

Table of Contents

Volume 1

PART I. PATENT SYSTEM ORGANIZATION AND PROCESS

CHAPTER 1. HISTORY AND POLICY JUSTIFICATION

I. DEFINITION OF THE TERM “PATENT”

§ 1:1 Generally

II. HISTORICAL ORIGINS OF THE MODERN PATENT GRANT

§ 1:2 Generally

§ 1:3 Early English precedents

§ 1:4 —Royal letters patent prior to 1623

§ 1:5 —Patents for invention prior to 1623

§ 1:6 —The Statute of Monopolies

§ 1:7 —Summary and conclusion

§ 1:8 Developments in the United States

§ 1:9 —Colonial period

§ 1:10 —Constitutional provision

§ 1:11 ——Parallel structure

§ 1:12 ——Underlying purpose

§ 1:13 ——Other issues

§ 1:14 ——Preemption of State Competition Laws

§ 1:15 ——Early History; Relation to Federal Common
Law

§ 1:16 ——Developments Post-*Erie Railroad v.
Tompkins*

§ 1:17 ——Early History; Relation to Federal Common
Law—*Stiffel Co. v. Sears, Roebuck & Co.*

§ 1:18 ——*Compco Corp. v. Day-Brite Lighting, Inc.*

§ 1:19 ——*Kewanee Oil Co. v. Bicron Corp.*

§ 1:20 ——*Bonito Boats v. Thunder Craft Boats*

§ 1:21 ——Subsequent Developments

§ 1:22 ——Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016

- § 1:23 ——Sovereign immunity of the States
- § 1:24 ——Relation to trademark
- § 1:25 —Constitutional period
- § 1:26 ——Law-making sources in United States Patent Law
- § 1:27 ——Initial statutes and developments up to 1836
- § 1:28 ——Patent Acts of 1836 and 1839
- § 1:29 ——Developments up to 1870
- § 1:30 ——Patent Act of 1870 and related events
- § 1:31 ——Subsequent developments to 1952
- § 1:32 ——Patent Act of 1952
- § 1:33 ——Subsequent developments to 1982
- § 1:34 ——Creation of the Federal Circuit and related developments
- § 1:35 America Invents Act

III. CURRENT POLICY JUSTIFICATION

- § 1:36 Generally
- § 1:37 Inventions as a form of property
- § 1:38 Natural law
- § 1:39 Economic discretion
- § 1:40 —Social costs of patenting
- § 1:41 ——Impact of single-source control
- § 1:42 ——Decreased supply
- § 1:43 ——Resource scarcity
- § 1:44 ——Decreased rate of future inventive activity
- § 1:45 ——Overall balance
- § 1:46 —Social benefits of patenting
- § 1:47 ——Analogy to bilateral contract: Exchange of control for disclosure
- § 1:48 ——Analogy to unilateral contract: Incentive to invent
- § 1:49 ——Other economic justifications: Innovation, prospects, etc
- § 1:50 ——Incentive to innovate
- § 1:51 ——Orderly control of economic prospects
- § 1:52 ——Other rationales

CHAPTER 2. THE PATENT SYSTEM AND THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

I. INTRODUCTION

- § 2:1 Generally

II. CONGRESS' EXERCISE OF ITS CONSTITUTIONAL POWER

- § 2:2 Generally

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 2:3 General v. specific acts
- § 2:4 —Special acts
- § 2:5 —General acts
- § 2:6 Judicial versus executive authority over the patent grant
 - § 2:7 —Current United States law: Separate delegations
 - § 2:8 —General Supremacy of Judiciary
 - § 2:9 —Rule of doubt
 - § 2:10 —Administrative post-grant proceedings
 - § 2:11 —Contrast: European patent systems
 - § 2:12 Administration of initial grant
 - § 2:13 —General considerations
 - § 2:14 —Historical developments in the United States
 - § 2:15 ——Act of 1790
 - § 2:16 ——Registration under the Act of 1793
 - § 2:17 ——Examination under the Act of 1836
 - § 2:18 —Subsequent developments

III. THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

- § 2:19 Generally
- § 2:20 Historical development
- § 2:21 Prelude: The USPTO, administrative law, and the APA
- § 2:22 Internal structures and personnel
- § 2:23 Rule-making activities of the USPTO
- § 2:24 —Rule sources
- § 2:25 ——Codified rules: 37 C.F.R.
- § 2:26 ——Manual of Patent Examining Procedure
- § 2:27 ——Notices
- § 2:28 —Rule making procedures

IV. JUDICIAL REVIEW OF USPTO DECISIONS

- § 2:29 Generally
- § 2:30 Historical overview
- § 2:31 —Acts of 1790 and 1793
- § 2:32 —Act of 1836
- § 2:33 —Judicial review under the Act of 1839
- § 2:34 —Reforms of 1870
- § 2:35 —Required election under the Act of 1927
- § 2:36 —Creation of Court of Customs and Patent Appeals
- § 2:37 —Consolidation in the Federal Circuit
- § 2:38 Current mechanisms
- § 2:39 Standards of review
- § 2:40 —Determinations of fact
- § 2:41 ——Review of facts under the APA generally

- § 2:42 ——Application to review of USPTO
- § 2:43 ——*Dickinson v. Zurko*
- § 2:44 —Determinations of law
- § 2:45 ——Legal rules under the APA generally
- § 2:46 ——Procedural versus nonprocedural rules
- § 2:47 ——Substantive/legislative rules
- § 2:48 ——Interpretive rules
- § 2:49 ——Application to legal rules of the USPTO
- § 2:50 ——Substantive/legislative rulemaking authority of the USPTO
- § 2:51 ——Interpretive rules of the USPTO

CHAPTER 3. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE PROCEDURES

I. INTRODUCTION; SCOPE OF CHAPTER

- § 3:1 Generally

II. EXAMINATION OF ORIGINAL APPLICATIONS

A. IN GENERAL

- § 3:2 Generally
- § 3:3 Application papers
- § 3:4 —Regular applications
- § 3:5 ——Specification
- § 3:6 ——Drawings
- § 3:7 ——Oath or Declaration
- § 3:8 ——Fee
- § 3:9 ——Models and specimens
- § 3:10 ——Biological deposits
- § 3:11 ——Missing parts
- § 3:12 —Provisional applications
- § 3:13 ——Policy justification
- § 3:14 ——Other aspects
- § 3:15 Examination
- § 3:16 Historical developments
- § 3:17 Relation to validity litigation

B. RESPONSE AND REEXAMINATION

- § 3:18 Generally
- § 3:19 Required content of response
- § 3:20 Amendments
- § 3:21 —To the disclosure: prohibition against new matter
- § 3:22 ——Policy justification
- § 3:23 ——Analogy to reissue

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 3:24 ——Historical developments
- § 3:25 ——Modern developments
- § 3:26 ——Relation to inadequate disclosure
- § 3:27 ——Incorporation by reference
- § 3:28 ——Relation to obviousness
- § 3:29 ——Inherency
- § 3:30 ——Exception for biological deposits
- § 3:31 —To the claims: Doctrine against late claiming
- § 3:32 ——Policy issues
- § 3:33 ——Historical developments of the late claiming doctrine
- § 3:34 ——Supreme Court cases
- § 3:35 ——Subsequent developments
- § 3:36 ——Prosecution laches
- § 3:37 Interviews
- § 3:38 Submissions by third parties

C. MECHANISMS TO ENCOURAGE DILIGENT PROSECUTION

- § 3:39 Generally
- § 3:40 Historical developments and policy issues
- § 3:41 Effect of term calculated from filing date
- § 3:42 Response deadlines
- § 3:43 Final rejection

D. CONTINUATION PRACTICE

- § 3:44 Generally
- § 3:45 Historical origins and policy justification
- § 3:46 Modern law
- § 3:47 —Time limits on filing
- § 3:48 ——Laches, abandonment, and the doctrine against late claiming
- § 3:49 ——Modern law; Co-pendency
- § 3:50 ——Continuation after allowance
- § 3:51 —Cross reference
- § 3:52 —Same subject matter
- § 3:53 ——Rule of adequate disclosure
- § 3:54 ——Policy issues and historical developments
- § 3:55 ——Reference to disclosure
- § 3:56 ——Best mode issues
- § 3:57 ——Additions and deletions
- § 3:58 ——Deletions
- § 3:59 ——Additions: Continuations in part
- § 3:60 ——Multiple continuations in sequence; Continuity of disclosure
- § 3:61 —Filing procedures

E. OTHER PROCEDURAL MATTERS

- § 3:62 Internal appeals and petitions
- § 3:63 Issuance
- § 3:64 Secrecy and 18-month publication
- § 3:65 Interferences and derivation proceedings
- § 3:66 Post-issuance proceedings
- § 3:67 Certificates of correction
- § 3:68 Disclaimers

PART II. PATENTABILITY AND VALIDITY

CHAPTER 4. PATENT CLAIMS

I. OVERVIEW

- § 4:1 Introduction; Scope of chapter
- § 4:2 Policy justification and historical development
- § 4:3 —Ascendancy and development of peripheral claiming, 1870–1880
- § 4:4 —Accommodating peripheral claiming, 1880–1952
- § 4:5 —Statutory developments, 1952 – 1982
- § 4:6 —Structural revision of the judiciary, 1982 – present

II. CLAIM THEORY

- § 4:7 Generally

A. CENTRAL VS. PERIPHERAL CLAIMING

- § 4:8 Generally
- § 4:9 —Notice and definitional accuracy
- § 4:10 The mechanics of claim interpretation
- § 4:11 —The identity of the decision maker
- § 4:12 ——Law vs. fact
- § 4:13 ———Law and fact generally
- § 4:14 ———Mixed questions of law and fact
- § 4:15 ———Law and fact in patent claim interpretation
- § 4:16 ———*Markman v. Westview Instruments*
- § 4:17 ———Underlying questions of fact
- § 4:18 Generally—The mechanics of claim interpretation—
The identity of the decision maker—Law vs. fact—
Law and fact in patent claim interpretation—
Markman v. Westview Instruments—Underlying
questions of fact—*Lighting Ballast Control LLC v. Philips Electronics North America Corp.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 4:19	— — — — — <i>Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc. v. Sandoz, Inc.</i>
§ 4:20	The mechanics of claim interpretation—The identity of the decision maker—Law vs. fact—Corollary issues
§ 4:21	— — — Finality and appellate review
§ 4:22	— — — Issue preclusion and <i>Stare Decisis</i>
§ 4:23	— — Judge vs. jury
§ 4:24	— — — Verdicts and instructions generally
§ 4:25	— — — Application to patent claim interpretation
§ 4:26	— — — Example decisions
§ 4:27	— Target meaning
§ 4:28	— — Author and recipient meanings generally
§ 4:29	— — — Example: statutory interpretation
§ 4:30	— — — Example: contract interpretation
§ 4:31	— — Application to patent claim interpretation
§ 4:32	— — — Patentee's meaning vs. recipient's meaning
§ 4:33	— — — Patentee's intended meaning as circumstantial evidence
§ 4:34	— — Hierarchy of sources
§ 4:35	— — Historical development
§ 4:36	— — — <i>Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc.</i>
§ 4:37	— — — Federal Circuit decisions after <i>Vitronics</i>
§ 4:38	— — — <i>Johnson Worldwide v. Zebco</i>
§ 4:39	— — — <i>Toro v. White Consol. Industries</i>
§ 4:40	— — — <i>Texas Digital Instruments v. Telegenix</i>
§ 4:41	— — — <i>Phillips v. AWH</i>
§ 4:42	— — — Subsequent developments
§ 4:43	— — Intrinsic and extrinsic sources
§ 4:44	— — Specialized sub-rules
§ 4:45	— — — Claims
§ 4:46	— — — Specification
§ 4:47	— — — Prosecution history
§ 4:48	— — — Dictionaries
§ 4:49	— — — Expert testimony
§ 4:50	— — — <i>Contra Proferentum</i>
§ 4:51	— — — Preservation of validity
§ 4:52	— — — Criticism of intrinsic and extrinsic categories
§ 4:53	— — — Contrast with statutory interpretation
§ 4:54	— — — Analogy to contract interpretation
§ 4:55	— — — Criticism of contract analogy
§ 4:56	— — — Alternative organization
§ 4:57	— — — Semantic and pragmatic meanings generally
§ 4:58	— — — General example
§ 4:59	— — — Illustrative diagram
§ 4:60	— — — Application to patent claim interpretation
§ 4:61	— — — Illustrative diagram
§ 4:62	— — — Recommendation

- § 4:63 —Required process
- § 4:64 —Patentability vs. validity

B. DOMINANCE AND SUBSERVIENCE

- § 4:65 Generally
- § 4:66 Combination and subcombination
- § 4:67 Genus and specie
- § 4:68 Product - method

C. SINGLE-CATEGORY REQUIREMENT AND MULTIPLE-CATEGORY HYBRIDS

- § 4:69 Generally
- § 4:70 Hybrid claim presentations and nonlimiting recitations
- § 4:71 —Indefinite vs. nonlimiting
- § 4:72 —General practice and specific rules
- § 4:73 —Conflict with all-elements rule
- § 4:74 —Patentability determinations
- § 4:75 —Treatment in determination of infringement
- § 4:76 —Products defined by process
- § 4:77 —Starting and ending materials in chemical processes; 1995 Amendments to Section 103(b)
- § 4:78 —Traditional practice
- § 4:79 ——Hostility to traditional practice
- § 4:80 ——PTO guidelines
- § 4:81 —Hybrid inventions incorporating nonstatutory elements
- § 4:82 Analysis and commentary
- § 4:83 —Other forms of hybrid claims
- § 4:84 —Hybrid claiming as an impetus to discard anomalies

D. MEANS EXPRESSIONS

- § 4:85 Generally
- § 4:86 Historical development
- § 4:87 —Retention of means expressions after 1870
- § 4:88 —Judicial reaction to means expressions under peripheral claiming practice
- § 4:89 —Statutory treatment of means expressions in 1952 Patent Act
- § 4:90 —Recent developments
- § 4:91 Boundary with non-means expressions
- § 4:92 Commentary
- § 4:93 Determination of corresponding structure
- § 4:94 Scope of coverage
- § 4:95 PTO practice

III. DEFINITENESS AND NOTICE

- § 4:96 Generally

TABLE OF CONTENTS

IV. REQUIRED FORMAT

- § 4:97 Generally
- § 4:98 Tripartite form of individual claims
- § 4:99 —Body; Diagraming convention
- § 4:100 —Transitional phrase; Open, closed, and partially closed formats
- § 4:101 —Preamble: Jepson-style claims
- § 4:102 Alternative recitations and Markush groupings
- § 4:103 Multiple claims in a single patent
- § 4:104 —Independent and dependent claims
- § 4:105 —Multiply dependent claims

CHAPTER 5. STATUTORY SUBJECT MATTER

I. OVERVIEW

- § 5:1 Introduction; Scope of chapter

II. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT AND POLICY JUSTIFICATION

- § 5:2 Generally
- § 5:3 —Policy explanations
- § 5:4 ——Targeting patent incentive to developments in applied technology
- § 5:5 ——Matters of undue social cost

III. PARTICULAR FIELDS OF ACTIVITY

- § 5:6 Generally
- § 5:7 —Static physical configurations
- § 5:8 ——Machines and articles of manufacture
- § 5:9 ——Compositions
- § 5:10 ——Printed matter
- § 5:11 ———Policy justification
- § 5:12 ———Exception for functional relationships
- § 5:13 ——Plants
- § 5:14 ———Arguments for and against utility patents
- § 5:15 ———*Pioneer Hi-Bred* case
- § 5:16 ———Animals and related biotechnology
- § 5:17 ———History
- § 5:18 ———*AMP v. Myriad*
- § 5:19 ———Animals and related biotechnology—Policy
- § 5:20 ——Processes
- § 5:21 ——Industrial processes generally
- § 5:22 ———Historical developments

- § 5:23 ——Impact of peripheral claiming: *Cochran v. Deener*
- § 5:24 ——Modern developments
- § 5:25 —— *Bilski v. Kappos*
- § 5:26 —— *Mayo v. Prometheus*
- § 5:27 ——Mathematical formulae, scientific principles, natural phenomena, and end results
- § 5:28 ——Mental steps
- § 5:29 ——Policy rationales
- § 5:30 ——Exception for Ministerial Acts
- § 5:31 ——Business methods
- § 5:32 ——Early history
- § 5:33 ——Modern developments
- § 5:34 —— *Bilski v. Kappos*
- § 5:35 —— *CLS v. Alice*
- § 5:36 ——America Invents Act
- § 5:37 ——Tax strategies
- § 5:38 ——Expanded post-grant review
- § 5:39 ——Observations
- § 5:40 ——Adapting the requirement of physical transformation
- § 5:41 ——Hybrid claiming
- § 5:42 ——Medical and surgical procedures
- § 5:43 ——Computer-related inventions
- § 5:44 ——Policy discussion
- § 5:45 ——Computer software as an article of manufacture: Printed matter and factual compilations
- § 5:46 ——Computer software as a process: Physical or other transformation
- § 5:47 ——Mathematical algorithms
- § 5:48 ——Mental steps
- § 5:49 ——Designs

IV. NON-STATUTORY HYBRID INVENTIONS

A. CATEGORIZING INDIVIDUAL INVENTIONS

- § 5:50 Introduction
- § 5:51 —Inventions of a single character versus those claimed as hybrid of statutory and non-statutory elements
- § 5:52 —Summary of existing law regarding hybrid inventions
- § 5:53 —Overview of following sections
- § 5:54 Analyzing claimed inventions as hybrids of statutory and non-statutory elements
- § 5:55 —Refutation of “claimed invention as a whole”
- § 5:56 *[Reserved]*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 5:57	Analyzing claimed inventions as hybrids of statutory and non-statutory elements—Consistency with peripheral claiming and modern claim theory
§ 5:58	—Conclusion
§ 5:59	Nomenclature convention
§ 5:60	Policy objectives
§ 5:61	Inventions claimed as hybrid of statutory and non-statutory elements—Statutory and non-statutory elements combined
§ 5:62	—Current law
§ 5:63	—Outline of remaining sections in group
§ 5:64	<i>[Reserved]</i>
§ 5:65	<i>[Reserved]</i>
§ 5:66	Inventions claimed as hybrid of statutory and non-statutory elements—Policy objectives—Practical importance
§ 5:67	—Fundamental issue of binary classification
§ 5:68	—Statutory provision
§ 5:69	—Overall policy objectives
§ 5:70	——Bounding the patent incentive
§ 5:71	——Absence of inquiry into prior state of the art
§ 5:72	——Proper placement of non-statutory adjudication
§ 5:73	——Implementation by detailed rule
§ 5:74	—Historical progression of substantive approaches
§ 5:75	—Point of novelty
§ 5:76	—Blue-pencil rule
§ 5:77	——Historical development
§ 5:78	——Critique
§ 5:79	——Requirement that statutory element be “nontrivial”
§ 5:80	——Operation of the blue-pencil rule under Sections 102 and 103
§ 5:81	——Lack of documentation
§ 5:82	—Supreme Court decisions
§ 5:83	—— <i>Parker v. Flook</i>
§ 5:84	—— <i>Diamond v. Diehr</i>
§ 5:85	—Subsequent developments and current law
§ 5:86	—Federal Circuit
§ 5:87	——Computer-related examples— <i>In re Warmerdam</i>
§ 5:88	—— <i>State Street Bank</i>
§ 5:89	——Significance of apparatus vs. method
§ 5:90	——Process requirements and information technologies
§ 5:91	——Non-computer related inventions
§ 5:92	—United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO)
§ 5:93	—Impact of hybrid claiming on application of Sections 102 and 103

§ 5:94 ——Commentary

Volume 2

CHAPTER 6. ADEQUATE UTILITY

- § 6:1 Introduction; Scope of chapter
- § 6:2 Historical development and policy justification
- § 6:3 —Advance in the art
- § 6:4 —Use of market forces
- § 6:5 —Deterring unwanted activity
- § 6:6 —Limiting scope of control over future uses
- § 6:7 —Relation between adequate utility and establishing date of invention
- § 6:8 Operability
- § 6:9 —Historical developments
- § 6:10 —Economic justification
- § 6:11 —Corollaries
- § 6:12 —Interactions with restriction on use
- § 6:13 —Proof during prosecution
- § 6:14 —Treatment in litigation
- § 6:15 Public order, morality
- § 6:16 Relation between disclosure and scope of future uses; “Practical utility”
- § 6:17 —*Brenner v. Manson*
- § 6:18 —Common interpretation: Practical utility as fixed standard
- § 6:19 —Alternate interpretation: Practical utility as required correlation between disclosed and potential uses
- § 6:20 Impact of infringing activity

CHAPTER 7. ADEQUATE DISCLOSURE

I. IN GENERAL

- § 7:1 Introduction and summary

II. ENABLEMENT

- § 7:2 Generally
- § 7:3 —Possession
- § 7:4 —Questions of single-embodiment and breadth distinguished
- § 7:5 —Historical development and policy justification
- § 7:6 —Single-embodiment issues
- § 7:7 ——Claimed configuration
- § 7:8 ——Statutory basis

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 7:9 ——Case decisions
- § 7:10 ——Method of making
- § 7:11 ——Biological starting materials
- § 7:12 ——Trademarks and brand names
- § 7:13 ——How to use
- § 7:14 ——Relation to adequate utility
- § 7:15 ——Background knowledge
- § 7:16 ——Target audience
- § 7:17 ——Private knowledge
- § 7:18 ——Relation to section 103
- § 7:19 ——Incorporation by reference
- § 7:20 ——Reasonable vs. undue experimentation
- § 7:21 ——Time frame
- § 7:22 ——Biological deposits
- § 7:23 ——Adequate range of embodiments: Breadth of disclosure vs. breadth of claims
- § 7:24 ——The problem of over-breadth
- § 7:25 ——Existing case law
- § 7:26 ——Critique and alternative explanation

III. SUBJECTIVE APPRECIATION AND THE DESCRIPTION REQUIREMENT

- § 7:27 Generally
- § 7:28 —Policy justification
- § 7:29 ——Assumption as of filing date
- § 7:30 ——Example
- § 7:31 ——Relation to new-matter prohibition
- § 7:32 ——Impact of America Invents Act
- § 7:33 ——Limitation on claim breadth
- § 7:34 —Subjective appreciation distinguished from enablement
- § 7:35 —Ambiguity of “description” requirement
- § 7:36 ——Involved aspects of the enablement requirement
- § 7:37 ——Example cases
- § 7:38 ——*Ariad Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Eli Lilly and Co.*
- § 7:39 ——Commentary
- § 7:40 —Typical scenarios
- § 7:41 ——Amended claims
- § 7:42 ——*In haec verba*
- § 7:43 ——Frame of reference

IV. BEST MODE

- § 7:44 Generally
- § 7:45 —Historical development and policy justification
- § 7:46 ——Confusion and criticism; basic policy objective

- § 7:47 —Well-settled issues
- § 7:48 ——Distinction between best mode and enablement
- § 7:49 ——Two-prong test for occurrence of violation
- § 7:50 ——Trade secrets and reverse engineering
- § 7:51 ——Unsettled issues; Failure to discuss objectives opposing disclosure
- § 7:52 ——Related information, production details, and commercial embodiments
- § 7:53 ——Critique
- § 7:54 ——Duty of employer/assignee
- § 7:55 ——Comment and suggestion
- § 7:56 ——Time frame; Continuing applications
- § 7:57 ——Intent

CHAPTER 8. LACK OF ANTICIPATION

I. OVERVIEW OF SECTION 102

- § 8:1 Generally

II. DERIVATION VS. ORIGINALITY; 102(f)

- § 8:2 Generally
- § 8:3 —Policy justification
- § 8:4 —Definition of “invent”
- § 8:5 —Analogies to par. 102(g) and § 116
- § 8:6 —102(f) “Invent” as conception only
- § 8:7 —Complete vs. substantial prior conception
- § 8:8 —1984 amendments to section 116
- § 8:9 Elements of proof

III. TECHNICAL SUFFICIENCY OF INVALIDATING EVENT

- § 8:10 Generally
- § 8:11 Relation to claimed invention; “All elements” rule
- § 8:12 —Combination/subcombination
- § 8:13 —Genus/specie
- § 8:14 —Effect of non-limiting recitations
- § 8:15 Required presence of enabling knowledge
- § 8:16 —Relation to underlying rationale
- § 8:17 —Incorporation of paragraph 112, par. 1
- § 8:18 —Paragraph 102(a)
- § 8:19 —Paragraph 102(b)—Printed publications
- § 8:20 ——On-sale activity
- § 8:21 ——Prior public use
- § 8:22 —Inoperative disclosures
- § 8:23 “Accidental anticipations” and inherency

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 8:24 —Anticipation vs. obviousness
- § 8:25 —Sporadic vs. regular result
- § 8:26 —Policy justifications
- § 8:27 —Circumstantial proof
- § 8:28 —Preservation of public domain
- § 8:29 —Potential conflicts
- § 8:30 Incorporation of outside sources
- § 8:31 —Section 103 vs. section 112, par. 1
- § 8:32 —Background knowledge vs. additional elements

IV. TIMING OF EVENT

- § 8:33 Generally

A. PRIORITY

- § 8:34 Generally
- § 8:35 First-to-invent vs. first-to-file
- § 8:36 —Advantages and disadvantages
- § 8:37 Priority, interference priority, and patentability
- § 8:38 —Right to use, right to exclude
- § 8:39 —Illustrations
- § 8:40 —Public domain issues
- § 8:41 —Critique
- § 8:42 —Nomenclature issues
- § 8:43 —Interference priority vs. public invention

1. General Rule of First-to-Invent Priority; 102(g)

- § 8:44 Generally
- § 8:45 Mental aspect: Conception
- § 8:46 —Appreciation
- § 8:47 —Completeness, relation to claim language
- § 8:48 —Generic inventions
- § 8:49 —Inherency
- § 8:50 —Implementing knowledge
- § 8:51 —Practical utility
- § 8:52 —Unexpected properties
- § 8:53 —Offensive vs. defensive invention
- § 8:54 —Needed experimentation
- § 8:55 Physical aspect: Reduction-to-practice
- § 8:56 —Policy rationale
- § 8:57 —Completeness, relation to claim language
- § 8:58 —Appreciation
- § 8:59 —Degree of testing required
- § 8:60 —Tripartite analysis
- § 8:61 —Unified standard
- § 8:62 —Resolution

§ 8:63	Diligence
§ 8:64	—Historical development
§ 8:65	—Modern law
§ 8:66	—Standard of continuity
§ 8:67	—Excuses for inactivity
§ 8:68	Proof issues
§ 8:69	—Standard of proof
§ 8:70	—Corroboration
§ 8:71	—Traditional justification
§ 8:72	—Analysis—Quantified probativeness
§ 8:73	—Credibility substitute
§ 8:74	—Rule of reason
§ 8:75	—USPTO vs. court proceedings
§ 8:76	Basic rule illustrated
§ 8:77	—Basic examples
§ 8:78	—Adequate diligence
§ 8:79	—Race of diligence
§ 8:80	—Genus/specie
§ 8:81	Abandoned, suppressed, concealed
§ 8:82	—Correction for otherwise private acts
§ 8:83	—Historical development
§ 8:84	—Underlying rationales
§ 8:85	—Classical abandonment
§ 8:86	—Laches or estoppel
§ 8:87	—Deliberate secrecy
§ 8:88	—Proof issues
§ 8:89	—Relation to diligence
§ 8:90	Conceptual inconsistencies
§ 8:91	—Constructive reduction to practice
§ 8:92	—Theoretical justification
§ 8:93	—Analysis: Justification for issuance of patent
§ 8:94	—Prior abandoned applications
§ 8:95	—Prior issued patent
§ 8:96	—Impact on actual reduction to practice
§ 8:97	—Inconsistencies with patentability
§ 8:98	—Section 104; Inventive activities in foreign countries
§ 8:99	—History and policy justifications
§ 8:100	—Symmetry arguments
§ 8:101	— <i>Bain v. Morse</i>
§ 8:102	— <i>Electric Storage Battery Co. v. Shimadzu</i>
§ 8:103	—International competitiveness
§ 8:104	—Foreign activities as evidence of prior invention
§ 8:105	—Law prior to 1993
§ 8:106	—NAFTA
§ 8:107	—GATT/TRIPs

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 8:108	— — —Offensive vs. defensive invention
§ 8:109	— —Discovery presumption
§ 8:110	—Section 119—Priority by foreign filing
§ 8:111	— —History and policy justifications
§ 8:112	— —Eligible countries
§ 8:113	— —Same invention
§ 8:114	— — —Claims
§ 8:115	— — —Disclosure
§ 8:116	— —Interaction with novelty requirement under 102(b)
§ 8:117	— —Impact of foreign priority on paragraph 102(e)
§ 8:118	— — —Offensive vs. defensive uses
§ 8:119	— — —Criticisms and counter-arguments
§ 8:120	— — —Historical development
§ 8:121	— — — <i>In re Hilmer</i>
§ 8:122	— — —Current law
§ 8:123	— —Procedural issues—Computation of 12-month period
§ 8:124	— — —Amended foreign application
§ 8:125	— — —Multiple foreign priority claims
§ 8:126	— — —First and subsequent foreign applications
§ 8:127	—Indeterminate events
§ 8:128	— —Simultaneous events
§ 8:129	— —Multiple-party contests
§ 8:130	—Renewed activity; <i>Paulik v. Rizkalla</i>
§ 8:131	Date of invention in Paragraphs 102(a) and (e); Affidavits under Rule 131
§ 8:132	—Basic rule
§ 8:133	—Procedure; Rule 131
§ 8:134	—Anomalies
§ 8:135	— —Required technical content of showing
§ 8:136	— —Analogy to obviousness standard under section 103
§ 8:137	—Critique and comment
2. Paragraph 102(e); Description in a Previously Filed Patent	
§ 8:138	Generally
§ 8:139	Historical development and policy justification
§ 8:140	— <i>Alexander Milburn Co. v. Davis-Bourbonville Co.</i>
§ 8:141	—Constructive publication
§ 8:142	—Evidence of superior priority
§ 8:143	—Relation to “abandoned, suppressed or concealed”
§ 8:144	—Published applications
§ 8:145	Continuing applications and the requirement of description
§ 8:146	—Discontinued subject matter

- § 8:147 —Added subject matter; Continuations in part
- § 8:148 —Importance of subject matter claimed in reference
- § 8:149 —Provisional and published applications
- § 8:150 Foreign applications, international agreements, and
In re Hilmer I
- § 8:151 —Potential interpretations of statutory language
- § 8:152 —Conflicting policy arguments
- § 8:153 —*In re Hilmer*
- § 8:154 —Patent cooperation treaty
- § 8:155 —Provisional applications

3. Paragraph 102(a); Public Possession Prior to Patentee's Date of Invention

- § 8:156 Generally
- § 8:157 Historical development and policy justification
- § 8:158 —General absence of policy discussions
- § 8:159 —Public disclosure
- § 8:160 —Evidence of superior priority
- § 8:161 ——Knowledge and circumstantial evidence of prior knowledge
- § 8:162 ——Status of applicant's own prior work
- § 8:163 —Inconsistencies with paragraph 102(g)
- § 8:164 Public knowledge
- § 8:165 —Example: *In re Borst*
- § 8:166 —Extent of knowledge required
- § 8:167 —Extent of publicness required
- § 8:168 —Abandoned applications
- § 8:169 Circumstantial proof of public knowledge
- § 8:170 —Acceptance of low probabilities
- § 8:171 —Rule-based definiteness
- § 8:172 —Social disutility
- § 8:173 —Printed publication
- § 8:174 ——Historical development
- § 8:175 ——Proof of prior public knowledge
- § 8:176 ——Effective date of publication
- § 8:177 ——“Printed”; “Publication”
- § 8:178 —Described in patent
- § 8:179 ——Potential relation to paragraph 102(d)
- § 8:180 ——Relation to printed publications
- § 8:181 ——Secret patents
- § 8:182 —Used
- § 8:183 ——Conflicting authorities
- § 8:184 ——Improper analogies to paragraph 102(b)
- § 8:185 ——Prior use and prior invention
- § 8:186 ——Synthesis of existing authorities
- § 8:187 ——Individual uses
- § 8:188 ——Relation to reduction to practice

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 8:189	— — —Abandoned and failed experiments
§ 8:190	— — —Secret, noninforming uses
§ 8:191	Geographic limitations
§ 8:192	—Administrative justification
§ 8:193	—Symmetry with local priority
§ 8:194	—“In this country”; Speed of diffusion
§ 8:195	—Historical development
§ 8:196	— — <i>Shaw v. Cooper</i>
§ 8:197	— — <i>Bain v. Morse</i>
§ 8:198	—Summary

B. PARAGRAPH 102(B)—NOVELTY IN RELATION TO FILING DATE OF APPLICATION

§ 8:199	Generally
§ 8:200	Novelty and priority distinguished
§ 8:201	Historical development and policy justification
§ 8:202	—Patent Act of 1793
§ 8:203	— <i>Pennock v. Dialogue, Shaw v. Cooper</i> , and the Patent Act of 1836
§ 8:204	—Abandonment
§ 8:205	—Complications
§ 8:206	—The Patent Act of 1870 and <i>Andrews v. Hovey</i>
§ 8:207	—Modern authorities
§ 8:208	Absolute novelty v. grace period
§ 8:209	—Acts of 1790, 1793, and 1836: Absolute novelty
§ 8:210	—Act of 1839: Quantified abandonment
§ 8:211	—Post- <i>Hovey</i> rationale
§ 8:212	—Patent Act of 1939
§ 8:213	—Modern rationale
§ 8:214	—Current law
§ 8:215	— —Continuing vs. foreign priority applications
§ 8:216	— —Provisional applications
§ 8:217	Prior possession by the public
§ 8:218	—Analogy to paragraph 102(a)
§ 8:219	—Information “known” as of critical date
§ 8:220	—Description in a printed publication
§ 8:221	— —Relationship to paragraph 102(a)
§ 8:222	— —Historical development
§ 8:223	— —Substantive law
§ 8:224	—Patented
§ 8:225	“On sale”; Prefiling commercialization
§ 8:226	— —Historical development
§ 8:227	— —Modern rationale
§ 8:228	— —Settled issues—Private offers for sale
§ 8:229	— — —Sufficiency of a single offer
§ 8:230	— — —Inherent details

- § 8:231 — — — Sale of patent right
- § 8:232 — — Unsettled issues—Third-party offers
- § 8:233 — — Onset of bar—Sufficient technological completion
- § 8:234 — — — *Pfaff v. Wells Electronics*
- § 8:235 — — — “Ready for patenting”
- § 8:236 — — — Initial and improvement inventions
- § 8:237 — — — Sufficient commercialization
- § 8:238 — Commentary
- § 8:239 “In public use”
- § 8:240 — Historical development
- § 8:241 — Withdrawal of material from the public domain
- § 8:242 — Time-wise extension of the applicant’s period of exclusive control
 - — *Metallizing Engineering v. Kenyon Bearing*
- § 8:244 — Unresolved issues
- § 8:245 — Commentary
- § 8:246 Corroboration and proof requirements
- § 8:247 Experimental use
- § 8:248 — Historical development
- § 8:249 — Early cases
- § 8:250 — Patent Act of 1839
- § 8:251 — — *City of Elizabeth v. Nicholson Pavement Co.*
- § 8:252 — — *Andrews v. Hovey*
- § 8:253 — Modern rationale and law
- § 8:254 — — Completion of claimed invention
- § 8:255 — — Inventor’s intent vs. objective circumstances
- § 8:256 — — Mixed purposes
- § 8:257 — — Experiments by third parties
- § 8:258 — Difficulties and unsettled issues
- § 8:259 — — Reduction to practice
- § 8:260 — — Reliance on exact claim language
- § 8:261 — — Adequate evidence of experimentation
- § 8:262 — Law vs. fact
- § 8:263 Geographic limitations
- § 8:264 — Historical development
- § 8:265 — Relationship to paragraph 102(a)
- § 8:266 — “On-sale” activities

V. PARAGRAPH 102(C)—ABANDONMENT

- § 8:267 Generally
- § 8:268 Historical development
- § 8:269 — Relation to novelty bar
- § 8:270 — Statutory history
- § 8:271 Modern law
- § 8:272 — Relation to general abandonment
- § 8:273 — Potential issues

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VI. PARAGRAPH 102(D)—DISPARATE ONSET IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

- § 8:274 Generally
- § 8:275 Policy justification
- § 8:276 Historical development
- § 8:277 Modern law—Relation to period of foreign priority
- § 8:278 —Identical or related applicants
- § 8:279 —Meaning of “patented”
- § 8:280 —Same invention
- § 8:281 National effect

Volume 3

CHAPTER 9. NON-OBVIOUSNESS

I. IN GENERAL

- § 9:1 Introduction and summary
- § 9:2 History
- § 9:3 —*Hotchkiss v. Greenwood*
- § 9:4 —Subsequent developments up to 1952
- § 9:5 —Patent Act of 1952
- § 9:6 ——*Graham v. John Deere*
- § 9:7 —Subjectiveness
- § 9:8 Policy justification
- § 9:9 —Existing public domain
- § 9:10 —Patent-driven inventions
- § 9:11 —Other explanations

II. GRAHAM V. JOHN DEERE AND THE PROCESS OF DETERMINING OBVIOUSNESS

- § 9:12 Generally
- § 9:13 *Graham v. John Deere*
- § 9:14 —Compromise for administrative efficiency
- § 9:15 ——Historical perspective
- § 9:16 ——Patent Act of 1952

A. SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE PRIOR ART

- § 9:17 Generally
 - 1. Relation to Technological Field; Analogousness
- § 9:18 Generally
- § 9:19 —Inoperative disclosures

2. Timeliness and Other Circumstances; Relation to Paragraphs of Section 102

§ 9:20 Generally

- a. "At the Time the Invention Was Made"; Public Knowledge Under 102(A)

§ 9:21 Generally

- b. Preservation of Existing Public-Domain; Public Events Under 102(B)

§ 9:22 Generally

§ 9:23 —The law prior to 1952

§ 9:24 —Effect of 1952 Patent Act

§ 9:25 ——*Palmquist*

§ 9:26 ——*Foster*

§ 9:27 —Policy justification

c. Secret Prior Art

§ 9:28 Generally

§ 9:29 —Pipeline justifications

§ 9:30 ——Contents of prior-filed applications under Paragraph 102(e)

§ 9:31 ———Law prior to 1952

§ 9:32 ———Patent Act of 1952

§ 9:33 ———*Hazeltine Research Inc. v. Brenner*

§ 9:34 ——Prior Inventive Acts under Paragraph 102(g)

§ 9:35 ———Early law

§ 9:36 ———*Robbins*

§ 9:37 ———*Bass*

§ 9:38 ——Contrast with foreign systems

§ 9:39 ——Policy justification

§ 9:40 ——Adequacy of applicant's subjective insight

§ 9:41 ——Prior work derived from another under Paragraph 102(f)

§ 9:42 ——Admissions generally

§ 9:43 ——Policy rationale

§ 9:44 ——Exceptions for common ownership; 103(c)

§ 9:45 ——Patent law amendments of 1984

§ 9:46 ——Underlying policy

§ 9:47 ——Examples of provision applied

§ 9:48 ——Patent law amendments of 1999 and Paragraph 102(e)

§ 9:49 ——Cooperative Research and Technology Enhancement Act of 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

**B. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE PRIOR ART
AND THE CLAIMED INVENTION**

§ 9:50 Generally

C. ORDINARILY SKILLED ARTISAN

§ 9:51 Generally

D. SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS

§ 9:52 Generally

§ 9:53 Treatment in *Grahm v. John Deere*

§ 9:54 Early history

§ 9:55 Underlying policy

§ 9:56 —Corollaries

§ 9:57 Types of secondary considerations

§ 9:58 —Long-felt need

§ 9:59 —Simultaneous invention

§ 9:60 —Laudatory statements

§ 9:61 —Copying

§ 9:62 —Commercial success

§ 9:63 —Underlying rationale

§ 9:64 —Consequences

§ 9:65 —Nexus

E. THE DETERMINATION OF OBVIOUSNESS

§ 9:66 Generally

§ 9:67 —Adequate suggestion

§ 9:68 —Obvious to try; Unpredictable arts and optimization

§ 9:69 —Small differences

§ 9:70 —Relation to inherent anticipation

**III. STRUCTURES ACCOMPANIED BY
PROPERTIES OR USES**

§ 9:71 Generally

§ 9:72 —General considerations and explanations

§ 9:73 —Properties of chemical compositions

§ 9:74 —Historical development

§ 9:75 ——*prima facie*, or structural obviousness

§ 9:76 ——Rebuttal showings

§ 9:77 —Unexpected results

§ 9:78 —Critique; Relation to limits on hybrid claiming

**IV. STARTING AND ENDING MATERIALS;
BIOTECHNOLOGICAL PROCESSES;
PARAGRAPH 103(B)**

§ 9:79 Generally

- § 9:80 —Older authorities
- § 9:81 —Federal circuit authorities prior to 1995
- § 9:82 —Biotechnological processes; Section 103(b)
- § 9:83 ——Historical development
- § 9:84 ——Specific statutory provisions
- § 9:85 ——Overall effect
- § 9:86 —Case law developments after 1995
- § 9:87 —Comment: Product and method as a claim construction issue

CHAPTER 10. INVENTORSHIP

I. IN GENERAL

- § 10:1 Introduction; Scope of chapter
- § 10:2 History and policy justification
- § 10:3 —Critique of economic justification
- § 10:4 —Analogy to general law of property

II. RULE OF PROPER INVENTORSHIP

- § 10:5 Rule of proper inventorship
- § 10:6 —Comparison to copyright
- § 10:7 —Corollary rules
- § 10:8 —Perfection of patent rights by assignee
- § 10:9 —General observations

III. DEFINITION OF “INVENTOR”

- § 10:10 Definition of “inventor”
- § 10:11 —Partial analogy to first-to-invent priority
- § 10:12 ——Critique
- § 10:13 —Business entities and employed inventors
- § 10:14 ——Historical development
- § 10:15 ——Conflicts with modern collaborative research
- § 10:16 ——Contrast with copyright
- § 10:17 ——Critique
- § 10:18 ——Recent legislative adjustments

IV. JOINT INVENTORSHIP

- § 10:19 Joint inventorship
- § 10:20 —Joint invention and proper inventorship
- § 10:21 ——Joint inventors and joint applicants distinguished
- § 10:22 ——Structure of discussion in following sections
- § 10:23 —Joint invention defined
- § 10:24 ——General evaluation of area

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 10:25	— — Prior limits on correcting inventorship
§ 10:26	— — Basic rule of joint inventorship
§ 10:27	— — — Effect of 1984 amendments
§ 10:28	— — — Examples of basic rule applied
§ 10:29	— — — Inventive contribution versus suggestion
§ 10:30	— — — Specific tests identified and critiqued
§ 10:31	— — — — Complete or definite conception
§ 10:32	— — — — Materiality
§ 10:33	— — — — Excess over state of the art
§ 10:34	— — — — Consent
§ 10:35	— — Joint applicants; Cooperating inventors and the 1984 amendments to Section 116
§ 10:36	— — Application by joint inventors
§ 10:37	— — Joint applications by cooperating inventors
§ 10:38	— — Historical background
§ 10:39	— — — Conflict between the all-claims rule and modern group research
§ 10:40	— — — Legislative purpose of the 1984 amendments
§ 10:41	— — — Current interpretation of the 1984 amendments
§ 10:42	— — Joint inventors and the meaning of “another”
§ 10:43	— — Sole inventors
§ 10:44	— — Joint inventors
§ 10:45	— — Effect of 1984 amendments
§ 10:46	— — Examples of current rule applied
§ 10:47	— — Rights and obligations of joint inventors
§ 10:48	— — Early history
§ 10:49	— — Initial analogy to tenancy in common
§ 10:50	— — Later modifications
§ 10:51	— — Modern rule and rationale
§ 10:52	— — Effective abandonment
§ 10:53	— — Contrast with copyright law

V. CORRECTION OF INVENTORSHIP

§ 10:54	Correction of inventorship
§ 10:55	— Historical development and policy justification
§ 10:56	— — Pre-1952 law
§ 10:57	— — Patent Act of 1952
§ 10:58	— — 1982 amendments
§ 10:59	— — Policy justification
§ 10:60	— Error without deceptive intent
§ 10:61	— Consent
§ 10:62	— Diligence
§ 10:63	— Sole-to-sole conversions
§ 10:64	— Patent Act of 1952
§ 10:65	— — 1982 amendments

- § 10:66 — —Common vs. non-common assignment; Conflicts with other limits
- § 10:67 — —First inventorship
- § 10:68 — —Lack of novelty

PART III. INFRINGEMENT

CHAPTER 11. TEMPORAL SCOPE

I. OVERVIEW

- § 11:1 Infringement generally
- § 11:2 —Qualities of the patent right
- § 11:3 —Temporal scope
- § 11:4 —Geographic scope
- § 11:5 —Technological scope
- § 11:6 —Adequate commerciality
- § 11:7 —Structure of following chapters
- § 11:8 Introduction to temporal scope
- § 11:9 History and policy justification
- § 11:10 —Early US law
- § 11:11 —Intermediate period: 17 years from issuance
- § 11:12 —Modern changes
- § 11:13 —Patent term restoration
- § 11:14 —20 years from filing
- § 11:15 —Conveyed changes
- § 11:16 —Policy
- § 11:17 —Natural right
- § 11:18 —Economic justifications

II. ONSET AT ISSUANCE AND FILING

- § 11:19 Generally
- § 11:20 Policy and history
- § 11:21 Basic 20-year patent term; applications filed on or after June 8, 1995
 - § 11:22 —Claims of benefit under Sections 120 and 121
 - § 11:23 —Claims of foreign and domestic priority
 - § 11:24 —Claims to prior PCT applications
 - § 11:25 Term restoration
 - § 11:26 —1994 provisions; applications filed on or after June 8, 1995
 - § 11:27 —1999 provisions; applications filed on or after May 29, 2000
 - § 11:28 —Limitations
 - § 11:29 —Procedures and appeals
 - § 11:30 —Effective date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 11:31 Provisional rights and 18-month publication
- § 11:32 —Policy justification
- § 11:33 —Requirement of published application
- § 11:34 —Limitations
- § 11:35 —Effective date
- § 11:36 —Commentary: general impact of patent value
- § 11:37 Transitional provisions; applications filed before June 8, 1995

III. BEGINNING AND ENDING OF THE TERM

- § 11:38 Beginning of the term
- § 11:39 Ending of the term

IV. PATENT TERM EXTENSIONS UNDER SECTION 156

- § 11:40 Generally
- § 11:41 History and policy justification
- § 11:42 Basic extension
- § 11:43 Application for extension
- § 11:44 Interim extensions
- § 11:45 Special issues
- § 11:46 —Identity of drug product
- § 11:47 ——Salts and esters
- § 11:48 ——Pro-drugs and metabolites
- § 11:49 ——Combinations and subcombinations

CHAPTER 12. GEOGRAPHIC SCOPE

I. OVERVIEW

- § 12:1 Generally
- § 12:2 Historical development
- § 12:3 —Early decisions and statutes
- § 12:4 —*Brown v. Duchesne, Gardiner v. Howe*
- § 12:5 —Patent Act of 1870 and subsequent decisions
- § 12:6 —Patent Act of 1952 and subsequent developments
- § 12:7 ——*Deepsouth Packing Co. v. Laitram Corp.* and Section 271(f)
- § 12:8 ——Section 271(g)
- § 12:9 ——Outer space and Section 105
- § 12:10 Policy justification

II. ENCOMPASSED TERRITORY

- § 12:11 Generally
- § 12:12 Territories and controlled spaces

- § 12:13 Registered vessels
- § 12:14 Outer space

III. SITUS OF ACCUSED ACTIVITY

- § 12:15 Generally
- § 12:16 Making
- § 12:17 Using
- § 12:18 Sale
- § 12:19 Offer for sale
- § 12:20 —Situs of offer
- § 12:21 —Requirement of domestic sale

IV. CROSS-BORDER TRANSACTIONS

- § 12:22 Generally

A. OUTGOING TRANSACTIONS

- § 12:23 Generally
- § 12:24 Export of claimed embodiments
- § 12:25 Export of apparatus to perform claimed process
- § 12:26 Inducing and contributing to foreign practice of invention; Section 271(f)
- § 12:27 Early cases
- § 12:28 *Deepsouth Packing Co. v. Laitram Corp.*
- § 12:29 Section 271(f); Patent Law Amendments Act of 1984
- § 12:30 Inducing and contributing to foreign practice of invention; Section 271(f)—Special issues
- § 12:31 ——*Cardiac Pacemakers, Inc. v. St. Jude Medical, Inc.*
- § 12:32 ——Commentary

B. INCOMING TRANSACTIONS

- § 12:33 Generally
- § 12:34 Products produced with patented materials
- § 12:35 Products made by patented apparatus
- § 12:36 Products made by patented process; Section 271(g)
- § 12:37 —History
- § 12:38 —Section 271(g); Process Patents Amendment Act of 1988
- § 12:39 ——The meaning of “product”
- § 12:40 ——Products “made by” process
- § 12:41 —Special issues
- § 12:42 ——Domestic application
- § 12:43 ——Relation to issue date of asserted patent
- § 12:44 —Presumption as to making

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 12:45 Foreign inducement of infringing acts inside the United States

V. TRANSITORY EMBODIMENTS

§ 12:46 Generally

Volume 4

CHAPTER 13. TECHNOLOGICAL SCOPE—DIRECT

I. OVERVIEW

§ 13:1 Generally

II. HISTORY AND POLICY JUSTIFICATION

§ 13:2 Generally

A. EARLY HISTORY

§ 13:3 Generally

B. THE IMPACT OF CLAIM THEORY

§ 13:4 Generally

§ 13:5 Central claiming and technological scope

§ 13:6 —*Winans v. Denmead*

§ 13:7 —Criticisms

§ 13:8 Technological scope and peripheral claiming

C. EQUIVALENTS UNDER PERIPHERAL CLAIMING

§ 13:9 Generally

§ 13:10 Developments to 1950

§ 13:11 —Descriptions by learned hand

§ 13:12 *Graver Tank & Mfg. Co. v. Linde Air Products Co.*

§ 13:13 Developments in the Federal Circuit to 1994

§ 13:14 *Hilton Davis Chemical Co. v. Warner-Jenkinson Co., Inc.*

§ 13:15 —Initial Federal Circuit decision

§ 13:16 ——Majority opinion

§ 13:17 ——Dissenting opinions

§ 13:18 —Decision of the supreme court

§ 13:19 ——Effect of 1952 Patent Act

§ 13:20 ——Equity vs. law

- § 13:21 ——Factual equivalency
- § 13:22 ——All-elements rule
- § 13:23 ——Prosecution history estoppel
- § 13:24 ——Time frame
- § 13:25 ——Concurring opinion
- § 13:26 —Federal Circuit decision on remand
- § 13:27 *Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., Ltd.*
- § 13:28 —Early procedural history
- § 13:29 —Facts
- § 13:30 —Federal Circuit 3-judge decision on remand
- § 13:31 —Federal Circuit *en banc* decision
- § 13:32 ——Majority opinion
- § 13:33 ——Concurrences and dissents
- § 13:34 —Supreme court opinion
- § 13:35 —Federal Circuit decision on second remand
- § 13:36 ——Majority opinion
- § 13:37 ——Concurrences and dissents
- § 13:38 *Johnson & Johnston v. R.E. Service Co.*
- § 13:39 Subsequent developments

D. POLICY JUSTIFICATION

- § 13:40 Introduction
- § 13:41 General Principles
- § 13:42 Role of claims and claim theory

III. TECHNOLOGICAL SCOPE UNDER PERIPHERAL CLAIMING

A. OVERVIEW

- § 13:43 Generally

B. LITERAL INFRINGEMENT

- § 13:44 Generally
- § 13:45 History and policy justification
- § 13:46 Relation to claim interpretation
- § 13:47 “All-elements” rule
- § 13:48 —Methods
- § 13:49 —Additional elements or functions
- § 13:50 —Alternative species
- § 13:51 Reverse doctrine of equivalents

C. DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS

1. Overview

- § 13:52 Generally

TABLE OF CONTENTS

2. Policy justification

- § 13:53 Generally
- § 13:54 Notice vs. definitional accuracy
- § 13:55 Language issues
 - Later-discovered technology
 - § 13:57 —Context and inadvertent mistakes
 - § 13:58 —Non-patent example
 - Patent example: *International Rectifier Corp. v. Ixys Corp.*
 - § 13:60 —Infringement by equivalents as a reaction
 - § 13:61 Law vs. equity
 - § 13:62 Relation to reissue

3. Factual equivalency

- § 13:63 Generally
- § 13:64 History and policy justification
- § 13:65 Formulation of test
 - § 13:66 —Function, way, result
 - § 13:67 —Insubstantial differences
 - § 13:68 —Commentary and synthesis
 - § 13:69 —Inventive concept
 - Sanitary Refrigerator Co. v. Winters*
 - § 13:71 —*Claude Neon Lights v. E. Machlett & Son.*
 - § 13:72 —Illustrative diagram
 - § 13:73 Element-by-element inquiry
 - § 13:74 Pioneer inventions vs. improvements
 - § 13:75 Known interchangeability
 - § 13:76 —Time frame

4. Legal defenses

- § 13:77 Generally
- § 13:78 Graphical illustration
- § 13:79 Prior art
 - § 13:80 —History and policy justification
 - § 13:81 —Obvious variations
 - Wilson Sporting Goods*
 - § 13:83 —Hypothetical claim
 - § 13:84 —Burdens of proof
 - § 13:85 —Required relation to patent claim
 - § 13:86 —Other issues of patentability
 - § 13:87 Patentee's conduct
 - § 13:88 —Policy justification
 - § 13:89 —Abandonment and classical estoppel
 - § 13:90 —Analogy to novelty requirement
 - § 13:91 —Judicial estoppel
 - § 13:92 —Disclosure dedication

- § 13:93 ——Historical development
- § 13:94 ——Early Federal Circuit decisions
- § 13:95 —— —— *Maxwell v. J. Baker, Inc.*
- § 13:96 —— —— *YBM Magnex, Inc. v. USITC*
- § 13:97 —— —— *Johnson & Johnston Associates Inc. v. R.E. Service Co., Inc.*
- § 13:98 ——Definition of “claimed”
- § 13:99 ——Definition of “disclosed”
- § 13:100 ——Dedication via other activities
- § 13:101 ——Prosecution history estoppel
- § 13:102 ——History and policy justification
- § 13:103 ——Estopping events
- § 13:104 —— —— Cancellations and substitutions
- § 13:105 —— —— Arguments
- § 13:106 —— —— Narrowing of related claims and applications
- § 13:107 —— —— Formal rejections and restrictions
- § 13:108 —— —— Insufficient disclosure rejections
- § 13:109 —— —— Extent of estoppel
- § 13:110 —— —— Underlying purpose
- § 13:111 —— —— *Festo*
- § 13:112 —— —— Subsequent decisions
- § 13:113 All-elements rule

IV. CENTRAL CLAIMING AND MEANS EXPRESSIONS

- § 13:114 Generally

CHAPTER 14. ADEQUATE COMMERCIALITY

- § 14:1 Generally
- § 14:2 ——Historical development
- § 14:3 —— —— Early United States statutes
- § 14:4 —— —— Patent Acts of 1836 and 1870
- § 14:5 —— —— Patent Act of 1952
- § 14:6 —— —— Regulated inventions and the Hatch-Waxman Act
 - § 14:7 —— —— —— 1984 Hatch-Waxman Act
 - § 14:8 —— —— —— Subsequent developments to 2003
 - § 14:9 —— —— —— 2003 Amendments
 - § 14:10 —— —— —— GATT/TRIPs and offers for sale
 - § 14:11 —— —— —— Policy justifications
 - § 14:12 —— —— —— Commercial exclusivity
 - § 14:13 —— —— —— Rule-based implementation
 - § 14:14 —— —— —— Definition without reference to intent
 - § 14:15 —— —— —— Comparison to copyright

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 14:16	— — —Intent as circumstantial evidence
§ 14:17	— — —Contrast with indirect infringement
§ 14:18	Acts of infringement
§ 14:19	—Making
§ 14:20	— — —Basic definition
§ 14:21	— — —Radio Corporation of America v. Andrea
§ 14:22	— — —Deepsouth Packing Co. v. Laitram Corp.
§ 14:23	— — —Holding
§ 14:24	— — —Deepsouth Packing Co. v. Laitram Corp— Effect of subsequent enactment of section 271(f)
§ 14:25	— — —Developments after 1982
§ 14:26	— — —Paper Converting Machine Co. v. Magna- Graphics Corp.
§ 14:27	— — —Subsequent developments
§ 14:28	— — Inapplicability to method inventions
§ 14:29	— — Questions of capacity for use
§ 14:30	— — —Modifications required before use
§ 14:31	— — —Capacity for additional uses
§ 14:32	—Using
§ 14:33	— — Basic definition
§ 14:34	— — Use of method inventions
§ 14:35	— — —Contrast with making and selling; offers to use
§ 14:36	— — —Serial performance by different persons
§ 14:37	— — Use of claimed structure for alternative purpose
§ 14:38	—Selling
§ 14:39	— — Basic definition
§ 14:40	— — Delivery
§ 14:41	— — Sale vs. license
§ 14:42	— — Transfer of embodiments vs. intellectual property rights
§ 14:43	— — Inapplicability to method inventions
§ 14:44	— — Relation to offers for sale
§ 14:45	— Offers for sale
§ 14:46	— — Historical development
§ 14:47	— — Basic definition
§ 14:48	— — Section 271(i); date of offered sale
§ 14:49	— — Application to methods; offers to use
§ 14:50	Experimental, noncommercial and de minimis activities
§ 14:51	— Experimental uses generally
§ 14:52	— — Early history
§ 14:53	— — Policy justification
§ 14:54	— — Pre-Federal Circuit developments
§ 14:55	— — Developments in the court of claims
§ 14:56	— — Developments in the Federal Circuit
§ 14:57	— — —Experimental use for regulatory approval

- § 14:58 — — — Use of genomic material
- § 14:59 — — — Recent developments
- § 14:60 — — — Regulated inventions and the Hatch-Waxman Act
- § 14:61 — — — Historical development
- § 14:62 — — — Early history
- § 14:63 — — — *Roche Prod. Inc. v. Bolar Pharmaceutical Co., Inc.*
- § 14:64 — — — Initial Hatch-Waxman Act
- § 14:65 — — — *Eli Lilly and Co. v. Medtronic, Inc.*
- § 14:66 — — — 1988 and 2003 statutory amendments
- § 14:67 — — — *Merck KGaA v. Integra Lifesciences I, Ltd.*
- § 14:68 — — — 271(e)(1)–Safe harbor
- § 14:69 — — — Application to medical devices
- § 14:70 — — — *Eli Lilly and Co. v. Medtronic, Inc.*
- § 14:71 — — — Class I and II medical devices
- § 14:72 — — — Reasonably related uses
- § 14:73 — — — *Merck KGaA v. Integra Lifesciences I, Ltd.*
- § 14:74 — — — Subsequent developments
- § 14:75 — — — 271(e)(2)–Technical infringement
- § 14:76 — — — Statutory mechanics
- § 14:77 — — — Special issues
- § 14:78 — — — Limitations on remedies
- § 14:79 — — — Relation to induced infringement
- § 14:80 — — — Availability of declaratory judgment action

Volume 5

CHAPTER 15. INDIRECT INFRINGEMENT

- § 15:1 Generally
- § 15:2 Historical development
- § 15:3 — Early history
- § 15:4 — *Blake v. Smith, Wallace v. Holmes*, and the onset of indirect infringement
- § 15:5 — License restrictions, unpatented supplies, and *Henry v. A.B. Dick*
- § 15:6 — Judicial reaction and the development of patent misuse
- § 15:7 — *Motion Picture Patents Co. v. Universal Film Mfg. Co.*
- § 15:8 — *Carbice Corporation of America v. American Patents Development Corporation*
- § 15:9 — *Mercoid Corp. v. Mid-Continent Inv. Co.*
- § 15:10 — 1952 Patent Act; paragraphs 271(b), (c), (d)
- § 15:11 — *Aro Mfg. Co. v. Convertible Top Replacement Co.*
- § 15:12 — *Dawson Chemical Co. v. Rohm and Haas Co.*
- § 15:13 — 1988 Patent Misuse Reform Act

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 15:14 Policy justification
- § 15:15 Inducing infringement; section 271(b)
- § 15:16 —Proof of direct infringement
- § 15:17 —Required relation to direct infringer
- § 15:18 ——Sale of materials suited to dual use
- § 15:19 ——Inducement by officers and directors
- § 15:20 —Required knowledge and intent
- § 15:21 Contributory infringement; section 271(c)
- § 15:22 —Proof of direct infringement
- § 15:23 —Staple vs. nonstaple article of commerce
- § 15:24 —Required knowledge and intent

PART IV. POSTISSUANCE PROCEEDINGS

CHAPTER 16. REISSUE AND REEXAMINATION

I. IN GENERAL

- § 16:1 Generally

II. HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT

A. IN GENERAL

- § 16:2 Generally

B. REISSUE

- § 16:3 Generally
- § 16:4 Prestatutory history
- § 16:5 —*Grant v. Raymond*
- § 16:6 Early statutory history
- § 16:7 —Patent Act of July 3, 1832
- § 16:8 —Patent Act of 1836
- § 16:9 —Patent Act of 1870
- § 16:10 Developments up to 1882: dealing with broadening reissues
 - § 16:11 —The problem of broadening
 - § 16:12 ——Mistaken reliance
 - § 16:13 ——Inclusion of later inventions
 - § 16:14 ——Speculation
 - § 16:15 ——Example: Woodworth patents
 - § 16:16 ——Example: *Hoffheins v. Brand*
 - § 16:17 —Reactive measures
 - § 16:18 ——Patent Act of 1836; outright ban on broadening

- § 16:19 ——Impact of central claiming; *Carver v. Braintree*
- § 16:20 ——Disagreement over statutory interpretation
- § 16:21 ——Broadening reissues allowed; *Battin v. Taggart*
- § 16:22 ——Insistence on same invention
- § 16:23 ——*Goodyear v. Day*
- § 16:24 ——*Giant Powder Co. v. California Powder Works*
- § 16:25 ——Inadvertence, accident, or mistake
- § 16:26 ——General claiming requirements
- § 16:27 ——*O'Reilly v. Morse*
- § 16:28 ——*Burr v. Duryee*
- § 16:29 ——*Carlton v. Bokee*
- § 16:30 ——Prohibition against new matter
- § 16:31 ——Earliest Patent Office practices
- § 16:32 ——Patent Office rules
- § 16:33 ——Initial use of parol evidence
- § 16:34 ——Later prohibition of parol evidence
- § 16:35 ——Judicial reactions
- § 16:36 ——Patent Act of 1870
- § 16:37 ——Later court decisions
- § 16:38 ——Overall effect; reduction in frequency of reissue
- § 16:39 ——Models as a lingering problem
- § 16:40 ——Imposition of time limit
- § 16:41 ——Early calls for reform
- § 16:42 ——*Miller v. Bridgeport Brass Co.*
- § 16:43 ——Factual setting
- § 16:44 ——Supreme Court decision
- § 16:45 ——Subsequent acceptance
- § 16:46 ——Effect on reissue practice
- § 16:47 Developments 1882–1952
- § 16:48 —Effect of reissue on existing causes of action
- § 16:49 —Patent Act of 1928
- § 16:50 —Rule against recapture
- § 16:51 —Intervening rights
- § 16:52 —Pre-1882: no defense
- § 16:53 —1882–1915: invalidity
- § 16:54 —1915–1952: rise of personal defense
- § 16:55 ——Early cases
- § 16:56 ——*Sontag Chain Stores Co. Limited v. National Nut Co. of California*
- § 16:57 Patent Act of 1952
- § 16:58 —Section 251
- § 16:59 —Section 252
- § 16:60 —Section 253
- § 16:61 —Subsequent amendments

TABLE OF CONTENTS

C. REEXAMINATION

- § 16:62 Generally
- § 16:63 Early developments
- § 16:64 “No-defect” reissue practice under the Dann amendments
- § 16:65 Patent Act of 1980
- § 16:66 Inter partes reexamination under the 1999 amendments
- § 16:67 2002 Amendments
- § 16:68 Subsequent developments

III. POLICY JUSTIFICATION

- § 16:69 Generally
- § 16:70 Reissue
- § 16:71 Reexamination

IV. REISSUE

A. IN GENERAL

- § 16:72 Generally

B. REQUIREMENTS FOR ELIGIBILITY

- § 16:73 Generally
- § 16:74 Defect
- § 16:75 —Claims
- § 16:76 ——Narrowing changes
- § 16:77 ——Broadening changes
- § 16:78 ——Definition of broadening
- § 16:79 ——Two-year time limit
- § 16:80 ——Changes to improve definiteness
- § 16:81 ——Disclosure and the prohibition of new matter
- § 16:82 ——Assertions of priority under section 119
- § 16:83 ——Assertions of continuation status under section 120
- § 16:84 —Changes in inventorship
- § 16:85 —Mechanisms to prevent expanded prosecution
- § 16:86 —Same invention
- § 16:87 ——Early history
- § 16:88 ——Court decisions prior to 1952
- § 16:89 ——Parker & Whipple Co. v. Yale Clock Co.
- § 16:90 ——U.S. Industrial Chemicals v. Carbide & Carbon Chemicals Corporation
- § 16:91 ——Patent Act of 1952
- § 16:92 ——Court decisions to 1982
- § 16:93 ——Federal Circuit decisions

§ 16:94	— — — <i>In re Hounsfiede</i>
§ 16:95	— — — <i>In re Weiler</i>
§ 16:96	— — — <i>In re Amos</i>
§ 16:97	— — Analysis and recommendation
§ 16:98	— Lack of deceptive intent
§ 16:99	— Error
§ 16:100	— — Historical development
§ 16:101	— — — Early statutory provisions
§ 16:102	— — — 1846–1884; <i>Stimpson v. West Chester R Co.</i>
§ 16:103	— — — 1884–1952; <i>Mahn v. Harwood</i>
§ 16:104	— — — 1952 Patent Act
§ 16:105	— — General definition
§ 16:106	— — — Nonelected subject matter
§ 16:107	— — — Rule against recapture
§ 16:108	Reissue oath

C. LIMITATIONS ON REMEDIES

§ 16:109	Generally
§ 16:110	Time span
§ 16:111	— Treatment of original rights
§ 16:112	— Newly added rights
§ 16:113	— — Starting date of new rights
§ 16:114	— — Expiration date of new rights
§ 16:115	Intervening rights
§ 16:116	— Historical development
§ 16:117	— Calculation on date of reissue grant
§ 16:118	— Application to narrowing claims
§ 16:119	— Implied license as to existing embodiments
§ 16:120	— Potential license to continue other utilization

V. REEXAMINATION

§ 16:121	Generally
§ 16:122	— Overview of reexamination procedures
§ 16:123	— — Ex parte procedures
§ 16:124	— — Inter partes procedures
§ 16:125	— Constitutional questions
§ 16:126	— — Court review, jury trials, and retroactivity
§ 16:127	— — Due process and estoppel
§ 16:128	Substantial new question of patentability
§ 16:129	— “Substantial”
§ 16:130	— “New”
§ 16:131	Stays of parallel proceedings
§ 16:132	Scope of reexamination
§ 16:133	Effect of reexamination
§ 16:134	— Intervening rights

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 16:135 —Estoppel of unsuccessful third-party requester in
inter partes reexamination

Volume 6

PART V. DEFENSES

CHAPTER 17. DEFENSES GENERALLY— NONINFRINGEMENT AND INVALIDITY

- § 17:1 Generally
- § 17:2 Relation of current statute to general pleading theory
- § 17:3 —Prior statutes generally
- § 17:4 —Patent infringement actions and pleading theory
generally
 - § 17:5 ——Defenses in pleading theory generally
 - § 17:6 ——Negation vs. avoidance
 - § 17:7 ——Common-law pleading practices
 - § 17:8 ——Modern federal code pleading
 - § 17:9 —Application to patent statute
 - § 17:10 —Defenses in prior statutes
 - § 17:11 —Section 282
 - § 17:12 —Status of pleading under current statute
 - § 17:13 ——Notice of prior art
 - § 17:14 Noninfringement
 - § 17:15 Invalidity
 - § 17:16 —Presumption of validity
 - § 17:17 ——Burdens of proof
 - § 17:18 ——Standard of proof
 - § 17:19 —Mootness and order of resolution
 - § 17:20 ——General considerations
 - § 17:21 ——Early developments
 - § 17:22 ——Supreme Court decisions
 - § 17:23 ——Subsequent lower-court decisions to 1982
 - § 17:24 ——*Cardinal Chemical Co. v. Morton International, Inc.*
 - § 17:25 Subsequent developments
 - § 17:26 Mootness and order of resolution—Issue preclusion
 - § 17:27 Invalidity—Issue preclusion—Traditional rule
 - § 17:28 Mootness and order of resolution—Issue preclusion—
*Blonder-Tongue Laboratories, Inc. v. University of
Illinois Foundation*
 - § 17:29 ——Facts
 - § 17:30 ——Holding
 - § 17:31 —Full and fair opportunity to litigate
 - § 17:32 —Subsequent developments

- § 17:33 Invalidity—Estoppel by transfer of ownership
- § 17:34 ——Licensee estoppel
- § 17:35 ——Early history
- § 17:36 ——*Lear, Inc. v. Adkins*
- § 17:37 ——Holding
- § 17:38 ——Modern rule
- § 17:39 ——Recovery of royalties paid
- § 17:40 ——Escrow and breach
- § 17:41 ——Prior consent decrees and settlements
- § 17:42 ——Assignee estoppel
- § 17:43 ——Assignor estoppel

CHAPTER 18. MISUSE

- § 18:1 Generally
- § 18:2 Historical development
- § 18:3 —Initial period: onset to 1913
- § 18:4 —Indirect infringement
- § 18:5 ——Initial recognition; *Wallace v. Holmes*
- § 18:6 ——Limitations; *Morgan Envelope Co. v. Albany Perforated Wrapping Paper Co.*
- § 18:7 ——The proliferation of restrictive licensing
- § 18:8 ——Indirect infringement—Patent rights as property
- § 18:9 ——Restrictive covenants in patented inventions
- § 18:10 ——*Heaton-Peninsular Button-Fastener Co. v. Eureka Specialty Co.*
- § 18:11 ——*Henry v. A.B. Dick Co.*
- § 18:12 —Judicial reaction: 1913 to 1952
- § 18:13 ——*Bauer & Cie v. O'Donnell*
- § 18:14 ——*Motion Picture Patents Co. v. Universal Film Mfg. Co.*
- § 18:15 ——*Carbice Corporation of America v. American Patents Development Corporation*
- § 18:16 ——*Mercoid Corp. v. Mid-Continent Inv. Co.*
- § 18:17 —Statutory regulation; 1952 to present
- § 18:18 ——1952 Patent Act; paragraphs 271(b), (c), (d)
- § 18:19 ——Supreme Court decisions to 1982
- § 18:20 ——*Zenith Radio Corp. v. Hazeltine Research, Inc.*
- § 18:21 ——*Dawson Chemical Co. v. Rohm and Haas Co.*
- § 18:22 ——Federal Circuit decisions to 1988
- § 18:23 ——1988 Patent Misuse Reform Act
- § 18:24 ——Subsequent Federal Circuit decisions
- § 18:25 Policy justification
- § 18:26 Specific acts of misuse
- § 18:27 —Refusal of patent owner to participate in the market
- § 18:28 —Suppression
- § 18:29 —Refusal to license

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 18:30	— —Excessive royalties
§ 18:31	— —Discriminatory royalties
§ 18:32	— —Restrictions on licensee's freedom of action
§ 18:33	— —Territorial limitations
§ 18:34	— —Industry or commercial field limitations; prohibited customers
§ 18:35	— —Resale restraints; price fixing
§ 18:36	— —Covenant not to deal in competing goods
§ 18:37	— —Actions required of licensee
§ 18:38	— —Royalty based on unpatented subject matter
§ 18:39	— —Grant-back clauses
§ 18:40	— —Post-expiration royalties
§ 18:41	— —Tying arrangements

CHAPTER 19. DEFENSES: EXPRESS AND IMPLIED LICENSES; EXHAUSTION

§ 19:1	Generally
§ 19:2	Historical development
§ 19:3	— Express licenses
§ 19:4	— Early implied licenses
§ 19:5	— — License to use, based on purchase
§ 19:6	— — License from recovered infringements
§ 19:7	— Subsequent developments
§ 19:8	— — Imposition of implied license in other circumstances
§ 19:9	— — Effect of express limitations by patent owner
§ 19:10	— — — Initial recognition
§ 19:11	— — — Early expansion
§ 19:12	— — — Framing the dispute; <i>Keppell v. Bailey</i>
§ 19:13	— — — Early indecision
§ 19:14	— — — The ascendancy of property
§ 19:15	— — — — <i>Heaton-Peninsular Button-Fastener Co. v. Eureka Specialty Co.</i>
§ 19:16	— — — — <i>Henry v. A.B. Dick Co.</i>
§ 19:17	— — — Reaction: Restrictions on the division of title
§ 19:18	— — — — <i>Miles Medical Co. v. John D. Park & Sons Co.</i>
§ 19:19	— — — — <i>Bauer & Cie v. O'Donnell</i>
§ 19:20	— — — — Supreme Court decisions in 1917
§ 19:21	— — — Subsequent developments
§ 19:22	— — — — Contractual powers limited
§ 19:23	— — — — Extent of limit addressed
§ 19:24	— Federal Circuit decisions
§ 19:25	— Subsequent Supreme Court decisions
§ 19:26	— — <i>Leegin Creative Leather Products, Inc. v. PSKS, Inc.</i>

- § 19:27 — — *Quanta Computer, Inc. v. LG Electronics, Inc.*
- § 19:28 *Bowman v. Monsanto Co.*
- § 19:29 Policy Justification
- § 19:30 — Express versus implied
- § 19:31 — Implied in fact versus implied in law
- § 19:32 — Prohibition Against Restraints on Chattel; Freedom of Contract
- § 19:33 — Actions in patent versus actions in contract
- § 19:34 — Exhaustion and implied-in-law licenses compared
- § 19:35 Express licenses
- § 19:36 Implied licenses
- § 19:37 — Lenses implied in fact
- § 19:38 — Lenses implied in law
- § 19:39 — — First sale doctrine
- § 19:40 — — — “Unrestricted” sales; Effect of contract limitation
- § 19:41 — — — “Embodiments” and range of patents subject to doctrine
- § 19:42 — — Involuntary sales
- § 19:43 — — Repair versus reconstruction
- § 19:44 — — Recovered infringements
- § 19:45 — — Parallel importation and international sales

CHAPTER 20. DEFENSES: SECTION 287(C); MEDICAL AND DIAGNOSTIC PROCEDURES

- § 20:1 Generally
- § 20:2 Historical development
- § 20:3 — Patenting medical technology generally
- § 20:4 — Specific prior examples
- § 20:5 — — *Pallin v. Singer*
- § 20:6 — Proposed responses
- § 20:7 — — H.R. 1127
- § 20:8 — — S. 1334
- § 20:9 — — H.R. 3814
- § 20:10 — — S. 2105
- § 20:11 — — H.R. 3610 and H.R. 4278
- § 20:12 — Public Law 104-208
- § 20:13 — Subsequent developments
- § 20:14 Policy justification
- § 20:15 Basic rule
- § 20:16 Definitions
- § 20:17 — Affected subject matter: medical activity
- § 20:18 — Immunized persons
- § 20:19 — — Medical practitioner
- § 20:20 — — Related health-care entity
- § 20:21 Exceptions

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 20:22 Effective date

**CHAPTER 21. DEFENSES: SECTION 286;
SIX-YEAR LIMITATION**

- § 21:1 Generally
- § 21:2 Historical development
- § 21:3 —Early cases
- § 21:4 —Patent Act of 1870
- § 21:5 —Revised Statutes of 1874
- § 21:6 —*Campbell v. City of Haverhill*
- § 21:7 —Patent Act of 1897
- § 21:8 —Subsequent cases to 1952
- § 21:9 ——*Peters v. Hanger*
- § 21:10 ——*Pollen v. Ford Instrument Co*
- § 21:11 —Patent Act of 1952
- § 21:12 —Court decisions since 1982
- § 21:13 ——*Standard Oil Co. v. Nippon Shokubai Kagaku Kogyo Co.*
- § 21:14 ——*Stucki Co. v. Buckeye Steel Castings Co.*
- § 21:15 ——*Hughes Aircraft Co. v. National Semiconductor Corp.*
- § 21:16 Policy justification
- § 21:17 Basic rule
- § 21:18 Subsidiary Issues
- § 21:19 —Burden of proof
- § 21:20 —Burden of pleading
- § 21:21 —Accrual
- § 21:22 ——Indirect infringers
- § 21:23 —Tolling
- § 21:24 ——Effect of contractual agreements

**CHAPTER 22. DEFENSES: SECTION 273;
PRIOR INVENTOR, PRIOR-USER RIGHTS**

- § 22:1 Generally
- § 22:2 Historical development
- § 22:3 —Prior-user rights generally
- § 22:4 ——Correction to first-to-file
- § 22:5 ——Protectionism
- § 22:6 ——Shelter for trade-secret user
- § 22:7 —Prior-user rights internationally
- § 22:8 ——Prior-user rights and the Paris Convention
- § 22:9 ———Original 1883 text
- § 22:10 ———Subsequent amendments
- § 22:11 ——Prior-user rights and GATT/TRIPs
- § 22:12 ——Prior-user rights and the Patent Law Treaty
- § 22:13 —Prior-user rights in United States

- § 22:14 — —Proposed legislation, 1992–1997
- § 22:15 — —American Inventors Protection Act 1999 and the prior-inventor defense
- § 22:16 — —Case law decisions
- § 22:17 Policy justification
- § 22:18 Basic rule
- § 22:19 Definitions
- § 22:20 —Limitation to business methods
- § 22:21 —Commercial use
- § 22:22 — —Use by non-profit entity
- § 22:23 —Effective filing date
- § 22:24 Scope of defense
- § 22:25 —Limitation to particular uses
- § 22:26 —Extension by exhaustion

CHAPTER 23. DEFENSES: LACHES

- § 23:1 Generally
- § 23:2 Scope of chapter; Forms of laches distinguished
- § 23:3 Historical development
- § 23:4 Law vs. Equity generally
- § 23:5 Historical development—Law vs. Equity generally—
 - Laches vs. Statutes of Limitation
- § 23:6 —Application to actions for patent infringement
- § 23:7 — —Early period
- § 23:8 — — —*Campbell v. City of Haverhill*
- § 23:9 — — —Section 6, Patent Act of 1897
- § 23:10 — — —Court decisions, 1895—1915
- § 23:11 — — —Law and Equity Act of 1915
- § 23:12 — — —Patent Act of 1946
- § 23:13 — — —Patent Act of 1952
- § 23:14 —Application to actions for patent infringement—
 - Federal Circuit decisions
- § 23:15 — — — —*Cornetta v. U.S.*
- § 23:16 — — — —*Aukerman v. Chaides*
- § 23:17 — — — —Facts
- § 23:18 — — — —Initial panel decision
- § 23:19 — — — —*En banc* decision
- § 23:20 — — — —Subsequent decisions
- § 23:21 Policy justification
- § 23:22 General rule
- § 23:23 Special issues
- § 23:24 —Unreasonable delay
- § 23:25 — —Onset of period
- § 23:26 — — —*Wanlass v. General Elec. Co.*
- § 23:27 — — —*Wanlass v. Fedders*
- § 23:28 — — —Subsequent decisions

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 23:29	— — Excuses
§ 23:30	— — — Other litigation
§ 23:31	— — — Insecure title
§ 23:32	— — — Ongoing license negotiations
§ 23:33	— — — Poverty
§ 23:34	— — — Lack of counsel
§ 23:35	— — — Prior minimal infringement
§ 23:36	— Prejudice to defendant
§ 23:37	— — Economic prejudice
§ 23:38	— Unreasonable delay—Evidentiary prejudice
§ 23:39	— Burdens of pleading and proof
§ 23:40	— Six-year presumption
§ 23:41	— Defendant’s unclean hands
§ 23:42	— Effect on remedies
§ 23:43	Developments in the Supreme Court
§ 23:44	— <i>Petrella v. Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer, Inc.</i>
§ 23:45	— <i>SCA Hygiene Products Aktiebolag v. First Quality Baby Products, LLC.</i>

CHAPTER 24. DEFENSES: ESTOPPEL

§ 24:1	Generally
§ 24:2	Scope of chapter
§ 24:3	Estoppel generally
§ 24:4	— Basic definition
§ 24:5	— Early categories of estoppels; estoppels <i>in pais</i>
§ 24:6	— Development of estoppel by conduct and equitable estoppel
§ 24:7	— Elements of equitable estoppel
§ 24:8	Historical development of estoppels as defense to patent infringement
§ 24:9	Historical development of estoppel as defense to patent infringement—Early law; <i>Wyeth v. Stone</i>
§ 24:10	— Example court decisions to 1982
§ 24:11	— <i>Dwight & Lloyd Sintering Co. v. Greenawalt</i>
§ 24:12	— <i>Continental Coatings Corporation v. Metco, Inc.</i>
§ 24:13	— <i>Advanced Hydraulics, Inc. v. Otis Elevator Co</i>
§ 24:14	— Summary
§ 24:15	— Federal Circuit developments
§ 24:16	— Early decisions
§ 24:17	— <i>A.C. Aukerman Co. v. R.L. Chaides Const. Co.</i>
§ 24:18	— Subsequent developments
§ 24:19	Policy justification
§ 24:20	— In general
§ 24:21	— Estoppel vs. laches
§ 24:22	— Estoppel vs. fraud
§ 24:23	Basic rule

- § 24:24 Specific issues
- § 24:25 —Communication from patent owner
- § 24:26 — —Threat, silence, and delay
- § 24:27 — —Other litigation
- § 24:28 —Reliance
- § 24:29 —Material prejudice
- § 24:30 —Proof issues
- § 24:31 —Unclean hands
- § 24:32 —Impact on remedies

Volume 7

Table of Laws and Rules

Table of Cases

Index