

Table of Contents

PART I. ORIGIN OF PATENT CLAIMS

CHAPTER 1. EVOLUTION OF PATENT CLAIMS

- § 1:1 Historical development under the early statutes
- § 1:2 The statute of 1836 first requiring claims
- § 1:3 Central definition versus peripheral definition
- § 1:4 Development of peripheral claiming (1870 to 1952)
- § 1:5 —Infringement and peripheral claim drafting
- § 1:6 —Present practice in claim drafting and interpretation
- § 1:7 —Broadening claims under the central system and narrowing claims under the peripheral system

CHAPTER 2. STATUTORY REQUIREMENTS FOR CLAIMS

- § 2:1 Statutory requirements regarding the form of claims
- § 2:2 Requirements for claims (format)
- § 2:3 —Form of claims should be adapted to the invention to be covered
- § 2:4 — —Tripartite form
- § 2:5 — — —*Preamble*
- § 2:6 — — —Transitional phrase—Words of inclusion and exclusion
- § 2:7 — — — —Interpretation of “comprising,” “including” and “containing”
- § 2:8 — — — —Interpretation of “consisting of” and “composed of”
- § 2:9 — — — —Interpretation of “Consisting essentially of”
- § 2:10 — — —Body of claims
- § 2:11 Phraseology of claims should be in agreement with the specification
- § 2:12 —The statement of invention should be commensurate with the scope of the claims as allowed
- § 2:13 Double inclusion of the same part
- § 2:14 Applicants should not be required to change their terminology unless clearly erroneous as allowed
- § 2:15 General classes of claims

CHAPTER 3. STATUTORY CLASSES OF INVENTIONS

- § 3:1 Constitutional provision
- § 3:2 Statutory classes
- § 3:3 Each claim should indicate the statutory class of inventions to which it relates
- § 3:4 Definition of a process
- § 3:5 Definition of a machine
- § 3:6 Definition of a manufacture
- § 3:7 Definition of a composition of matter
- § 3:8 Definition of an improvement
- § 3:9 An invention may not be patentable in one statutory class but patentable in another class and it is fatal to direct the claims to the former class
- § 3:10 Where the invention may be claimed either as a machine or product on the one hand, or as a process on the other hand, or by both types of claims, the courts have sustained patents for meritorious inventions even though the claims on their face were drawn to the wrong class

PART II. TYPES OF PATENT CLAIMS

CHAPTER 4. MACHINE CLAIMS

- § 4:1 Characteristics of machine claims
- § 4:2 Relationship between machines and processes
- § 4:3 A machine must be claimed as a specific piece of mechanism
- § 4:4 Including the article acted upon by a machine does not impart patentability
- § 4:5 Claims including parts which wear out more rapidly than the rest of the machine (repair vs. reconstruction)
- § 4:6 When material used in the operation of a machine can be made a positive element of the claim
- § 4:7 Generic machine claims
- § 4:8 Combination claims
- § 4:9 Mechanical equivalents covered by machine claims
- § 4:10 The use of terms such as “means,” “mechanism,” and the like, in machine claims

CHAPTER 5. FUNCTION OF A MACHINE

- § 5:1 General aspects of the doctrine of the function of a machine

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 5:2 Processes must be capable of conception apart from any one specific form of apparatus for carrying it out
- § 5:3 —One form of apparatus must be described unless the apparatus necessary would be obvious to one skilled in the art
- § 5:4 —Processes that define the inherent function of a machine may be patentable
- § 5:5 —Cases when a method may not be patentable even though only one form of apparatus is the known for carrying it out
- § 5:6 —When process and apparatus claims are of substantially the same scope, the process claims must be cancelled or held invalid
- § 5:7 —Where one or more steps can be performed manually, the method claim is not unpatentable as the function of a machine
- § 5:8 Process claims should be presented where the invention is primarily in the treatment of a particular article or material
- § 5:9 —Whether apparatus or method claims or both are allowable is often a matter of choice
- § 5:10 Apparatus limitations in process claims
- § 5:11 Patentability of a method claim may be based upon differences in the structural elements in the claim over those of the prior art, when such difference affects the mode of operation
- § 5:12 —Operation of a number of units, each unpatentable per se, in a particular way to produce a new and useful result is properly patentable as a method
- § 5:13 —A mode of operating an old machine or apparatus is patentable if it is non-obvious and is not performed by the old apparatus in its normal and usual operation
- § 5:14 —Usually some structural change is required to enable apparatus to operate in a new way
- § 5:15 —Practice relating to the drafting of claims defining a patentable process and avoiding unpatentable subject matter

CHAPTER 6. PROCESS CLAIMS

- § 6:1 Statutory basis for process claims
- § 6:2 —Historical interpretation given by the courts to the statutory provision for the protection of processes with regard to mechanical process
- § 6:3 —Processes which do not involve transforming or reducing physical matter to a different state or thing
- § 6:4 Chemical processes

- § 6:5 Mechanical processes
- § 6:6 Electrical processes
- § 6:7 Testing and measuring processes
- § 6:8 Mental processes
- § 6:9 Transitional Program for Covered Business Methods
- § 6:10 Negative processes
- § 6:11 Principles, doctrines, and rules relating to processes

CHAPTER 7. NUMBER OF STEPS TO BE INCLUDED IN PROCESS CLAIMS

- § 7:1 General principles regarding completeness of claims applies to processes
- § 7:2 Maximum breadth of process claims with relation to number and definition of steps
- § 7:3 The number of steps must not be reduced to the point at which those remaining do not define any advance in the art or an operative process
- § 7:4 Where the process is old and the improvement consists in using a new reagent a general reference to the type of process and the name of the new reagent are all that need be mentioned in the claim
- § 7:5 Allowability of both process and subprocess claims
- § 7:6 Combination process claims
- § 7:7 —Where result of the conjoint use of the steps is merely the sum of the results of the individual steps, the steps form an aggregation not a patentable combination
- § 7:8 —Process claims reciting an old combination of steps, in which the improvement is in but one of them, are improper

CHAPTER 8. OPERATING CONDITIONS INCLUDING TEMPERATURES, PRESSURES, TIME PERIODS AND THE LIKE IN PROCESS CLAIMS

- § 8:1 Operating conditions need not be defined in the claims where patentability does not depend on differences in such conditions
- § 8:2 It is the function of the specification rather than of the claims to give operating details including limits
- § 8:3 Where the invention involves a novel combination of steps or reacting materials there is no need to give procedural limits in the claims
- § 8:4 Claims not defining operating conditions are construed as covering all operative conditions

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 8:5 One of a number of operating conditions cannot be claimed alone unless the specification indicates that some useful result will be obtained when the other conditions are absent
- § 8:6 Inclusion of precise limits to operating conditions, aids evasion of claims and should be insisted on only where necessary
- § 8:7 —Operating conditions must be recited when necessary to distinguish from the prior art and to define an operative process
- § 8:8 —While a process application is pending, claims should be rejected which do not include the operational features which distinguish the invention from the prior art and which define an operative process
- § 8:9 —Operating conditions other than those necessary to define a patentable and operative invention
- § 8:10 Undue breadth of disclosure versus undue breadth of claims
- § 8:11 Negative definition of operating conditions

CHAPTER 9. PROCESS AND THE MATERIAL TREATED THEREBY

- § 9:1 A process cannot be patented for use on all kinds of material
- § 9:2 A process may generally be patentable although the procedure, except for the material treated or the reagent used in such treatment, is identical with that of a prior process
- § 9:3 Restriction of process to a specific type of material is usually necessary to avoid the claim reading on subsequent independent inventions of others or defining inoperative procedures
- § 9:4 Attitude of courts and the patent office toward process claims broad enough to include inoperative uses
- § 9:5 Where process is applicable to all common members of the class defined in the preamble
- § 9:6 Lack of utility or of inoperativeness of processes and products relating thereto

CHAPTER 10. DEFINITION IN PROCESS CLAIMS

- § 10:1 Class definitions of reacting substances broad enough to include inoperative species
- § 10:2 Functional definition of reagents or materials used in processes

- § 10:3 Various chemical agents, substances or steps entering into a combination claim may be defined functionally
- § 10:4 Where there is doubt as to the composition of a reagent used or material involved in a process, the reagent should be defined by its process of manufacture
- § 10:5 Substitution of one reactant for another in an otherwise old process with reference to the doctrine of exhausted combinations
- § 10:6 When the process consists in causing a novel mixture of two or more substances to react together, it is ordinarily not necessary to specify in the claims the relative proportions of such substances
- § 10:7 Where the proportions are not an essential element in determining patentability, they may be defined functionally
- § 10:8 Where the reacting mixture is old and the invention resides in the discovery of advantages or new proportions between the reacting substances, such new proportions must be set forth in the claims
- § 10:9 “Critical” proportions
- § 10:10 —Where patentability resides in a change of proportions, the new proportions must be “critical.” in the sense of being important as regarding consequences
- § 10:11 —Where proportions must be relied upon to distinguish from the prior art, it is advisable that the specification show that they are critical
- § 10:12 —How far must the limits given in the claim be “critical” in the sense of coinciding with the transition point between the prior art results and those of the patent in suit?

Table of Contents

PART II. TYPES OF PATENT CLAIMS (CONTINUED)

CHAPTER 11. CLAIMS FOR A NEW MANUFACTURE

- § 11:1 Statutory basis
- § 11:2 New articles of commerce do not come within the term manufacture
- § 11:3 Products of nature are not new manufactures
- § 11:4 A product cannot be defined by its use, function, effect or result
- § 11:5 Claims for structural parts capable of use in the construction of a wide variety of machines or articles of manufacture
- § 11:6 Claims for blanks and other partially manufactured parts or articles for the construction of specific articles of manufacture or machines
- § 11:7 An intermediate product which is transitory may be claimed
- § 11:8 Building structures as new manufactures
- § 11:9 Printed matter is not a new manufacture
- § 11:10 Article of manufacture claims considered by courts and by tribunals of the patent office
- § 11:11 Articles of manufacture defined by process or method of making the same

CHAPTER 12. COMPOSITION-OF-MATTER CLAIMS

- § 12:1 Prediction in composition-of-matter cases and its relation to composition claims
- § 12:2 Aggregation and combination in composition-of-matter claims
- § 12:3 Claims to compositions of matter per se
- § 12:4 Definition of compositions by mode of manufacture
- § 12:5 Properties of ingredients upon which utility of the composition depends must be recited in a claim, where such properties are not inherent in all members of the class mentioned
- § 12:6 Definition of compositions as the reaction product of certain specified ingredients and the right to add by

- amendment specific ingredients in view of applicant's original disclosure and state of the art
- § 12:7 Where the invention resides in a novel combination of ingredients, the various ingredients may be defined functionally

CHAPTER 13. COMPOSITION-OF-MATTER CLAIMS WITH RESPECT TO ADDITIONS OF INGREDIENTS NOT ENUMERATED IN THE CLAIMS

- § 13:1 An addition to a patented combination does not avoid infringement is of limited application in composition cases
- § 13:2 In general, additions of and substitutions for ingredients which do not substantially alter, change, modify or destroy the essential properties or characteristics of a substance or composition do not avoid infringement
- § 13:3 The extent to which other ingredients may be added to or substituted for in a composition without modifying, changing, or destroying the properties varies
- § 13:4 Compositions which do not restrict the amount of material which may be added to the ingredients mentioned in the claim may include inoperative compositions
- § 13:5 The rule relating to claims defining compositions for various uses and patentability distinguishing the same over prior products is different from the rule relating to claims defining articles of manufacture made of prior products but limited to nonanalogous use
- § 13:6 Composition claim construction—Words of inclusion and exclusion
- § 13:7 Interpretation of “comprising,” “including,” and “containing”
- § 13:8 Interpretation of “consisting of” and “composed of”
- § 13:9 Interpretation of “consisting essentially of”
- § 13:10 Interpretation of “alloy of”

CHAPTER 14. REFERENCES TO RELATIVE PROPORTIONS OF INGREDIENTS IN COMPOSITION-OF-MATTER CLAIMS WITH RELATION TO PATENTABILITY

- § 14:1 In compositions, proportions are more or less variable

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	and are not fixed as in the case of true chemical compounds
§ 14:2	Fundamental considerations determining whether or not proportions must be given in composition claims
§ 14:3	Proportions and prior art
§ 14:4	Where the combination of ingredients is old and the sole novelty is in new proportions, the new results must be outstanding or “critical” to impart patentability
§ 14:5	Claims to compositions having ingredients and proportions of ingredients falling within the broad disclosures of the prior art
§ 14:6	Claims for narrow ranges of proportions and specific formulas
§ 14:7	That the prior art does not disclose the combination of ingredients does not warrant claims unrestricted as to proportions directly or indirectly
§ 14:8	With most compositions, except alloys, one suitable example of proportions is generally all that is required to meet the patent requirements
§ 14:9	Compositions may be patented for all uses only when limited to specific proportions or narrow ranges of proportions
§ 14:10	Where the combination of ingredients is novel and no proportions are set forth
§ 14:11	The applicant for a patent is not given the benefit of any doubt as to whether the limits within which the proportions of ingredients may be varied are too broad
§ 14:12	Right to add by amendment specific proportions within broad range originally set forth
§ 14:13	Where the real invention has been appropriated, courts are reluctant to hold composition claims invalid for undue breadth
§ 14:14	Where the claim gives no proportions but indicates the intended use of the composition, courts will construe it to cover only such ranges of proportions as are suitable for such use
§ 14:15	Limits inserted for sake of definiteness not for distinguishing from the prior art are not construed strictly as prosecution history estoppels
§ 14:16	Avoidance of claimed combination by use of an additional ingredient partly replacing one of the claimed ingredients or adding to or substituting for one of the claimed ingredients
§ 14:17	Wide departure from elements or ingredients or from range of proportions of elements or ingredients claimed avoids infringement

- § 14:18 The closeness of prior art determines whether small deviations from the claimed proportions avoids infringement
- § 14:19 Variations in proportions of a minor ingredient and infringement
- § 14:20 Infringement of claims setting forth a specific formula
- § 14:21 Failure to disclose the chemical composition range constitutes a lack of written description support

CHAPTER 15. CLAIMS TO SINGLE INGREDIENTS AND SUBCOMBINATIONS OF INGREDIENTS DEFINING COMPOSITIONS OF MATTER

- § 15:1 Claims to a single ingredient or subcombination of ingredients are permissible where such ingredient or subcombination is useful when used alone for the same purpose as the composition as a whole or has a vital and usually dominating function separable from the functions of the other ingredients
- § 15:2 Where neither one of two ingredients is capable of use alone and neither makes a separable contribution to the desired useful result, both ingredients must be included in the claim
- § 15:3 Applicant should lay a foundation in the specification for subcombination composition claims
- § 15:4 It is not always essential that the specification state that the elements enumerated in the claim may be used without the other ingredients mentioned in the specification

CHAPTER 16. CLAIMS FOR NEW CHEMICAL COMPOUNDS

- § 16:1 Compositions, chemical compounds, and articles of manufacture
- § 16:2 Discovery of a new chemical compound does not give the right to claim all compounds made of the same elements irrespective of proportions and mode of combination
- § 16:3 Misconception of the composition of the new compound may be fatal
- § 16:4 Definition of a new organic compound solely by percentages of component elements or by its empirical formula
- § 16:5 Definition of a new organic compound by an empirical formula plus an identifying characteristic

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 16:6 Definition of a new compound by its process of manufacture
- § 16:7 Claims for substances, products, or compounds isolated for first time from admixture with other materials with which they occur especially in nature
- § 16:8 Equivalents of new chemical compounds
- § 16:9 Prediction of characteristics in organic chemistry
- § 16:10 Essential and non-essential radicals or groups of atoms in organic compounds
- § 16:11 Claims for portions only of chemical compounds
- § 16:12 Claims directed to a dominant group in a series of organic compounds

CHAPTER 17. PRODUCT CLAIMS WITH PROCESS LIMITATIONS

- § 17:1 Restrictions on claims of products by their process of manufacture
- § 17:2 A product may be defined by its method of manufacture when there is no other satisfactory way of defining the invention
- § 17:3 Inability to determine chemical composition of a substance is ground for permitting claims in terms of its process of manufacture
- § 17:4 Claims for the reaction product of two or more specified substances
- § 17:5 Where the product is distinguished from prior art products by the presence, absence or variation in amount of small quantities of constituents of unknown composition, the product may be defined by its process of manufacture
- § 17:6 Heat and/or pressure treatment of a product often gives rise to valuable changes in chemical composition or physical characteristics which are difficult, if not impossible, to define satisfactorily without reference to the process
- § 17:7 References to process of making a product are permissible where the physical and/or chemical characteristics resulting from such process are well understood
- § 17:8 The process must produce characteristics vital to the invention to warrant the product being claimed as produced by such process
- § 17:9 To permit a claim to be made to a new product as produced by a specified process, the functional differences between the new product and those of the prior art must be definite and substantial

- § 17:10 Claims to a product defined by its process of manufacture should, where possible, be allowed in addition to process claims
- § 17:11 A claim cannot be made for a product produced by a specified process when the product so produced was already known as having been made by another process
- § 17:12 A claim to a product produced by a specified process is not infringed by the same product made by a different process

CHAPTER 18. NEW USE OF A KNOWN PROCESS, MACHINE, MANUFACTURE, COMPOSITION OF MATTER, OR MATERIAL

- § 18:1 Patentability of new uses
- § 18:2 Doctrine that a patentee is entitled to every use of which the invention is susceptible is well established as well as that a new use must be unobvious to be patentable
- § 18:3 New uses of processes, machines, manufactures, compositions of matter or materials old per se may be protected by claims in process form
- § 18:4 Patents may be granted for certain new uses, but there must be novelty, utility and non-obviousness to validate a claim for a new use of a known process, machine, manufacture, composition of matter or material
- § 18:5 A new use should imply the solution of a different problem from the old use, especially a new use coupled with minor changes in form to impart patentability
- § 18:6 Where a new chemical substance or composition of matter possesses utility for one particular use, it may be patented for all uses
- § 18:7 Where a new use is analogous to an old use, changes in composition, form or structure will usually not suffice to avoid anticipation
- § 18:8 Protecting a new use by claims including some of the old elements constituting the setting for the new use
- § 18:9 New uses of old compounds are not patentable where such compounds are adjacent homologues of known substances with known similar uses
- § 18:10 New use and the Supreme Court
- § 18:11 New use and the courts of appeals
- § 18:12 New use and the Patent Office

Table of Contents

PART III. DRAFTING OF CLAIMS

CHAPTER 19. GENERAL PRINCIPLES UNDERLYING THE DRAFTING OF UNITED STATES CLAIMS TO SECURE ADEQUATE PROTECTION

- § 19:1 Claims must be drafted to conform to and be in harmony with statutory requirements
- § 19:2 Claims measure the invention
- § 19:3 Claims fulfill a purpose in the patent system
- § 19:4 United States type of claim and rules of interpretation require a plurality of claims to give adequate protection
- § 19:5 The broadest claims in a patent should define the boundary line of what is patentable
- § 19:6 The boundary line between patentable and unpatentable inventions depends on a number of factors besides individual idiosyncrasies
- § 19:7 Claims should be cast in as many different statutory classes as possible
- § 19:8 —Where possible, process claims should be made in addition to machine claims
- § 19:9 —Claims directed to two statutory classes of invention permissible where there is doubt as to which class the invention properly belongs
- § 19:10 Number of claims required to protect an invention properly
- § 19:11 —Graduated series of claims should be prosecuted to avoid possible anticipation by later discovered prior art
- § 19:12 In cases of doubt as to whether a claim is patentable or not, the Patent Office no longer gives the applicant the benefit of the doubt
- § 19:13 —Prior rule giving inventor the benefit of doubt as to patentability does not apply to Federal Circuit
- § 19:14 —The weight placed by the courts on commercial success in determining patentability
- § 19:15 —The weight placed by the courts on other secondary considerations

CHAPTER 20. HYBRID CLAIMS

- § 20:1 The general rule is that claims should relate to only one class
- § 20:2 Possible permutations and combinations of the statutory classes
- § 20:3 Combination 1. process and apparatus
- § 20:4 Combination 2. process and manufacture
- § 20:5 Combination 3. process and composition
- § 20:6 Combination 4. apparatus and manufacture
- § 20:7 Combination 5. apparatus and composition
- § 20:8 Combination 6. manufacture and composition
- § 20:9 Apparatus limitations in product claims are not allowed

CHAPTER 21. BROAD AND NARROW CLAIMS AND THEIR RELATIONSHIP

- § 21:1 Analysis of United States type of claim and comparison with British type of claim
- § 21:2 Broad claims: types
- § 21:3 Narrow claims: definition
- § 21:4 Dependent claims
- § 21:5 —Dependent claims: comparison with subsidiary claims
- § 21:6 —Multiple dependent claims
- § 21:7 Dependent claims: rejection of supporting claim no basis for rejection of dependent claim
- § 21:8 Dependent claims: situation caused by invalidation by court decree of supporting claim even though combined subject matter of dependent claim and supporting claim may be patentable
- § 21:9 Formulation of claims on the basis of theoretical combinations and permutations

CHAPTER 22. COMBINATIONS

- § 22:1 Meaning of terms “combination” and “aggregation”
- § 22:2 Exhausted combinations
- § 22:3 —The effect of definiteness on combination claims
- § 22:4 Combinations and the effect of *Black Rock* and *Sakraida*
- § 22:5 The Patent Office should not insist on claims to the combination instead of to the improved element or the subcombination
- § 22:6 A claim to the combination should be allowed where an element or subcombination claim might be

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- unpatentable as lacking a feature necessary to define an invention
- § 22:7 Where the other elements of the combination form the natural setting for the element or subcombination improved there is little objection to redefine the old combination with the substitution of the improved element or subcombination
- § 22:8 Where prior art discloses the desirability of the combination without showing how it can be produced, a claim cannot be made for the same old combination but a claim can be made for the new operative combination

CHAPTER 23. CLAIM PREAMBLES OR INTRODUCTORY CLAUSES WITH RELATION TO PATENTABILITY

- § 23:1 Function or purpose of preambles to claims
- § 23:2 Circumstances under which the preamble or other introductory statement may be omitted partially or entirely
- § 23:3 Whenever a preamble implies a change in composition, form or arrangement of parts it is a limitation regardless of whether it is sufficient to render the claim patentable or not
- § 23:4 The preamble as a limitation
- § 23:5 The field to which the invention is applicable as defined by the preamble should not be broader than the invention
- § 23:6 “Label” claims for products
- § 23:7 All references in claims to use of a product are not necessarily limitations
- § 23:8 Preamble may be used to distinguish between non-analogous applications of a process

CHAPTER 24. CLAIM PREAMBLES WITH RELATION TO INFRINGEMENT

- § 24:1 A patentee is entitled to every use of which the invention is susceptible whether such use be known or unknown to him
- § 24:2 —Interpretation of the Phrase “A Patentee is Entitled”
- § 24:3 Interpretation of phrase “Every use of . . . His Invention”
- § 24:4 Distinction between unknown advantages for the use specified by the patentee and unknown capabilities for other uses than those specified by the patentee

- § 24:5 Where the patentee is compelled to restrict the field of use to secure the patent anything outside of such field is not an infringement
- § 24:6 Where a patentee voluntarily and intentionally limits the claims to a specific field of use of the invention, other uses outside of such limits involving at least some change of composition, form, or structure do not infringe
- § 24:7 Trend of decisions is to hold that an article outside of the preamble is not an infringement
- § 24:8 Where a patentee by the preamble of the claim limits its field unnecessarily and unintentionally analogous uses outside of such field may in some instances be held to infringe
- § 24:9 Unless the preamble specifically includes old elements, the latter are not a part of the claims so far as direct versus contributory infringement is concerned
- § 24:10 Where the preamble specifically includes old elements, the latter are part of the claims so far as direct versus contributory infringement is concerned

CHAPTER 25. SELECTION AND DEFINITION OF TERMS USED IN CLAIMS

I. SELECTION OF TERMS

- § 25:1 Proper claim drafting requires knowledge of essential and nonessential features of the invention
- § 25:2 Selection of terms broad enough to secure the fullest possible protection of the invention
- § 25:3 Definition of terms by patentee
- § 25:4 —The ordinary meaning of terms should not be extended wholly arbitrarily by definition in the specification
- § 25:5 —Where a term is open to a range of interpretation, the exact meaning to be given it for the purpose of the patent may and often should be defined in the specification

II. DEFINITION OF TERMS

- § 25:6 Definitions of terms must be given where omission would render claim indefinite
- § 25:7 Patentees may use coined words provided these are defined in the specification
- § 25:8 Where a patentee in the specification gives a specific meaning to an old term, that definition is used

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 25:9 Effect of use of terms broad enough to cover inoperative constructions or materials
- § 25:10 Specific definitions are not necessary where the meaning can be deduced from the proposed function of the element, ingredient, or process
- § 25:11 Extent to which claim elements may be defined as “means” followed by function or “member” qualified by essential structural feature
- § 25:12 “Adapted,” “arranged,” or “constructed” so as to perform a specified function or operate in a particular manner
- § 25:13 Indefinite terms in composition patents
- § 25:14 Technical definitions and distinctions which clearly have no relation to the line of division required by the nature of the invention are not controlling
- § 25:15 Trademarks and trade names associated with products of unknown composition and manufacture must not be used in specifications and claims

CHAPTER 26. CLASS DEFINITIONS IN CHEMICAL CASES

I. GENERAL RULES FOR DEFINITIONS

- § 26:1 The rules applied to chemical and mechanical inventions
- § 26:2 In mechanical cases broad claims may be based on a single species but that is rarely true of chemical cases
- § 26:3 Where physical rather than chemical properties are involved, the requirements for enumeration of several suitable species is relaxed
- § 26:4 Claims to a class may be based on one example where chemical equivalency of the class as a whole is clear
- § 26:5 Where invention resides in combined use of a plurality of chemicals of different types, it is not necessary to submit proof of utility of all members
- § 26:6 Where the discovery is a characteristic of a material the inventor may be entitled to claim all substances having such characteristics
- § 26:7 Disclosure of several species may be required where the genus comprises species having widely different characteristics
- § 26:8 Usual mode of demonstrating the right to claim the genus is to insert in the application as filed representative examples of the genus

- § 26:9 To warrant broad claims to an entire class the examples given in the specification should be reasonably representative of all subdivisions of the class
- § 26:10 Claims to individual members of a class in addition to claims to the class as a whole
- § 26:11 In chemical cases claims cannot validly be made for all members of a class having a certain desired property
- § 26:12 A specific disclosure and claim cannot be later broadened to cover the entire genus
- § 26:13 The disclosure of a species in a reference will anticipate a claim to a genus

II. OPERATIVENESS OF CHEMICAL CLAIMS

- § 26:14 Evidence of operativeness of class as a whole
- § 26:15 —What portion of a class must be operative to warrant a claim to the class as a whole
- § 26:16 —Effect of availability of the operative and inoperative members of the class on claims to the entire class
- § 26:17 —Class definitions which include inoperative species may be valid where any skilled chemist can recognize which species are operative
- § 26:18 —Operativeness of entire genus is relaxed where the generic term applies to a feature collateral to the main feature on which patentability is predicated
- § 26:19 —The relaxation of the rule requiring operativeness of a class in the case of secondary features may be extended to the component parts of a chemical compound
- § 26:20 Where the novelty is chiefly in the steps of a process rather than in the chemicals used in such process the ban against terms broad enough to include inoperative species is relaxed
- § 26:21 Equitable considerations are fundamental in deciding whether an inventor is entitled to broad claims to a class where part only of the members of the class is operative
- § 26:22 Applicant has the right after filing his application to supply evidence that the class in general is operative
- § 26:23 Where priority of invention is involved, the party who first tests the utility of the class as a whole is the first inventor
- § 26:24 Nomenclature used in connection with claims

CHAPTER 27. FUNCTIONAL EXPRESSIONS

I. PURPOSE AND USE OF FUNCTIONAL CLAIMS (MEANS CLAIMS)

- § 27:1 Origin and purpose of functional expressions
- § 27:2 Functional claims
- § 27:3 Types of functional statements
- § 27:4 A claim covering all means for arriving at the desired result is invalid
- § 27:5 —A chemical product may not be defined solely by its functional suitability for its designated use
- § 27:6 —Validity of claims covering in terms all materials having certain characteristics
- § 27:7 —Subsidiary elements may be defined functionally
- § 27:8 —Elements old per se constituting the setting for the novel elements may be defined functionally
- § 27:9 —Elements of a novel combination may be defined purely functionally
- § 27:10 — —Where the invention consists in the use of a combination of substances, each substance may be defined functionally
- § 27:11 —Extent to which a functional definition must be limited structurally or operationally to avoid the claim being held invalid as functional
- § 27:12 Functional limitations defining the relative size of the parts of a machine or proportions of ingredients of a composition are usually not objected to
- § 27:13 —Effect of degree of experimentation required to determine scope of such functional limitation

II. EFFECT OF “WHEREBY CLAUSES”

- § 27:14 The function set forth in a whereby clause adds nothing to patentability
- § 27:15 —Language of the claim should make it clear whether the functional statement is intended to limit the structure
- § 27:16 —Doubt as to whether the inclusion of a functional statement in a claim should be construed as a limitation on structure
- § 27:17 The addition of a functional statement does not avoid anticipation
- § 27:18 —A claim must include sufficient structure to effect the function expressed in the claim

CHAPTER 28. CLAIMS WITH NEGATIVE LIMITATIONS

- § 28:1 Defining something by what it is not usually results in including much that is outside of the real invention
- § 28:2 Classes of materials defined in part by characteristics expressed negatively
- § 28:3 Claims for something minus something
- § 28:4 —Where claims to something minus something have been rejected, it has usually been for lack of patentability not for improper form of claim
- § 28:5 —Claims calling for something minus something are more difficult to avoid than claims restricted to the remaining elements and no others
- § 28:6 Negative limitations cannot be inserted to avoid the prior art when there is no patentable difference between what remains and the prior art
- § 28:7 Use of negative limitations to avoid double patenting
- § 28:8 A claim cannot be predicated solely on the absence of a functional defect
- § 28:9 Claims for holes, spaces, and other intangible elements

CHAPTER 29. ALTERNATIVES

- § 29:1 Basic reasons for objecting to claims in the alternative
- § 29:2 Reasons for restricting each patent to one invention
- § 29:3 —The test of unity of invention is whether all the claims relate to the same subject of invention
- § 29:4 The false assumption that any use of the word “or” is improper
- § 29:5 A claim is objectionable as alternative where it covers two separate inventions, such as structures, processes, or compositions
- § 29:6 —Employment of alternatives to give a class definition broader than any existing term
- § 29:7 Phrases such as “or the like,” “or its equivalent” in describing the elements of a claim
- § 29:8 —There is no objection to alternative expressions in claim preambles
- § 29:9 Claims covering variable numbers of identical elements
- § 29:10 Claims covering a machine or composition with or without a specified element or ingredient

Table of Contents

PART III. DRAFTING OF CLAIMS (CONTINUED)

CHAPTER 30. INDEFINITENESS

I. GENERAL RULES FOR DETERMINING INDEFINITENESS

- § 30:1 Reasons why claims are required to be definite
- § 30:2 Test of definiteness is whether the claim is definite to those skilled in the art
- § 30:3 Indefiniteness in claims as distinguished from indefiniteness in specification
- § 30:4 Breadth of claim not to be confused with indefiniteness
- § 30:5 Claims are definite if, in the light of the specification, they teach the invention
- § 30:6 One indefinite clause in claim renders the whole claim indefinite
- § 30:7 Types of situations where claims may be objected to as indefinite
- § 30:8 Functional claims are frequently objected to as indefinite
- § 30:9 Omission of an essential element or step
- § 30:10 Circumstances under which elements or steps may be implied
- § 30:11 Undue multiplication of claims is objectionable
- § 30:12 Ambiguity as to antecedents of terms used in claims
- § 30:13 All essential elements or steps must be claimed positively, except where the elements or steps merely constitute the “setting” for the invention
- § 30:14 Uncertainty as to the relative proportions of reacting materials
- § 30:15 Where the prior art is close, claim must be more definite
- § 30:16 Claims comparing a characteristic with a “standard,” “ordinary,” or other value which is not definitely fixed or determinable are indefinite
- § 30:17 Uncertainty as to the relation of the elements or steps claimed to each other and/or to old elements or steps by which the desired result is effected

II. APPLICATION OF THE RULES TO TERMS AND PHRASES

- § 30:18 Limitations such as “high” and “small” with respect to indefiniteness
- § 30:19 The terms “substantial” and “substantially”
- § 30:20 The phrase “substantially as described”
- § 30:21 The phrase “for the purpose set forth”
- § 30:22 The use of various phrases, expressions, and terms in claims
- § 30:23 The use of letters or numerals in claims
- § 30:24 The use of vague names for parts or materials
- § 30:25 Definiteness is essential in claims

CHAPTER 31. MARKUSH CLAIMS

- § 31:1 Generic and subgeneric terms in relation to the ban against claims in alternative form
- § 31:2 A Markush claim should be used only where no other type will give adequate protection
- § 31:3 Coined terms used in the Markush type of claims not permitted in other than chemical cases
- § 31:4 Terminology required in Markush claims
- § 31:5 Rules regarding adequate basis for single generic terms apply to each generic term used in a Markush type of claim
- § 31:6 Community of chemical or physical characteristics among the substances enumerated to warrant their inclusion in a Markush group
- § 31:7 Markush expression or grouping must be suggested by the discovery of the utility of the other substances included in such expression or grouping
- § 31:8 Structural and functional relationships, not patent office classification, determine whether the Markush grouping is proper or not
- § 31:9 Substances within Markush grouping must be distinguished in characteristics from analogous substances outside of such grouping
- § 31:10 Generic and subgeneric Markush type claims
- § 31:11 Markush claims of varying or diminishing scope

CHAPTER 32. JEPSON CLAIMS

- § 32:1 The Jepson doctrine
- § 32:2 Authorities cited to support the Jepson doctrine
- § 32:3 Jepson type claims and the Patent Office
- § 32:4 Jepson claims in the Federal Circuit and its predecessor court

TABLE OF CONTENTS

§ 32:5 Jepson claims and the courts

CHAPTER 33. COMPLETENESS OF CLAIMS

- § 33:1 General considerations
- § 33:2 Cataloging elements without reference to their mutual cooperation renders claim objectionable as broader than the invention
- § 33:3 Mere omission of function or mode of operation from the claim does not mean that it is infringed by the same elements operating in a different way
- § 33:4 Claim should not specify the advantages to be derived from the use of the invention
- § 33:5 Claims are not rendered unpatentable due to the omission of something which can be easily supplied by one skilled in the art or which is unessential
- § 33:6 Claims should be sufficiently specific to give a conception of the invention
- § 33:7 Incorporation into claims of sufficient structure qualified by functional statement may make combination complete
- § 33:8 Limiting functional phrases versus explanatory functional phrases
- § 33:9 Principal types of cooperative structural relationships which may or should be inserted in claims
- § 33:10 Necessary connections between the component elements
- § 33:11 Relative movements between the component parts
- § 33:12 Relative dimensions and shapes of parts

CHAPTER 34. MULTIPLICITY OF CLAIMS

- § 34:1 There is no prohibition against a multiplicity of claims
- § 34:2 Attitude of the courts toward redundant claims
- § 34:3 Every additional claim must lessen the chance of invalidation or make it more difficult to avoid infringement
- § 34:4 The number of claims permissible depends on how many individually distinct ways the invention or inventions can be claimed
- § 34:5 Each claim must be patentably different from every other claim
- § 34:6 Where two claims are not substantially the same, both are allowable provided there is no undue multiplication of claims and each of the two claims separately considered is patentable
- § 34:7 Burden on the applicant to point out how all claims differ from each other

- § 34:8 Claims differing in words but not in substance are objectionable
- § 34:9 Uncertainty as to the best way of defining an invention some approximation to duplication of claims as to subject matter may be permitted
- § 34:10 Limitation of a claim to a compound to a particular use does not produce a materially different claim except where the statement of use implies a specific form or structure
- § 34:11 Claims differentiated only by the preamble
- § 34:12 Right to add a claim differing from another by defining one element more specifically either as to form or composition
- § 34:13 Structural differences which cannot import anything patentable cannot be relied upon to distinguish claims from each other
- § 34:14 Claims differentiated from other claims solely by the addition of a functional statement
- § 34:15 An excessive number of claims tends to reduce rather than to broaden the scope of the patent
- § 34:16 The maximum number of claims is determined by what is reasonably necessary to define the invention rather than by what is mathematically possible
- § 34:17 Recent practice relating to duplicate claims and multiplicity of claims

CHAPTER 35. MINIMUM NUMBER OF ELEMENTS PERMISSIBLE IN CLAIMS

- § 35:1 The fewer the elements in a claim the broader its scope does not apply where reducing the number of elements requires those retained to be defined more narrowly
- § 35:2 Reducing the number of elements as far as possible
- § 35:3 Article claimed need not be operative of itself
- § 35:4 A claim may be invalid which is in such broad terms that it fails to set forth a patentable invention
- § 35:5 Elements recited in a claim need not equal or exceed those required to completely define the particular invention
- § 35:6 The number of elements specified in a claim must not be reduced to the point where the claim does not define and constitute an advance in the art
- § 35:7 A subcombination mechanical claim is valid where the elements enumerated therein have utility without the additional elements included in the claim to the entire combination

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 35:8 A claim is not objectionable for lack of completeness where the omitted element of the structure is not absolutely necessary
- § 35:9 A part referred to for the purpose of defining the position of other parts should be made a positive element of the claims
- § 35:10 Subcombinations having no separate functional use may be claimed
- § 35:11 Where there is doubt as to whether an element may be claimed alone or only in conjunction with associated old elements, the doubt should be resolved in applicant's favor
- § 35:12 Precision desirable in claims reciting minimum number of elements and in the inclusion of a minimum number of claims in a patent

CHAPTER 36. MAXIMUM NUMBER OF ELEMENTS PERMISSIBLE IN CLAIMS AND MAXIMUM NUMBER OF CLAIMS TO BE INCORPORATED IN A PATENT

- § 36:1 The claims should be limited to the improvement and should not cover the entire machine plus the improvement
- § 36:2 Right to add a claim differing from another by the addition of an extra element
- § 36:3 Where practicable, the specification should set out how each additional element cooperates with other elements of the novel combination
- § 36:4 A claim differing from another claim solely by the addition of an old element is justified only where there is a possibility that it might be sustained at the same time that the first claim was held invalid
- § 36:5 Inclusion of old elements to indicate the "setting" for the invention and to restrict the use of the new elements to operative forms of construction
- § 36:6 Where the number of doubtful claims is small, considerable latitude is permitted in allowing claims differing from others by the inclusion of features old per se
- § 36:7 Maximum number of claims in a patent and maximum number of elements in a claim depend on the patent statute, the rules of practice, and the court decisions

PART IV. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION

CHAPTER 37. GENERAL RULES FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF CLAIMS

- § 37:1 In general, the rules applicable to the interpretation of contracts apply also to the construction of claims
- § 37:2 While an application is pending, claim will be given the broadest interpretation of which they are reasonably capable
- § 37:3 “Back-firing” expressions
- § 37:4 “Substantially as described”
- § 37:5 Where terms are indefinite, the specification is resorted to for elucidation
- § 37:6 Claims may be held invalid for uncertainty as to how they are to be read on the structure described in the specification
- § 37:7 —Indefiniteness or ambiguity should be remedied while an application is pending
- § 37:8 Use of dictionary definitions for determining the meaning of terms used in claims
- § 37:9 Modification of generally accepted meaning of terms by definition in specification express or implied
- § 37:10 Each claim is for a complete and independent invention requires that claims are differentiated by interpretation where possible
- § 37:11 Application of doctrine of equivalents to claim interpretation
- § 37:12 Scope of conception of invention given in specification assists in determining the scope to be given the claims
- § 37:13 Prosecution history estoppel
- § 37:14 —Changes in phraseology and not in substance are not construed as file-wrapper limitations
- § 37:15 Limiting effect of arguments made by applicant during the prosecution of his application

CHAPTER 38. EXPANSION OF THE PATENTED CLAIMS BEYOND THEIR LITERAL MEANING

I. EXPANSION IN GENERAL

- § 38:1 Circumstance where claims may be expanded beyond their literal meaning
- § 38:2 Government accepts some responsibility if claims are

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- too broad but none if claims are narrower than they might have been
- § 38:3 Prior to issuance of patent, claims may be expanded so long as the changes do not expand the invention beyond the disclosures in the original application
- § 38:4 Where an inventor accepts a patent claiming only part of an invention, the inventor is presumed to have abandoned the residue to the public

II. EXPANSION OF CLAIMS BY REISSUE

- § 38:5 Broadening of claims by elimination of specified elements can be accomplished only by reissue
- § 38:6 Recapture of dedicated matter by a broadening reissue
- § 38:7 —Application of the recapture rule
- § 38:8 Prosecution history estoppel may not apply where allowed claims are voluntarily withdrawn
- § 38:9 —Reinstatement by reissue of allowable claims inadvertently cancelled
- § 38:10 —Intervening rights and broadened reissues
- § 38:11 —The broad claims sought to be added by reissue must have a broad basis in the original specification

III. EXPANSION OF CLAIMS BY THE DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS

- § 38:12 Claims cannot be extended by court interpretation by the application of the doctrine of equivalents
- § 38:13 Exceptions to the general rule that claims cannot be extended by the application of the doctrine of equivalents
- § 38:14 Terms selected unintentionally and unnecessarily limited in scope broadens interpretation
- § 38:15 Where description of element in claim is specific and intentional, the claim cannot be interpreted as if the description of such element had been generic
- § 38:16 Use of “may” in specification cannot enlarge claims beyond the scope of the positive disclosures therein
- § 38:17 Substantial correspondence in form and geometrical arrangement
- § 38:18 Change in position of parts, reversal of movement of mechanical parts or the like which change does not affect the operation of the apparatus as a whole
- § 38:19 Infringement is not avoided by multiplication or unification of elements or parts or by making separate parts integral or vice versa where such feature is no part of the real invention

- § 38:20 Change of sequence of the steps of a process as claimed without loss of function or result does not avoid infringement
- § 38:21 Change in proportion of ingredients of a composition or in chemical nature of an ingredient, which does not affect the operation or function of the composition as a whole, will usually not avoid infringement
- § 38:22 Circumstances under which a claim specific to one substance has been held infringed by the use of another substance
- § 38:23 Infringement where an immaterial element or step of the claim has been omitted without substituting an equivalent
- § 38:24 Infringement is not avoided by the addition of an element, part, ingredient, or step to those specified in a claim

CHAPTER 39. CONTRACTION OF THE CLAIMS OF AN ISSUED PATENT WITHIN THEIR LITERAL TERMS

- § 39:1 Reasons for the necessity for contracting the field covered by the claims
- § 39:2 During prosecution of an application, all limitations relied upon for patentability must be set out in the claim and not read into the claim by interpretation
- § 39:3 Limitations will not be read into claims to avoid declaration of an interference
- § 39:4 Methods by which the field covered by the claims of an issued patent may be contracted within its literal terms
- § 39:5 Comparison of the reissue and disclaimer statutes

CHAPTER 40. LIMITATION OF CLAIMS BY COURT INTERPRETATION

I. GENERAL RULES OF CLAIM INTERPRETATION

- § 40:1 Limitation by court interpretation versus limitation by reissue or disclaimer
- § 40:2 Claims will not be narrowed by court construction when it is clear they were intentionally drawn broadly
- § 40:3 A claim to a product cannot be restricted by interpretation to a product made by a certain process
- § 40:4 Intention to have the claims construed broadly may be inferred

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- § 40:5 Claim differentiation
- § 40:6 Limitations which appear only in the drawings cannot be read into the claims

II. RULES RELATING TO NARROWING OF CLAIMS BY CONSTRUCTION

- § 40:7 A claim will be construed narrowly to maintain its validity
- § 40:8 Situations in which claims may be narrowed by interpretation
- § 40:9 Preambles in claims require interpretation and might involve limitation
- § 40:10 Narrowing of claims by addition of elements cannot be accomplished by court interpretation
- § 40:11 An element may be read into a claim where such element must be implied to enable the claim to function as described
- § 40:12 An omitted function set out in the specification will be read into the claims when necessary to restrict them to the real invention
- § 40:13 Partial unintentional operation in accordance with the terms of a patent
- § 40:14 Where an element of the claim has to have a specific form to perform the function specified in the claim, the claim may be restricted to such form
- § 40:15 Size and similar limitations may be read into claims
- § 40:16 Protection is available only for that which has been invented and substantial equivalents thereof, no matter what the breadth of the terms
- § 40:17 Requirements for a subsequent independent invention by another

III. RULES RELATING TO DETERMINING THE SCOPE OF THE REAL INVENTION

- § 40:18 Paper patents are strictly construed with respect to subsequent invention coming within the terms of the claims
- § 40:19 When defendant has appropriated the real invention, courts often consider whether the claims are broader than the invention as a moot point
- § 40:20 Claims broad enough to cover all means of securing a result are either held invalid or limited by interpretation
- § 40:21 Unless there is equivalency of operation, there is no infringement even though the claim is infringed in terms

- § 40:22 —Requirement that infringing device must operate in substantially the same way as the patent does not mean that it must operate in the same way in all respects
- § 40:23 —If the mode of operation of a process is different, there is no infringement although to a minor extent the operation may be that of the patent
- § 40:24 A claim for one mode of arriving at a result is not unduly broad because no other modes are known
- § 40:25 Interpretation of claims defining pioneer inventions and secondary inventions and the interpretation of a claim associated with other claims
- § 40:26 Even in interferences, broad terms extending the literal scope of the claims beyond the real invention are not given their broadest interpretation

Table of Cases

Index