **13:13**
patentee's conduct
generally, **13:87-13:112**
abandonment, **13:89**
arguments, **13:105**
cancellations, **13:104**
claimed defined, **13:98**
classical estoppel, **13:89**
dedication via other activities,
13:100
disclosed defined, **13:99**

INDEX

TECHNOLOGICAL SCOPE OF INFRINGEMENT—Cont'd

Equivalents, Doctrine of—Cont'd
patentee's conduct—Cont'd
disclosure dedication, generally,
13:92-13:100
early Federal Circuit decisions,
13:94-13:96
estopping events, generally,
13:103-13:108
extent of estoppel, **13:109-13:112**
Festo case, **13:111**
formal rejections and restrictions, **13:107**
historical development, **13:93**
history, prosecution history
estoppel, generally, **13:101-13:112**
insufficient disclosure rejections,
13:108
Johnson & Johnston Associates
Inc. v. R.E. Service Co.,
Inc., **13:97**
judicial estoppel, **13:91**
Maxwell v. J. Baker, Inc., **13:95**
narrowing of related claims and
applications, **13:106**
novelty requirement, analogy to,
13:90
policy justification, **13:88-13:91, 13:102**
prosecution history estoppel,
generally, **13:101-13:112**
subsequent decisions, **13:112**
substitutions, **13:104**
underlying purpose, **13:110**
YBM Magnex, Inc. v. USITC,
13:96
peripheral claiming
generally, **13:10-13:39, 13:52-13:113**
decisions
Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu
Kinzoku Kogyo
Kabushiki Co., Ltd.,
below this subgroup
Hilton Davis Chemical Co. v.
Warner-Jenkinson Co.,

TECHNOLOGICAL SCOPE OF INFRINGEMENT—Cont'd

Equivalents, Doctrine of—Cont'd
peripheral claiming—Cont'd
decisions—Cont'd
Inc., below this subgroup
descriptions by learned hand,
13:11
Federal Circuit
generally, **13:13**
developments to 1994, **13:13**
Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu
Kinzoku Kogyo
Kabushiki Co., Ltd.,
13:30-13:33, 13:35-13:37
Hilton Davis Chemical Co. v.
Warner-Jenkinson Co.,
Inc., **13:15-13:17, 13:26**
Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu
Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki
Co., Ltd.
generally, **13:27-13:37**
concurrences, Federal Circuit
decision on second
remand, **13:37**
concurrences, Federal Circuit
en banc decision, **13:33**
dissents, Federal Circuit deci-
sion on second remand,
13:37
dissents, Federal Circuit en
banc decision, **13:33**
early procedural history,
13:28
facts, **13:29**
Federal Circuit 3-judge deci-
sion on remand, **13:30**
Federal Circuit decision on
second remand, **13:35-13:37**
Federal Circuit en banc deci-
sion, **13:31-13:33**
majority opinion, Federal
Circuit decision on
second remand, **13:36**
majority opinion, Federal
Circuit en banc decision,
13:32

**TECHNOLOGICAL SCOPE OF
INFRINGEMENT—Cont'd**

Equivalents, Doctrine of—Cont'd
 peripheral claiming—Cont'd
 Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu
 Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki
 Co., Ltd.—Cont'd
 Supreme Court opinion,
 13:34
 Graver Tank & Mfg. Co. v.
 Linde Air Products Co.,
 13:12
 Hilton Davis Chemical Co. v.
 Warner-Jenkinson Co., Inc.
 generally, **13:14-13:26**
 all-element rule, **13:22**
 concurring opinion, **13:25**
 dissenting opinions, **13:17**
 equity vs. law, **13:20**
 factual equivalency, **13:21**
 Federal Circuit decision,
 initial, **13:15-13:17**
 Federal Circuit decision on
 remand, **13:26**
 majority opinion, initial
 Federal Circuit decision,
 13:16
 Patent Act of 1952, effect of,
 13:19
 prosecution history estoppel,
 13:23
 Supreme Court decision, gen-
 erally, **13:18-13:25**
 time frame, **13:24**
 Johnson & Johnston v. R.E. Ser-
 vice Co., **13:38**
 1950, developments to, **13:10,**
 13:11
 1994, developments to, **13:13**
 subsequent developments, **13:39**
 policy justification
 generally, **13:53-13:62**
 context and inadvertent
 mistakes, **13:57, 13:58**
 factual equivalency, **13:64**
 infringement by equivalents as
 reaction, **13:60**
 International Rectifier Corp. v.
 Ixys Corp., **13:59**

**TECHNOLOGICAL SCOPE OF
INFRINGEMENT—Cont'd**

Equivalents, Doctrine of—Cont'd
 policy justification—Cont'd
 language issues, generally,
 13:55-13:60
 later-discovered technology,
 13:56
 law versus equity, **13:61**
 non-patent example, context and
 inadvertent mistakes, **13:58**
 notice versus definitional
 accuracy, **13:54**
 patentee's conduct, **13:88-**
 13:91, 13:102
 patent example, **13:59**
 prior art, **13:80**
 reissue, relation to, **13:62**
 prior art
 generally, **13:79-13:86**
 burden of proof, **13:84**
 history, **13:80**
 hypothetical claim, **13:83**
 obvious variations, **13:81, 13:82**
 other issues of patentability,
 13:86
 patent claim, required relation
 to, **13:85**
 policy justification, **13:80**
 Wilson Sporting Goods case,
 13:82
 prosecution history estoppel. Pate-
 ntee's conduct, above this
 group
 subsequent developments, **13:39**
 synthesis. Factual equivalency,
 above this group
 test. Factual equivalency, above
 this group
 Estoppel. Equivalents, Doctrine of,
 above
 Facts, **13:29**
 Factual equivalency. Equivalents,
 Doctrine of, above
 Federal Circuit. Equivalents, Doc-
 trine of, above
 Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku
 Kogyo Kabushiki Co., Ltd.
 Equivalents, Doctrine of, above

INDEX

TECHNOLOGICAL SCOPE OF INFRINGEMENT—Cont'd

Formal rejections and restrictions, **13:107**
Formulation of test. Equivalents, Doctrine of, above
Function, way, result, **13:66**
Graphical illustration, **13:78**
Graver Tank & Mfg. Co. v. Linde Air Products Co., **13:12**
Hilton Davis Chemical Co. v. Warner-Jenkinson Co., Inc. Equivalents, Doctrine of, above
Historical development, **13:93**
History
 generally, **13:2-13:39**
 claim theory, impact of, above
 early history, **13:3**
 Equivalents, Doctrine of, above
Hypothetical claim, **13:83**
Illustrative diagram, **13:72**
Improvements, **13:74**
Inadvertent mistakes, **13:57, 13:58**
Infringement by equivalents as reaction, **13:60**
Insubstantial differences, **13:67**
Insufficient disclosure rejections, **13:108**
International Rectifier Corp. v. Ixys Corp., **13:59**
Inventive concept, **13:69**
Johnson & Johnston Associates Inc. v. R.E. Service Co., Inc., **13:97**
Johnson & Johnston v. R.E. Service Co., **13:38**
Judicial estoppel, **13:91**
Justification. Policy justification, below
Known interchangeability, **13:75, 13:76**
Language issues. Equivalents, Doctrine of, above
Later-discovered technology, **13:56**
Law versus equity, **13:20, 13:61**
Learned hand, **13:11**
Legal defenses. Equivalents, Doctrine of, above
Limitations and restrictions, **13:107**

TECHNOLOGICAL SCOPE OF INFRINGEMENT—Cont'd

Literal infringement
 generally, **13:44-13:51**
 additional elements or functions, **13:49**
 all-elements rule, **13:47-13:50**
 alternative species, **13:50**
 claim interpretation, relation to, **13:46**
 history, **13:45**
 methods, all-elements rule, **13:48**
 peripheral claiming, generally, **13:44-13:51**
 policy justification, **13:45**
 reverse doctrine of equivalents, **13:51**
Majority opinion, **13:16, 13:32, 13:36**
Maxwell v. J. Baker, Inc., **13:95**
Means expressions, **13:114**
Mistakes, **13:57, 13:58**
1994, developments to, **13:13**
Notice and knowledge, **13:54, 13:75, 13:76**
Novelty requirement, analogy to, **13:90**
Obvious variations, **13:81, 13:82**
Opinions. Case law, above
Patent Act of 1952, effect of, **13:19**
Patentee's conduct. Equivalents, Doctrine of, above
Peripheral claiming
 generally, **13:43-13:113**
 claim theory, impact of, **13:8**
 Equivalents, Doctrine of, above
 literal infringement, above
Pioneer inventions versus improvements, **13:74**
Policy justification
 generally, **13:40-13:42**
 claims, role of, **13:42**
 claim theory, role of, **13:42**
 Equivalents, Doctrine of, above
Prior art. Equivalents, Doctrine of, above
Procedural history, **13:28**

TECHNOLOGICAL SCOPE OF INFRINGEMENT—Cont'd

Prosecution history estoppel.
 Equivalents, Doctrine of, above
 Reissue, **13:62**
 Rejections, **13:107, 13:108**
 Related claims and applications,
 13:106
 Remand, **13:26, 13:30, 13:35-13:37**
 Sanitary Refrigerator Co. v. Winters,
 13:70
 Second remand, **13:35-13:37**
 Statutes, effect of Patent Act of 1952,
 13:19
 Subsequent decisions, **13:112**
 Subsequent developments, **13:39**
 Substitutions, **13:104**
 Sufficiency, **13:108**
 Supreme Court. Case law, above
 Synthesis. Equivalents, Doctrine of,
 above
 Temporal scope, **11:5**
 Time frame, **13:24, 13:76**
 Variations, **13:81, 13:82**
 Wilson Sporting Goods case, **13:82**
 Winans v. Denmead, **13:6**
 YBM Magnex, Inc. v. USITC, **13:96**

TECHNOLOGY

Community, technical, non-obvious-
 ness, **9:54**
 Completeness, technical. Anticipa-
 tion, Lack Of (this index)
 Completeness, technological, lack of
 anticipation, **8:32**
 Configuration, technical
 Inspection, **9:71**
 Non-obviousness, **9:19, 9:65, 9:70,**
 9:77
 Configuration, technological
 claims, **4:65, 4:71, 4:94**
 Content of showing, technical, prior-
 ity, **8:135**
 Details, technical, non-obviousness,
 9:77
 Disclosure, technical
 claims, **4:8**
 Joint inventorship, **10:44**
 Non-obviousness, **9:54**

TECHNOLOGY—Cont'd

Field, technological, non-obvious-
 ness, **9:17-9:19**
 Ideas, technical, statutory subject
 matter, **5:4**
 Knowledge, technological, joint
 inventorship, **10:33**
 Methods, technological, static physi-
 cal configurations, **5:7**
 Scope of infringement. Technical
 scope of infringement (this
 index)
 Sophistication, technological, ade-
 quate disclosure, **7:5**
 Sufficiency, technical. Anticipation,
 Lack Of (this index)

TELECOMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY

Processes, **5:23**

TELEFLEX, INC. v. FICOSA NORTH AMERICA CORP.

Adequate disclosure, **7:52, 7:53**

TEMPORAL SCOPE OF INFRINGEMENT

Generally, **11:1 et seq.**
 Adequate commerciality, **11:6**
 Appeals, **11:29**
 Applications
 extension of term under Section
 156, application for, **11:43**
 onset at issuance versus filing,
 below
 PCT applications, **11:24**
 Basic 20-year patent term, **11:21-**
 11:24
 Basic extension, **11:42**
 Beginning of term, **11:38**
 Changes, **11:12-11:15**
 Claims, **11:22-11:24**
 Combinations and subcombinations,
 identity of drug products, **11:49**
 Commerciality, adequacy, **11:6**
 Domestic priority, **11:23**
 Drug products, **11:46-11:49**
 Economic justifications, **11:18**
 Effective date, **11:30, 11:35**

INDEX

TEMPORAL SCOPE OF

INFRINGEMENT—Cont'd

- 18-month publication. Onset at issuance versus filing, below
- Ending of term, **11:39**
- Esters, identity of drug products, **11:47**
- Extension of term under Section 156
 - generally, **11:40-11:49**
 - application for extension, **11:43**
 - basic extension, **11:42**
 - history, **11:41**
 - interim extensions, **11:44**
 - policy justification, **11:41**
 - special issues
 - generally, **11:45-11:49**
 - combinations and subcombinations, **11:49**
 - identity of drug products, **11:46-11:49**
 - pro-drugs and metabolites, **11:48**
 - salts and esters, **11:47**
- Filing
 - history and policy justification, 20 years from filing, **11:14**
 - onset at issuance versus filing, below
- Foreign and domestic priority, claims of, **11:23**
- Geographic scope, **11:4**
- History
 - generally, **11:9-11:15**
 - convoys changes, **11:15**
 - early U.S. law, **11:10**
 - extension of term under Section 156, **11:41**
 - intermediate period, 17 years from issuance, **11:11**
 - modern changes, **11:12-11:15**
 - onset at issuance versus filing, **11:20**
 - restoration of term, **11:13**
 - 20 years from filing, **11:14**
- Identity of drug products, **11:46-11:49**
- Infringement
 - generally, **11:1-11:7**
 - adequate commerciality, **11:6**

TEMPORAL SCOPE OF

INFRINGEMENT—Cont'd

- Infringement—Cont'd
 - geographic scope, **11:4**
 - qualities of patent right, generally, **11:2-11:6**
 - technological scope, **11:5**
- Interim extensions under Section 156, **11:44**
- Issuance. Onset at issuance versus filing, below
- Justification. History and policy justification, above
- Limitations, **11:28, 11:34**
- Metabolites, identity of drug products, **11:48**
- Natural right, **11:17**
- 1994 provisions, applications filed on or after June 8, 1995, **11:26**
- 1999 provisions, applications filed on or after May 29, 2000, **11:27-11:30**
- Onset at issuance versus filing
 - generally, **11:19-11:37**
 - applications filed on or after June 8, 1995, **11:21-11:24**
 - basic 20-year patent term, **11:21-11:24**
 - 18-month publication. Provisional rights and 18-month publication, below this group
 - foreign and domestic priority, claims of, **11:23**
 - history, **11:20**
 - policy, **11:20**
 - prior PCT applications, claims to, **11:24**
 - provisional rights and 18-month publication
 - generally, **11:31-11:36**
 - effective date, **11:35**
 - limitations, **11:34**
 - policy justification, **11:32**
 - requirement of published application, **11:33**
 - value, general impact of value of patent, **11:36**
- restoration of term
 - generally, **11:25-11:30**

TEMPORAL SCOPE OF

INFRINGEMENT—Cont'd

- Onset at issuance versus filing
 - Cont'd
 - restoration of term—Cont'd
 - appeals, 1999 provisions, **11:29**
 - effective date, 1999 provisions, **11:30**
 - limitations, 1999 provisions, **11:28**
 - 1994 provisions, applications filed on or after June 8, 1995, **11:26**
 - 1999 provisions, applications filed on or after May 29, 2000, **11:27-11:30**
 - procedures, 1999 provisions, **11:29**
- Sections 120 and 121, claims of benefit under, **11:22**
- term
 - basic 20-year patent term, **11:21-11:24**
 - restoration of term, above this group
 - transitional provisions, applications filed before June 8, 1995, **11:37**
- Policy, onset at issuance versus filing, **11:20**
- Policy justification
 - generally, **11:16-11:18**
 - economic justifications, **11:18**
 - extension of term under Section 156, **11:41**
 - natural right, **11:17**
 - onset at issuance versus filing, **11:20, 11:32**
- Priority, **11:23**
- Prior PCT applications, claims to, **11:24**
- Procedures, 1999 provisions, **11:29**
- Provisional rights and 18-month publication. Onset at issuance versus filing, above
- Publication. Onset at issuance versus filing, above
- Restoration of term
 - history and policy justification, **11:13**

TEMPORAL SCOPE OF

INFRINGEMENT—Cont'd

- Restoration of term—Cont'd
 - onset at issuance versus filing, above
- Salts, identity of drug products, **11:47**
- Section 120, claims of benefit under, **11:22**
- Section 121, claims of benefit under, **11:22**
- Section 156. Extension of term under Section 156, above
- Special issues. Extension of term under Section 156, above
- Subcombinations, identity of drug products, **11:49**
- Technological scope, **11:5**
- Term
 - beginning of term, **11:38**
 - ending of term, **11:39**
 - extension of term under Section 156, above
 - onset at issuance versus filing, above
 - restoration of term, above
- Transitional provisions, applications filed before June 8, 1995, **11:37**
- Value, general impact of value of patent, **11:36**

TEMPORARY NATIONAL

EMERGENCY COMMITTEE (TNEC)

- Policy justification, **1:29**

TENANCY IN COMMON

- Joint inventorship, **10:49, 10:50**

TERMINAL DISCLAIMERS

- History, **1:24**

TERMINATION

- Examination of Original Application (this index)

TERRITORIAL LIMITATIONS

- Adequate commerciality, **14:22**
- Misuse of patent, **18:33**

TESTS AND EXPERIMENTS

- Adequate utility, **6:1, 6:8, 6:18**
- Anticipation, lack of, **8:5**

INDEX

TESTS AND EXPERIMENTS

—Cont'd

Claims, **4:74, 4:92**
Disclosure (this index)
Joint Inventorship (this index)
Non-Obviousness (this index)
Non-statutory hybrid inventions,
5:59, 5:74, 5:78, 5:81
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:2
Priority (this index)
Technological Scope of Infringement
(this index)

TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC. v. PFIZER, INC.

Adequate commerciality, **14:80**

TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC. v. SANDOZ, INC.

Claims, **4:17.75**

TEXAS DIGITAL INSTRUMENTS v. TELEGENIX

Claims, **4:38**

TEXT

Adequate disclosure, **7:5**
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:83**

THE CLOTHWORKERS OF IPSWICH

History, **1:5**

THEORETICAL JUSTIFICATION

Priority, **8:92**

THIRD PARTIES

Adequate commerciality, **14:32**
Adequate disclosure, **7:24**
Adequate utility, **6:7**
Inventorship, **10:11, 10:13, 10:18**
Joint inventorship, **10:28, 10:29,**
10:42, 10:47, 10:49, 10:51
Non-obviousness, **9:28, 9:29, 9:40,**
9:41, 9:59
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:12, 2:13, 2:18
Policy justification, **1:29**
Priority, **8:232, 8:256**
Reexamination, **16:135**

THIRD-PARTY PARTICIPATION

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:13

THIRD PERSONS

Indirect infringement, **15:14**
Third Parties (this index)

35 USC

Generally, **1:23**
Adequate commerciality, section
271(e)(2)(a), **14:79**
Claims, **4:5**
Inventorship, **10:7**
Section 01, **10:7**
Section 102(f), **10:7**
Section 115, **10:7**
Section 261, **10:7**

37 CFR

History, **1:20**
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:83**
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:24, 2:25, 2:27, 2:28

THREAT

Estoppel, communication from patent
owner, **24:26**

3D SYSTEMS, INC. v. AAROTECH LABORATORIES, INC.

Adequate commerciality, **14:47**

TIGHLMAN v. PROCTOR

Anticipation, lack of, **8:27**

TILGHMAN v. MITCHELL

Processes, **5:21**

TIME OR DATE AND RELATED MATTERS

Adequate Commerciality (this index)
Adequate disclosure, **7:21, 7:22,**
7:29, 7:56
Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)
Correction of inventorship, **10:62,**
10:68
Disclosure, **7:29, 7:52, 7:56**
Effective Filing Date (this index)
Examination of Original Application
(this index)
Geographic scope, **12:41**

**TIME OR DATE AND RELATED
MATTERS—Cont'd**

History, **1:5, 1:18**
Inventorship, **10:14**
Non-obviousness, **9:17, 9:57**
Non-Obviousness (this index)
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:1
Priority (this index)
Reissue of patent, **16:40-16:46,**
16:110-16:114
Statutory subject matter, **5:1, 5:4**
Technological scope, **13:24, 13:76**
Temporal Scope of Infringement (this
index)
Utility Requirement (this index)

TIME-WISE PRIORITY

Adequate disclosure, **7:5**
Anticipation, lack of, **8:5**
Non-obviousness, **9:38**
Priority, **8:33**

TITLE AND OWNERSHIP

Adequate commerciality, **14:18**
Claims, **4:2**
History, **1:16**
Inventorship (this index)
Laches, insecure title, **23:31**
Non-Obviousness (this index)
Policy justification, **1:28**
Static physical configurations, **5:18**

TITLE TO LAND

History, **1:1**

TOLLING

Six-year limitation, **21:23, 21:24**

**TOPPAN v. TIFFANY
REFRIGERATOR CAR CO.**

Adequate commerciality, **14:42**

**TORO v. WHITE CONSOL.
INDUSTRIES**

Claims, **4:37**

**TORPHARM, INC. v. RANBAXY
PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.**

Non-obviousness, **9:85**

TOTAL INCAPACITY

Adequate utility, **6:11**

TOTAL USES

Adequate utility, **6:16**

TOWNS

History, **1:4**

TRADEMARKS

See also Patent and Trademark Office
(PTO) (this index)
Adequate disclosure, **7:12**
Designs, **5:46**
History, **1:14, 1:15**

**TRADE-RELATED ASPECTS OF
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
RIGHTS, AGREEMENT ON
(TRIPS)**

Adequate commerciality, **14:10,**
14:27, 14:46
Prior inventor, prior-user rights,
22:11

TRADE SECRETS

Adequate disclosure
generally, **7:1**
best mode, **7:46, 7:50**
history and policy justification, **7:5**
single-embodiment, **7:17, 7:21**
Adequate utility, **6:5**
Correction of inventorship, **10:68**
History, **1:15**
Inventorship, **10:3**
Policy justification, **1:38**
Prior inventor, prior-user rights, **22:6**
Processes, **5:30**

TRADE SHOWS

Adequate commerciality, **14:33**

**TRAINING AND TRAINING
MATERIALS**

Adequate disclosure, **7:16**
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:83**

**TRANSCO PRODUCTS INC. v.
PERFORMANCE
CONTRACTING, INC.**

Adequate disclosure, **7:56**

INDEX

TRANSFERRING FUNDS

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:83**

TRANSFERS OF RIGHTS AND TITLE

Adequate commerciality, **14:42**

Correction of inventorship, **10:61,**
10:64, 10:68

Invalidity (this index)

Inventorship, generally, **10:7-10:17**

Joint inventorship, **10:25**

TRANSFORMATION

Processes, **5:19, 5:22, 5:30**

TRANSITIONAL PHRASE

Claims, **4:96, 4:98, 4:99**

TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS

Temporal scope, **11:37**

TRANSITORY EMBODIMENTS

Geographic scope, **12:44**

TREATISES

Inventorship, **10:2**

Joint inventorship, **10:24**

Priority, **8:154**

Processes, **5:30**

TRIAL-AND-ERROR

Adequate disclosure, **7:20**

TRIAL COURTS

Claims, **4:2, 4:80**

Non-obviousness, **9:3, 9:50**

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:79**

Processes, **5:21**

Static physical configurations, **5:15**

TRIPARTITE ANALYSIS

Priority, **8:60**

TRIPARTITE FORM OF INDIVIDUAL CLAIMS

Generally, **4:96-4:99**

TRIPS

Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual
Property Rights, Agreement on
(TRIPs) (this index)

TROPIX INC. v. LUMIGEN INC.

Claims, **4:74**

TRUE INVENTOR

Adequate disclosure, **7:28**

Correction of inventorship, **10:60,**
10:66

TRUE METHOD

Processes, **5:27**

TUBER-PROPAGATED PLANTS

Static physical configurations, **5:14**

TUBULAR BODY

Claims, **4:97, 4:98**

21 USCA §§ 151 TO 158

Adequate commerciality, **14:76**

28 USCA § 1498

Adequate commerciality, **14:55**

TWO-PRONG TEST

Adequate disclosure, **7:49**

2002 AMENDMENTS

Reissue of patent, **16:67, 16:68**

TWO-YEAR TIME LIMIT

Reissue of patent, **16:79**

TYING ARRANGEMENTS

Misuse of patent, **18:41**

TYPICAL SOPHISTICATION

Adequate disclosure, **7:10**

UNASSISTED HUMAN THOUGHT

Processes, **5:26**

UNCLEAN HANDS

Estoppel, **24:31**

Laches, **23:41**

UNDERLYING POLICY

Non-obviousness, **9:46**

UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:22

UNDERSTANDING OF CONFIGURATIONS

Technological configuration, **9:71**

UNDUE DELAY

Non-obviousness, **9:39**

UNDUE EXPERIMENTATION

Adequate disclosure, **7:20, 7:25**

UNDUE SOCIAL COST

Statutory subject matter, **5:5**

UNEXPECTED PROPERTIES

Non-obviousness, **9:77**

Priority, **8:52**

UNEXPECTED RESULTS

Non-obviousness, **9:76**

UNFAIR COMPETITION

History, **1:14**

UNIFIED STANDARD

Priority, **8:61**

UNIFORMITY

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:59**

UNILATERAL ACTION

Joint inventorship, **10:52**

UNILATERAL CONTRACT

Justification, **1:39**

**UNION OIL CO. OF CALIFORNIA
v. ATLANTIC RICHFIELD CO.**

Adequate commerciality, **14:37**

UNIVERSITIES

Non-obviousness, **9:47**

UNPREDICTABLE ARTS

Non-obviousness, **9:67**

UNRESTRICTED SALES

Defenses, implied-in-law licenses,
19:39

UNSCRUPULOUS ENTITY

Adequate utility, **6:15**

UNWANTED ACTIVITY

Adequate utility, **6:5**

Utility requirement, **6:5**

UNWANTED BEHAVIOR

Adequate utility, **6:5**

UNWANTED FIELDS

Adequate utility, **6:5**

URUGUAY ROUND

Adequate commerciality, **14:10**

**U.S. INDUSTRIAL CHEMICALS v.
CARBIDE & CARBON
CHEMICALS CORPORATION**

Reissue of patent, **16:90**

USEFUL ARTS

Copyright clause, **1:11**

History, **1:12**

Inventorship, **10:2, 10:7**

Non-obviousness, **9:9**

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:15, 2:20

Priority, **8:56**

Statutory subject matter, **5:2**

Statutory Subject Matter (this index)

Utility Requirement (this index)

USEFULNESS

Claims, **4:66**

Non-obviousness, **9:2**

Statutory Subject Matter (this index)

Utility Requirement (this index)

USEFUL PROPERTY

Non-obviousness, **9:77**

USES

Non-Obviousness (this index)

UTILITY PATENT

Designs, **5:46**

Statutory subject matter, **5:14**

UTILITY REQUIREMENT

Generally, **6:1 et seq.**

Abstract acts and matters, **6:18**

Adequate disclosure, **6:6, 6:19**

Administrative law and procedure,
6:4

Advance in art, **6:3**

Amusement, **6:15**

Animals, **6:5, 6:18**

Anticipation, lack of, **6:7, 8:22**

Apparatus, **6:15**

Appeal and review, **6:6, 6:17**

Art, advance in, **6:3**

INDEX

UTILITY REQUIREMENT—Cont'd

- Bedford v. Hunt, **6:4, 6:6, 6:7, 6:9**
- Biotechnological arts, **6:6**
- Brenner v. Manson, **6:6, 6:7, 6:17-6:19**
- Burden of proof, **6:16**
- Case law, **6:14**
- Certiorari, **6:6**
- Change and modification, **6:18**
- Charge to the jury, **6:9**
- Chemical arts, **6:7, 6:19**
- Chemical markers, construction of, **6:18**
- Chemical process, **6:17**
- Chemical products, **6:1, 6:6, 6:16**
- Circumstantial evidence, **6:20**
- Clear and convincing evidence, **6:14**
- Cloning of multicellular animals or humans, **6:5**
- Combinations, **6:6**
- Commercialized, **6:4**
- Commercially salable, **6:8, 6:11**
- Commissioner of Patents, **6:6**
- Compounds, **6:18**
- Congress, **6:9**
- Constitutional law, **6:2, 6:5, 6:9**
- Construction and interpretation, generally, **6:1**
- Consumer fraud, **6:5, 6:15**
- Consumer Products Safety Commission, **6:5**
- Correctness, **6:13**
- Costs and expenses, **6:4, 6:10**
- Court of Customs and Patent Appeals (CCPA), **6:6, 6:17**
- Current, tangible benefit, **6:16**
- Currently available, **6:18**
- Dangerous, **6:12**
- Date of invention, **6:7**
- Deceptive scheme, **6:15**
- Defensive, **6:7**
- Demand, **6:4, 6:10**
- Disclosure, **6:6, 6:16-6:19**
- Discovery, **6:18**
- Disdainful amusement devices, **6:15**
- Dominant-subservient relationships, **6:6**
- Duplication, **6:3**

UTILITY REQUIREMENT—Cont'd

- Economic considerations, **6:2**
- Economic costs, **6:4, 6:10**
- Economic justification, **6:10**
- Electrical arts, **6:19**
- Embodiment, **6:14**
- Enforcement, **6:19**
- European Patent Convention (EPC), **6:3**
- Evidence
 - adequate utility
 - generally, **6:4**
 - burden of proof, **6:16**
 - circumstantial evidence, **6:20**
 - clear and convincing evidence, **6:14**
 - burden of proof, **6:16**
 - circumstantial evidence, **6:20**
 - clear and convincing evidence, **6:14**
 - history, **6:4**
 - practical utility, **6:18**
 - prosecution, **6:13**
- Examination, **6:13**
- Exceptions and exclusions, **6:5**
- Expectations, **6:19**
- Factual statements, **6:13**
- False assertions, **6:13**
- False scheme, **6:15**
- Federal Circuit, **6:18, 6:19**
- Federal Trade Commission, **6:5**
- Fixed standard, **6:18**
- Food and Drug Administration, **6:5, 6:12**
- Foreign countries, **6:3, 6:5, 6:6**
- Forensics, **6:18, 6:19**
- Foreseeability, **6:1, 6:6, 6:16**
- Fourteenth amendment, **6:5**
- Fraud, **6:5, 6:15**
- Frivolous or injurious to well-being, good policy, or sound morals of society, **6:15**
- Future acts and matters
 - practical utility, **6:16-6:19**
 - research, **6:6**
 - technology, **6:19**
 - use-based view, **6:20**
- Gambling, **6:5, 6:15**

UTILITY REQUIREMENT—Cont'd

- Genetics, **6:5, 6:6**
- Genomic inventions, **6:19**
- Genus dominate a species, **6:6**
- Germany, **6:3, 6:6**
- Good policy, **6:15**
- Harmful, **6:15**
- Historical development and policy justification
 - generally, **6:2-6:7, 6:15**
 - advance in art, **6:3**
 - date of invention, **6:7**
 - limiting scope of control over future uses, **6:6**
 - market forces, use of, **6:4**
 - operability, **6:9**
 - unwanted activity, deterring, **6:5**
- Humans, **6:5, 6:18**
- Incentives, **6:19**
- Industrial application, **6:8**
- Inferior, **6:3**
- Infringement, **6:4, 6:20**
- In re Joly, **6:17**
- In re Kirk, **6:17**
- In re Ziegler, **6:18**
- In vitro tests, **6:18**
- Initial rejection of application, **6:13**
- Intent, **6:1**
- Interactions with restriction on use, **6:12**
- Intervention, **6:4, 6:10**
- Investigation, **6:18**
- Issuance of patent, **6:13, 6:14, 6:19**
- Jurisdiction, **6:12**
- Jury, **6:9**
- Justification
 - economic justification, **6:10**
 - enablement, **6:15**
 - policy justification. Historical development and policy justification, above
- Known art, **6:8**
- Known to the art, **6:4**
- Limitations and restrictions, **6:5, 6:9, 6:11, 6:15, 6:16, 6:18**
- Limitations and restrictions, generally, **6:1, 6:5**
- Living organisms, **6:6**

UTILITY REQUIREMENT—Cont'd

- Lowell v. Lewis, **6:9, 6:10**
- Lower courts, **6:16, 6:17**
- Market forces, use of, **6:4**
- Marking, **6:19**
- Mechanical arts, **6:19**
- Minimum operability, **6:12, 6:20**
- Mischievous, **6:15**
- Monopoly of knowledge, **6:6, 6:17, 6:19**
- Morality or public order, contrary to, generally, **6:1 et seq.**
- Motivation, **6:13**
- National Institutes of Health, **6:18**
- Natural control, **6:5**
- Non-obviousness, **6:7**
- Notice and knowledge
 - history, **6:3, 6:4, 6:6, 6:7**
 - infringement, **6:20**
 - operability, **6:8**
 - practical utility, **6:17, 6:19**
- Notice and knowledge, generally, **6:3**
- Noxious behavior, **6:5, 6:15**
- Operability
 - generally, **6:8-6:14**
 - corollaries, **6:11**
 - economic justification, **6:10**
 - evidence during prosecution, **6:13**
 - historical developments, **6:9**
 - interactions with restriction on use, **6:12**
 - treatment in litigation, **6:14**
- Order, public, **6:15**
- Patentability, generally, **6:1, 6:4**
- Patent Act of 1790, **6:1**
- Patent Act of 1793, **6:1**
- Patent Act of 1836, **6:1**
- Patent Act of 1870, **6:1**
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), generally, **6:4-6:14**
- Pertinent art, advance in, **6:3**
- Potentially dangerous products or substances, **6:12**
- Potential uses, **6:19**
- Practical utility, **6:16-6:19, 6:19**
- Presumption of validity, **6:14**
- Primitive, **6:4**
- Prior activity of another, **6:7**

INDEX

UTILITY REQUIREMENT—Cont'd

- Priority, **8:51**
- Process Control Corp. v. Hydreclaim Corp., **6:19**
- Profits, **6:19**
- Prosecution, **6:13**
- Prospective-use-based view, **6:19**
- Public insensitivity, **6:10**
- Public order or morality, contrary to, generally, **6:1 et seq.**
- Public sale, **6:12**
- Qualifications, **6:7, 6:18**
- References, **6:7**
- Rejection of application, **6:6, 6:13**
- Research and development, **6:6, 6:15, 6:17**
- Reversal, **6:6**
- Safe and effective, **6:12**
- Sale, **6:8**
- Scientific development, **6:19**
- Scientific field, **6:5**
- Section 101, generally, **6:1**
- Section 103, **6:7**
- Section 112, **6:6, 6:19**
- Section 282, **6:14**
- Serviceable in vivo, **6:18**
- Skill in the art, **6:13**
- Social costs, **6:2, 6:4, 6:10**
- Sound morals, **6:15**
- Specification, **6:1, 6:7, 6:19**
- Specific uses, **6:18**
- Sub-combination dominate more comprehensive combinations, **6:6**
- Sub-issue, **6:7**
- Substantial uses, **6:18**
- Supreme Court, **6:6, 6:17**
- Tangible benefit, **6:16**
- Tests, **6:1, 6:8, 6:18**
- Third persons, **6:7**
- Total incapacity, **6:11**
- Total uses, **6:16**
- Trade secrets, **6:5**
- Unscrupulous entity, **6:15**
- Unwanted activity, deterring, **6:5**
- Unwanted behavior, **6:5**
- Unwanted fields, **6:5**
- Useful, generally, **6:1**

UTILITY REQUIREMENT—Cont'd

- Useful arts, generally, **6:2**
- Validity, **6:4, 6:7, 6:11-6:14**
- Value, **6:20**
- Well-being, **6:15**

VACATIONS

- Priority, **8:67**

VALIDITY

- Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)
- Claims, **4:49, 4:62**
- Correction (this index)
- Defense of invalidity. Invalidity (this index)
- Examination of Original Application (this index)
- History, **1:5, 1:18, 1:24**
- Inventorship, **10:1, 10:7, 10:10**
- Joint Inventorship (this index)
- Non-Obviousness (this index)
- Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:76**
- Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) (this index)
- Priority, **8:69**
- Processes (this index)
- Static physical configurations, **5:8, 5:17**
- Statutory subject matter, **5:4**
- Utility Requirement (this index)

VALUE

- Adequate utility, **6:20**
- Anticipation, lack of, **8:1**
- Joint inventorship, **10:47, 10:50, 10:52**
- Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:49**
- Policy justification, **1:39**
- Priority, **8:56**
- Static physical configurations, **5:15**
- Statutory subject matter, **5:5**
- Temporal scope, **11:36**

VAN KANNEL REVOLVING DOOR CO. v. REVOLVING DOOR & FIXTURE CO.

- Adequate commerciality, **14:39, 14:40, 14:46**

VARIATIONS

- Processes, **5:21**

VARIATIONS—Cont'd

Technological scope, **13:81, 13:82**

VENN DIAGRAM

Claims, **4:63**

VERDICT

Claims (this index)

Non-obviousness, **9:3**

VESSELS

Geographic scope, **12:13**

VESTING OF TITLE

Inventorship (this index)

**VETERINARY BIOLOGICAL
PRODUCTS**

Adequate Commerciality (this index)

VICE PRESIDENT

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:22

VIEWED PER SE

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, **5:83**

**VITRONICS CORP. v.
CONCEPTRONIC, INC.**

Claims, **4:34**

**VOID AND VOIDABLE ACTS AND
MATTERS**

Correction of inventorship, **10:56**

History, **1:4, 1:5**

Joint inventorship, **10:19**

Processes, **5:24**

VOLUNTARINESS

Defenses, implied-in-law licenses,
involuntary sales, **19:41**

History, **1:14**

Priority, **8:67**

VOSE v. SINGER

Joint inventorship, **10:50**

WAIVER

History, **1:14**

WALLACE v. HOLMES

Indirect infringement, **15:4, 15:16**

Misuse of patent, **18:5**

WANLASS v. FEDDERS

Laches, unreasonable delay, **23:27**

WANLASS v. GENERAL ELEC. CO.

Laches, unreasonable delay, **23:26**

**WARNER JENKINSON v. HILTON
DAVIS**

Claims, **4:6**

**WARNER-LAMBERT CO. v.
APOTEX CORP.**

Adequate commerciality, **14:79**

**WAYMARK CORP. v. PORTA
SYSTEMS CORP.**

Adequate commerciality, **14:27**

WEBSTER LOOM CO. v. HIGGINS

Adequate disclosure, **7:48**

**WEED CHAIN TIRE GRIP CO v.
CLEVELAND CHAIN & MFG
CO.**

Adequate commerciality, **14:31**

**WEIGHT AND SUFFICIENCY OF
EVIDENCE**

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:39

Priority, **8:72**

WELL-BEING

Adequate utility, **6:15**

WHITE v. WALBRIDGE

Adequate commerciality, **14:20**

WHITTEMORE v. CUTTER

Adequate commerciality, **14:3, 14:52**

WHOLE TRUTH

Adequate disclosure, **7:45**

**WILSON SPORTING GOODS
CASE**

Technological scope, **13:82**

WINANS v. DENMEAD

Technological scope, **13:6**

WITHDRAWAL

History, **1:4, 1:15**

Priority, **8:241**

INDEX

WITNESSES

Priority (this index)

WOMEN

Inventorship, **10:7**

WOODWORTH PATENTS

Reissue of patent, **16:15**

WORKABILITY

Priority, **8:60**

WORK-FOR-HIRE

Inventorship, **10:16, 10:17**

WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION (WTO) AGREEMENT

Adequate commerciality, **14:46**

WORST CASE SCENARIO

Non-obviousness, **9:65**

WRITTEN ACTS AND MATTERS

Adequate disclosure, **7:8, 7:11, 7:27, 7:37**

Claims (this index)

Correction of inventorship, **10:56**

Examination of Original Application
(this index)

WRITTEN ACTS AND MATTERS

—**Cont'd**

History (this index)

Non-obviousness, **9:2**

Priority, **8:74**

Utility Requirement (this index)

WTO

World Trade Organization (WTO)

Agreement (this index)

WYETH v. STONE

Estoppel as defense to patent
infringement, **24:9**

Processes, **5:24**

YBM MAGNEX, INC. v. USITC

Technological scope, **13:96**

YET-TO-BE-INVENTED TECHNOLOGY

Adequate disclosure, **7:14, 7:24**

ZENITH RADIO CORP. v. HAZELTINE RESEARCH, INC.

Misuse of patent, **18:20**