

Index

2023

ABS Global, Inc. v. Cytonome/St, LLC, **1:381**
Actelion Pharmaceuticals LTD v. Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc., **1:382**
Allgenesis Biotherapeutics Inc. v. Cloudbreak Therapeutics, LLC, **1:383**
AlterWAN, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc., **1:384**
Amgen Inc. v. Sandoz Inc., **1:385**
Apple Inc. v. Corephotonics, Ltd., **1:386**
Apple Inc. v. Vidal, **1:387**
Arbutus Biopharma Corporation v. ModernaTX, Inc., **1:388**
Axonics, Inc. v. Medtronic, Inc., **1:389**; **1:390**
Baxalta Incorporated v. Genentech, Inc., **2:203**
Blue Gentian, LLC v. Tristar Products, Inc., **2:204**
Bot M8 LLC v. Sony Interactive Entertainment LLC, **2:205**
ChromaDex, Inc. v. Elysium Health, Inc., **3:245**
Columbia Sportswear North America, Inc. v. Seirus Innovative Accessories, Inc., **3:246**
Corephotonics, Ltd. v. Apple Inc., **3:247**
Cyntec Company, Ltd. v. Chilisyn Electronics Corp., **3:248**
CyWee Group Ltd. v. Google LLC, **3:249**
Elekta Limited v. ZAP Surgical Systems, Inc., **5:156**
Finjan LLC v. SonicWall, Inc., **6:108**
FS.com Inc. v. International Trade Commission, **6:109**
H. Lundbeck A/S v. Lupin Ltd., **8:166**
Hawk Technology Systems, LLC v. Castle Retail, LLC, **8:167**
Hip, Inc. v. Hormel Foods Corporation, **8:168**
Incept LLC v. Palette Life Sciences, Inc., **9:522**

2023—Cont'd

Inguran, LLC v. ABS Global, Inc., **9:523**
In re: Collect, LLC, **9:516**
In re Couvaras, **9:517**
In re Float 'N' Grill LLC, **9:518**
In re Google LLC, **9:519**
In re PersonalWeb Technologies LLC, **9:520**
In re Stingray IP Solutions, LLC, **9:521**
Intel Corporation v. PACT XPP Schweiz AG, **9:524**
Ironburg Inventions Ltd. v. Valve Corporation, **9:525**
K-fee System GmbH v. Nespresso USA, Inc., **11:91**
Malvern Panalytical Inc. v. TA Instruments-Waters LLC, **13:254**
Medtronic, Inc. v. Teleflex Innovations S.a.r.l., **13:255**; **13:256**
Medtronic, Inc. v. Teleflex Life Sciences Limited, **13:257**
Medytox, Inc. v. Galderma S.A., **13:258**
Minerva Surgical, Inc. v. Hologic, Inc., **13:259**
Netflix, Inc. v. DivX, LLC, **14:109**; **14:110**
Parkervision, Inc. v. Vidal, **16:188**
Parus Holdings, Inc. v. Google LLC, **16:189**
Personalized Media Communications, LLC v. Apple Inc., **16:190**
Philip Morris Products S.A. v. International Trade Commission, **16:191**
Purdue Pharma L.P. v. Collegium Pharmaceutical, Inc., **16:192**
Regents of the University of Minnesota v. Gilead Sciences, Inc., **18:134**
Rembrandt Diagnostics, LP v. Alere, Inc., **18:135**
Roku, Inc. v. Universal Electronics, Inc., **18:136**
Salazar v. AT&T Mobility LLC, **19:344**

2023—Cont'd

- Sanderling Management Ltd. v. Snap Inc., **19:345**
- Sanofi-Aventis Deutschland GmbH v. Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc., **19:346**
- Schwendimann v. Neenah, Inc., **19:347**
- Sequoia Technology, LLC v. Dell, Inc., **19:348**
- Sisvel International S.A. v. Sierra Wireless, Inc., **19:349**; **19:350**
- SNIPR Technologies Limited v. Rockefeller University, **19:351**
- SSI Technologies, LLC v. Dongguan Zhengyang Electronic Mechanical LTD., **19:352**
- Trinity Info Media, LLC v. Covalent, Inc., **20:165**
- UCB, Inc. v. Actavis Laboratories UT, Inc., **21:92**
- United Cannabis Corporation v. Pure Hemp Collective Inc., **21:93**
- United Therapeutics Corporation v. Liquidia Technologies, Inc., **21:94**
- VLSI Technology LLC v. Intel Corporation, **22:68**
- Volvo Penta of the Americas, LLC v. Brunswick Corporation, **22:69**

2024

- AI Visualize, Inc. v. Nuance Communications, Inc., **1:391**
- AlexSam, Inc. v. Aetna, Inc., **1:392**
- Allergan USA, Inc. v. MSN Laboratories Private Ltd., **1:393**
- Amarin Pharma, Inc. v. Hikma Pharmaceuticals USA Inc., **1:394**
- Astellas Pharma, Inc. v. Sandoz Inc., **1:395**
- Backertop Licensing LLC v. Canary Connect, Inc., **2:206**
- Beteiro, LLC v. DraftKings Inc., **2:207**
- Broadband iTV, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc., **2:208**
- Brumfield, Trustee for Ascent Trust v. IBG LLC, **2:209**
- Celanese International Corporation v. International Trade Commission, **3:250**
- Chewy, Inc. v. International Business Machines Corporation, **3:251**

2024—Cont'd

- Cloudofchange, LLC v. NCR Corporation, **3:252**
- Contour IP Holding LLC v. GoPro, Inc., **3:253**
- Crown Packaging Technology, Inc. v. Belvac Production Machinery, Inc., **3:254**
- Cytiva BioProcess R&D AB v. JSR Corp., **3:255**
- CyWee Group Ltd. v. ZTE (USA), Inc., **3:256**
- DDR Holdings, LLC v. Priceline.com LLC, **4:134**
- DexCom, Inc. v. Abbott Diabetes Care, Inc., **4:135**
- Dragon Intellectual Property LLC v. DISH Network L.L.C., **4:136**
- EcoFactor, Inc. v. Google LLC, **5:157**
- Edwards Lifesciences Corporation v. Meril Life Sciences Pvt. Ltd., **5:158**
- Freshub, Inc. v. Amazon.com, Inc., **6:110**
- Galderma Laboratories, L.P. v. Lupin Inc., **7:145**
- Google LLC v. EcoFactor, Inc., **7:146**
- Inline Plastics Corp. v. Lacerta Group, LLC, **9:526**
- Intellectual Tech LLC v. Zebra Technologies Corporation, **9:527**
- IOENGINE, LLC v. Ingenico Inc., **9:528**
- Janssen Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Teva Pharmaceuticals USA, Inc., **10:55**
- LKQ Corporation v. GM Global Technology Operations LLC, **12:124**
- Luv n' Care, Ltd. v. Laurain, **12:125**
- Maxell, Ltd. v. Amperex Technology Limited, **13:260**
- Miller Mendel, Inc. v. City of Anna, Texas, **13:261**
- Mirror Worlds Technologies, LLC v. Meta Platforms, Inc., **13:262**
- Mobile Acuity Ltd. v. Blippar Ltd., **13:263**
- Natera, Inc. v. NeoGenomics Laboratories, Inc., **14:111**
- NexStep, Inc. v. Comcast Cable Communications, LLC, **14:112**

INDEX

2024—Cont'd

- Osseo Imaging, LLC v. Planmeca USA Inc., **15:63**
- Packet Intelligence LLC v. NetScout Systems, Inc., **16:193**
- Palo Alto Networks, Inc. v. Centripetal Networks, LLC, **16:194**
- ParkerVision, Inc. v. Qualcomm Incorporated, **16:195**
- Pfizer Inc. v. Sanofi Pasteur Inc., **16:196**
- Platinum Optics Technology Inc. v. Viavi Solutions Inc., **16:197**
- Promptu Systems Corporation v. Comcast Corporation, **16:198**
- Provisur Technologies, Inc. v. Weber, Inc., **16:199**
- PS Products Inc. v. Panther Trading Co. Inc., **16:199**
- Rai Strategic Holdings, Inc. v. Philip Morris Products S.A., **18:137**
- Roku, Inc. v. International Trade Commission, **18:138**
- Salix Pharmaceuticals, Ltd. v. Norwich Pharmaceuticals Inc., **19:353**
- Sanho Corp. v. Kaijet Technology International Limited, Inc., **19:354**
- SnapPower v. Lighting Defense Group, **19:355**
- SoftView LLC v. Apple Inc., **19:356**
- Speck v. Bates, **19:357**
- Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson v. Lenovo (United States), Inc., **20:166**
- Teva Branded Pharmaceutical Products R&D, Inc. v. Amneal Pharmaceuticals of New York, LLC, **20:167**
- UTTO Inc. v. Metrotech Corp., **21:95**
- Vascular Solutions LLC v. Medtronic, Inc., **22:70**
- Virtek Vision International ULC v. Assembly Guidance Systems, Inc., **22:71**
- Voice Tech Corp. v. Unified Patents, LLC, **22:72**
- Weber, Inc. v. Provisur Technologies, Inc., **23:103**
- Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation v. Apple Inc., **23:104**
- Zircon Corp. v. International Trade Commission, **26:17**

2024—Cont'd

- ZyXEL Communications Corp. v. UNM Rainforest Innovations, **26:18**

2025

- Agilent Technologies, Inc. v. Synthego Corp., **1:398**
- AliveCor, Inc. v. Apple Inc., **1:400**
- Alnylam Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Moderna, Inc., **1:401**
- AMP Plus, Inc. v. DMF, Inc, **1:402**
- Ancora Technologies, Inc. v. Roku, Inc, **1:403**
- Apple Inc. v. Gesture Technology Partners, LLC, **1:405; 1:406**
- Azurity Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Alkem Laboratories Ltd., **1:407**
- BearBox LLC v. Lancium LLC, **2:212**
- CQV Co., Ltd. v. Merck Patent GmbH, **3:262**
- Dolby Laboratories Licensing Corporation v. Unified Patents, LLC, **4:137**
- EcoFactor, Inc. v. Google LLC, **5:159**
- Eye Therapies, LLC v. Slayback Pharma, LLC, **5:163**
- Fintiv, Inc. v. PayPal Holdings, Inc., **6:112**
- Fraunhofer-Gesellschaft zur Forderung der angewandten Forschung e.V. v. Sirius XM Radio Inc., **6:115**
- HD Silicon Solutions LLC v. Microchip Technology Inc., **8:169**
- Honeywell International Inc. v. 3G Licensing, S.A., **8:170**
- ImmunoGen, Inc. v. Stewart, **9:530**
- Incyte Corporation v. Sun Pharmaceutical Industries, Inc., **9:537**
- Ingenico Inc. v. IOENGINE, LLC, **9:538**
- In re Entresto, **9:531**
- In re Forest, **9:532**
- In re Kostic, **9:534**
- In re Riggs, **9:535**
- In re Xencor, Inc., **9:536**
- IQRIS Technologies LLC v. Point Blank Enterprises, Inc., **9:542**
- Jazz Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Avadel CNS Pharmaceuticals, LLC, **10:54**
- Kroy IP Holdings, LLC v. Groupon, Inc., **11:92**
- Lashify, Inc. v. International Trade Commission, **12:127**

2025—Cont'd

- Lynk Labs, Inc. v. Samsung Electronics Co., Ltd., **12:128**
- Maquet Cardiovascular LLC v. Abiomed Inc., **13:265**
- Merck Sharp & Dohme B.V. v. Aurobindo Pharma USA, Inc., **13:267**
- Mitek Systems, Inc. v. United Services Automobile Association, **13:269**
- Odyssey Logistics & Technology Corp. v. Stewart, **15:64**
- Optis Cellular Technology, LLC v. Apple Inc., **15:65**
- Qualcomm Incorporated v. Apple Inc., **17:14**
- Realtek Semiconductor Corporation v. International Trade Commission, **18:139; 18:140**
- Recentive Analytics, Inc. v. Fox Corp., **18:141**
- Regeneron Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Mylan Pharmaceuticals Inc., **18:142**
- Regents of the University of California v. Broad Institute, Inc, **18:143**
- Restem, LLC v. Jadi Cell, LLC, **18:144**
- Sage Products, LLC v. Stewart, **19:358**
- Sierra Wireless, ULC v. Sisvel S.p.A., **19:361**
- Sigray, Inc. v. Carl Zeiss X-Ray Microscopy, Inc., **19:362**
- Steuben Foods, Inc. v. Shibuya Hoppmann Corporation, **19:364**
- United Services Automobile Association v. PNC Bank N.A., **21:96**
- US Synthetic Corp. v. International Trade Commission, **21:98**
- Wash World Inc. v. Belanger Inc., **23:105**
- Wuhan Healthgen Biotechnology Corp. v. International Trade Commission, **23:107**

“A”

- Generally, **1:85; 1:130; 3:96; 11:46**
- Claim interpretation, **2:127; 20:90**
- One or more than one, **5:44**

ABANDONMENT

- Delay, unreasonable delay, **12:21**
- Earlier devices, defendant's abandonment of, **3:3**

ABANDONMENT—Cont'd

- Law question, **1:111**
- Mandamus, changing filing date on abandoned application, **9:54**
- Revival, **1:177**
- Suppression, **3:59; 6:33**
- Time, length of, **4:65**
- Unreasonable delay, **12:21**

ABBREVIATED NEW DRUG APPLICATION (ANDA)

- Generally, **1:116; 2:54; 2:74; 4:40; 7:55; 7:139; 13:107; 19:182; 20:79**
- Amendments, infringement, **6:90**
- Attorney fees, **25:7**
- Certification pledging, **19:247**
- Conduct before FDA, **5:95**
- Covenant not to sue, **3:132**
- Damages, **1:280**
- Declaratory judgment, **10:39**
- Dependent claims, **15:31**
- Disclose, obligation to, **2:81**
- Double patenting, **1:166**
- Enablement, **3:169**
- Exclusivity period, **4:98**
- Infringement
- generally, **2:88**
 - amendments, **6:90**
- Jurisdiction over orange book, **1:135**
- Labeling, indications and usage, **2:152**
- Obviousness, **6:91; 16:108; 19:271**
- 180-day exclusivity period, **4:98**
- Paragraph IV, **3:132; 13:113; 20:78**
- Preliminary injunction, **1:202**
- Reasonable royalty, **1:280**
- Repetitive filing, **1:156**
- Reverse doctrine of equivalents, **18:80**
- Safe harbor provision of Hatch-Waxman, **13:187**
- Sec. 271(e)(2)(A), **9:312**
- Sec. 1337(a), **1:175**
- Settlement agreements, **9:309**
- Subject matter, **20:100**
- 30-month period, **1:120; 5:95**
- Use different than claimed in method claims, **1:128**
- Willful, **7:81**

“ABOUT”

- Generally, **15:27**

INDEX

“ABOUT”—Cont’d

Doctrine of equivalents, **3:136**

ABOUT CLAIM TERMINOLOGY

Generally, **10:26; 13:80**

Meaning thereof, **5:20**

ABS GLOBAL, INC. V.

CYTONOME/ST, LLC

2023, **1:381**

ABSOLUTE

Intervening rights, **13:168; 19:137**

ABSOLUTE PREDICTABILITY

Obviousness, **9:52; 13:18**

ABSOLUTE RULES

Claim preamble, **7:61**

ABSTENTION

Generally, **23:100**

ABSTRACT

Generally, **8:73**

Claim interpretation, **8:73**

Sec. 101, abstract ideas, **1:95; 1:253; 1:285; 1:286; 1:290; 1:333; 2:163; 3:143; 3:212; 4:104; 5:128; 6:94; 9:286; 9:308; 13:188; 19:298; 19:301; 19:323; 20:143; 21:61; 22:58**

Sec. 112, abstract ideas, **18:85**

Statutory subject matter, **21:57**

ABSTRACTIONS

Graver Tank, **20:6**

ABSURD RESULTS

Statutory construction, **2:39**

ABUSE

Anticipation, **18:20**

Fraud, **16:25**

ABUSE OF DISCOVERY

FRCP 37, **7:23**

FRCP 37(a)(4), **13:48**

Monetary sanctions, **13:6**

ABUSE OF DISCRETION

Generally, **12:76; 13:41**

Appellate review, **13:1**

Attorney fees award, **16:24**

Dismissal of pendent state law claim for unfair competition, **22:2**

Examiner’s deposition, **23:5**

ABUSE OF DISCRETION—Cont’d

Found, **2:27**

FRCP 26, **8:9**

FRCP 56(f), **13:154**

Inequitable conduct, **18:78**

Interference, **5:68**

Motion for new trial, **23:10**

Motion to compel discovery, **19:17**

Permanent injunction, **1:219; 9:315**

Prejudgment interest, **3:96; 8:20**

Preliminary injunction, **1:155; 1:169; 13:89**

Sec. 271(e)(1), **5:3**

Sec. 285, **1:299; 2:170; 7:20**

Written description, **3:197; 9:318**

ABUSE OF PROCESS

State tort claim, **1:42**

ACCEPTABLE SUBSTITUTES

Generally, **19:96**

Availability, **7:47**

Lost profits, **13:45**

Panduit, **3:8; 4:90**

ACCEPTED WISDOM, CONTRARY TO

Generally, **23:11**

Obviousness, **3:3**

ACCESS AND ACCESSIBILITY

Public access, **4:101; 9:261; 12:89; 19:207; 22:42**

ACCESSORY SALES

Damages base, **11:21**

ACCIDENTAL DUPLICATION

Anticipation, **19:107**

ACCORD AND SATISFACTION

Discharge of claim, **3:48**

ACCOUNTING AND ACCOUNTING PHASE

Attorney, authoritative opinion of, **11:15**

Damages, **1:20; 1:38; 11:15**

Enhanced damages, **11:15**

Final judgment rule, **18:104**

Jurisdiction, **16:72**

Law of the case, **11:15**

Lost profits, defendant’s profits as measure of, **11:15**

**ACCOUNTING AND ACCOUNTING
PHASE—Cont'd**

Nonparty's motion to quash discovery subpoena, **20:17**

ACCURACY

Claim interpretation, **19:155**

ACCUSTOMED MEANING

Ordinary and Accustomed Meaning (this index)

**ACORDA THERAPEUTICS, INC. V.
ALKERMES PLC**

2025, **1:396**

**ACTELION PHARMACEUTICALS
LTD V. MYLAN
PHARMACEUTICALS INC.**

2023, **1:382**

ACTING ON BEHALF OF

Sec. 119(a), **2:125**

ACTIVE INGREDIENT

Patent term extension, **16:125**

ACTUAL CASE

Subject matter jurisdiction, **12:22**

ACTUAL COMBINATION

Sec. 271(f)(2), **23:53**

**ACTUAL COMMERCIAL
CONSEQUENCES**

Sec. 102(e) v. sec. 102(g), **19:41**

ACTUAL CONTROVERSY

Declaratory judgment, **1:94; 2:122;
3:69; 6:35; 6:38; 7:38; 7:55; 8:66;
9:324; 23:22**

Declaratory judgment of infringement,
20:26

Subject matter jurisdiction, **12:22**

ACTUAL DEVICE SOLD

Blonder-Tongue, **1:13**

**ACTUAL NOTICE AND
KNOWLEDGE**

Infringement, **12:61**

Willful infringement, **3:80; 14:24**

**ACTUAL REDUCTION TO
PRACTICE**

Interference, **14:3**

Law question, **4:27**

ACTUAL REPORTS OF FAILURE

Obviousness, **2:101**

ACTUAL SKILL

Invention, **19:34**

ACTUAL WORDS

Claim interpretation, **4:53**

ADDENDA

Motion to strike, **6:10**

Strike, motion to, **6:10**

**ADDITIONAL COMPONENTS OR
ELEMENTS**

Compare claims with accused product,
12:18

Consisting of claim language, **13:7**

Gist, **12:18**

Good faith prosecution, **12:18**

Infringement not avoided, **12:18**

Prosecution history, **12:18**

Reverse doctrine of equivalents, **12:18**

ADDITIONAL EVIDENCE

Generally, **21:36**

ADDITIONAL PRECISION

Claim interpretation, **16:55; 22:40**

ADDITIONAL REFERENCES

Sec. 102(b), **9:18**

ADDITIONS

After entry of judgment, **15:13**

CIP, **19:28**

Correcting inventorship, **1:54**

Cross-appeal to reverse validity or
infringement component of judg-
ment, **18:2**

Factual findings to support jury verdict
presumed, **2:15**

FRCP 15(c), **6:11**

Infringement, **9:186; 14:8**

Judgment, after entry of judgment,
15:13

Obviousness, **21:8**

Transfer of appeal, **7:14**

ADDRESS OF CLAIMS

Court findings, **1:9**

ADJUSTMENT OF PATENT TERM

Generally, **3:232; 7:116; 9:484; 13:205;
13:237; 19:321**

INDEX

ADJUSTMENT OF PATENT TERM

—Cont'd

Equitable tolling, **14:74**

Sec. 154(b), **23:69**

Summary judgment, **1:315**

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCY

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) (this index)

ADMINISTRATIVE BOARD

Factual underpinning, **2:37**

Review, standard of, **13:49; 22:9**

Substantial evidence standard, factual determinations reviewed under, **8:34**

ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

Appeal and review, **4:38; 15:8**

Cross-examination, right to, **4:38**

Discretionary agency decision, standard of review of, **4:38**

Inter parties review, **19:282**

Limitation of actions, **13:62**

Presumption that government officials perform their duties properly and in good faith, **13:70**

Sec. 101 patentability, **3:143**

Vitalness thereof, **4:38**

ADMINISTRATIVE NULLIFICATION

Final judgment, **9:354**

ADMINISTRATIVE PATENT JUDGES

Generally, **21:85**

Appointment, **9:311**

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE

ACT (APA)

Generally, **2:202; 5:81; 15:59; 19:176**

Comprehensive record, **2:126**

Good cause exception under, **14:17**

Interference, **9:263**

Judicial review of PTO decisions under APA, **16:134**

Notice requirement, **9:344**

Own regulations, **19:180**

Restriction requirement, **8:165**

Sec. 553, **1:45**

Sec. 703(c), **13:51**

Sec. 706(2), **13:50**

Sec. 7513, **1:354**

Sec. 7703, **2:32**

Sec. 7703(c), **8:31; 11:26**

ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE

ACT (APA)—Cont'd

Substantial evidence standard, administrative board's factual determinations reviewed under, **8:34**

ADMISSIBILITY OF EVIDENCE

Claim interpretation, **19:16**

Discretion of court, **3:57**

Expert testimony, **1:42; 1:43; 7:29**

FRAP 28(e), **12:11**

Inventor's testimony, **8:106**

PTO examination, evidence withheld during, **8:111**

Sec. 145, **8:118**

ADMISSIONS

Antedate reference, failed attempt to, **3:54**

Choice of law, **13:121**

Dismissal, **3:19**

Ex parte test, **3:10**

MPEP, **16:6**

Obviousness, **9:125; 18:70**

Own work, **18:70**

Presumption of validity, **18:10**

Specifications, **16:109**

ADNEXUS INC. V. META PLATFORMS, INC.

2025, **1:397**

ADR PROCEEDING

Discovery, **8:37**

ADVERSARINESS, LACK OF

Jurisdiction, **7:8**

ADVERTISING

Abstract ideas, **1:285**

ADVICE OF COUNSEL

Willful infringement, **14:5; 19:154**

ADVISORY JURY

Obviousness findings, **11:69**

Substantial evidence standard, **18:14**

Verdict, **20:39**

ADVISORY OPINION

CAFC jurisdiction, **20:2**

Declaratory judgment, **9:92**

ADVOCACY

FRCP 15(c), **6:11**

AESTHETICS DETERMINATION

Sec. 171, **9:73**

AFFIDAVIT

Antedating reference, **7:19**
 Appreciation or recognition by inventor of invention of interference counts, **9:23**
 Claims construed, **9:77**
 Declaration, **9:177**
 Evidence, how treated, **9:23**
 Inequitable conduct, **7:34**
 Intent to deceive, **18:37**
 Protested reissue, **9:23**
 Reissue, protested, **9:23**
 Rule 131, **7:19; 17:2**
 Sec. 1.192(a), **9:142**
 Sham affidavit doctrine, **17:12**
 Skill in the art, level of, **9:23**

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

Collateral estoppel, **4:3**
 Double patenting, **3:4**
 FRCP 8(c), **3:24**
 Patent misuse, **23:9**

AFFIRMATIVE DUTY

Anticipation, **18:20**
 Willful infringement, **18:29**

AFTER-THE-FACT TESTIMONY

Earlier writings, **14:12**

AFTERTHOUGHT

Secondary considerations, **9:82**

AGENCY

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) (this index)

AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES, INC. V. SYNTHOGO CORP.

2025, **1:398**

AGREEMENT ON TRIPS

Enforcement of patents, **22:36**

AGREEMENTS

Contracts and Agreements (this index)

AI VISUALIZE, INC. V. NUANCE COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

2024, **1:391**

AKAMAI TECHNOLOGIES, INC. V. MEDIAPOINTE, INC.

2025, **1:399**

ALEXSAM, INC. V. AETNA, INC.

2024, **1:392**

ALGORITHM

Mathematical Algorithm (this index)

ALICE DECISION

Inventive concept, **1:253; 1:277; 2:163; 2:167; 2:168; 4:104; 4:105; 5:124; 5:128; 7:118; 9:383; 9:414; 12:22; 15:46; 19:292; 20:139**

ALIENS

State immunity from suit under Eleventh Amendment, **10:11**

ALIVECOR, INC. V. APPLE INC.

2025, **1:400**

ALL ELEMENTS RULE

Generally, **6:26; 10:7**
 Claim interpretation, **10:7; 16:118; 16:119**
 Claim preamble, **3:22**
 Conflicting precedent, **10:7**
 Doctrine of equivalents, **1:82; 5:86**
 Law question, **10:7**

ALLERGAN USA, INC. V. MSN LABORATORIES PRIVATE LTD.

2024, **1:393**

ALL EVIDENCE

Generally, **16:36**
 Obviousness, **1:80; 5:5; 18:15**

ALLGENESIS BIOTHERAPEUTICS INC. V. CLOUDBREAK THERAPEUTICS, LLC

2023, **1:383**

ALLOWANCE OF COSTS

Claim construction, **1:5**
 Deposition transcripts, **19:45**
 Transcripts, deposition transcripts, **19:45**

“ALL THE CIRCUMSTANCES”

Declaratory judgment, **13:155**

ALL WRITS ACT

Generally, **1:75**
 Sec. 1651, **9:157**

INDEX

ALNYLAM PHARMACEUTICALS, INC. V. MODERNA, INC.

2025, **1:401**

ALTER EGO DOCTRINE

FRCP 25(a), **13:25**

Piercing corporate veil, **13:50**

ALTERWAN, INC. V. AMAZON.COM, INC.

2023, **1:384**

ALTVATER

JNOV motion, **6:6**

Mootness, **13:46; 22:4**

Vacating judgment of patient invalidity,
13:46

AMARIN PHARMA, INC. V. HIKMA PHARMACEUTICALS USA INC.

2024, **1:394**

AMBIGUITY

See also Certainty and Definiteness (this
index)

Assignment, **5:99**

Claim interpretation, **2:98; 4:51; 16:53;
19:115**

Contract drafter, **9:132**

Contract interpretation, **3:44; 7:43;
9:160**

Judicial inquiry complete, **23:29**

PTO fact findings, **9:80**

Raises duty to inquire, **9:132**

Sec. 156, **21:6**

Statutory construction, **1:76; 6:24; 7:55;
8:45**

AMEND, LEAVE TO

Choice of law, **3:92**

Defective notice, **4:25**

FRCP 15(a), **20:5**

AMEND, MOTION TO

Generally, **19:6**

Denial, when appropriate, **7:33**

FRCP 15, **3:24**

AMENDMENT

Substitution of claims, **9:421**

AMENDMENT, NARROWING

Claim interpretation, **8:80; 12:83;
19:210**

AMENDMENT, NARROWING

—Cont'd

Prosecution history estoppel, **2:128;
7:69; 18:77**

AMENDMENT OF 1984

Sec. 103, **11:23**

Sec. 116, **11:23**

AMENDMENT OF CLAIMS

Burden of proof, **1:305**

CIP, **19:28**

Competitor's device, **13:91; 16:72**

Consisting of claim language, **13:7**

Doctrine of equivalents, **5:53; 6:64;
8:65; 8:66**

Incorporation by reference, **8:113**

Inter partes review, **1:305**

Motion for prejudgment interest, **10:14**

Prosecution history, **5:44**

Prosecution history estoppel, **2:9;
2:128; 3:130; 4:73; 6:48; 8:13;
20:29**

Reexamination, **3:102; 6:8; 16:115;
17:6; 20:4**

Sec. 112, **20:6**

AMENDMENT OF DECISION

Special master, **16:37**

AMENDMENT OF JUDGMENT

Review, standard of, **1:102**

AMENDMENT OF PLEADINGS

Choice of law, **1:107**

FRCP 15(a), **20:24**

FRCP 15(b), **2:40**

FRCP 15(c), **6:11**

AMENDMENTS

ANDA, infringement, **6:90**

Doctrine of equivalents, **9:108; 9:235;
12:51**

Eleventh Amendment (this index)

Incorporation by reference language,
clarification, **8:124**

Indefiniteness, **1:21; 8:86**

Prosecution history estoppel, **2:66;
8:47; 18:40; 19:146**

Sec. 120, **8:19**

Seventh Amendment (this index)

AMERICA INVENTS ACT

Compulsory counterclaim, **9:430**

AMERICA INVENTS ACT—Cont'd

Constitutionality, standing, **13:191**
 False marking, **16:134**
 Inter partes review, **19:282**
 Joinder in patent cases, **9:359**
 Partial institution, **19:282**
 Person challenging, **18:127**
 Qui tam provision, retroactive elimination, **2:151**
 Selective institution, **19:282**

AMERICAN RULE

Party-prepared findings not improper, **13:12**
 Shifting fees, **1:62**

AMGEN INC. V. SANDOZ INC.

2023, **1:385**

AMICUS CURIAE

Intervention, motion for leave to intervene, **9:67**
 Motion for leave to intervene, **9:67**
 Volunteer, as, **1:41**

AMINO ACID SEQUENCE

Written description, **3:133; 9:264; 9:306**

AMP PLUS, INC. V. DMF, INC

2025, **1:402**

“AN”

Generally, **3:96**
 Claim interpretation, **2:127; 20:90**

ANALOGOUS ART

Generally, **9:78; 9:114; 9:127; 19:253**
 Anticipation, irrelevant, **19:154**
 Anticipation, irrelevant to, **9:201**
 Criteria, **23:25**
 Disclosure, familiar with all that references disclose, **9:78**
 Factors, **9:168**
 Fact questions, **8:42; 9:121; 9:154; 10:15**
 Familiar with all that references disclose, **9:78**
 Field of endeavor test, **9:256**
 Inventor's reference, **19:36**
 Obviousness, **9:338; 11:70; 18:23**
 Ordinary skill in the art, hypothetical person of, **9:78**
 Prior art, **1:329**
 Reference, **9:78; 19:36**

ANALOGOUS ART—Cont'd

Sec. 102(b), **19:7**
 Summary judgment, **6:1; 21:7**

ANCILLARY PROCEEDING

Discovery from nonparty, **13:37**

ANCILLARY TO PRIORITY

Interference, **13:31; 16:16**

ANCORA TECHNOLOGIES, INC. V. ROKU, INC

2025, **1:403**

ANDA

Abbreviated New Drug Application (ANDA) (this index)

ANIMALS

Interference, **3:28**
 Sec. 101, **1:45**

ANSWER

FRCP 41(a)(1), voluntary dismissal when neither answer nor summary judgment motion filed, **5:18**

ANTEDATING REFERENCE

Generally, **9:163; 13:251**
 Reduction to practice, **9:341**
 Rule 131 affidavit, **7:19**

ANTICIPATED PROFITS

Lost profits, **13:131**
 Reasonable royalty, **13:131**

ANTICIPATION

Generally, **1:101; 1:131; 1:154; 1:340; 1:341; 2:190; 3:77; 3:211; 3:212; 4:31; 5:55; 5:77; 8:71; 9:44; 9:201; 9:262; 9:280; 9:391; 9:408; 11:57; 12:13; 13:122; 14:85; 15:15; 15:51; 16:47; 16:72; 16:96; 16:145; 18:14; 19:60; 20:63; 20:72; 20:144; 21:50; 22:25**
 Abuse, unfounded defenses as, **18:20**
 Accidental duplication of invention, **19:107**
 Addition, **1:33**
 Affirmative duty of due care, **18:20**
 All elements, **3:83; 19:249**
 Alternatives, **2:86**
 Analogous art, **9:201; 19:154**
 Burden of persuasion and quantum of proof required, court must state, **18:7**

INDEX

ANTICIPATION—Cont'd

Burden of production, **20:88**
Burden of proof, **9:201**
Change of ingredient, **1:33**
Chemical compound, **10:26**
Claim, **18:20**
Claim construction, **5:142; 8:96; 8:146; 8:148; 9:285; 20:67**
Claim differentiation, **11:2**
Claim preamble, **3:22; 4:15; 13:164**
Claim-supporting vs. claim-anticipating disclosures, **22:7**
Claim terms, **8:148**
Clearly erroneous standard, **18:20**
Commercial success, **1:10; 1:227**
Conception, **1:255**
Concepts, **16:4**
Continuation with new matter, **1:127**
Copying as indicium of nonobviousness, **4:15**
Corroboration, **14:94**
Covered business method patents, **2:168**
Damages, **5:138**
Defenses, unfounded defenses as abuse, **18:20**
Design patent, **4:64; 8:62; 9:325**
Discovery of properties, **9:257**
Dismissal, **3:19**
Disparagement following disclosure, **2:143**
Doctrine of last antecedent, **6:68**
Dominating patent, **18:20**
Double patenting, **3:4; 21:76**
Due care, affirmative duty of, **18:20**
Duplication, accidental, **19:107**
Enablement, **1:202; 2:82; 9:291; 13:120; 20:156**
Entire market value rule, **18:35**
Evidence, anticipation that certain thing may result in insufficient to proof, **5:19**
Examiner's rejection, **9:427**
Exclusion, **1:33; 1:98**
Existence and recognized, **1:92**
Extrinsic evidence considered, **19:51**
Fact question, **7:34; 8:49; 9:96; 9:111; 9:154; 9:363; 13:45; 19:249; 20:11; 20:56**
Factual determination, **20:63**
File history estoppel, **4:15**
Filing date, **26:12**

ANTICIPATION—Cont'd

Good faith, subjective, **18:20**
Hatch-Waxman Act, **21:76**
Hybrid sec. 102, **9:104**
Hypothetical claim, **1:115**
Identity of invention, **7:33; 20:20**
Incorporation by reference, prior art, **1:238**
Indefiniteness, **5:107**
Inducement, **5:138**
Inequitable conduct, **1:25; 18:20**
Inherency
generally, **1:106; 5:61; 9:242; 20:73**
characteristics, **3:41; 8:58; 9:220; 13:101; 18:56**
claim limitation, **19:56**
combination of prior art, **12:81**
factual question, **20:56**
inevitability, **9:360**
prior art, recognition of, **8:148; 19:150; 19:154**
Injunctions, **1:219**
Interference, **3:32**
Inter partes review, **5:139; 11:80; 11:81; 23:86**
Ipsissimis verbis test, **1:10**
ITC, **1:17**
Judgment as a matter of law, determination of invalidity, **23:87**
Jury instructions, **10:4; 19:249**
Knowledge available to public, **23:48**
Limitation, inherent, **19:56**
MPEP, **16:6**
Multiple different patents, **16:156**
Nonobviousness, copying as indicium of, **4:15**
Objective, **18:20**
Obviousness, **1:255; 3:167; 3:203; 5:139; 9:442; 9:461; 10:8; 11:77; 13:204; 13:227; 20:67; 21:76**
Oral testimony, **5:47**
Ordinary observer test, **9:321**
Ordinary skill in the field of the invention, recognized by, **3:103**
Possible to alter prior device, **19:129**
Potential claim unpatentable, **8:142**
Presumption of validity, **19:37**
Printed publication, **9:322; 9:327; 14:94**
Prior art
arranged as in claim, **14:56**

ANTICIPATION—Cont'd

- Prior art—Cont'd
 - burden of production, **20:88**
 - incorporation by reference, **1:238**
 - inherent anticipation does not require recognition in, **19:150; 19:154**
 - means-plus-function claim, **6:68; 20:116**
 - method claims, **9:48**
 - single reference, must be found in, **7:48; 19:38**
- Prior device, possible to alter prior device, **19:129**
- Priority, **5:142**
- Proper claim construction first, **20:67**
- Public, knowledge available to, **23:48**
- Public use, **16:167; 26:13**
- Read in teachings not in reference, **13:85**
- Reexamination, **9:314; 9:340; 19:225**
- Reference, **5:66; 7:48; 7:94; 9:291; 13:85; 19:38; 19:201**
- Relevance, analogous art irrelevant, **19:154**
- Review, standard of, **3:54; 9:169; 18:44; 19:12**
- Sec. 101, **1:368; 3:207**
- Sec. 102, hybrid, **9:104**
- Sec. 102(b), **7:99; 9:18; 9:129**
- Sec. 102(c), **5:65**
- Sec. 102(e), **9:28; 20:115**
- Sec. 284, **16:167**
- Sec. 285, **3:212**
- Secondary considerations, **4:15**
- Single prior art reference, must be found in, **7:48**
- Subjective good faith, **18:20**
- Subject matter jurisdiction, lack of, **1:7**
- Two-step analysis, **11:43**
- Unfounded defenses as abuse, **18:20**
- Validity, **16:167**
- Verbatim findings of counsel adopted, **8:22**
- Witnesses, oral testimony, **5:47**

ANTITRUSTS

- Generally, **9:282**
- Choice of law, **5:30; 7:73; 9:219; 14:21; 14:25**
- Citizen petition, **20:127**
- Common law fraud, based on, **3:83**

ANTITRUSTS—Cont'd

- Competitors disadvantage, changing product to, **3:83**
- Enforcement of patent, **21:45**
- Fraud, **3:83; 14:25; 16:48**
- Inequitable conduct, **6:5; 14:21**
- Jurisdiction, **3:69**
- Jury, **1:16**
- Licensing activities, **7:25**
- Mandamus, **9:41**
- Market power, **9:219; 13:133**
- Monopoly power, **7:73**
- Noerr immunity, **3:46; 5:108; 20:127**
- Patent misuse, **16:126**
- Private party, **5:30**
- Quoting material out of context, **11:16**
- Relevant market determination, **9:349**
- Reverse settlement agreements, **6:86**
- Sanctions, timing of request for, **11:16**
- Sec. 1338(a), **21:13**
- Settlement agreements, **9:309**
- Standing, **9:89**
- Timing of request for sanctions, **11:16**
- Walker Process, **1:25; 1:42; 4:84; 11:16; 18:97**

ANY CLAIM AMENDMENT

- Prosecution history estoppel, **6:48**

ANY METHOD OF ANALYSIS

- Claim interpretation, **6:46**

ANY USE OF DEVICE

- Claim interpretation, **16:120**

AORTIC INNOVATIONS LLC V. EDWARDS LIFESCIENCES CORPORATION

- 2025, **1:404**

APA

- Administrative Procedure Act (APA) (this index)

APPARATUS

- Claim interpretation, indefiniteness, **9:280; 13:220**
- Entire market value rule, **6:36**
- Functional language in apparatus claims, **20:110**
- Marking, **3:146**
- Obviousness, **4:74; 16:19**
- Sec. 103 rejection, **9:101**

INDEX

APPEALABILITY

Generally, **8:31**
Attorney disqualification, **16:3; 23:12**
Board decision with remand, **9:31**
CAFC jurisdiction, **7:8; 19:50; 22:2**
Cohen triparte test, **19:71**
Contempt, **3:85; 5:85; 19:118**
Discovery, **8:9; 17:3**
Dismissal on merits vs. lack of subject matter jurisdiction, **1:39**
Finality rule, **13:23**
Infringement determination, **2:31**
Interlocutory order, **7:21; 17:3; 20:5**
Interlocutory partial judgment, **7:16**
Jurisdiction, **8:15**
Mandamus writ, **2:2**
Partial judgment, **3:9; 7:16**
Preliminary injunction, **11:19**
Quashing discovery, **8:9**
Remand, board decision with, **9:31**
Remand order, **8:97**
Sanctions simultaneously imposed on party and its attorney, **19:64**
Sec. 271(e)(1), **5:13**
Sec. 1292(a)(1), **18:11; 23:13**
Sec. 1292(c)(2), **10:12; 13:5**
Stay order, **11:1**
Stipulation, **10:37; 10:38**
Willful infringement, **3:26**

APPEAL AND REVIEW

Generally, **11:19; 16:37; 21:5**
Abuse of discretion, **13:1**
Administrative law, **4:38; 15:8**
All arguments presented below, **2:87**
APA, **8:34; 16:134**
Assessment of costs, Sec. 145, **14:4**
Attorneys, **6:12; 14:55; 16:29; 19:16**
Attorneys' fees, **4:16; 18:19; 19:8**
Board, **4:39; 7:23; 9:191; 9:195**
Burden, **12:11**
CAFC jurisdiction, **7:14**
Certification of order, **20:28**
Claim interpretation, **19:16**
Clearly erroneous standard, **12:2**
Clear or manifest error, **4:6**
Collateral order doctrine, **9:343**
Commission, not raised before, **6:40**
Confidential information, unsealing, **1:239**

APPEAL AND REVIEW—Cont'd

Considerations involved, **19:49**
Consolidation of claims, **19:95**
Cross-Appeal (this index)
Damages, **1:20**
Dann Amendment, **19:30**
Date of decision, **13:162**
Decision by implication, **5:41**
Declaratory judgment, **9:233**
Defined on theory never presented, **4:67**
Definitions, **10:19**
De novo, **9:7; 11:32**
Dependent claims not separately argued, **9:100**
Deposition testimony introduced on appeal, **13:183**
Design patent, **19:8; 21:4**
Discretionary authority, Board's exercise of, **7:23**
Dismissal, **9:47**
District Court, **6:9; 9:1; 12:36; 16:19**
Enhanced damages, **9:125**
Equitable tolling, **7:32**
Escrow, **3:21**
Examination, **9:2**
Examiner's rejection, **9:64**
Exhaustion, **2:143**
Expanding scope of, **4:25**
Ex parte test, **3:10**
Explained, **12:43**
Favorable judgment, **8:82**
Filing, **10:3; 23:28**
Final decision, **8:82**
FRAP 2, **10:20**
FRAP 4(a)(2), **16:110**
FRAP 4(a)(4), **10:14**
FRAP 30(b), **6:10**
FRAP 39(c), **3:29**
FRCP 26, **8:9**
FRCP 52(a), **3:45; 12:6; 16:25**
FRCP 60(b) motion, **3:5**
Frivolous Appeal (this index)
Immediate appeal, 28 USC Sec. 1291, **11:10**
Implication, decision by, **5:41**
Inequitable conduct, **23:47**
Infringement, award to prevailing infringer, **18:19**
Interference, **4:11; 5:68; 7:26; 7:74; 12:99; 13:119**

APPEAL AND REVIEW—Cont'd

Interlocutory appeal, **9:6; 13:61; 14:9**
 ITC, **1:15; 1:129; 1:254; 2:117; 6:2; 7:104; 7:105; 19:25**
 Judgment Notwithstanding Verdict (JNOV) (this index)
 Jurisdiction. Appellate Jurisdiction (this index)
 Jury, **5:41; 19:60**
 Jury verdict, generally, **4:18**
 License, **21:5**
 Limitations and restrictions, **2:9; 7:2; 7:58; 9:59**
 Mandamus, **9:41; 9:63**
 Mandate, **12:47**
 Manifest or clear error, **4:6**
 Meaningful appellate scrutiny, **15:40**
 Means-plus-function claim, **22:26**
 Mootness (this index)
 Motion, **9:38; 23:10**
 New ground of rejection, **9:22**
 9 cir, **19:51**
 Notice, **4:25; 9:169; 10:14; 10:18**
 Obviousness, **9:15; 9:52; 9:56; 15:40**
 Opinions or findings, **19:42**
 Overturn on appeal, **23:33**
 Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **9:2; 13:162**
 Pendency of appeal, **19:25**
 Post-trial motions, **18:3**
 Prejudgment interest, no award of, **8:20**
 Preliminary injunction, **2:16; 7:81; 8:2**
 Preservation of issue, **3:54**
 Prima facie case, **9:37**
 Privilege, **9:184**
 Prosecution history estoppel, **2:9**
 Raising argument or issue
 generally, **7:58; 8:44; 13:85; 16:32**
 first time, **2:34**
 not before trial court not considered on appeal, **16:35**
 not presented below, **2:33**
 not raised below, **8:44; 13:85**
 Reconsideration, request for, **20:21**
 Reexamination, **9:206**
 Rejection, examiner's, **9:64**
 Relationship between, **11:13**
 Removal, Sec. 1447(d), **22:46**
 Reply brief, first mentioned in, **23:23**
 Reprehensible conduct, **9:159**

APPEAL AND REVIEW—Cont'd

Reviewed without deference, **21:42; 21:44**
 Scope, no restriction on
 Sec. 141 proceedings, **9:59**
 Sec. 142 proceedings, **9:59**
 Sec. 143 proceedings, **9:59**
 Sec. 144 proceedings, **9:59**
 Sec. 145 proceedings, **9:59**
 Scope of judgment appealed from, **5:43**
 Sec. 102(b), de novo review from PTO, **9:7**
 Sec. 112, **9:40**
 Sec. 141, **22:44**
 Sec. 145, **6:9; 14:4**
 Sec. 146, interference, **7:26**
 Sec. 271(e)(1), **5:3**
 Sec. 285, award of attorney fees, **4:16**
 Sec. 337, appellate function, **3:23**
 Sec. 1292(b), **9:97; 14:9**
 Sec. 1292(c)(2), interlocutory appeal, **9:6; 13:61**
 Sec. 1447(d), removal, **22:46**
 Secondary considerations, **9:82**
 Separate argument, **9:173**
 Special interrogatories, **8:84**
 Special master's decision, **13:24**
 Standard of review
 generally, **7:2; 9:165**
 administrative agency, **3:50**
 administrative board action, **22:9**
 administrative board's decision, **13:49**
 amend the judgment, **1:102**
 anticipation, **3:54; 9:169; 18:44; 19:12**
 arbitration, **4:33; 6:45**
 attorney fees award, **9:161**
 bankruptcy court decisions, **9:213**
 best mode, **26:4**
 board, **9:166; 9:208; 9:217**
 claim construction and interpretation, **3:74; 12:35; 12:103; 19:12; 19:121; 20:64; 20:130**
 claims court, **6:29; 19:67**
 commission factual findings, **15:18**
 conclusion of obviousness, **9:26**
 construction of count, **7:74**
 contempt, **3:56**
 contract interpretation, **8:41**
 contracts, **1:76**

INDEX

APPEAL AND REVIEW—Cont'd

Standard of review—Cont'd

damages, **18:35; 19:96; 20:39; 21:23**
declaratory judgment, **19:86**
directed verdict, **1:46; 1:71**
disclosure dedication, **20:74**
discovery matters, **11:7**
discretion of court, **7:72**
dismissal, **2:44; 12:44**
disputed material facts, **19:120**
district court, **7:33; 7:72**
enablement, **2:79**
evidentiary rulings, **13:71**
experimental use, **13:109**
fact finding, **4:41; 9:217**
factual determination, PTO, **4:56**
factual findings, commission, **15:18**
finding, **7:27; 7:33; 9:217**
FRAP 38, **16:29**
FRCP 11, **1:42; 8:75; 16:76; 19:87**
FRCP 52(a), **3:39**
indefiniteness, **1:119; 12:61**
inequitable conduct, **2:59; 3:72; 6:50;**
9:35; 10:31; 11:11; 13:84;
14:19; 18:37; 18:40; 20:39
infringement, **3:43; 5:36; 9:254;**
16:11
injunction, **3:56; 15:6**
instructions, **5:30; 8:47; 21:27**
interference, **5:46**
inter partes review, **9:418; 13:213;**
19:286
inventorship, **5:40**
ITC, **2:117; 7:52; 8:28; 8:86; 19:25**
JMOL, **2:91; 3:96; 5:30; 6:46;**
12:61; 13:85; 13:101; 14:21;
14:25; 18:62
JNOV, **4:2; 6:36; 9:186; 12:31;**
13:34; 19:12; 19:60; 22:2
judgment as a matter of law (JMOL),
5:21; 12:45; 13:75; 20:41
jury findings, **7:27**
jury instructions, **1:136; 4:32; 5:52;**
10:4; 20:64
jury trial, **2:34; 7:28; 23:25**
jury verdict, **2:49; 6:26; 8:51; 21:27**
laches, **5:30; 5:53; 8:50**
Lanham Act, **9:249**
license agreement, **19:104**
limitation of actions, **12:46**
litigation misconduct, **1:112**

APPEAL AND REVIEW—Cont'd

Standard of review—Cont'd

long-felt need, **19:12**
mandamus, **9:128**
material fact, disputed, **19:120**
means-plus-function claim, **14:38**
merit system board, **8:48**
motion, JNOV, **9:186**
new trials, **2:99; 5:54; 13:85; 14:25;**
16:87
obviousness, **2:59; 9:26; 9:168;**
9:174; 9:195; 9:202; 9:418;
16:19; 22:13
on-sale bar, **1:119; 22:20**
oral testimony of anticipatory devices,
19:12
personal jurisdiction, **6:50**
preliminary injunction, **7:70; 8:46;**
13:89; 20:61
PTO, **4:56; 4:69; 9:43; 9:165; 9:196**
punitive damages, **18:58**
reduction to practice, **19:90**
regulations, **19:137**
remittitur, **15:10**
sanctions, **9:161**
Sec. 112(2), **9:240**
Sec. 145, **13:115**
Sec. 146, **23:52**
Sec. 282, **18:6**
Sec. 314(d), **9:418**
secondary considerations, **9:207;**
19:12
special verdicts, **20:35**
specification, use of, **19:12**
state claim, failure to, **4:29**
statutory construction, **2:54; 3:58;**
6:44; 9:162; 9:176; 16:30;
19:88
statutory interpretation, **13:59**
substantial evidence, **16:31**
summary judgment, **1:67; 1:82; 1:87;**
2:44; 2:52; 2:63; 4:29; 7:7;
7:35; 9:162; 15:12; 17:5; 18:33;
19:84; 22:7; 23:36; 23:43
willful infringement, **19:96**
willfulness, **5:54**
witnesses, **19:12**
Standard of review on appeal
interference, **13:119**

APPEAL AND REVIEW—Cont'd

Standard of review on appeal—Cont'd
 preliminary injunction, **2:62; 7:50; 8:71; 12:16; 16:46; 20:53; 22:16**

Standing, **7:39; 19:48; 20:75**

Stay of injunction pending appeal, **5:2**

Subject matter jurisdiction, **1:37; 6:19**

Subordinate, **9:2**

Summary judgment, **8:17; 21:29**

Supporting evidence, citing only, **13:45**

Theory not raised below, **8:44**

37 CFR Sec. 1.191, **9:2**

Timeliness, **10:3; 11:38; 13:162**

Tolling, equitable, **7:32**

Transfers

generally, **16:45**

action, distinction between claim, **7:14**

addition of bona fide patent claim, **7:14**

bona fide patent claim, addition of, **7:14**

CAFC jurisdiction, **7:14**

claim, distinction between action, **7:14**

jurisdiction, CAFC jurisdiction, **7:14**

well-pleaded complaint rule, **1:160; 7:14**

Trial de novo, not, **6:12**

Trial of issues not presented to jury, **5:41**

28 USC § 1291, immediate appeal, **11:10**

Validity

generally, **7:61; 8:49; 18:39**

review of jury verdict, standard of, **8:62**

review of jury verdict thereon, standard of, **21:26**

Verdict, generally, **4:18; 16:14**

APPEAL BRIEF

File, failure to, **7:23**

Improper, **12:22**

Substitute for notice, **10:14**

Summary judgment, **2:29**

Supporting argument in, failure to provide any, **4:36**

APPELLATE COURT

Appendix documents not of record, improper to include in, **2:3**

APPELLATE COURT—Cont'd

Inequitable conduct, **6:4**

Infringement, **2:95**

Law of the case doctrine, **20:34**

APPELLATE JURISDICTION

Attorney fees award, **3:11**

Determination of, **8:1**

District Court, **1:31; 12:36**

Diversity of citizenship, not solely, **3:11**

Finality of judgment, **9:300**

FRCP 21, **1:31**

FRCP 42(b), **1:31**

Frivolous appeal, **3:11**

Infringement, threatened, **3:11**

Judgment as appealable, **8:15**

Pendent, **5:85**

Post-trial injunction pending appeal, denial of stay of, **19:9**

Preliminary injunction, **3:12**

Review of Board decision by expanded panel, **9:147**

Rumors, **3:11**

Sec. 1292, **1:31; 16:116**

Separately tried claims, **1:31**

Threatened infringement, **3:11**

Timeliness of appeal, **2:5; 13:8**

Transfer of appeal, **3:152; 21:12**

APPENDIX DOCUMENTS

Appellate court may consider only the record as it was made before the district court, **2:3**

APPLE INC. V. COREPHOTONICS, LTD.

2023, **1:386**

APPLE INC. V. GESTURE TECHNOLOGY PARTNERS, LLC

2025, **1:405; 1:406**

APPLE INC. V. VIDAL

2023, **1:387**

APPLICATION

Abbreviated New Drug Application (ANDA) (this index)

Assignor estoppel doctrine, **17:4**

Claim interpretation, applicants' inaccurate statement, **19:155**

Confidence, high degree of confidence and trust between PTO and patent applicants, **10:5**

INDEX

APPLICATION—Cont'd

Continuation Application (this index)
Continuation-in-Part Application (this index)
Design patent issued as division of earlier utility application may be entitled to latter's priority date, **18:1**
Double patenting, **1:115**
Earlier filing date, **13:53; 26:12**
Estoppel, **23:30**
Obviousness, **9:29; 9:152**
Original application, meaning of term, **3:139**
Prima facie case, **9:150**
Prima facie obviousness, **2:25; 9:152**
Priority analysis, **9:340**
Provisional, **5:88**
Reissuance, 37 CFR Sec. 1.175(a)(4), **9:25**
Res judicata, **11:35**
Retroactive application of judicial decision, **23:33**
Sec. 119, **9:143**
Sec. 120, **8:19; 12:10**
Specification, **9:189**
Statutory construction, **15:7**
Substitute, must be obvious to, **9:29**
37 CFR Sec. 1.175(a)(4), **9:25**
Unrelated applications, **13:108**

APPOINTMENT

Administrative patent judges, **9:311**
Clause, **9:509**

APPORTIONMENT

Damages, **1:376; 13:224; 15:61**
Delay, **23:27**
Infringement, **13:224**
Reasonable royalty, **14:5**

APPRECIATION

Affidavit describing work of third party at reasonably contemporaneous time, **9:23**
Conception, **13:105**

APPREHENSION, REASONABLE

Generally, **6:35**

ARBITRATION

Generally, **13:127; 18:131**

ARBITRATION—Cont'd

Agreement to arbitrate, **4:85; 16:136; 22:55; 23:91**
Anti-suit injunction, **19:239**
CAFC, **18:3**
Choice of law, **9:278**
District court order compelling arbitration, **16:136; 22:55**
International Trade Commission, **9:380**
9 USC § 3, **18:13**
Review, standard of, **4:33; 6:45**

ARBUTUS BIOPHARMA CORPORATION V. MODERNATX, INC.

2023, **1:388**

ARITHMETICAL ERROR

Generally, **13:45**

ARO

Contributory infringement without direct infringement, none, **13:29**
Repair doctrine, **19:56**

ARRANGED AS IN CLAIM

Printed publication, **14:56**

ART CLASS

Interference, **4:21**

ARTICLE III

Judicial error, **19:55**

ARTICULATED REASON FOR DECISION

Agency, **12:64**

AS A WHOLE

Generally, **19:34**
Chemical, **9:60**
Claim preamble, **16:58**
Combination patent, **13:15**
Double patenting, **5:111**
Focus on one facet, **18:28**
FRCP 52(a), **12:6**
Infringement, **3:100**
Jury instructions, **10:15**
New prior art not considered by PTO, **5:11**
Obviousness, **2:8; 2:171; 5:111; 7:17; 9:46; 9:86; 9:179**
Prima facie obviousness, **9:86**
Printed matter and substrate, no specific type of functional relationship

AS A WHOLE—Cont’d

needed between, **9:32**
 Prior art references, **9:59**
 Sec. 102(g), **11:9**
 Special master’s decision, **13:24**
 Statutory construction, **3:63**
 Summary judgment, **12:15**

ASSERTION OF ONLY CERTAIN CLAIMS

Entire patent not in issue, **3:46**

ASSESSMENT OF COSTS ON APPEAL

Sec. 145, **14:4**

ASSIGNMENT

Generally, **19:324**
 Ambiguity, **5:99**
 Bayh-Dole Act, **2:135**
 Exclusive ownership, **20:134**
 License, **13:79; 13:87; 19:154**
 On-sale, **13:87**
 Patent claims, **12:84**
 Patentee status, **4:115**
 Patent rights, generally, **4:86; 13:28**
 PTO, failure to record assignment, **1:60**
 Reassignment, **5:82**
 Requirements, **7:39; 13:79**
 Standing, **1:191; 1:196; 1:218; 1:264; 5:38; 13:87**

ASSIGNOR ESTOPPEL

Generally, **3:117; 8:158; 8:163; 13:223; 16:89; 17:4**
 Application, **17:4**
 Challenges to validity of contract, **21:38**
 Contradictory, **19:47**
 Damages, reservation of, **19:47**
 Defenses, equitable, **19:47; 19:241**
 Equitable defenses, **19:47**
 Equities weighed, **3:46**
 Infringement, inefficient, **19:47**
 Judgment, **19:47**
 Less advantageous, **19:47**
 License back, **1:43**
 Privity, **9:118; 13:88; 19:47**
 Public policy, **4:13**
 Remand, **6:96**
 Removal, **6:96**
 Reservation of damages, **19:47**
 Sec. 1447(d), **6:96**

ASSIGNOR ESTOPPEL—Cont’d

Statements in declaration, **19:47**
 Summary infringement, **13:207**
 Validity of contract, challenges to, **21:38**

ASSUMPTIONS

Jurisdiction, **4:44**
 Sec. 1400(b), control of litigation, **9:11**

ASTELLAS PHARMA, INC. V. SANDOZ INC.

2024, **1:395**

“AT LEAST ONE”

Generally, **18:50**

“AT LEAST TWO”

Plurality, **18:67**

ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGE

Generally, **6:57; 7:52**
 Choice of law, **1:19; 9:184**
 Crime fraud exception, **21:58**
 Interview of third-party inventor, **19:60**
 ITC, **23:55**
 Mandamus writ, **9:184; 9:293**
 Order to produce communications, **23:74**
 Record of invention, **9:221**
 Third party interview, **19:60**

ATTORNEY FEES

Generally, **1:349; 18:132; 19:336.50**
 Bad faith, **18:121**
 Exceptional cases, **1:342**

ATTORNEYS

Appealability, **16:3; 19:64; 23:12**
 Appeal and review, **6:12; 14:55; 16:29; 19:16**
 Attorney-Client Privilege (this index)
 Attorneys’ Fees (this index)
 Awards. Attorneys’ Fees (this index)
 Claim interpretation, **9:94**
 Client bound by acts or omissions of, **4:36**
 Criticism by court, **14:55**
 Disclosure, duty of, **9:43**
 Disqualification
 generally, **4:124; 11:6**
 appealability, **9:343; 16:3; 23:12**
 attorney, **11:6**
 canons, **20:3**
 confidences, sharing client’s, **16:3**

INDEX

ATTORNEYS—Cont'd

Disqualification—Cont'd
defined, procedure, **16:3**
law firm, **5:12**
merged firms, **16:18**
presumption, **16:3**
procedural, **1:32**
procedure defined, **16:3**
rebuttal, **16:3**
screening, effectiveness of, **16:3**
settlement agreement, **19:40**
Drafting claims specifically directed to competitor's device, **9:158**
Evidence, **7:33; 19:6; 19:209**
FCR 7(a), **18:15**
Flagrant misrepresentations of record, **16:9**
FRCP 11, **18:95**
FRCP 37, **16:71; 21:69**
Inequitable conduct, **15:3**
Infringement, neither intent nor preparation constitutes, **12:22**
ITC, **13:40**
JNOV, **23:4**
Mandamus, **9:57**
Merged firms, **16:18**
Misconduct, **8:35; 11:13**
Obviousness, **3:104; 16:19**
Opinion of counsel
generally, **19:101**
accounting phase, **11:15**
appeal is review and not trial de novo, **6:12**
competency, **4:6; 13:45**
competency requirement, **3:80; 10:21**
damages, **1:20**
inference that adverse, failure to introduce supports, **5:30**
issue preclusion, **4:9**
marketing, prior to, **3:72**
no adverse effect, **11:56**
prior to marketing, **3:72**
willful infringement, **1:62; 8:50; 9:125; 10:15; 12:32**
willfulness, **21:18**
Personal jurisdiction, attorney-client relationship, **18:90**
Preliminary injunction, denial of, **12:16**
Qualifications. Disqualification, above
Reissue, **9:84**

ATTORNEYS—Cont'd

Role of counsel, generally, **19:6**
Root, **12:24; 16:4**
Sanctioning counsel
Rule 11, **8:122**
Sec. 1292(c)(2), **9:6**
Sec. 10.57(b), **13:69**
Sec. 32, **23:15**
Sec. 1292(c)(2), **9:6**
Settlement agreement, **19:40**
Verbatim findings of counsel adopted, **8:22**
Willful infringement
generally, **14:5; 19:92; 19:154; 23:26**
advice of counsel, **14:5; 19:154**
opinion of counsel, **1:62; 8:50; 9:125; 10:15; 12:32; 19:92; 23:26**

ATTORNEYS' FEES

Generally, **1:364; 2:61; 7:81; 19:8; 23:56**
Abuse of discretion explained, **16:24**
ANDA, **25:7**
Appellate jurisdiction, **3:11**
Clearly erroneous standard, **19:23**
Collateral estoppel, **4:3**
Conflict of laws, **17:7; 19:163**
Cost-plus-overhead vs. private firm market rate for in-house counsel fee award, **16:24**
De novo review, **3:171**
Design patent, **19:8; 21:4**
Divided infringement, refusal to deem unreasonable, **13:208**
Enforcement order, **4:20**
Enhanced damages, **1:43**
Exceptional case, **1:62; 1:299; 2:85; 4:83; 5:109; 5:143; 9:316; 9:328; 9:377; 9:455; 9:483; 11:16; 12:24; 12:32; 12:110; 13:175; 13:197; 14:58; 18:9; 19:92; 19:249; 20:87; 20:115; 20:122; 23:65**
Experience, reliance upon, **19:65**
Expert witness fees, **15:48**
Findings, for remand when no express findings, **3:46**
Fixed sum, **19:57**
Frivolous appeal, **16:20; 18:11; 20:16**
Inequitable conduct, **1:193; 8:18; 10:2; 13:19; 18:43; 20:97**

ATTORNEYS' FEES—Cont'd

Infringement, **18:19**
 In-house counsel, **16:24**
 Joint liability of inventor, **8:18**
 Jury trial, **1:300**
 Litigation misconduct, **13:167; 13:197; 19:100; 20:87**
 Local rules, **1:260**
 Mandamus, **9:68**
 Market rate, **16:24**
 Mootness, **19:200**
 Non-patent issues, **7:54**
 Other circumstances may support, **19:26**
 Party-prepared findings not improper, **13:12**
 Prevailing party, **3:35; 13:73**
 Prior experience, **19:65**
 Private firm, **16:24**
 Privity, **11:14**
 Prosecution aggressiveness, **13:116**
 Public service, **10:2**
 Rate calculation, **22:22**
 Reissue proceedings, **16:24; 18:82**
 Reliance upon his prior experience, **19:65**
 Remand, **3:46**
 Restitution of award improperly granted, **19:58**
 Review, standard of, **9:161**
 Routine assessment, **18:12**
 Sanctions, **12:36; 19:42**
 Sec. 85, **9:159**
 Sec. 145, **14:80**
 Sec. 285, **1:300; 2:170; 3:42; 3:196; 4:16; 4:32; 5:109; 5:137; 7:20; 7:27; 8:18; 8:38; 8:130; 9:328; 9:455; 12:4; 13:38; 13:175; 16:5; 18:121; 18:123; 19:3; 19:33; 19:35; 19:51; 19:58; 19:313; 23:6**
 Sec. 1117(a), **18:121**
 Sec. 2412(b), **13:48**
 Settlement negotiations, failure to engage in, **15:37**
 Success in sustaining validity of valid patent is public service, **10:2**
 Summary judgment, **1:2; 2:71**
 Two-prong inquiry, **13:85**
 Two-step analysis required, **7:37**
 Two-step process, **6:53**
 Validity of valid patent is public service, **10:2**

ATTORNEYS' FEES—Cont'd

Willfulness finding not upheld, **19:103**

ATTRIBUTION

Infringement, **20:141**

AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC

Printed publication, **9:386**

AXIOMATIC

Case or controversy requirement, **1:113**

AXONICS, INC. V. MEDTRONIC, INC.

2023, **1:389; 1:390**

AZURITY PHARMACEUTICALS, INC. V. ALKEM LABORATORIES LTD.

2025, **1:407**

BACKERTOP LICENSING LLC V. CANARY CONNECT, INC.

2024, **2:206**

BAD AXIOM

Sec. 102(g), **11:9**

BAD FAITH

Attorney fees, **13:167; 18:121; 20:115**

Damages, **20:19**

Exceptional case, **9:328; 13:69**

Litigation misconduct, **18:29**

Objectively baseless, **4:88; 7:92**

Settlement, **12:39**

Willful infringement, **10:21**

BANKRUPTCY

Choice of law, **9:213**

11 USC § 1141, **2:21**

Infringement, **8:94**

Jurisdiction, **9:213**

Review, standard of, **9:213**

Standing analysis, **13:148**

Summary judgment, **2:21**

BARRETTE OUTDOOR LIVING, INC. V. FORTRESS IRON, LP

2025, **2:210**

BATCH PROCESS

Inequitable conduct, **10:2**

BAXALTA INCORPORATED V. GENENTECH, INC.

2023, **2:203**

INDEX

**BAYER PHARMA
AKTIENGESELLSCHAFT V.
MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS
INC.**
2025, **2:211**

BAYH-DOLE ACT
Generally, **3:108**
Assignment, **2:135**

BEARBOX LLC V. LANCIUM LLC
2025, **2:212**

BED OF ITS OWN MAKING
FRCP 15(c), **6:11**

BEST MODE
Generally, **1:80; 1:161; 2:70; 3:109;
9:125**
Claimed invention, **20:63**
Commercial mode, **26:4**
Concealment, **2:34; 19:231**
Defined by scope of claimed invention,
14:30
Deposit, **1:44; 19:51**
Design patent, **18:1**
Disclosure, **7:37; 7:47; 9:357; 23:72**
Enablement, **2:90; 3:31; 9:177**
Fact-law question, mixed, **3:31**
Fact question, **14:8; 20:35**
Interference, **4:8; 13:3**
JNOV motion, denial of, **13:13**
Knowledge, only disclose what aware
of, **7:47**
Law-fact question, mixed, **3:31**
Mixed law-fact question, **3:31**
Only disclose what aware of, **7:47**
Possessed best mode, **5:55**
Review, standard of, **26:4**
Sec. 112, **1:161; 1:194; 2:14; 4:2; 5:16;
19:21; 19:60**
Sec. 112(1), **7:34; 20:33; 23:19**
Sec. 120, **8:19**
Specification, **9:357**
State of mind of inventor not sole focus,
3:31
Time of belief, **1:246**
Trade name alone, **18:5**
Two component analysis, **1:91; 7:41;
13:79; 21:25**
Two factual inquiries, **5:49; 6:36;
14:21; 18:42; 23:41; 25:4**

BEST MODE—Cont'd
Unclaimed subject matter, **13:101**
Unintentional omission, **8:87**
Verbatim findings of counsel adopted,
8:22

**BETEIRO, LLC V. DRAFTKINGS
INC.**
2024, **2:207**

BEYOND EXPRESS TERMS
Consent judgment, **14:28Z**

BIAS
Generally, **16:29**
See also Prejudice (this index)

BIFURCATION
Sec. 287, **4:12**
Trial, **19:195**
Willfulness, **17:3**

BIOGENIC
DNA technology, **1:44**

BIOLOGICAL ACTIVITY
Chemical, **9:60**

BIOLOGICAL DEPOSITS
Description, **5:69**

BIOLOGICAL PROCESSES
Enablement, **5:66**

**BIOLOGICS PRICE COMPETITION
AND INNOVATION ACT (BPCIA)**
Generally, **1:273**
Doctrine of equivalents, **1:337**
Infringement, **1:337**
Preemption, **1:303; 19:294**

BIOSIMILAR PRODUCTS
Preliminary injunction, **1:291**

BLEAK HOUSE
Dickens, **19:83**

BLOCK DIAGRAM
Combination patent, **13:15**

BLOCKING PATENT
Obviousness, **1:314**

BLONDER-TONGUE
Generally, **1:13**
Actual device sold, **1:13**

BLONDER-TONGUE—Cont'd

Collateral estoppel, **1:47; 13:26; 13:61; 19:33**
 Delay in disclaiming, **1:13**
 Earlier adjudication, not augmented by, **1:13**
 FRCP 52(a), **1:13**
 Inequitable conduct, **1:13**
 Infringement proof, **1:13**
 Law question, **1:13**
 Lear, **20:9**
 Obviousness, **1:13**
 Presumption of validity, **1:13**
 Repair parts, **1:13**
 Royalty, **1:13**
 Subjective good faith, **1:13**

BLUE GENTIAN, LLC V. TRISTAR PRODUCTS, INC.

2023, **2:204**

BLUEPRINT

Obviousness, **9:90**

BOARD

Appealable, **9:31**
 Appropriate, when, **11:26**
 Clearly erroneous standard review of facts, **9:191**
 EIC, **7:23**
 Explanation, sufficient, **9:218**
 Fact findings, **9:195**
 Filings, late, **18:56**
 Findings, review for, **9:195**
 Grounds relied upon, **1:348**
 Interference, dissolution of, **16:7**
 Invention ownership vs. inventorship, **2:36**
 Late filings, **18:56**
 Merit Systems Protection Board standard of review thereof, **4:39**
 Review, standard of, **2:126; 9:166; 9:208; 9:217**
 Sec. 135(a), **9:116**
 Sufficient explanation required, **9:218**
 37 CFR Sec. 1.191, **9:2**

BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS

Scope of review, **9:265**

BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Jurisdiction, **2:150**

BONA FIDE PATENT CLAIM

Transfer of appeal, **7:14**

BONA FIDE PURCHASER

Generally, **1:46; 8:63**
 Choice of law, **18:61**
 License agreement, **18:61**

BORN VALID

Sec. 282, **6:10**

BOT M8 LLC V. SONY

INTERACTIVE ENTERTAINMENT LLC

2023, **2:205**

BRIEFS

Appeal Briefs (this index)
 Commissioner's brief not prior art, **9:140**
 Confidentiality markings, **9:337**
 Filing, **7:23**
 First time develop fraud allegation, **12:3**
 Sec. 143, **9:116**
 Waiver by not raising issue, **23:25**

BRIGHT-LINE TEST

Fitness for intended use, **6:23**
 Intent, **6:23**
 On-sale bar, **3:83**
 Owner's right to preserve patented machine's fitness for its intended use, **6:23**
 Repair vs. reconstruction, **2:75**

BRITA LP V. INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

2025, **2:213**

BROADBAND ITV, INC. V. AMAZON.COM, INC.

2024, **2:208**

BROAD DISCRETION

Injunctive relief, **10:23**

BROADEN BEYOND CORRECT SCOPE

Claim differentiation, **13:91; 20:51**

BROADENED CLAIMS

Reissue, **9:192; 17:6**

BROADENING REISSUE

Filing, timely filed, **9:3**

INDEX

BROADENING REISSUE—Cont'd

Objective intent to claim is not criterion, **9:109**
Prosecution history, **9:368**
Sec. 251, **1:52**
Summary judgment, **20:10**
Timely filed, **9:3**

BROADENING SCOPE

Injunction, **19:48**

BROADEN TERM

Reexamination, **1:90**

BROADEST REASONABLE INTERPRETATION

Claim construction, **3:201; 9:350**
Claim interpretation, **9:149; 9:256**
Claim not read in vacuum, **9:58**
Claims construed, **9:77**
Examiner's rejection, **9:427**
Interference, **9:88; 23:14**
Interference counts, **18:56**
Inter partes review, **3:201; 4:112; 9:400; 9:448; 22:56**
Obviousness, **3:201**
Reexamination, **9:8; 9:154; 9:255**

BROAD STATUTORY LANGUAGE

Statutory construction, **20:31**

BRUMFIELD, TRUSTEE FOR ASCENT TRUST V. IBG LLC

2024, **2:209**

BURDEN

Appeal, **12:11**
Challenger, **16:12; 18:4**
Coming forward, **10:18**
Establish, PTO's burden to establish, **9:140**
Heavy burden
challenging validity, **1:9**
FRCP 26, **8:9**
obviousness question, **16:19**
reasonable royalty, **8:51**
validity, **23:48**
Interference, **15:1; 19:70**
Mandamus writ, **9:193**
Obviousness, **1:30**
Prima facie obviousness, **9:153**
Prior art, noting differences from, **4:6**
Rebut, **9:152**

BURDEN—Cont'd

Show, **2:96; 22:18**
Summary judgment, **13:90; 18:47**
Willful infringement, **16:22**

BURDEN OF PERSUASION AND QUANTUM OF PROOF

Generally, **12:74; 18:7**
Anticipation, **18:7**
Burden of proof, **19:68**
Claim element, **18:7**
Court must state, **18:7**
Dependent, independent vs. dependent claims, **18:7**
Independent vs. dependent claims, **18:7**
Means-plus-function, **18:7**
Obviousness, **9:357; 18:7**
Validity, **15:15**

BURDEN OF PRODUCTION

Anticipatory prior art, **20:88**
Reduction to practice, **12:63**

BURDEN OF PROOF

Generally, **9:282**
See also Presumptions (this index)
Amendment of claims, **1:305**
Anticipation, **9:201**
Burden of persuasion, **19:68**
Circumstantial evidence, carried by, **4:33**
Copying claims from patent, **2:26**
Declaratory judgment, **13:179; 13:194**
Defenses, **9:118; 19:48**
Disclosure, **13:10**
Evidence required, **5:83**
Exceptional case, **15:45**
Indefiniteness, **1:21**
Inequitable conduct, **19:92**
Infringement, **1:123; 7:31; 13:179; 13:194**
Interference, **2:47; 2:107; 4:8; 5:52; 13:31; 16:36**
Invalidity, **2:92**
ITC, **19:25**
Jury, **1:16**
Laches, **23:46**
License defense, **3:56; 9:118**
New prior art, **5:11**
Obviousness, **14:71**
On-sale bar, **9:171; 12:98**

BURDEN OF PROOF—Cont'd

Preliminary injunction, **3:76; 5:92; 14:20; 19:235**
 Printed publication, **13:72**
 Prior art, **5:11**
 Reverse doctrine of equivalents, **19:24**
 Sec. 282, **9:80**
 Summary judgment, **1:35; 10:4**
 Validity, **14:21; 20:35; 20:39; 21:25**

BURYING REFERENCE

Relevancy of foreign patent prosecution, **13:69**

BUSINESS DAMAGE

Mandamus, **9:76**

BUSINESS DAY

Timely appeal, failure to file, **23:28**

BUSINESS METHODS EXCEPTION

Estoppel, **3:202**
 Statutory subject matter, **9:308; 19:112; 19:297**

BUSINESS RECORDS EXCEPTION

Evidence, **3:67; 13:71**

BUSINESS SYSTEMS

Sec. 101, **1:293; 9:286**

BUSY COURT

FRCP 15(a), **20:5**

BUT FOR CAUSATION

Panduit guidelines, **3:62**

BUT FOR TEST

Lost profits, **5:54; 6:36; 7:47; 8:51; 11:32; 13:121; 16:40; 18:35; 20:52**

BUT ONE FACTOR FOR REJECTING

Intent to claim, **9:39**

CAFC

Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (CAFC) (this index)

CAMOUFLAGED ATTACK

Claim interpretation, **20:8**

CANATEX COMPLETION SOLUTIONS, INC. V. WELLMATICS, LLC

2025, **3:257**

CANCELLATION

Claim interpretation, **16:118; 16:119**
 Doctrine of equivalents, **13:106**
 Prosecution history estoppel, **5:36**
 Reissue claim, **9:364; 12:31**

CANDOR

Generally, **11:11**
 Inequitable conduct, **12:55**

CANONS

Attorney disqualification, **20:3**

CAPACITOR

Generally, **8:58; 9:220**

CASE OR CONTROVERSY

Generally, **1:274; 16:144; 19:160; 20:79**
 Axiomatic, **1:113**
 Declaratory judgment inducement, **1:319**
 plaintiff must establish, **19:86**
 Escrow, **3:21**
 Infringement, **7:10**
 Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act, **20:78**
 Orange book, **20:78**
 Patent Office issuance of final decisions, challenging, **19:290**
 Summary judgment, **7:7**

CATALOG OF PARTS

Generally, **12:13**

CAUSAL RELATION MUST BE SHOWN

Lost profits, **5:71**

CAUSAM ENTERPRISES, INC. V. ECOBEE TECHNOLOGIES ULC

2025, **3:258**

CAUSAM ENTERPRISES, INC. V. INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

2025, **3:259**

CAUSATION

Lost profits, **13:79; 15:10**
 Permanent injunction, **7:121**

CAUSATION, BUT FOR

Lost profits, **3:96**

INDEX

CAUSE OF ACTION

Generally, **13:62**

CCPA DECISIONS

Binding precedent, **9:74**
Fast moving industry, **9:74**
Long-felt need, **9:74**
Secondary considerations, **9:74**

CD-ROM

FRAP 25, **25:5**

CEASE AND DESIST LETTERS

Corporate officers, **6:67**
Importation, **19:221**
Minimum contact, **18:45**
Personal jurisdiction, **24:5**

CEILING

Factual findings to support jury verdict presumed, **2:15**

CELANESE INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION V. INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

2024, **3:250**

CELLS

Hepatocytes, freeze-thaw cycles, **18:109**
Microbiology field, **9:53; 18:109**

CENTRIPETAL NETWORKS, LLC V. PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC.

2025, **3:260**

CERTAINTY AND DEFINITENESS

Generally, **2:166; 3:237; 4:111; 5:122; 8:93; 9:252; 9:396; 9:473; 14:103; 14:105 to 14:107; 15:50; 16:127; 19:161; 19:337**

See also Ambiguity (this index)

Amenable to construction, **5:58**
Amendments, **1:21; 8:86**
Antecedent basis, **5:81**
Anticipation, **5:107**
Apparatus method, mixed, **13:220**
Appeal and review, **21:44**
Basic and novel properties, **8:156**
Burden of proof, **1:21**
Claim construction, **3:193; 7:120; 20:99**
Claim language as precise as subject matter permits, **16:47**

CERTAINTY AND DEFINITENESS

—Cont'd

Claim preclusion, indefiniteness, **4:110; 13:223**
Clarity, **19:213**
Competitor, potential competitor cannot determine infringement, **13:57**
Construction, **5:58; 5:81; 8:86; 8:103**
Damages, indefiniteness, **1:275**
Deference, reviewed without, **21:44**
De novo review, **9:328**
Design patent, indefiniteness, **1:275; 5:126**
Difficulty in determining scope of claim by one skilled in the art, **9:156**
Discretion of court, **19:60**
Enablement, versus, **16:60; 20:121**
Essentially factual, when issues are, **2:99**
Explicit antecedent basis, failure to provide, **2:84**
Express definition of terms, **2:105**
Extrinsic evidence, **2:156**
Indefiniteness. See entries throughout this topic
Infringement, **13:57**
Inherent, **9:486**
Intervening rights, **16:161**
Language
claim language as precise as subject matter permits, **16:47**
indefinite, **2:169**
Legal conclusions, **1:118; 9:253**
Means-plus-function claim, **1:289; 5:112; 9:330; 13:200; 18:107; 26:15**
Method and apparatus of claim, **9:280**
Noninfringement, **21:68**
Not amendable to construction, **8:86**
Obviousness, **2:160**
Opposing views of experts, **1:21**
Ordinary artisan, **8:103**
Ordinary skill, hypothetical person of, **5:106**
Potential competitor cannot determine infringement, **13:57**
Prosecution history estoppel, **1:21**
Question of law, **9:328**
Reasonably apprise of the scope of invention, **15:21**
Review, standard of, **1:119; 12:61**

CERTAINTY AND DEFINITENESS

—Cont'd

- Sec. 112, **1:21; 1:44; 1:161; 16:114; 19:4**
- Sec. 112(1), **3:54**
- Sec. 112(2), **3:37; 5:106; 13:55; 14:12; 14:66; 14:72**
- Skilled in the art, **9:156**
- Standard to apply, **9:389**
- Subject matter, **16:47**
- Summary judgment, **2:175; 5:141; 19:131**
- Technical terms, **13:80**
- Those skilled in the art would understand the scope, **1:99**
- Understand, hard to, **19:131**

CERTIFICATE OF CORRECTION

- Generally, **3:224; 8:154; 19:126**
- Clear and convincing standard, **3:128; 19:142**
- Material limitation omission, **8:132**
- Reasonable debate, subject to, **14:39**
- Recapture rule, **3:187**
- Sec. 254, **19:56**
- Subject to reasonable debate, **14:39**
- Terminal disclaimer, **10:44**
- Written description, **3:187**

CERTIFICATES AND CERTIFICATION

- Choice of law, **19:155**
- Correction. Certificate of Correction (this index)
- FRCP 54(b), **19:141; 19:191**
- Order for appeal, **20:28**
- Reexamination, **9:239**

CERTIFICATION PLEDGING

- Abbreviated New Drug Application (ANDA), **19:247**

CERTIFIED APPEAL

- Limitation thereon, **6:17**

CERTIFIED QUESTION

- Generally, **8:55**
- Federal patent policy, **6:17**

CERTIORARI

- Sec. 135(c), **3:29**

CFR 1.601(n)

- Generally, **5:68**

CHAIN OF RELATED APPLICATIONS

- Sec. 120, **12:10**

CHALLENGE

- Assignor estoppel, **21:38**
- Burden, heavy, **1:9**
- Burden on patent challenger, **16:12**
- Claim preclusion, **8:76**
- Executive Order 10096, **8:10**
- Interference, **13:3**
- Jurisdiction, **19:46**
- Liquidated damages, **4:46**
- Public policy, **4:13**
- Sec. 112, **18:4**

CHEMICAL

- Biological activity, **9:60**
- Contemporaneous invention as evidence of knowledge level, **9:60**
- Medicinal drug, **9:60**
- Obvious to try, **9:60**
- Reference read in combination with prior art as a whole, **9:60**
- Structural similarity, **9:60**

CHEMICAL CASES

- Doctrine of equivalents, **26:2**
- Infringement, **13:46**
- Interference, **3:28**
- Obviousness, showing of nonobviousness, **9:44**
- Showing of nonobviousness, **9:44**

CHEMICAL COMPOSITION

- Obviousness, prima facie obviousness, **9:98**
- Prima facie obviousness, **9:98**

CHEMICAL COMPOUND

- Anticipation, **10:26**
- Disclosure, encompassed by disclosed generic formula, **9:148**
- Encompassed by disclosed generic formula, **9:148**
- Exact compounds, **21:33**
- Generic formula, encompassed by disclosed generic formula, **9:148**
- Infringement, **5:29**
- Interference, **15:1**
- Obviousness, **5:90; 5:91**
- Obviousness-type double patenting, **15:41**

INDEX

CHEMICAL GENUS

Disclosure, **9:126**

CHEMICAL INTERFERENCE

Sec. 112, **2:14**

CHEMICAL PROCESS

Define, process defined, **9:20**

Each statutory claim class to be considered independently, **9:20**

Obvious, otherwise, **9:20**

Process defined, **9:20**

CHEVRON DEFERENCE

Statutory construction, **4:45; 6:31; 13:77; 26:3**

CHEWY, INC. V. INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION

2024, **3:251**

CHINESE WALL

Confidences acquired, **5:12**

CHOICE OF FORUM

License agreement, **23:2**

CHOICE OF LAW

Generally, **2:34; 2:116; 6:78; 18:32; 19:61**

Admitting evidence, **13:121**

Advertising, false, **2:132**

Amend, leave to, **3:92**

Amendment of pleadings, **1:107**

Antitrust, **5:30; 7:73; 9:219; 14:21; 14:25**

Arbitration award, **9:278**

Attorney-client privilege, **1:19; 9:184**

Attorneys' fees, **17:7; 19:163**

Bankruptcy, **9:213**

Bona fide purchaser, **18:61**

CAFC, **5:67; 6:51; 7:75; 19:156; 21:44**

Certification, **19:155**

Civil contempt, **5:59**

Claim preclusion, **13:65**

Collateral estoppel, **2:88; 4:71; 16:57; 20:72; 22:24**

Common law, federal common law, **18:38**

Competition, unfair, **7:55; 16:48**

Compliance with court rules, **5:54**

Conflicts with other federal statutes, **13:92**

CHOICE OF LAW—Cont'd

Consent judgment, **14:28Z**

Contracts, **19:134; 20:53**

Co-pending actions, **12:67**

Copyright, **1:151**

Cost awards, **11:51**

Counterclaim, infringement, **22:18**

Deference to regional circuit law, **2:31**

Discovery, **1:19; 4:47; 19:114**

Dismissal, without-prejudice, **8:82**

Evidence, admitting, **13:121**

Evidentiary rulings, **1:92; 15:14; 19:142**

Factors considered, **13:73**

Federal common law, **18:38**

FRCP, **19:16**

FRCP 11, **22:14**

FRCP 15(b), **19:105**

FRCP 26(c)(7), **1:19**

FRCP 37, **16:71; 21:69**

FRCP 51, **5:60**

FRCP 56(f), **5:83; 14:50**

FRCP 60(b), **13:93**

Implied-in-fact contract, **20:40**

Inconsistent jury verdicts, **13:105**

Infringement counterclaim, **22:18**

Insurance policy, **21:31**

Interpretation, **1:132**

JMOL, **2:91; 19:137**

Joinder, **9:268**

Judgment disposes of fewer than all issues, **19:95**

Judicial estoppel, **21:24**

Jury verdict, inconsistent, **13:105**

Justiciability, **13:30**

Misconduct, sanctions for, **19:114**

Motion for new trial, **5:56; 5:65; 19:165**

Motion to remand, **19:45**

New trial, **5:56; 5:65; 13:101; 19:126; 19:165**

Nonparty's motion to quash discovery subpoena, **20:17**

Patent tying, **9:276**

Personal jurisdiction, **1:70; 4:49; 8:69; 8:79; 9:226; 18:45**

Postjudgment interest, **20:49**

Prejudice, without-prejudice dismissal, **8:82**

Preliminary injunction, **13:89; 16:33**

Pre-trial order, **19:149**

Procedural issues, **8:21; 19:42; 20:4**

CHOICE OF LAW—Cont'd

Purely procedural issues, **12:58**
 Recusal, **2:55**
 Regional circuit court, case transferred by, **24:1**
 Rule 60(b)(6), **6:49**
 Sanctions for misconduct during discovery, **19:114**
 Sec. 285, **23:57**
 Settlement agreement, **1:100; 7:54; 16:99**
 Sixth Circuit, **1:42**
 State law, **18:64; 18:66**
 Subject matter jurisdiction, **20:66**
 Supreme Court case law as controlling precedent, **23:24**
 Trade dress, **9:161; 15:11**
 Trade secrets, **12:65; 18:39**
 Transfer of case, **24:1**
 Unfair competition, **7:55; 16:48**
 Uniformity objective, **23:37**
 Without-prejudice dismissal, **8:82**

CHROMADEX, INC. V. ELYSIUM HEALTH, INC.

2023, **3:245**

CHUTZPAH

Design patent, **19:8**

CIP

Continuation-in-Part Application (this index)

CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE

Burden of proof, **4:33**
 Direct evidence versus, **13:28**
 Inducement, **2:130**
 Infringement, **12:90**
 Process performable by person, **1:12**
 Rule of reason, **3:82**

CITATION TO RECORD

FRAP 28(e), **12:22**

CITED ART

Presumption re uncited art, **12:13**
 Sec. 282, **12:6**

CITED PRIOR ART

Generally, **13:28**
 Inequitable conduct, **8:29**

CITING EVIDENCE

Only supporting evidence on appeal, **13:45**

CITIZEN PETITION

Antitrusts, **20:127**

CIT (UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE)

Procedural rule corresponds to FRCP, **5:18**

CIVIL ACTIONS

Generally, **3:38**
 Interference, **18:49**
 Sec. 145, **8:118**

CIVIL CONTEMPT

Choice of law, **5:59**
 Criminal distinguished, **19:48**
 Damages, **7:11**
 Severe remedy, **13:1**

CLAIM AGAINST GOVERNMENT

Just compensation, **12:27**

CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND INTERPRETATION

Generally, **1:142; 1:144; 1:336; 1:379; 2:72; 2:95; 2:102; 2:110; 2:142; 2:188; 2:192; 3:97; 3:179; 3:214; 3:217; 4:77; 5:123; 5:145; 6:106; 7:91; 7:120; 7:144; 8:104; 8:141; 9:396; 9:399; 9:405; 9:409; 9:424; 9:468; 9:485; 9:494; 9:495; 9:503; 9:513; 11:44; 11:76; 11:84; 11:88; 13:137; 13:228; 13:250; 14:49; 14:51; 14:87; 14:102; 15:22; 15:25; 16:93; 16:165; 16:180; 16:183; 18:74; 19:169; 19:172; 19:189; 19:256; 19:270; 19:277; 19:289; 19:343; 20:81; 20:138; 20:142; 21:83; 22:33; 22:47; 23:56; 23:60; 23:79; 23:80; 23:90**
 “A” and “an,” **2:127; 20:90**

Absent meaning interpret as in patent, **9:273**

Abstract, **8:73**

Accuracy, **19:155**

Accused device. Device, below

Accustomed and ordinary meaning, **4:60**

Actual words controlling, **4:53**

Additional precision, **16:55; 22:40**

Adequacy, **5:2**

INDEX

CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND INTERPRETATION—Cont'd

Admissibility of evidence, **19:16**
Advantages, **7:83**
Affidavit, **9:77**
Aids, **19:19**
All elements rule, **10:7; 16:118**
Allowance during prosecution, positions taken to obtain, **1:5**
Ambiguity, **2:98; 16:53; 19:115**
Amendment, narrowing, **8:80; 12:83; 19:210**
Anticipation, **2:188; 5:142; 8:96; 8:146; 8:148; 9:285; 20:67**
Any method of analysis, **6:46**
Any use of device, **16:120**
Apparatus and method claims, **8:125; 13:220**
Apparatus of claim, **9:280**
Appeal and review, **19:16**
Arguing claim, **1:123; 3:7**
Asserted claims valid, **19:285**
Attorneys, **9:94**
Avoid ensnaring prior art, **8:57**
Beginning with language of claims, **20:71**
Broadening ordinary meaning, **13:156**
Broadest reasonable interpretation, **3:223; 9:77; 9:149; 9:256; 9:350**
Camouflaged attack, **20:8**
Canceled claims, **16:118; 16:119**
Choice between two views of evidence cannot be clearly erroneous, **16:13**
Claim differentiation, **6:93; 23:88**
Claim language, **1:85; 1:125; 5:101**
Claim narrowing, **4:23**
Claim preamble, **1:313; 3:224; 9:94**
Claim terms, construing, **9:420**
Claim vs., **18:46**
Clearly erroneous, **4:23; 16:13**
Close proximity of terms, **2:105**
Collateral estoppel, **5:113**
Commercial embodiment, **1:192**
Commercial product, comparison to, **9:94**
Commercial success, **9:77**
Common meanings, several, **9:246**
Common term among patents, **13:128**
Comparison to commercial product, **9:94**
“Comprised of” construed, **3:129**

CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND INTERPRETATION—Cont'd

“Comprising” construed, **19:158**
Consistent interpretation, **3:3**
Consistent terms, **3:119**
Consistent with dependent claims, **23:43**
Consisting essentially of, **1:127; 23:3**
Consult sources other than claims, **5:30**
Context of intrinsic record, **16:138**
Contributory infringement, **5:98**
Copies, claim copied from patent to provoke interference, **9:130**
Correction of error by District Court, **3:156**
Corroboration, **9:77**
Cover more than preferred embodiment, **7:57**
Critical claim term construction, **13:169**
Crowded art, improvement in, **20:8**
Customary meaning, **6:51**
Dedication to public, **16:88**
Defining the invention, claim as, **9:267**
Definiteness, **5:114; 8:103; 20:99**
Definition, **7:28; 8:99; 9:253; 14:30**
Dependent claims, consistent with, **1:158; 15:31; 23:43**
Designing around, **3:7**
Device
 accused device, generally, **5:83; 23:60**
 how works, **12:28**
Dictionary, **1:90; 1:154; 3:105; 6:51; 7:79; 9:253; 9:269; 9:396; 11:53; 13:151; 16:85; 16:94; 20:51**
Different meaning with different words, **24:2**
Direct infringement, **12:108**
Disavowal of claim scope, **3:140; 5:97; 7:109; 15:47; 16:143; 16:151; 20:112; 20:148; 21:70**
Disfavor argue own construction improves, **11:43**
Doctrine of equivalents, **1:192; 3:170; 3:178; 4:23; 4:87; 5:120; 20:8**
Doctrine of last antecedent, **6:68**
Drawings, **16:82**
Effective amount, **1:122**
Effective filing date
 generally, **16:92**
 ascertainment on, **16:95**
Elaborating terse claim language, **5:50**

CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND INTERPRETATION—Cont'd

Embodiment, **1:207; 7:57; 7:77; 10:23; 14:34; 16:54; 19:196; 22:12; 22:30; 22:35; 23:49**

Enablement, **19:205; 22:49**

Erroneous remark, **9:94**

Erroneous statement during prosecution, **2:80**

Essential element, **1:119**

Estoppel
 argument-based estoppel, **19:320**
 marking estoppel, **19:15**

Evidence, **1:79; 4:23; 5:53; 6:37; 16:13**

Evolving claim construction, **15:42**

Examiner, **9:94; 19:184; 20:72**

Exceptional case determination, **8:122; 16:13**

Exclusion, **1:233; 14:34; 19:138; 22:12**

Expand or limit scope of terms,
 applicant, **7:76**

Experience, **8:52**

Experimental and physical evidence, **6:37**

Expert or opinion evidence, **3:111; 9:77; 13:86; 19:16; 19:279; 19:340; 22:40**

Explicit arguments, **12:54; 18:60**

Expressly redefine claim terms, **5:48**

Extreme skepticism, renders claim inoperable viewed with, **20:60**

Extrinsic evidence, **2:62; 4:51; 4:59; 5:36; 11:43; 14:30; 16:53; 19:115; 20:77; 22:45; 23:79; 25:3**

Fact, mixed question of law and fact, **13:78**

Factors, **1:52; 1:82; 12:35; 16:40**

Fact question, **26:1**

File history attorney, **9:94**

File history estoppel, **18:29**

File Wrapper (this index)

Filing date. Effective filing date, above

Foreign prosecution activities, relevancy, **1:209; 3:7**

FRCP 12(b)(6), **15:56**

FRCP 52(a), **3:7**

FRCP 56(c), **8:27**

Functional language, **1:124**

Harmless error, **19:15**

Hatch-Waxman Act, **19:314**

Heavy presumption, **5:70; 18:67; 20:63**

CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND INTERPRETATION—Cont'd

Hindsight, **19:15**

History attorney, **9:94**

Identity of invention, **5:2**

Import limitations, **2:92; 5:62**

Improper to inject limitation, **9:94**

Improvement in crowded art, **20:8**

“Including” and “comprising,” **12:83**

Incorporation by reference, **16:128**

Indefiniteness and infringement, **3:193; 13:220; 20:136; 21:68**

Independent/dependent claim infringement, **26:1**

Induced infringement, **5:98**

Inequitable conduct, **1:138; 19:15**

Infringement, generally, **2:82; 2:129; 3:7; 6:93; 16:35; 19:15; 19:167; 19:242; 23:58; 23:88; 26:1**

Ingredients, **13:125**

Inimical, **8:88**

In light of specification vs. into the claim, **1:108**

Injunction, **20:149**

Interference, **1:5; 1:182; 2:172; 9:88; 9:130**

International Trade Commission, **5:98; 12:87; 19:196**

Inter partes review, **1:328; 8:149**

Intrinsic evidence, **1:140; 5:53; 11:40; 16:53; 16:58; 18:51; 19:111; 19:115; 20:117; 22:45**

Intrinsic evidence primary source, **1:140**

Intrinsic record, **11:53; 22:31**

Inventor’s testimony, **8:106**

Issue preclusion, **9:151**

JMOL, failure to make, **21:39**

JNOV motion, **6:6**

Joint infringement, **1:195**

Judge, extrinsic evidence only to educate, **5:36**

Judgment, acquiescence in, **19:16**

Jury verdict, **19:5**

Kessler Doctrine, **19:309**

Knowledgeable in the field, understanding as that of persons, **13:120**

Laches, **8:114**

Language, **18:68; 20:71**

Last antecedent, **6:68**

Law, mixed question of law and fact, **13:78**

INDEX

CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND INTERPRETATION—Cont'd

Law of the case, evolving claim construction, **15:42**

Law question, **1:50; 1:77; 2:52; 4:17; 4:23; 4:102; 5:22; 8:52; 8:74; 9:131; 12:33; 13:29; 13:45; 13:54; 13:80; 16:40; 18:30; 19:56; 19:266; 20:25; 23:16**

Lexicographer, **1:132; 2:81; 5:94; 9:254; 13:124; 26:1**

Limitations and restrictions

- generally, **1:158; 14:32**
- applicant may expand or limit scope of terms, **7:76**
- attorney's erroneous remark, **9:94**
- certificate of correction, **8:132**
- disclaimer, **15:38**
- file history, **9:94**
- import, may not, **5:62**
- means plus function claim, **9:339; 20:116**
- preferred embodiment, **6:56; 7:77**
- read unwritten limitation therein, **11:47**
- specification, **9:94; 20:61**
- specific examples, **9:298**

Literal infringement, **2:139**

Made inside body, **14:46**

Malpractice, disregard of alternative claim language, **13:184**

Marking estoppel, **19:15**

Markman hearing, **5:100**

Markush claim, **13:218; 19:299**

Meaning, **9:396**

- extrinsic evidence to contradict meaning, **4:59**
- no meaning removed from context, **7:66**
- same meaning, **19:15**
- several common meanings, **9:246**
- trial testimony not alter established meaning, **10:22**
- useful to ascertain claim meaning, **10:32**
- words given meaning as would persons experienced in field of invention, **8:52**

Means-plus-function, **20:149**

Method and apparatus claim, **8:123; 9:280; 13:195**

CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND INTERPRETATION—Cont'd

Minority, **5:71**

Mixed question of law and fact, **13:78**

Motion for judgment as matter of law, **5:130**

Motion for new trial, **19:16**

Motions, post-trial mottos, cannot be reserved for, **8:84**

Multiple applications, **14:47**

Multiple constructions for same claim, **1:247**

Multiple definitions of phrase, **7:28**

Multiple dictionary definitions, **9:253**

Multiple embodiments, **22:30**

Narrowing amendment, **8:80; 12:83; 19:210**

Negative claim construction, **19:234**

New property, **5:2**

New trial, motion for, **19:16**

Nexus, **9:77**

No meaning removed from context, **7:66**

Noninfringement stipulated, **1:130; 23:80**

Nonsensical result, **3:113**

Not limited to preferred embodiment, **6:56; 7:77**

Objection, waiver of, **3:200; 19:16**

Obviousness, **1:223; 1:365; 2:183; 2:185; 2:189; 3:178; 9:397; 9:459; 9:504; 19:11; 19:243; 19:315; 20:8**

Obviousness to try, **9:459**

Obviousness-type double patenting, **19:226**

"Or," **2:86; 19:145**

Ordinary and Accustomed Meaning (this index)

Ordinary skill in the art, **2:88; 5:110; 8:88; 8:112; 20:99**

Overtake, easily, **16:13**

Patentability, reason related to, **11:49**

Patent drawings, **16:82**

Patent marking, **18:118**

Petition to make special, **7:57**

Phrase, multiple definitions of, **7:28**

Physical and experimental evidence, **6:37**

Physically combinable, references need not be, **9:77**

Pioneer invention, **20:8**

CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND INTERPRETATION—Cont'd

Plain meaning, **19:167**
 Plain meaning of specification, **21:9**
 Plurality, **1:372**
 Policy driven, **19:161**
 Post-trial mottos, cannot be reserved for, **8:84**
 Preamble, **9:478; 16:86; 19:335; 20:131**
 Preferred embodiment, **1:116; 1:207; 5:31; 6:56; 7:57; 7:77; 16:54; 22:12; 23:49**
 Preferred embodiment, exclusion, **1:233**
 Prejudicial error, **14:2**
 Preliminary injunction, **1:241; 3:135**
 Present invention, **18:64**
 Presumption, **1:161; 4:73; 4:74; 5:70; 9:94; 11:48; 18:67; 20:63**
 Prevailling party, JMOL, **3:161**
 Printed publication, **1:313**
 Prior art, **1:103; 8:57; 13:63; 19:15**
 Prior art, unpatentable in view of, **19:281**
 Priority, **5:142**
 Priority claim, **1:199**
 Priority date, **20:102**
 Process, **21:61**
 Prosecution disclaimer, **1:309; 7:140; 15:21; 19:336; 20:138**
 Prosecution history, **1:77; 2:77; 11:12; 12:31; 14:57; 19:84; 19:193; 23:51**
 Prosecution history estoppel, **9:94; 15:30; 22:37; 26:1**
 PTO interpretation during prosecution, **9:199**
 Publication, unpublished paper, **20:8**
 Purely legal question, **3:84**
 Read unwritten limitation therein, **11:47**
 Reasonable interpretation, **9:77; 16:60**
 Reasonable royalty, **19:279**
 Reason related to patentability, **11:49**
 Redefine, expressly redefine claim terms, **5:48**
 Redraft claims, **18:91**
 Redundancy, **22:67**
 Reexamination, broadest reasonable interpretation, **9:87; 9:154; 9:255; 9:424**
 References need not be physically combinable, **9:77**

CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND INTERPRETATION—Cont'd

Reissue, **9:77**
 Relevant, problem inventor was attempting to solve is, **3:75**
 Renders claim inoperable viewed with extreme skepticism, **20:60**
 Repeatedly and consistently characterizing claims, **7:120**
 Reservation, **8:84**
 Reverse doctrine of equivalents, **3:7; 19:24; 19:51**
 Review, standard of, **3:74; 12:35; 12:103; 19:12; 19:121; 20:64**
 Rewriting, specification, use to rewrite claim language, **18:68**
 “Rewritten” claims, **16:91**
 Same meaning, **19:15**
 Same term, **1:106; 5:63; 6:43**
 Same way construction, **23:11**
 Scope of invention, **8:112**
 Sec. 102(g), **11:9**
 Sec. 103, **20:8**
 Sec. 112, **4:23; 9:40; 20:6**
 Sec. 112(6), **9:339; 11:28**
 Sec. 116, **19:15**
 Sec. 285, **1:5**
 Sec. 291, **1:5**
 Sequences, **9:326**
 Several common meanings, **9:246**
 Skill in the art, **3:75; 4:61; 4:66; 9:232; 20:8**
 Special, petition to make special, **7:57**
 Special definition, **14:30**
 Specification, **1:134; 3:80; 5:2; 9:94; 13:86; 13:104; 14:57; 18:68; 19:26; 19:191; 19:196; 20:61; 21:9; 25:4**
 Specifications, limitations, **12:68**
 Standard of review, **3:74; 12:35; 12:103; 19:12; 19:121; 20:64; 20:130**
 Standing, **1:264**
 Statements describing whole invention, **22:32**
 Statement that claims not include feature, **19:136**
 Stipulated judgment, **10:37**
 Strong presumption ordinary meaning, **4:73**

INDEX

CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND INTERPRETATION—Cont'd

Substantial evidence vs. clearly erroneous, **20:1**
Substantiality, **12:70**
Substantially, **12:61; 13:134**
Suggestion in prior art, **19:15**
Summary judgment, **1:256; 2:24; 8:17; 20:10**
Technical terms, **14:44; 16:56**
Terms, **3:91; 5:48; 6:43; 7:31; 7:76; 9:338**
Terse claim language, elaborating, **5:50**
Timing, **3:123**
Timing of analysis, **22:18**
Trial testimony not alter established meaning, **10:22**
True inventor, **19:15**
Two-step analysis, **19:15; 20:62**
Unambiguous meaning, extrinsic evidence not contradict, **4:51**
Unclaimed elements, **6:58**
Understood by person in field, **22:25**
Uniform interpretation, **9:130**
Useful to ascertain claim meaning, **10:32**
Use of evidence, **1:92; 1:129; 25:3**
Use of prosecution history, **19:84**
Vacating, **1:5**
Vacuum, claims not interpreted in, **9:58; 19:13**
Validity (this index)
Varied use of a term, **2:78**
Vitiating, **3:178**
Waiver, **3:174; 3:200; 4:99; 9:234; 15:29; 19:16; 19:279**
Werein clauses, **1:331**
Whereby clause, **8:91; 20:29**
Wired and wireless technologies, limitation of claims to, **18:114**
Witnesses, **10:22; 19:16; 22:17**
Words, **1:136; 8:52; 10:24**
Written description, **6:93; 22:49**

CLAIM DIFFERENTIATION

Generally, **1:293; 2:45; 2:82; 5:5; 6:58; 6:92; 7:70; 8:141; 11:2; 11:44; 11:48; 12:35; 12:121; 13:8; 14:43; 14:48; 22:30; 23:16**
Anticipation, **11:2**

CLAIM DIFFERENTIATION—Cont'd

Broaden beyond correct scope, **13:91; 20:51**
Claim construction and interpretation, **6:93; 23:88**
Claim terms, construing, **9:420**
Combinations, hypothetical, **11:2**
Covenant not to sue, **9:411**
Covered business method, **1:293**
Defer to PTO, no reason to, **11:2**
Dependent claim, **5:60; 9:237**
Dictionaries, **19:261**
Different words not mandate different interpretations, **20:52**
FRCP 56(c), **8:27**
Hard and fast rule, **19:157**
Hindsight reconstruction, **11:2**
Hypothetical combinations, **11:2**
Identity of invention, **11:2**
Immutable fixed rule, **4:17**
Independent claims, **5:60; 9:237**
Infringement, **6:93; 23:88**
Inventor's theory, **6:10**
Law question, **11:2**
Limitations, **3:89; 9:370**
Means-plus-function, **18:17; 23:54**
Plain language, cannot overcome, **13:105**
Presumption of different scope, **3:80; 19:171**
Prosecution history, **1:162**
PTO, defer to PTO, no reason to, **11:2**
Reading dependent claim into independent claim, **9:237**
Reconstruction, hindsight, **11:2**
Reverse doctrine of equivalents, **11:2; 19:24**
Sec. 112(6) equivalency, **12:26**
Sec. 112 equivalency, **16:2**
Separate claims have different scope is not rigid, **1:92**
Uncited art, **11:2**
Words, **19:261**
Written description, **6:93**

CLAIMED INVENTION

Best mode, **20:63**

CLAIMED METHOD

Infringement, **2:52**

CLAIMED RANGES

Obviousness, **9:277**

CLAIM LANGUAGE

Generally, **3:41**

Claim interpretation, **1:85; 1:125; 5:101**

Controlling language, **18:30**

Design patent, **7:59**

Doctrine of equivalents, **3:136**

Indefiniteness, **2:169; 5:114; 16:47**

Means-plus-function claim, **2:137; 3:97; 5:112**

Sec. 112, **9:72**

CLAIM NOT READ IN VACUUM

Generally, **19:13**

Broadest reasonable interpretation, **9:58**

CLAIM PREAMBLE

Generally, **1:80; 2:82; 2:115; 4:128.50; 7:74; 9:123; 9:272; 12:28; 16:142; 18:47; 19:130; 19:145**

Absolute rules, none, **7:61**

All elements rule, **3:22**

Anticipation, **3:22; 4:15; 13:164**

As a whole, **16:58**

Burden on patent challenger, **16:12**

Claim construction and interpretation, **1:313; 9:94; 16:86; 19:210; 20:131**

Claim limitation, **1:198; 9:154; 13:164; 22:41**

Combining prior art teachings, **9:79**

Deposition, **1:338**

Derive antecedent basis, **5:65**

Doctrine of equivalents, **3:22; 7:80**

Effect, **3:22**

Function, **3:22**

Genus, **3:22**

Import that claim as whole suggests, **2:52; 16:58**

Intent, **1:103; 2:101; 9:79**

Inter partes review, **1:338**

Jepson claim, **5:63**

Life and meaning, **9:154; 22:41**

Limitations, **1:119; 3:22; 7:16; 9:154; 18:44; 19:210; 22:41**

Litmus test, **9:242**

Meaning, **7:113; 9:154; 16:20; 22:41**

Obviousness, **9:79**

Printed publication, **1:313**

Prior art, combining, **9:79**

CLAIM PREAMBLE—Cont'd

Reasonable diligence, **1:338**

Reciting structural limitations, **18:44**

Redrafting claim, **3:22**

Species, **3:22**

Statement of intended purpose, **9:79**

Statement of purpose, **1:208; 5:63**

Structural limitations, **1:198; 18:44**

Suggestions, **16:58**

Verdict, **16:14**

CLAIM PRECLUSION

Generally, **1:170; 2:159; 13:117; 24:8**

Certainty and definiteness, **4:110**

Challenge to validity when second action involves different device, **8:76**

Choice of law, **13:65**

Claim limitations unchanged, **14:61**

Essentially the same, **1:170**

Identical parties, not limited to, **13:65**

Inter partes review, **23:86**

Law question, **8:76**

Material differences in claim limitation, **14:64**

Privity, **23:86**

Reexamination, **19:255**

Res judicata, **19:255**

Reverse doctrine of equivalents, **18:80**

CLAIMS COURT

Generally, **13:50; 19:65; 23:28**

Binding precedent, **19:63; 23:33**

Dismissal for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, **20:27**

Findings of special master, **3:49**

FRCP 12(b)(4), **13:56**

Limitation of actions, **2:53; 3:55**

Review, standard of, **6:29; 19:67**

RUSCC 60(b) motion, **3:40**

Sec. 1498, **16:38**

Sec. 2412(b), **13:48**

Special master's findings, **3:49**

Subject matter jurisdiction, **2:41; 20:27; 21:21**

Summary judgment, **16:30**

CLAIM TERMS

Anticipation, **8:148**

Consistently interpreted, **18:30**

Construction of critical claim term, **13:169**

INDEX

CLAIM TERMS—Cont'd

- Essentially, **26:2**
- Expand or limit scope of terms, **7:76**
- Expressly redefine, **5:48**
- Inequitable conduct, **18:116**
- Limitations, **21:53**
- Means for cross-referencing, **20:110**
- Ordinary meaning unless used differently by inventor, **3:91; 7:31; 11:61**
- Same terms appearing in different portions, **6:43**
- Scope, **11:61**

CLAIM WORDS

- In first instance, **5:7**

CLAM INDEFINITENESS

- Sec. 112(2), **2:45**

CLASSIC TEST

- Sec. 102, **12:12**

CLEAR AND CONCISE

- Prosecution history estoppel, **23:42**
- Sec. 112, **15:2**

CLEAR AND CONVINCING EVIDENCE

- Certificate of correction, **3:128; 19:142**
- Conception, **7:46**
- Defined, **9:118**
- Exceptional case, **9:161**
- Inequitable conduct, **1:71; 7:68; 13:141; 15:3; 19:38**
- Infringement, **3:158**
- Obviousness, **2:171; 14:9**
- On-sale bar, **2:23**
- Validity, **5:49; 5:64; 19:132; 19:142**
- Willful infringement, **16:129; 20:39**

CLEAR AND UNAMBIGUOUS

- Plain and ordinary meaning, they must be given their, **1:56**

CLEAR-CUT GROUNDS

- Frivolous appeal, **19:90**

CLEAR DEMARCATION

- Sec. 121, **7:75**

CLEARLY ERRONEOUS

- Generally, **2:59; 19:23**
- Anticipation, **18:20**
- Appeal and review, **4:6; 7:2; 12:2**

CLEARLY ERRONEOUS—Cont'd

- Attorney fees, **19:23**
- Board, **9:191**
- Claim construction, **4:23; 16:13**
- Defense, implied license, **19:23**
- Definition, **4:41**
- Due care, duty of, **19:23**
- Equitable estoppel, **19:23**
- Findings, PTO fact, **9:80**
- Identity of invention, **20:20**
- Implied license defense, **19:23**
- Increased damages, **19:23**
- Interference, **4:11**
- Legal, **19:23**
- License, **19:23**
- Literal infringement, **19:23**
- Mandamus, **9:57**
- Means-plus-function, **19:23**
- New evidence introduced, **6:9**
- On-sale bar, **2:23**
- Per se rule, **19:23**
- PTO fact findings, **9:80**
- PTO standard of materiality, **9:43**
- Substantial evidence versus, **20:1**
- Willful infringement, **19:23**

CLEARLY LINK

- Means-plus-function claim, **13:118**

CLEAR MEANING

- FRCP 52(a), **12:6**

CLEAR UNEQUIVOCAL LEGAL OPINION

- Generally, **3:8**

CLERICAL MISTAKE

- Sec. 255, **19:142**

CLOSED GROUP

- Markush group, **1:122**

CLOSE EXAMINATION

- Prosecution history estoppel, **8:13**

CLOSE PROXIMITY OF TERMS

- Claim interpretation, **2:105**

CLOSEST ART

- Expectation, unexpected results, **9:111**
- Unexpected results, **9:111**

CLOUDOFCHANGE, LLC V. NCR CORPORATION

2024, **3:252**

COHEN COLLATERAL ORDER EXCEPTION

Final judgment rule, **20:28**

COHEN TRIPARTE TEST

Appealability of interlocutory nonfinal decision, **19:71**

CO-INVENTORS

Generally, **16:48**

Collaboration required, **5:40; 6:35; 22:39**

Correcting inventorship, **6:79**

Deceptive intent, **1:106**

Freedom to license, **19:98**

Interference, **4:31**

Inventorship, **8:81; 22:54**

License, freedom to license, **19:98**

Non-joinder, **14:59**

On-sale bar, **2:85**

Ownership, **9:303**

Physically work together or at same time, **20:68**

Presumption named properly, **7:79**

Requirements, **16:50**

Same time, **20:68**

Scope of claims first, **5:73**

Sec. 116, **22:39**

Sec. 262, **8:5**

COLIBRI HEART VALVE LLC V. MEDTRONIC COREVALVE, LLC

2025, **3:261**

COLLABORATION

Co-inventors, **5:40; 6:35; 22:39**

COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL

Generally, **1:152; 1:325; 7:142; 9:143; 13:111; 13:231; 14:93; 16:38; 16:160; 16:170; 19:274; 19:338; 20:68; 21:65; 21:90; 22:24; 22:60**

Adoption of party's findings, **4:9**

Affirmative defenses, **4:3**

Agency acting in judicial capacity, **20:41**

Alternative position, taking, **10:3**

Applicable, when, **3:62**

Attorney fee award, relevant to, **4:3**

COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL—Cont'd

Attorneys, opinion of counsel, **4:9**

Blonder-Tongue, **1:47; 13:26; 13:61; 19:33**

Choice of law, **2:88; 4:71; 16:57; 20:72; 22:24**

Claim construction, effect of prior litigation on, **9:151**

Claim construction and interpretation, **5:113**

Construction, narrow, **1:3**

Cross-examine, right to, **13:53**

Damages, measure of, **4:9**

Declaratory judgment, **10:6**

Defenses, affirmative defenses, **4:3**

Description, **1:249**

Expert's conclusion not controlling, **4:9**

Factors, **4:71**

Fair, full and fair opportunity to litigate, **16:57**

Findings, adoption of party's findings, **4:9**

Full and fair opportunity to litigate, **2:50; 16:57**

Holding of patent invalidity, **4:3**

Hypothetical judicial statements, **1:3**

Identical parties, **9:232**

Inequitable conduct, **4:3**

Infringement, **1:3; 1:155; 25:10**

Infringement, willful, **4:9**

Issues of law differ, **21:24**

ITC decision, **2:17**

ITC's decision, **20:41**

Judicial capacity, **20:41**

Lost profits, **4:9**

Multi-defendant cases, **9:310**

Non-mutual, **9:296**

Non-parties, **9:296**

Obviousness, claims are focus of, **10:3**

Opinion of counsel, **4:9**

Opportunity, **16:57**

Pleaded, must be, **4:3**

Prior adjudication, **9:90**

Prior decision or validity, **8:73; 13:105**

Prior litigation, effect on claim construction, **9:151**

Raise claim in second proceeding, **7:65**

Res judicata, **4:9; 7:99; 9:122; 13:51; 16:35**

Sec. 101, **22:61**

INDEX

COLLATERAL ESTOPPEL—Cont'd

- Second proceeding, raise claim in second proceeding, **7:65**
- Specific devices before court, not embrace more than, **11:35**
- Test thereof, **16:31**
- Unique application to patent law, **1:244**
- Validity, **4:3; 8:73; 13:105**
- Willful infringement, **4:9**

COLLATERAL ORDER DOCTRINE

- Generally, **2:190; 3:85; 3:115; 5:25; 6:84; 21:80**
- Appeal of order disqualifying counsel, **9:343**
- Confidential information, unsealing, **1:239**
- Final judgment rule, **1:302; 20:28**
- Protective order, **13:249**

COLLATERAL SALES

- Entire market value rule, **18:35**

COLUMBIA SPORTSWEAR NORTH AMERICA, INC. V. SEIRUS INNOVATIVE ACCESSORIES, INC.

- 2023, **3:246**

COMBINATION

- Generally, **5:5; 9:118**
- As a whole, invention, **13:15**
- Block diagram, **13:15**
- Burden on patent challenger, **16:12**
- Claim differentiation, **11:2**
- Claim preamble, **9:79**
- Combination patent, **12:13; 13:15; 19:52**
- Cross-appeal, **18:2**
- Declaratory judgment, **10:6**
- Essence, **13:15**
- Expert testimony, motivation, **23:68**
- Hindsight, **13:15**
- Inherency, **12:81**
- Inventor's theory, **6:10**
- Is obvious, **18:22**
- Jury verdict, **3:17**
- Means-plus-function claim, **3:89**
- Modification, **9:51**
- Motion to remand, **19:45**
- Obviousness (this index)
- Pioneer invention, **13:1**

COMBINATION—Cont'd

- Prior art, **13:18**
- Reference (this index)
- Repair, **19:79**
- Sec. 271(f)(2), **16:141; 23:53**
- Sec. 282, **6:10; 18:6**
- Simplification of reference, **13:15**
- Sophistication as nonobviousness, **13:15**
- Summary judgment, **3:1**
- Synergism, **19:36**

COMBINING REFERENCES

- Obviousness, **9:372; 23:11**

COMBINING TEACHINGS

- Known or used by others, **3:2**
- Prior art references related to one another, **9:74**

COMITY

- Generally, **9:238**

COMMERCIAL BUYERS

- Design patent infringement, **1:165**

COMMERCIAL CONSEQUENCES

- Sec. 102(e) v. sec. 102(g), **19:41**

COMMERCIAL EMBODIMENT

- Generally, **12:3; 26:2**
- Claim construction, **1:192**
- Comparing claims with accused device, **13:9**
- Costs on appeal, **1:20**
- Obviousness, **1:4**
- Patent misuse, **23:9**
- Reverse doctrine of equivalents, **19:24**
- Verdict, **16:14**

COMMERCIALIZATION

- Prior art, noting differences from, **4:6**

COMMERCIALLY AVAILABLE

- MPEP, **16:6**

COMMERCIAL MARKETPLACE

- Generally, **12:77**
- Enablement, **3:104**

COMMERCIAL MODE

- Best mode, **26:4**

COMMERCIAL OFFER FOR SALE

- On-sale bar, **13:102; 19:113**

COMMERCIAL OFFER TO SELL

On sale bar, **5:72; 8:145; 19:179**

COMMERCIAL PRODUCT

Claim interpretation, **9:94**

Infringement, **1:124**

COMMERCIAL SALE

On-sale bar, **1:177; 1:179; 8:145; 13:122; 19:133**

COMMERCIAL SUCCESS

Generally, **1:87; 13:18; 13:137**

Anticipation, **1:10; 1:227**

Appeal is review and not trial de novo, **6:12**

Burden on patent challenger, **16:12**

Claims construed, **9:77**

Inequitable conduct, **11:4**

New features, where it includes several, **23:7**

Nexus, **9:168; 18:28; 23:68**

Nexus required, **2:76**

Nonparty's motion to quash discovery subpoena, **20:17**

Number of units sold is weak showing, **9:181**

Obviousness, **7:108; 9:154; 9:311; 13:166; 18:15; 18:83; 20:107; 23:75**

Presumption, **23:52**

Results from claimed invention, **10:22**

Sales alone, **9:111; 20:50**

Secondary considerations, **3:41; 9:82; 9:331**

COMMERCIAL TRANSACTIONS

Statutory subject matter, **9:308**

COMMERCIAL USE

Public use bar, **11:12**

COMMISSIONER

Authority, **1:45**

Brief not prior art, **9:140**

Mandamus, **9:54**

Reexamination, **9:194**

Sec. 6(a), **23:15**

Sec. 41(a)(7), **13:32**

COMMON KNOWLEDGE

References, **9:154**

COMMON LAW

Generally, **12:27**

Antitrust, **3:83**

Choice of law, **18:38**

Good faith, **1:64**

Presumption, **9:154**

COMMONLY OWNED PATENTS

Prosecution history estoppel, **1:115**

COMMON MEANINGS

See also Ordinary and Accustomed Meaning (this index)

Claim interpretation, **9:246**

COMMON NUCLEUS OF OPERATIVE FACT

Sec. 1376, **22:36**

COMMON OCCURRENCE

Examiner's initial rejection of all claims, **17:4**

COMMON SENSE

Obviousness, **9:297; 9:450**

Reasonable royalty estimation, **9:213**

COMMUNICATION

Attorney-client privilege, **23:74**

Domestic disclosure, **1:224**

Injunction, **7:92**

Objectively baseless, **4:88**

COMPANIES

Sec. 102(g), **14:7**

COMPARATIVE DATA

Obviousness, **9:56**

COMPCO

Sears, **21:11**

COMPENSATION

Adjudicated infringer, **11:10**

Claim against government, **8:116; 12:27**

Damages, **16:40**

Prejudgment interest, **15:10; 23:73**

COMPETENCE

Generally, **10:18**

Attorney, opinion of counsel, **3:80; 4:6; 10:21; 13:45**

Ordinary skill, hypothetical person of, **9:65**

Prosecution history estoppel, **23:41**

INDEX

COMPETITION

Amendment, **16:72**
Amendment of claims, **13:91**
Antitrust, **3:83**
Attorney drafting claims specifically directed to competitor's device, **9:158**
Choice of law, **7:55; 16:48**
CIP, **19:28**
Drafting claims covering competitor's product, **11:11**
Estoppel, **1:345**
Indefiniteness, **13:57**
Inducing infringement, **18:48**
Infringement, **19:87**
Inter partes review, **1:345**
ITC, **13:40**
9 Cir, **22:2**
Patent misuse, **19:227**
Patent prosecution bar, disclosure, **5:110**
Preemption, **26:7**
Prosecution history estoppel, **8:38**
Sears, **21:11**
Sec. 43(a), **15:5; 16:21**
Sec. 112, **20:6**
Standing, **1:345**
Summary judgment, **12:15**
Unfair Competition (this index)

COMPETITIVE DECISION MAKING

Definition, **4:94**

COMPLAINT

Generally, **8:66; 13:59; 13:107; 19:14; 19:55; 19:66**
Appropriate, when, **19:14**
Dismissal with prejudice, **19:14**
Facts before court, **12:44**
Form 16, **13:142**
FRCP 15(c), **6:11**
FRCP 37(b), **23:34**
Jurisdiction, **7:38**
Prejudice, dismissal with prejudice, **19:14**
Res judicata, **11:35**
Sec. 41(a)(7), **13:32**
Sec. 102(b), **19:31**
Transfer of appeal, **7:14**

COMPLETE ARTICLES

Sec. 171, **9:73**

COMPLETENESS

Conception, **2:48**
Reexamination, **9:239**

COMPLEXITY

Master, use of, **19:37**
Reverse doctrine of equivalents, **19:24**

“COMPONENT” OF PATENTED INVENTION

Reasonable royalty rate, **12:97**
Sec. 271(c), **18:79**
Sec. 271(f), **1:146; 12:113**

COMPOSED OF

Generally, **1:109**

COMPOSITION

Generally, **9:129; 16:72**
Discovery of inherent properties, **20:11**
Infringement, **4:51**
Obviousness issue, **9:12**
Patentable, **9:104**
Prima facie obviousness, **9:17**

COMPOUND

Generally, **9:103**

COMPOUND INTEREST

Delay damages, **4:24**
Prejudgment interest, **18:35**

“COMPRISED OF”

Construction of phrase, **3:129**

COMPRISING

Cancellation of claims, **9:435**

“COMPRISING”

Generally, **3:96**
Claim interpretation, **5:102; 12:83**
Construction of phrase, **19:158**
Improvement, **3:37**
Open claim language, **13:174**
Presumption, **4:84**

COMPROMISING

Generally, **1:109; 7:49; 9:254; 13:28; 22:18**

COMPULSORY ARBITRATION

District court order, **16:136; 22:55**

COMPULSORY COUNTERCLAIM

America Invents Act, **9:430**
FRCP 13(a), **2:36; 9:430**

COMPUTATION

Patent term extension, **13:144; 23:70**

COMPUTER

Generally, **16:11**

Detailed disclosure thereof unnecessary, **9:154**

Display, infringement, **20:118**

Embodied in tangible medium, **9:164**

Infringement, **19:220**

Means-plus-function claim, **1:176; 6:68; 20:116**

New way is physically different machine, **9:153**

Organization of information, **9:153**

Programmer's skill, **14:8**

Sec. 101, **1:251; 1:286; 2:147; 5:128; 6:80; 19:292**

Sec. 120, **8:19**

Statutory subject matter, **9:175**

Tangible medium, embodied in, **9:164**

COMPUTER-FACILITATED PROCESSES

Sec. 101 patent-eligible subject matter, **6:71; 19:292**

CONCEALMENT

Best mode, **1:246; 2:34**

Sec. 102(g), **16:9**

Unreasonable delay, **12:21**

CONCEPTION

Generally, **1:44; 3:94; 5:40; 19:149; 19:152; 21:42**

Anticipation, **1:255; 20:115**

Appreciation, recognition and, **13:105**

Clear and convincing evidence, **7:46**

Complete, when, **19:72**

Completeness, **2:48**

Corroborating evidence, **3:160**

Corroboration, **4:74**

Definition, **2:126; 4:100**

Evidence, proven by, **9:244**

Facts supported by clear and convincing evidence, **7:46**

Fixed ideas, **13:72; 20:65**

Idea must be fixed and permanent, **13:72; 20:65**

Interference, **3:15; 9:244; 15:1; 19:240**

Inter partes review, **1:323; 18:110**

Inventorship, **2:99; 2:164; 6:35; 19:72; 19:195; 20:126; 21:55**

CONCEPTION—Cont'd

Law question, **2:47; 2:96; 6:18; 6:20**

Offer for sale, **1:216**

Only ordinary skill necessary to reduce to practice, **19:124**

Oral testimony, **16:70; 19:151**

Ordinary skill, **19:124**

Permanent ideas, **13:72; 20:65**

Recognition and appreciation, **13:105**

Reduction to practice, **9:407; 13:105; 19:124**

Requirements thereof, **11:41**

Sec. 131, **9:407**

Simultaneous reduction to practice, **13:105**

Testing, when required, **3:82**

Verbatim findings of counsel adopted, **8:22**

Willful infringement, **2:164**

Witnesses, oral testimony, **16:70; 19:151**

CONCEPTS

Anticipate, do not, **16:4**

Inventive, **1:290; 13:210**

CONCERNED PARTY

Inventorship, **3:93**

CONCESSION

Double patenting, **15:6**

Filing of CIP, **23:30**

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

FRCP 52(a), **3:45**

CONCLUSORY STATEMENT

Evidence, **2:80**

Routinely built, well-known and, **9:113**

Summary judgment, **3:13; 20:62**

Well-known and routinely built, **9:113**

CONCURRENT LITIGATION

Preliminary injunction, **11:19**

Same parties and same issues requirement, **9:116**

CONDITIONAL CROSS-APPEAL

Claim construction, **14:53**

CONDITIONAL NEW TRIAL

District court has wide discretion, **13:34**

INDEX

CONDUCT AND MISCONDUCT

- See also Inequitable Conduct (this index)
- Attorneys, **11:13**
- Choice of law, **19:114**
- Exceptional case, litigation misconduct, **18:64**
- FDA, conduct before, **5:95**
- Flagrant misrepresentations of record, **16:9**
- Litigation Misconduct (this index)
- Res judicata, continuing conduct, **1:229**

CONFIDENCE

- Attorney disqualification, **16:3**
- Chinese Wall, **5:12**
- High degree of confidence and trust between PTO and patent applicants, **10:5**

CONFIDENTIAL BUSINESS INFORMATION

- Preliminary injunction, **6:7**

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

- Discovery, **1:10**
- Motion to compel discovery, **19:17**
- Protective order, **13:40**
- Public use, **1:174; 2:106**
- Unsealing, appeal and review, **1:239**

CONFLICT OF LAWS

- Choice of Law (this index)

CONGRESS

- Agency's authority limited by, **11:26**
- Prejudgment interest, **19:83**
- Sec. 156, **6:3**
- Sec. 282, **12:5**
- Statutory Construction and Interpretation (this index)

CONGRESSIONAL INTENT

- Statutory construction and interpretation, **1:61; 7:24; 8:39; 19:75**

CONJECTURE

- Generally, **9:125**

CONNECTED

- Generally, **7:49**

“CONNECTED TO” OR “COUPLED TO”

- Claim construction, **7:104**

CONSENT

- FRCP 60(b), **23:23**
- Judicial Panel on Multi-District Litigation (JPMDL), **7:6**
- Personal jurisdiction, **8:79; 13:114; 16:124**
- Res judicata effect, **6:17**
- Standing, **19:263**
- Stipulated judgment, **8:6**

CONSENT ORDER AND JUDGMENT

- Generally, **11:28**
- Beyond express terms, **14:28Z**
- Choice of law, **14:28Z**
- Contract law, **4:58; 5:60; 21:64**
- Express terms, beyond, **14:28Z**
- FRCP 60(b)(6), **3:29**
- International Trade Commission, **4:108**
- Interpreted under contract law, **4:58**
- Relitigating patent validity, **5:8**
- Validity, **5:8**
- Written agreement, need for, **3:64**

CONSISTENCY

- Generally. Inconsistency (this index)

CONSISTENT INTERPRETATION

- Generally, **3:3; 3:119**
- Claim terms to be interpreted consistently, **18:30**

CONSISTENT TERMS

- Claim interpretation, **3:119**

“CONSISTING ESSENTIALLY OF”

- Prosecution history disclaimer, **5:94**

“CONSISTING OF”

- Generally, **1:109**
- Doctrine of equivalents, **3:124**

CONSISTING OF CLAIM

LANGUAGE

- Generally, **13:7**
- Additional elements, presence of, **13:7**
- Amendment, **13:7**
- Presence of additional elements, **13:7**
- Prosecution history estoppel, **13:7**

CONSOLIDATED PRETRIAL PROCEEDINGS

- Judicial Panel on Multi-District Litigation (JPMDL), **7:6**

CONSOLIDATION OF CLAIMS

Appeal, **19:95**

CONSOLIDATION ORDER

Sec. 1651, **9:128**

CONSONANCE

Generally, **1:80**

Obviousness-type double patenting,
19:246; 20:29

Restriction requirement, **2:140; 16:112**

CONSTITUTIONALITY

Decided only when court compelled to
do so, **3:209; 8:31**

IPR, **13:246.50**

Jurisdiction, **13:191; 18:34**

Jury trial, **16:8**

New art, reexamination over, **16:8**

Patent system, purpose of, **16:8**

Property, patents are, **16:8**

Public concern, patent grant is, **16:8**

Punitive damages, **20:58**

Reexamination proceeding, **10:16; 16:8**

Retroactive application of reexamination
statutes, **16:8**

Retroactive elimination of qui tam
action under AIA, **2:151; 3:195**

Sec. 303, **16:8**

Seventh Amendment (this index)

Standing, **13:191**

Waiver, **3:33**

**CONSTRUCTION AND
INTERPRETATION**

As to claims. Claim Construction and
Interpretation (this index)

Generally, **1:54; 9:36; 9:132; 12:31;
18:30; 21:19**

CAFC, **12:47**

Choice of law, **1:132**

Claim Construction and Interpretation
(this index)

Claim interpretation. Claim Construc-
tion and Interpretation (this index)

Collateral estoppel, **1:3**

Consent judgments, **4:58**

Contract Construction and Interpretation
(this index)

Design patent, **7:59**

Entitled to deference, **11:27**

FRCP generally, **23:34**

Indefiniteness, **5:58; 8:86**

**CONSTRUCTION AND
INTERPRETATION—Cont'd**

Information disclosure statement, **5:31**

Interference, **7:49; 7:74**

Interference estoppel by judgment,
23:14

Inventor's theory, **6:10**

Law question, **3:54; 4:31; 9:120; 9:132**

Means-plus-function claim, **3:166;
5:110; 9:199; 20:56**

Method claims, **9:223**

Performance of government contract,
8:8

Reduction to practice, **8:67**

Review, standard of, **7:74**

Sec. 41(a)(7), **13:32**

Sec. 112(6), **22:10**

Sec. 120, **9:13**

Settlement agreement, **10:9**

Statutory Construction and Interpreta-
tion (this index)

Summary judgment, **8:17; 21:46**

Validity, **19:145**

Waiver of sovereign immunity, **10:19**

CONSTRUCTIVE NOTICE

Generally, **19:172**

CONSTRUCTIVE POSSESSION

Written description, **3:157**

CONSULTANCY AGREEMENT

Generally, **1:46**

**CONSULT SOURCES OTHER THAN
CLAIMS**

Claim interpretation, **5:30**

CONSUMER BEHAVIOR

Market demand, **19:6**

**CONTEMPORANEOUS ACTS AND
MATTERS**

Generally, **3:49**

Chemical, **9:60**

Evidence of level of skill in the art, **9:23**

Invention, **19:34**

Obviousness issue, **9:12**

CONTEMPT

Generally, **5:117; 9:271; 12:3; 16:142;
19:129; 19:342**

Appealable decision, create, **3:85; 5:85**

INDEX

CONTEMPT—Cont'd

- Appealable when opportunity to purge has passed, **19:118**
- Civil vs. criminal distinguished, **19:48**
- Communications protected by attorney-client privilege, refusal to produce, **23:74**
- Contributory infringement, **16:25**
- Criminal, civil vs. criminal distinguished, **19:48**
- Infringement, injunctive relief against infringer is norm, **11:17**
- Injunction, **1:156; 1:234; 5:119; 11:17; 14:69; 16:25**
- Modified device, infringement by, **2:119**
- Motion, two-step procedure on ruling on motion, **11:17**
- Proof, standard of, **1:73**
- Reinstatement of license agreement, **16:23**
- Review, standard of, **3:56**
- Sec. 271(c), **16:25**
- Sec. 283, **11:17**
- Severe remedy, **13:1**
- Substantial open issues, **1:88**
- Third persons, conduct of, **20:54**
- Two-step procedure on ruling on motion, **11:17**

CONTINUATION

- Generally, **3:114; 7:89; 12:54**
- Anticipation, **1:127**
- Description, **20:47**
- Gorham infringement test, **12:17**
- Interference, **13:31**
- License duration, **9:369**
- Necessary conditions, **9:419**
- Prosecution history, **13:100**
- Sec. 112, **18:4**
- Sec. 120, **20:88**
- Sec. 1292(a)(1), **23:13**

CONTINUATION APPLICATION

- Generally, **9:166**
- Claims adequately described in prior application, **19:105**
- Design patent, **9:205**
- Means-plus-function, **4:51**
- Reexamination inter partes, **3:139; 13:213**

CONTINUATION-IN-PART APPLICATION (CIP)

- Added matter, newly, **19:28**
- Amending claims to read on competitor's product, **19:28**
- Benefit of earlier filing date, **1:80; 20:35**
- Competitor's product, amending claims to read on, **19:28**
- Date, **20:35; 20:59**
- Different filing dates, **20:59**
- Earlier filing date, **5:20; 20:35**
- Filing
 - concession, not concession of inadequate disclosure in parent case, **23:30**
 - MPEP, **16:6**
 - parent case, not concession of inadequate disclosure in, **23:30**
- Filing date, **5:20; 20:35; 20:59**
- Gorham infringement test, **12:17**
- MPEP, **16:6**
- Newly added matter, **19:28**
- Restriction requirement, **16:112**
- Sec. 120, **9:73**

CONTINUING CONDUCT

- Res judicata, **1:229**

CONTINUOUS PROCESS

- Inequitable conduct, **10:2**

CONTOUR IP HOLDING LLC V. GOPRO, INC.

- 2024, **3:253**

CONTOURS OF CORRESPONDING STRUCTURE IS LAW QUESTION

- Means-plus-function claim, **19:119**

CONTRACT CONSTRUCTION AND INTERPRETATION

- Generally, **2:65; 9:160; 9:236; 11:28; 13:76**
- Ambiguity, **3:44; 7:43; 9:160**
- Contract law, **13:47; 15:9**
- Ejusdem generis, **20:38**
- Law question, **1:56; 1:57; 3:70; 4:41; 4:42; 8:33; 9:132; 9:145; 9:159; 11:29; 17:5; 23:36**
- License agreement, **15:9**
- Meaning to all parts, **2:65; 13:47; 13:76**
- Review, standard of, **8:41**
- Spirit and purpose, **14:26**

CONTRACTS AND AGREEMENTS

Generally, **2:36; 13:64**
 Ambiguities are resolved against contract drafter, **9:132**
 Arbitration agreement, **4:85; 23:91**
 Assignment, **1:46; 4:86**
 Breach accrues, **8:44**
 Choice of law, **19:134; 20:53**
 Companies do not intend to be bound until written agreement is executed, **23:21**
 Consent judgments, **4:58; 5:60; 21:64**
 Damages, **8:43**
 Deference, **9:132**
 Depriving court of jurisdiction, **21:14**
 Elements of contract-based claim, **8:43**
 Enforcement in settlement agreement, **3:107**
 FNERDA, **6:18**
 Formation, **20:44**
 Good faith implied, **12:39**
 Government, **4:59**
 Illegality, **7:36**
 Implicates inequitable conduct, **4:54**
 Implied, **9:482**
 Implied, good faith, **12:39**
 Implied-in-fact contract, **12:38; 20:40**
 Inequitable conduct, implicates, **4:54**
 ITC, **13:20**
 Latent ambiguity, **3:48**
 Lear, **18:8**
 License agreement, **15:9**
 Mistake of fact, **4:34**
 Mutual mistake, **2:44; 4:34**
 On-sale bar, **26:8**
 Patent right clause, **8:8**
 Personal jurisdiction, **13:114**
 Public use, confidentiality agreement, **2:106**
 Qui tam provision, Government and relator, **2:151**
 Res judicata, **4:71**
 Review, standard of, **1:76**
 Settlement agreement, enforcement in, **3:107**
 Standard agreement, **9:252**
 Subject matter jurisdiction, **18:13; 25:1**
 Suit against former employees to obtain title to patent, **1:49**
 Trade secrets, **18:14**

CONTRACTS AND AGREEMENTS

—Cont'd
 Unilateral contract, **23:39**

CONTRADICTORY

Assignor estoppel doctrine, **19:47**

CONTRA PROFERENTUM RULE, EXCEPTION TO

Patent ambiguity, **9:160**

CONTRARY TO ACCEPTED WISDOM

Generally, **23:11**

CONTRARY TO PRIOR ART TEACHINGS

Obviousness, **9:31**

CONTRIBUTION

Inventorship, **6:50**

CONTRIBUTORY INFRINGEMENT

Generally, **2:195; 3:199; 5:10; 8:83; 16:20; 19:56**
 ARO, **13:29**
 Claim construction, **5:98**
 Contempt, **16:25**
 Customer end user as parties at trial, no necessity to have, **18:11**
 Damages, **20:23**
 Direct infringement, need for, **11:36; 19:100**
 Evidence, **18:11**
 FRCP 52(a), **7:82**
 Implied license, **13:21**
 Importance of an element, **1:129**
 Inducement, **7:130**
 Inducing infringement, **8:24; 9:356**
 Inequitable conduct, **1:210**
 Noninfringing use, existence, **20:113**
 Notice, single use notice, **19:79**
 Obviousness, **7:130**
 Patent misuse, **8:14**
 Process claims, **1:222**
 Sec. 271(c), **6:23; 18:79**
 Sec. 337, **19:222**
 Single use notice, **19:79**
 Summary judgment, **3:36**
 Utility, **7:130**

CONTROL

Direct infringement, “control” by one party over entire process, **1:222**

INDEX

CONTROL—Cont'd

System use, infringement by, **3:156**

CONTROLLING PRECEDENT

CAFC, **19:18**

CONTROVERSY

Declaratory judgment, **6:35; 6:38; 7:38; 7:55**

CONVENTIONAL

Well-understood, Routine and Conventional (this index)

CONVERSION

Proper notice required, **2:41**

CONVEYANCE

Damages, **3:56**

CONVOYED SALES

Lost profits, **1:174**
Sec. 284, **2:31**

CO-OWNERS

Generally, **19:98**
JNOV, **23:4**
Standing, **5:40; 19:221**

CO-PENDENCY

Interference, **2:70**
Markush claim rejection, **9:105**
Sec. 2201, **13:41**
Validity, **8:7**

COPIES

Generally, **1:87; 19:36**
Anticipation definition, **4:15**
Burden of proof, **2:26**
Costs, **11:51**
Damages, **19:29**
Designing around versus, **18:29**
Infringement, willful, **8:47**
Interference, **3:92; 4:8**
Interpretation thereof, **9:130**
Jepson format, **13:15**
Obviousness, as relevant to, **1:119**
Reissue, **11:5**
Seas and Compcoco decisions, **7:3**
Silence, **1:48**
Willful infringement, **8:47**

COPYRIGHT

Infringement, **16:110**

COREPHOTONICS, LTD. V. APPLE INC.

2023, **3:247**

CORPORATE OFFICERS AND DIRECTORS

Cease and desist order, **6:67**
FRCP 15(c), **6:11**
Sec. 112, **15:2**

CORPORATE VEIL, PIERCING

Piercing Corporate Veil (this index)

CORPORATION APPEARANCE BY NONLAWYER

FCR 7(a), **18:15**

CORRECTION

Accrual of claim for correction of inventorship, **16:131**
Adding co-inventor, **1:54; 6:79**
Claim construction error, **3:156**
Inventorship, **1:54; 6:35; 6:79; 16:131; 19:195; 19:218; 20:68**
Obviousness conclusion, **9:15**
Sec. 101, **18:6**

CORRESPONDENCE

Customers as infringement threats, letters to, **13:41**
Doctrine of equivalents, **5:39**

CORRESPONDING FUNCTION

Means-plus-function claim, **10:36; 18:48**

CORRESPONDING STRUCTURE

Means-plus-function claim, **1:114; 2:61; 2:123; 7:70; 11:42; 19:119; 19:238**
Sec. 112(6), **2:123; 14:38; 14:56**

CORROBORATING EVIDENCE

Generally, **3:117**
Conception, **3:160**
Inventorship, **19:132; 21:42**

CORROBORATION

Generally, **12:63; 19:152**
Activities for proof, **2:118**
Anticipation, **14:94**
Claims construed, **9:77**
Conception, **4:74**
Criteria, **23:48**
Evidence, forms of, **2:118; 5:40**
Factors, **20:75**

CORROBORATION—Cont'd

Inurement, **14:83**
 Invalidity and noninfringement, declaratory judgment, **20:133**
 Inventor's testimony, **8:30**
 New interference rules, **8:3**
 Non-party inventors, **20:48**
 Obviousness, **5:133**
 Oral testimony, **10:31**
 Physical exhibit, not necessary for, **2:96**
 Printed publication, **14:94**
 Rule of reason analysis, **9:288; 11:41; 12:92; 13:72; 19:132**
 Sec. 102(g), **20:48**
 Sec. 102 in general, **6:40**
 Witnesses, **8:30; 10:31; 20:64**

COST AWARD

Generally, **11:58**
 28 USC § 1920, **9:342**

COST-PLUS-OVERHEAD

Attorney fees award, **16:24**

COST SAVINGS

Sec. 284, **8:4**

COSTS OF ACTION

Allowance of Costs (this index)
 Commercial embodiment, comparison with, **1:20**
 Copies, exemplifications and copies, **11:51**
 Cost Award (this index)
 Deposition transcripts, **13:73; 19:45**
 Distortion of record, **1:20**
 Doctrine of equivalents, **1:20**
 E-discovery costs, **3:156**
 Exemplifications and copies, **11:51**
 Expert witness fees, **19:77**
 FRAP 39, **11:24**
 FRCP 54(d), **4:32; 15:32**
 Inequitable conduct, **1:193**
 Infringement, **1:20**
 Local rules, **1:260**
 Prevailing Party (this index)
 Process claims, irrelevant with, **1:20**
 Sec. 145, **10:16; 14:4**
 Sec. 2412(b), **13:48**
 Trial and deposition transcripts, **13:73**

COUNTERCLAIM

Choice of law, **22:18**

COUNTERCLAIM—Cont'd

Declaratory judgment, **13:46**
 Immunity, **19:141**
 Infringement, by licensee, **13:179**
 Jurisdiction, **4:57; 7:73**
 Sec. 1631, **19:2**
 Sec viii statement, **14:63**
 Substantive merit not basis for refusal to accept, **22:18**
 Validity, **13:91**
 Well-pleaded complaint, **2:31**

COUNTS

Generally, **3:43; 13:10**
 Affidavit describing work of third party at reasonably contemporaneous time, **9:23**
 Broadest reasonable interpretation, **18:56**
 Interference, **7:49; 7:74; 9:88; 9:141; 9:230; 13:31; 19:151**
 Interference estoppel, **9:49**
 Interference estoppel by judgment, **23:14**
 Law question, **4:31**

COURT ERROR

JNOV motion, **6:6**

COURT FINDINGS

All claims not addressed, **1:9**

COURT NOT LIMITED TO REASONABLE ROYALTY FIGURES URGED BY PARTIES

Generally, **19:53**

COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT (CAFC)

Arbitration, ultimate arbiter, **18:3**
 Choice of law, **5:67; 6:51; 7:75; 19:156; 21:44**
 Controlling precedent, **19:18**
 Declaratory judgment, **19:22**
 Disregarding precedent, **1:52**
 District court, **6:9**
 Diversity jurisdiction determined at time action filed, **2:11**
 Effect thereof, **17:2**
 Evidence, failure to submit, **18:3**
 Exclusive jurisdiction, **5:8**
 Factfinder, **18:3**
 Frivolous appeal, **2:11**

INDEX

COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT (CAFC)

—Cont'd

General verdict, **18:3**
Inter partes reexamination, **18:103**
Interpretation of own mandate, **12:47**
Interrogatories, **18:3**
Judge, **18:3**
Jurisdiction
 generally, **1:69; 2:11; 2:67; 2:69;**
 2:111; 3:60; 3:73; 5:33; 6:57;
 7:70; 8:66; 8:70; 9:213; 11:50;
 14:29; 16:45; 16:68; 16:73;
 19:95; 19:141; 19:170; 19:175;
 20:2; 20:45; 20:82; 21:35;
 21:37; 22:14
 advisory opinion, **20:2**
 appealability, **7:8; 10:43; 19:50; 22:2**
 contempt, **1:263**
 appeal and review, **7:14**
 arising under, **10:43; 13:14**
 equitable estoppel, **13:14**
 exclusive jurisdiction, **5:8**
 ex parte tests, **9:63**
 facts vs. law, **20:2**
 FDCA, **1:332**
 interlocutory order, **5:85; 13:219;**
 22:2
 inventor not required to understand,
 9:63
 ITC, **1:15**
 lack of, **2:11**
 law vs. facts, **20:2**
 mandamus, **9:54; 9:63; 9:292**
 nonpatent claims, **9:161**
 notice, **9:63**
 opinion, advisory, **20:2**
 reexamination, **7:8**
 repeal of jurisdictional statute, **6:30**
 repeal of jurisdictional statute, after,
 6:30
 Sec. 1651, **9:128**
 special dispatch, conducted with, **7:8**
 stipulation, **20:2**
 threshold question, **23:15**
 transfer of appeal, **7:14**
 understand, inventor not required to
 understand, **9:63**
 without notice to other party, **9:63**
Jury, obviousness question to, **18:3**
Late claiming, **18:3**

COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT (CAFC)

—Cont'd

Motion to publish cafc decision, **9:1**
MPEP, **9:10**
New ground of rejection, **9:22**
Obviousness question to jury, **18:3**
Opinions or findings, **19:42**
Parties, **21:22**
Precedent, **22:7**
Preemption, **21:42**
Purpose, **9:76**
Repeal, **6:30**
Sec. 145 proceeding in district court, **6:9**
State immunity from suit under Eleventh
Amendment, **10:11**
Submit evidence, failure to, **18:3**
Trial conduct, **18:3**
Ultimate arbiter, **18:3**

COURT OF CLAIMS

Claims Court (this index)

COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE STANDARD

Summary judgment, **20:38**

COVENANT NOT TO SUE

ANDA, **3:132**
Claim differentiation, **9:411**
Dismissal, **7:90**
Jurisdiction, **18:81**
Statement of nonliability, **19:55**
Subject matter jurisdiction, **4:95**
Summary judgment, **1:306; 13:244**

COVERED BUSINESS METHOD REVIEW

Generally, **1:293; 19:297; 19:318;**
19:330; 21:71; 22:51
Complimentary to, **21:71**
Estoppel, **3:202**
Final judgment, **9:415**
Incidental to, **21:71**
Obviousness, **21:72**
Sec. 101, **1:293; 18:119; 20:154; 21:71**
Sec. 329, **7:117**
Statutory definition, **21:71**
Stay, **2:158; 9:415; 22:48; 22:52**
Transitional program, **2:168**

CREDIBILITY OF EVIDENCE

Weight and Credibility of Evidence (this index)

CREDITING EXPERT

Sec. 145, **7:9**

CREDIT ONE WHEN CONFLICTING TESTIMONY

Witness' testimony, **7:47**

CRIME FRAUD EXCEPTION

Attorney-client privilege, **21:58**

CRIMINAL CONTEMPT

Generally, **19:48**

CRITICAL CLAIM TERM

Construction, **13:169**

CRITICAL DATE

Exceptional case, **18:9**

CRITICALITY

ITC, **1:17**

Obviousness, **9:107**

CROPS FROM SECOND GENERATION SEEDS

Replication of patented technology, **13:173**

CROSS-APPEAL

Generally, **2:87; 13:8; 14:53; 18:2; 22:4**

Conditional, **14:53**

Different claims in issue, **8:46**

Equitable estoppel, **18:98**

JNOV, **22:4**

Law of the case, **7:28**

Reverse validity or infringement component of judgment

generally, **18:2**

adding features, **18:2**

combination, **18:2**

doctrine of equivalents, **18:2**

fact question, **18:2**

jury instruction error, **9:317**

liability not avoided, **18:2**

means-plus-function claim, **18:2**

old combination rejection, **18:2**

rejection, **18:2**

secondary considerations must be considered, **18:2**

CROSS-EXAMINATION

Administrative law, **4:38**

Collateral estoppel, **13:53**

CROSS MOTIONS

Noninfringement, **1:66**

Summary judgment, **2:36**

CROSS-READING

Design patent, **19:8**

CROWDED ART

Claim interpretation, **20:8**

CROWN PACKAGING TECHNOLOGY, INC. V. BELVAC PRODUCTION MACHINERY, INC.

2024, **3:254**

CULPABILITY

Intent to mislead, **20:35**

CULPABLE INTENT

Inequitable conduct, **5:16; 15:34; 16:32; 20:25**

CUMULATIVE PRIOR ART

Inequitable conduct, **7:1**

CUMULATIVE REFERENCE

Generally, **5:16; 18:40**

Inequitable conduct, **19:51**

Materiality, **19:59**

Prior art, **12:61**

CURE

Damages, **1:20**

CUSTOM

Mandamus, **9:57**

CUSTOMER

Contributory vs.direct infringement, **18:11**

Patent license, **12:14**

Statutory notice under Sec. 287(b)(5), **13:41**

Use of system, infringement, **3:156**

CYNTEC COMPANY, LTD. V. CHILISIN ELECTRONICS CORP.

2023, **3:248**

CYTIVA BIOPROCESS R&D AB V. JSR CORP.

2024, **3:255**

INDEX

CYWEE GROUP LTD. V. GOOGLE LLC

2023, **3:249**

CYWEE GROUP LTD. V. ZTE (USA), INC.

2024, **3:256**

DAMAGES

Generally, **1:152; 1:350; 1:373; 11:88;
18:62; 19:38; 20:157; 21:44;
22:65**

Accounting, **1:20; 1:38**

Accounting phase, **11:15**

Adequate to compensate for infringement,
16:40

Amended complaint, **1:350**

Anticipation, **5:138**

Appeal and review, **1:20; 6:12; 18:35;
19:96; 20:39; 21:23**

Apportionment, **13:224; 15:61**

Assembly of completed machine after
patent term, **16:5**

Assignor estoppel doctrine, **19:47**

Bad faith, **20:19**

Breach of contract limited to those rea-
sonably foreseeable, **8:43**

Civil contempt, **7:11**

Compensation, adequate, **16:40**

Compound interest, **4:24**

Conflicting expert testimony, **1:20**

Contributory infringement, **20:23**

Conveyed sales vs. derivative sales,
3:56

Copying, **19:29**

Cure trial mistakes, cannot find facts de
novo or, **1:20**

Delay, **23:27**

Derivative sales, conveyed sales vs.,
3:56

Design, **20:15**

Design patent, **1:275; 3:98**

Discretion of court, **7:15; 13:45**

District court, affirm on grounds not
relied upon by, **2:15**

Divided infringement, **1:270; 1:271**

Double recovery, **1:148**

Doubts resolved against infringer, **19:92**

Dual-sided subject, **12:24**

Egregiousness of defendant's conduct,
5:54

DAMAGES—Cont'd

Enhanced damages during appeal,
9:125; 19:289

Equitable defense, **2:19**

Exceptional case, **3:180**

Expert testimony, **12:88; 22:43**

Fact question, **6:26; 15:10; 21:18**

Fact question with underlying
discretionary decisions, **13:45**

Foreign countries, invention not sold in
US, **20:23**

Foreseeability, **7:63; 13:79**

FRCP 52(a), **1:18; 19:4**

FRCP 60(b), **1:20**

Good faith challenge, **16:5**

Harm to reputation, **18:32**

Hypothetical negotiation, **1:296; 12:97**

Inadequacy of money damages, **14:9**

Inducement, **5:138; 9:410**

Infringement, **5:121; 13:146; 13:224;
16:40; 19:92; 22:35**

Injunction, **1:20; 1:262**

Invalidity, **3:180**

Issue preclusion, **4:9**

JNOV, **23:4**

Jury, **1:16; 1:199; 2:80; 23:73**

Laches, **2:19; 3:180**

Law of the case, **20:23**

Lear, **18:8**

Lost profits, **1:20; 1:59; 2:19; 2:40;
3:8; 7:15; 7:63; 13:157; 16:5;
18:2; 19:52; 20:23; 23:3; 23:82**

Lump sum royalty payment, **9:235**

Machine, assembly of completed
machine after patent term, **16:5**

Mandamus, **9:76**

Mandate, **18:105**

Marking, **4:89; 14:24; 18:2**

Master, special master, **20:19**

Maximum recovery rule, **19:137**

Method, notice required for, **19:154**

Methodology, **1:105; 11:10; 12:90;
13:75**

Modified item, **1:20**

Multi-component products, **22:47**

Negotiations, hypothetical, **1:296;
2:189; 20:23**

Notice, **7:66; 19:154**

Obviousness, **19:228**

Opinion of counsel, **1:20**

DAMAGES—Cont'd

Other damages, **23:73**
 Panduit, **16:40; 19:56**
 Payment, lump sum royalty, **9:235**
 Pre-issuance damages with no actual notice of patent, **18:113**
 Prejudgment interest, **2:15; 7:15; 16:5; 18:2**
 Prejudice, **8:50**
 Price erosion, **22:26**
 Prior judgment, **20:23**
 Process, notice required for method or process, **19:154**
 Punishment, not, **1:20**
 Punitive damages, **9:161; 18:14**
 Question of fact, **3:96; 5:71**
 Reasonable royalty
 generally, **8:20; 13:146; 16:163; 19:16; 23:25**
 ANDA, **1:280**
 apportionment, **14:5**
 floor on damages, **18:35**
 future lost sales, **6:74**
 hypothetical negotiation, **1:296; 12:90; 16:129**
 redetermination, **18:86**
 30 percent, **20:19**
 willfulness, **21:57**
 Reasonably foreseeable, **13:79**
 Reexamination, **12:50**
 Remand, **18:105**
 Requirement, **20:19**
 Reversal of award, **5:102**
 Royalty, lump sum royalty payment, **9:235**
 Royalty, reasonable royalty, **8:20**
 Sale, **3:180**
 Sears, **21:11**
 Sec. 101, **6:97**
 Sec. 271(a), **1:270; 3:180; 8:138**
 Sec. 271(f), **23:82**
 Sec. 289, **14:77; 19:293**
 Sec. 102(e), **19:41**
 Sec. 112, **8:7; 19:7**
 Sec. 271(c), **20:23**
 Sec. 284
 generally, **2:31; 4:6; 4:7; 8:4; 11:21; 12:4; 19:29; 19:35; 19:53; 20:23**
 enhanced damages, **2:30; 9:323**

DAMAGES—Cont'd

Sec. 284—Cont'd
 nominal damages, **12:24**
 precision, not ascertainable with, **2:30**
 Sec. 286, **1:47**
 Sec. 287, **4:12**
 Sec. 1498, **13:35**
 Simple v. compound interest, **4:24**
 Special master, **20:19**
 Standard essential patents, **3:186**
 Standing, **23:82**
 State law punitive damages, **9:161**
 Testimonial evidence alone, **7:11**
 30 percent reasonable royalty, **20:19**
 Two-step analysis, **10:21**
 Two-step process, **13:101**
 Unpatented accessory sales part of damages base, **11:21**
 Validity, **12:45**
 Willful infringement
 generally, **1:20; 2:19; 2:148; 13:145; 16:5; 18:2; 19:29**
 determination, **18:2**
 increased damages, **9:323; 11:10; 15:14**
 reasonable royalty, **21:57**

DANN AMENDMENT

Appeals from judgments, **19:30**
 Defect reissue, **19:30**
 Opinions, **19:30**
 Reissue, **9:47; 19:30**

DATE

Time and Timeliness (this index)

DDR HOLDINGS, LLC V.

PRICELINE.COM LLC

2024, **4:134**

DEAD INVENTOR'S VIDEOTAPE

DEPOSITION

FRE 403, **13:4**

DECEPTION

Intent to Deceive (this index)

DECLARATION

Affidavit, **9:177**

Foreign, **19:118**

Inequitable conduct, **9:378; 13:129**

DECLARATORY JUDGMENTS

Generally, **1:243; 5:74; 16:103**

INDEX

DECLARATORY JUDGMENTS

—Cont'd

Actual controversy
generally, **1:94; 2:122; 3:69; 4:103; 6:35; 6:38; 7:38; 7:55; 8:66; 9:324; 15:24; 19:250; 23:22**
infringement, **20:26**
patented transgenic seeds, **15:44**
Advisory opinion, **9:92**
“All the circumstances,” **13:155**
ANDA disputes, **10:39**
Appeal and review, **9:233; 19:86**
Appropriateness, **9:92**
Burden of proof, **13:179; 13:194**
CAFC, **19:22**
CAPC, **3:132**
Case or controversy requirement, **1:319; 19:86; 20:111**
Collateral estoppel, **10:6**
Combination invention, **10:6**
Discretion of court, dismissal is within, **5:24; 19:198**
Dismissal, **5:24; 19:81**
District court follows CAFC patent law, **19:22**
Escrow, **3:21**
Exceptional case, **1:159**
First to file, **3:226; 6:89**
Immediacy requirement, **3:134; 13:177; 19:250**
Inducement, **1:319**
Infringement, **13:194; 19:81; 19:101**
Inventorship, **12:86**
Jurisdiction, **1:27; 2:122; 8:109; 13:194; 19:192; 23:9**
Justiciable controversy, **19:61**
Justifiable controversy, **2:42**
Law question, **19:265**
Licenses
generally, **13:133**
license agreement, **7:79; 13:143; 19:192**
licensee, **13:132**
Limitations in specification, **10:6**
Notice of infringement, **19:101**
Opinion, advisory, **9:92**
Patented transgenic seeds, actual controversy, **15:44**
Pendent jurisdiction, **23:9**
Personal jurisdiction, **1:374**

DECLARATORY JUDGMENTS

—Cont'd

Redundant judgment to patentee's suit, **13:46**
Regional circuit law, **19:22**
Registration, trademark, **23:9**
Requirements, **4:40; 16:42**
Reversal of court ruling, **9:92**
Sec. 2201, **7:25; 9:89; 9:92; 10:6; 12:23; 13:41; 19:22; 19:55; 23:9**
Sovereign immunity, **7:25**
Specification, limitations in, **10:6**
Standing, **16:113**
Subject matter jurisdiction, **1:297; 1:301; 8:109; 16:130; 19:250**
Summary judgment, **7:7**
Synergism, **10:6**
Trademark registration, **23:9**
Unasserted claims, **19:236**
Validity, **1:312**

DECREES

See index topics Judgments; Orders (this index)

DEDICATION TO PUBLIC

Claim interpretation, **16:88**
Doctrine of equivalents, disclosure-dedication, **19:233**
Unclaimed subject matter, intent, **20:74**

DEFAULT JUDGMENT

Dismissal, **20:7**
FRCP 60(b), **9:144**
Interference, **1:60**

DEFAULT PROOF

Generally, **4:76**

DEFECTS

Dann Amendment, **19:30**
FRCP 12(b)(7), **21:56**
Sec. 251, **7:21**

DEFENSES

Anticipation, **18:20**
Assignor estoppel doctrine, **19:47; 19:241**
Burden of proof, **9:118; 19:48**
Clearly erroneous standard, **19:23**
Collateral estoppel, **4:3**
Exhaustion of patent rights, **5:93**
Factual overlap of issues, **23:24**

DEFENSES—Cont’d

Implied license, **1:100**
 Inconsistent jury findings, **2:10**
 Infringement, **5:60**
 Inherent element of every government contract, **8:41**
 Interrelationship of issues, **20:5**
 Invalidity, **1:177**
 Jury trial, **20:55**
 Jury verdict, **3:75**
 Laches, **8:114**
 Licensee agreement, **18:58**
 Obviousness, **16:4**
 Patent misuse, **23:9**
 Repair, **4:1**
 Sec. 282, **16:50**
 Sec. 1631, **19:2**
 Sovereign acts, **15:8**
 Waiver, **9:159**
 Willfulness, **3:96**

DEFERENCE

Agency’s interpretation of contract, **9:132**
 Agency’s interpretation of own regulations, **11:27**
 Certificate of correction, **10:44**
 Choice of law, **2:31**
 Claim differentiation, **11:2**
 Indefiniteness, **21:44**
 Inventorship, **21:42**
 ITC, **5:37**
 Patent term extension, **8:25**
 Sec. 41(a)(7), **13:32**
 Special master’s decision, **13:24**
 Statutory construction
 generally, **2:51; 4:30; 11:39; 14:17; 14:22; 19:74; 19:82**
 chevron deference, **6:31; 26:3**
 ITO agency, **23:31**
 own statute, **11:30**
 permissible construction, **12:34**
 silent or ambiguous statute, **6:24**
 Timing of agency’s decision making, **20:88**

DEFINITENESS

Certainty and Definiteness (this index)

DEFINITE STRUCTURE

Means-plus-function claim, **6:36**

DEFINITIONS

Abuse of discretion, **8:9**
 Appeal, **4:67; 10:19**
 Best mode, **14:30**
 Certainty and definiteness, failure to define term, **2:105**
 Claim interpretation, **8:99**
 Clearly erroneous standard, **4:41**
 Competitive decision making, **4:94**
 “Comprising,” **19:158**
 Conception, **2:126; 4:100**
 Extrinsic evidence rarely probative of special definition, **14:30**
 Machine, **9:290**
 Manufacture, **9:290**
 Markush claim, **13:218**
 Mathematical algorithm, **9:42**
 Multiple definitions of phrase, **7:28**
 Multiple dictionary definitions, **9:253**
 Ordinary skill, hypothetical person for, **19:26**
 Original application, **3:139**
 Precise proportions, **8:74**
 Preponderance of the evidence, **4:33**
 Procedure, **16:3**
 Process, **9:20; 18:85**
 Prosecution history defining claim terms, **19:84**
 Relationship, **9:34**
 Substantial evidence, **2:37; 3:23; 4:33; 6:31; 6:32; 7:43; 7:44; 8:31; 9:231; 10:31; 13:68; 20:22**
 Summary judgment, **20:10**
 Trade secret, **12:27**
 Undefined terms given their ordinarily understood meaning, **8:61**

DELAY

Laches or Delay (this index)

DELISTING

Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, **1:120**

DELIVERY

Judicial notice, **11:24**

DEMAND

Entire market value rule, **20:50**
 Sanctions, **17:2**

DEMEANING

Reprehensible conduct, **9:159**

INDEX

DEMONSTRATION

Infringement, **13:53**

DE NOVO REVIEW

Generally, **3:53**
Attorney fee ruling, **3:171**
Evidence, **11:32**
Explained, **12:43**
Prima facie obviousness, **2:133**
Sec. 102(b), **9:7**
Sec. 145, **14:4**
Sec. 252, **19:4**
Standard of review, **11:19**
Standing, **7:39**

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

Generally, **12:28**
Burden of persuasion and quantum of proof, **18:7**
Claim differentiation, **5:60; 9:237**
Claim interpretation, **15:31; 23:43**
Dependent claim tail cannot wag independent claim dog, **14:12**
Design patent, **19:8**
Doctrine of equivalents, **5:6; 18:65**
Independent claims, generally, **9:100; 9:123**
Infringement, **10:26; 13:100; 13:147; 23:17; 23:35**
Obviousness, **9:24; 16:4; 18:23; 19:245**
Prosecution history estoppel, **8:105**
Reissue, **9:336**
Sec. 1.192(c), **9:154**
Summary judgment, **2:29**
Validity, **8:7; 9:345**

DEPOSIT

Best mode, **1:44; 19:51**
Microbiology field, **9:53**
Recombinant DNA technology, **19:121**

DEPOSITION

Allowance of costs, **19:45**
Appeal, introduction on, **13:183**
Costs, **13:73**
Declaration in conflict with prior deposition testimony, **19:62**
Discovery, **23:5**
FRE 403, **13:4**
Inter partes reexamination, **1:232**
Inter partes review, **1:338**

DERIVATION OF INVENTION

Another, **12:122**
Claim preamble, **5:65**
Damages, **3:56**
Interference, **4:11**
Inurement versus, **3:82**
Law questions, **16:36**
Obviousness, **3:204**
Sec. 102(f), **14:10**
Two prong test, **7:46**

DESCRIPTION

Generally, **16:80**
Biological deposits, **5:69**
Collateral estoppel, **1:249**
Continuation, **20:47**
Continuation application, **19:105**
Design patent, **9:205**
DNA, **1:131; 2:143**
Drawings constitute an adequate description, **3:101**
Enablement, **21:9**
Enablement vs. description requirement, **22:7**
Fact question, **1:118; 9:177**
Failure to meet requirements for written description, **21:67**
Genus claim, **2:143; 2:144**
Haec verba, not, **3:103**
Inherency, **5:56**
Limitations, **12:50**
MPEP, **16:8**
Obvious for continuation, patent only renders, **20:47**
Obviousness, **6:99**
Possession, **13:124**
Precision, reasonable precision, **6:33**
Primarily factual, **21:33**
Reasonable precision, **6:33**
Sec. 112, **9:85; 18:40; 20:6**
Secondary considerations, **6:99**
Written description
generally, **3:210; 5:75; 9:488; 11:57; 12:73; 13:126; 14:42; 14:97; 18:120; 19:178; 19:283; 20:118; 20:123; 20:146**
abuse of discretion, **3:197; 9:318**
adequacy of disclosure, **1:185**
amino acid sequence, **3:133; 9:264; 9:306**
bacteria, **1:330; 3:114**

DESCRIPTION—Cont'd

Written description—Cont'd
 certificate of correction, **3:187**
 claim construction, **1:215; 6:93; 19:283; 22:49**
 claim differentiation, **6:93**
 constructive possession, **3:157**
 design patent, **9:376**
 disclosure, **16:133; 17:11**
 DNA, **2:143; 3:116**
 doctrine of equivalents, **1:164**
 enablement, **1:304; 9:476; 14:101; 22:49**
 enablement requirement vs., **19:236; 21:46; 21:47**
 fact question, **6:20; 7:112; 9:373; 21:14**
 failure to meet requirements, **21:67**
 features, **19:254**
 genus claim, **2:143; 2:144**
 genus when only disclose species, **2:107**
 induced infringement, **22:59**
 infringement, **9:453**
 inherent capabilities, **13:53**
 in haec verba, **12:54; 16:65**
 injunction, **1:304**
 injunctions, **22:59**
 interference, **1:182; 2:172; 7:123; 11:65; 18:88**
 inter partes review, **11:80**
 jurisdiction, **22:59**
 jury taint, **1:215**
 lack of written description, **11:62; 19:249**
 means-plus-function, **1:262**
 negative limitations, **9:412**
 obviousness, **14:101**
 ordinary and accustomed meaning, **18:46**
 priority filing date, **4:117; 19:120**
 provisional application, **14:36**
 public availability, **3:144**
 recapture rule, **3:187**
 reissue, **9:479**
 Sec. 112, **1:188; 1:252; 1:258; 1:304; 8:101; 9:46; 18:4; 25:11**
 Sec. 112(1), **1:200; 2:144; 9:125; 9:130; 19:254; 22:7; 23:25**
 species, need not describe all, **3:106**
 sufficiency, **1:185**

DESCRIPTION—Cont'd

Written description—Cont'd
 summary judgment, written description and enablement requirement, **2:144; 21:46**

DESIGN

See also Design Patent (this index)
 Combined references showing only components not overall appearance of, **9:137**
 Damages, **20:15**
 Double patenting, **3:4**
 Inequitable conduct, **6:4**
 Injunction against use, purpose of, **20:15**
 Modification, **20:15**
 Same, Sec. 171, **9:73**
 Sec. 171, **9:73; 9:106**

DESIGNER OF ORDINARY SKILL

Obviousness, **12:32**

DESIGNING AROUND PATENT

Generally, **4:35; 8:47**
 Claim interpretation, **3:7**
 Copying, versus, **18:29**
 Sec. 102(g), **11:9**
 Subject matter jurisdiction, **25:1**
 Willful infringement, **19:52**

DESIGN IN PUBLIC DOMAIN

Jurisdiction, **12:48**

DESIGN PATENT

Generally, **2:112; 3:208; 3:218; 8:157; 9:464; 12:118; 16:101; 19:333; 19:341**
 Anticipation, **3:216; 4:64; 8:62; 9:325; 9:500**
 Appeal and review, **19:8; 21:4**
 Attorneys' fees, **19:8; 21:4**
 Best mode requirement, **18:1**
 Case, **1:73**
 Chutzpah, **19:8**
 Claim language, **7:59**
 Construe claim language, **7:59**
 Continuing application, **9:205**
 Cross-reading, **19:8**
 Damages, **1:275; 3:98**
 Dependent vs. independent claims, **19:8**
 Description, **9:205**
 Double patenting, **19:8**
 Drawings, **9:137**

INDEX

DESIGN PATENT—Cont'd

Estoppel, **1:318**
Evidence, validity for each claim, **19:8**
Exhibits superior characteristics over single predecessor device, **18:63**
Experimental use, **3:81**
FRAP 38, **19:8**
Functional elements, **18:29**
Functionality, **1:151; 12:32**
Functional vs. non-functional aspects, **5:21**
Genuine issue, **16:17**
Gorham test, **2:33; 12:29; 15:5; 16:33; 19:8**
Improper to use reference's drawing to negate patentability, **9:137**
Indefiniteness, **1:275; 5:126**
Inequitable conduct, **7:59; 16:1**
Infringement
generally, **3:98; 3:100; 8:126; 15:11; 19:85; 21:4**
elements, **1:165**
Gorham test, **15:5; 19:8**
ordinary observer test, **1:151; 1:165; 5:89; 9:321; 18:96**
patentability distinguished, **11:25**
tests, **1:165; 5:89; 12:8**
Inventor, **8:81**
Issued as division of earlier utility application may be entitled to later's priority date, **18:1**
Materiality, **16:1**
Obviousness, **1:226; 3:227.50; 8:128; 9:120; 9:135; 9:178; 9:227; 12:17; 13:198; 16:17**
Ordinary designer standard, **4:48**
Ordinary observer test, **1:151; 1:165; 5:89; 6:88; 9:321; 18:96**
Ornamentality requirement, **1:151; 2:58; 8:62; 8:128; 18:87**
Overall design standard, **18:96**
Overall similarity compared, **2:63**
Patentability, **9:137; 11:25**
Points of novelty, **2:106; 9:325**
Preliminary injunction, **1:226; 3:34; 20:93**
Presumption not augmented by previous validity holding, **19:8**
Primarily functional, **16:21**
Priority claim, **9:376**

DESIGN PATENT—Cont'd

Profits and Sec. 284, not receive both, **3:98**
Prosecution history estoppel, **16:139**
Reference, improper to use reference's drawing to negate patentability, **9:137**
Scope, **9:55**
Sec. 102(b), **20:32**
Sec. 103, **9:8**
Sec. 284 and profits, not receive both, **3:98**
Sec. 1337 industry requirement, **3:154**
Stipulated judgment of noninfringement, **19:288**
Summary judgment, **1:35; 16:17**
Supervisory authority, **16:17**
Two-part test, **21:28**
Utility patent, **1:356**
Validity, **19:8**
Visible, not required to be, **19:118**
Written description sufficiency, **9:376**

DESIRABILITY

Obviousness (this index)

DESTROY

Presumption of validity, **13:81**

DESTRUCTION OF DOCUMENTS

Evidence, **5:1**

DETAIL

Sec. 112, **19:7**

DEVICES

Claim interpretation. Claim Construction and Interpretation (this index)
Claim preclusion, **8:76**
Doctrine of equivalents, **7:40**
Equivalent device, not necessarily, **11:22**
Infringement, **8:46**
MPEP, **16:6**
Obviousness, **20:72**
Refining, **13:8**
Sec. 103 rejection on single reference device capable of being operated like claimed apparatus, **9:101**
Suggestion or motivation to modify, must be, **9:101**

DEVOID

Generally, **13:98**

**DEXCOM, INC. V. ABBOTT
DIABETES CARE, INC.**

2024, **4:135**

DICKENS

Bleak House, **19:83**

DICTA

Generally, **11:37**

DICTIONARY

Generally, **4:67; 22:19**

Claim interpretation

generally, **7:79; 9:269; 16:85; 16:94**
definitions, **1:90; 13:151**

intrinsic record trumps dictionary,
11:53; 19:196

less useful than patent itself, **20:51**
multiple dictionary definitions, **9:253**
not always customary meaning, **6:51**
sole use improper, **3:105**

Extrinsic evidence, **22:19**

Technical terms, use technical dictionary
for, **1:109**

DIFFERENTIATION

Claim Differentiation (this index)

DILIGENCE

Generally, **2:118; 11:82; 13:103**

Experiment, laboratory, **19:144**

Laboratory experimentation, **19:144**

Reasonable, **13:105**

Sec. 102(g), **14:7; 16:148**

DIMENSIONS

Jury verdict, **19:5**

DIRECT APPEAL

District court, **6:9**

DIRECTED TO FACTS

Interrogatories, **23:7**

DIRECTED VERDICT

Generally, **5:22**

FRCP 50(a), **2:31**

JNOV, **22:4**

JNOV motion, **4:32**

Jury instructions, **10:4**

Renewal, **14:1**

Review, standard of, **1:46; 1:71**

Sufficiently specific, when, **23:17**

Summary judgment, **10:4**

Waiver, **10:15**

DIRECTED VERDICT—Cont'd

Willful infringement, **16:22**

DIRECT EVIDENCE

Generally, **13:28**

Disclosure, duty of, **12:52**

Inducement, **2:130**

DIRECT INFRINGEMENT

Generally, **5:63**

ARO, **13:29**

Claim construction, **12:108**

Contributory infringement, **11:36; 19:56**

Contributory requires direct infringe-
ment, **16:20**

“Control” or “direction” by one party
over entire process, **1:222**

Customer end user as parties at trial, no
necessity to have, **18:11**

Divided, **12:108**

Evidence, **18:11**

If none, then no contributory or induced
infringement, **5:10**

Implied license, **13:21**

Inducing infringement, **5:63; 5:102;**
12:104

Intent not required, **9:118**

Joint infringement, party in control,
2:124

Method claims, performance of all steps,
1:222; 5:121; 12:108

Single direct infringer requirement,
1:222

Single entity performing all steps, **1:242**

DIRECTORY STATUTES

Statutory construction, **5:17**

DISAVOWAL OF CLAIM SCOPE

Claim construction and interpretation,
3:140; 5:97; 15:47; 16:143;
16:151; 20:112; 20:148; 21:70

DISBELIEF BY EXPERTS

Generally, **5:5**

DISCHARGE OF CLAIM

Accord and satisfaction, **3:48**

DISCLAIMERS

Disavowal of claim, **3:137; 21:70**

Doctrine of prosecution disclaimer,
3:137

Double patenting, **15:6**

INDEX

DISCLAIMERS—Cont'd

Fundamental precept in claim construction, **1:309; 15:21; 20:138**
Interference, **7:45**
Inter partes review, **1:326; 1:327**
Patent marking, **18:118**
Patent term extension, **13:144**
Prior art, **19:216**
Prosecution history, **1:298; 2:155; 4:84; 13:209; 19:169; 19:193; 20:157.70; 22:35**
Prosecution history estoppel, **19:153**
Purpose, **9:110**
Recapture, **8:96**
Reissue, **22:15**
Rejection, **17:2**
28 USC § 1295, **1:327**

DISCLOSURE

Analogous art, **9:78**
ANDA, **2:81**
Best mode, **7:37; 7:47; 9:357; 23:72**
Chemical compound, **9:148**
Chemical genus, **9:126**
Claim-supporting vs. claim-anticipating, **22:7**
Computer, **9:154**
Conception, **3:160**
Doctrine of Equivalents (this index)
Double patenting, **9:45; 9:307**
Duty of, **9:43; 12:52; 14:19; 20:76**
Enablement, **1:102; 1:167; 10:23**
Exceptional case, **18:9**
Expert testimony, **3:141; 13:183**
Filing of CIP, **23:30**
FRCP 26, **3:141**
FRCP 52(a), **12:6**
Generic, **19:201**
Inequitable conduct, **3:98; 6:13; 19:128**
Infringement, **9:4**
Inherent, **25:12**
Intent to mislead, **8:51**
Interference, **7:13**
Inventor's admission of invention by another, **1:8**
ITC domestic disclosure communication, **1:224**
Later reference, discredited by, **9:117**
Means-plus-function, **2:134; 4:17**
MPEP, **16:6**
Obviousness, **9:107; 16:4; 19:243**

DISCLOSURE—Cont'd

Obviousness-type double patenting, **19:226**
Original claims, **14:8**
Patent prosecution bar, **4:94; 5:110**
Preemption, **21:30**
Prior art, **4:84; 7:68; 13:18**
Production specification, **5:16**
References, **15:28; 15:33**
Relative terms in claims given broadest reasonable interpretation during prosecution, **9:36**
Rule 26(a) expert testimony disclosure, **13:183**
Sec. 1.56, **8:29**
Sec. 10.57(b), **13:69**
Sec. 102(b), **9:18**
Sec. 102(e), **9:28**
Sec. 112, **2:123; 13:10; 16:10**
Sec. 145, **7:9**
Sec. 282, statutory outer limits, **23:76**
Specification need not disclose what is well known, **9:113**
Standard of review, disclosure dedication, **20:74**
Standard setting organizations, **17:9**
Substitute, must be obvious, **9:29**
Sufficiency of
 corresponding structure, **2:123**
 enablement, **1:102**
 good faith explanation of failure to disclose, **6:80**
 interference, **3:25**
 Sec. 112(1), **23:30**
 Sec. 120, **11:8**
 some claims but not all, **22:7**
Trade name information as failure to comply with best mode requirement, **20:33**
Written description, **1:185**

DISCOVERY

Abuse of Discovery (this index)
ADR proceeding, documents pertaining to ADR proceeding, **8:37**
Ancillary proceeding, **13:37**
Anticipation, discovery of properties, **9:257**
Appealability, **8:9**
Choice of law, **1:19; 19:114; 20:17**
Confidential information, **1:10; 19:17**

DISCOVERY—Cont'd

- Documents pertaining to ADR proceeding, **8:37**
- E-discovery costs, **3:156**
- Enhanced damages, **21:3**
- Examiner's deposition, **23:5**
- Exceptional case discovery, **4:83**
- Foreign countries, **3:65**
- FRCP 26, **23:76**
- FRCP 37(b), **23:34**
- FRCP 45, **11:24**
- FRCP 56(f), **13:154**
- Interference estoppel by judgment, **23:14**
- Monetary sanctions, **13:6**
- New property or new use cannot impart patentability to known composition, **9:129**
- New property or use of known composition, **9:104**
- New trial, **22:26**
- Nonparty's motion to quash discovery subpoena, **20:17**
- Old composition, **20:11**
- Prosecution disclaimer, **3:137**
- Protective order, **13:40**
- Record of invention, **9:221**
- Review, standard of, **11:7**
- Sanctions, **2:27; 18:94**
- Summary judgment, **1:35**

DISCOVERY ORDER

- Appealability, **17:3**
- Choice of law, **4:47**
- Mandamus review, **9:362; 9:430**

DISCOVERY SANCTIONS

- FRCP 37(b), **20:4**
- Respond, failure to, **13:25**

DISCRETION

- Abuse of Discretion (this index)
- Court's Discretion of Court (this index)
- Damages, **13:45**
- Difficulty of showing, **19:57**
- Injunctive relief, **10:23**

DISCRETIONARY

- Enhanced damages award, **15:14**
- Injunction, **15:14**
- 28 USC § 1292(b), **14:40**

DISCRETIONARY AGENCY

DECISION

- Standard of review, **4:38**

DISCRETIONARY AUTHORITY

- Review of EIC, standard of, **7:23**

DISCRETIONARY EXERCISE

- Mandamus, **6:19; 9:430**

DISCRETION OF COMMISSIONER

- Interference, **2:67**

DISCRETION OF COURT

- Conditional new trial, **13:34**
- Damages, **7:15**
- Declaratory judgment, **5:24; 19:198**
- Evidence, **3:57**
- FRE 403, **7:5**
- Inequitable conduct, **7:33; 13:38; 13:45**
- JMOL, **26:9**
- Laches, **14:11**
- Pendent jurisdiction, **11:20**
- Preliminary injunction, **2:60; 6:21; 8:81; 12:29; 23:20**
- Review, standard of, **7:72**
- Rule 60(b), **12:100**
- Sec. 252, **19:4**
- Sec. 283, **18:18**
- Summary judgment, **7:7**
- Supplemental jurisdiction, **7:39**
- Trial management, **20:25**

DISCRETION TO APPLY

- Doctrine of equivalents, **13:80**

DISEASE TREATMENT METHODS

- Bacterial species, **18:109**
- Cells, **18:109**
- DNA (this index)
- Recombinant DNA (this index)

DISMISSAL

- Generally, **8:95**
- Abuse of discretion, **22:2**
- Accessibility to public, **3:19**
- Admission of prior art in specification, **3:19**
- Anticipation, **3:19**
- Appealable final order, **1:39**
- Choice of law, **8:82**
- Claims court, **20:27**

INDEX

DISMISSAL—Cont'd

Complaint dismissed for mootness in view of settlement of controversy, **19:14**
Covenant not to sue, **7:90**
Declaratory judgment, **5:24; 19:81**
Default judgment, **20:7**
Factual allegations taken as true, **12:46**
Failure to state claim, **3:19; 4:121; 7:36; 10:42; 20:44**
Federal, **22:5**
Final decision, **8:82**
Final judgment, **16:62**
FRCP 12(b)(6), **1:42; 1:248; 3:147; 7:90; 8:102; 12:112; 19:237; 23:29**
FRCP 12(b)(7), **21:54**
FRCP 19(a), **22:8**
FRCP 37, **18:24**
FRCP 37(b), **23:34**
Harsh remedy, **7:52**
ITC, **25:2**
Joint motion, **20:95**
Jurisdiction
 all patent claims dismissed, **3:112**
 dismissal for lack of, **1:189; 6:30**
Jury trial, right to, **3:19**
Lexicographer, **3:19**
Limitations from specification, reading into claims, **3:19**
Merits vs. lack of subject matter jurisdiction, **12:38**
More pertinent prior art, **3:19**
Motion (this index)
 9 Cir, **22:2**
Printed publication, **3:19**
Prior art, **3:19**
Reissue application, **9:47**
Sanctions, **12:36**
Sec. 285, **3:42**
Sec. 1338(b), **13:58**
Sec. 1631, **19:2**
Sec. 2201, **7:25; 13:41**
Specification, admission of prior art in, **3:19**
State claim, failure to, **3:19; 4:121; 7:36; 10:42; 20:44**
Subject matter jurisdiction, merits vs. lack of, **12:38**
Summary judgment, **3:19**
Validity, **16:54**

DISMISSAL—Cont'd

Weapon of last resort, **1:60; 7:23**

DISPOSITIVE MOTIONS

Executive Order 10096, **8:10**

DISSOLUTION

Interference, **16:7**

DISTINCTIVENESS

Sec. 112, **12:28; 19:26; 21:17**

DISTORTION OF RECORD

Costs on appeal, **1:20**

DISTRICT COURT

Appellate jurisdiction, **1:31; 12:36**
Conditional new trial, **13:34**
Correction of error in claim construction, **3:156**
Damages, **2:15**
Declaratory judgment, **19:22**
Evidence, **6:12**
Findings by, need for, **18:32**
Inherent power to control its own docket, **12:36**
Injunctive relief pending appeal after patentee has prevailed, **16:19**
Mandamus, **9:41**
Preliminary injunction, **8:81**
PTO will not cite as authority district court decision reversed on appeal, **9:1**
Reexamination, **9:180**
Review, standard of, **7:33; 7:72**
Sec. 41(a)(7), **13:32**
Sec. 145 proceeding, **6:9**

DIVERSITY JURISDICTION

CAFC, **2:11**

DIVERSITY OF CITIZENSHIP

Appellate jurisdiction, **3:11**

DIVIDED INFRINGEMENT

Refusal to deem unreasonable, **13:208**
Summary judgment, **13:211**

DIVISIONAL APPLICATION

Generally, **2:106**

DIVORCE

Standing, **5:105**

DNA

Generally, **6:20**

DNA—Cont'd

Biogenic, **1:44; 18:109**
 Deposit of DNA, **19:121**
 Description, **1:131; 3:116**
 Interference, priority of invention,
19:240
 Isolated DNA molecules, **1:228; 9:383**
 Prima facie obviousness, **9:133**
 Recombinant DNA (this index)
 Sec. 101, **1:228; 1:245; 9:383**
 Sec. 112(1), **18:40**
 Subject matter jurisdiction, **1:214**
 Typing, **13:139**
 Written description, **2:143; 3:116**

DOCKET

District court's inherent power to
 control its own, **12:36**

DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS

Generally, **1:93; 1:132; 1:142; 1:145;**
1:356; 2:74; 2:84; 2:114; 4:78;
5:59; 5:144; 7:41; 7:78; 8:100;
11:42; 11:46; 12:26; 12:65; 12:66;
12:123; 13:229; 14:46; 16:53;
16:99; 16:102; 16:104; 20:47;
21:18; 22:23; 26:9
 "About," **3:136**
 Additional step, **5:36**
 All elements rule, **1:82; 5:86**
 Amendment, narrowing, **6:70; 7:80;**
8:87; 19:162
 Amendment of claims, **5:53; 6:64; 8:65;**
8:66
 Amendments, **9:108; 9:235; 12:51**
 Apply, no discretion to, **1:79**
 Cancellation of claim and replacement
 with another claim, **13:106**
 Chemical case, **26:2**
 Claim construction and interpretation,
1:192; 3:170; 3:178; 4:23; 4:87;
5:120; 20:8
 Claiming process not perfect, **1:80**
 Claim preamble, **3:22**
 Claim vitiation, **18:106**
 Complete identity not required, **14:1**
 Correspondence, **5:39**
 Costs on appeal, **1:20**
 Criticism of prior art, **16:106**
 Cross-appeal, **18:2**
 Dependent claim, **5:6; 18:65**

DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS**—Cont'd**

Device, cannot cover prior art device,
7:40
 Direct, if none, **13:28**
 Disclosure
 disclosure dedication, **5:152; 19:233;**
20:74
 unclaimed disclosed material, **13:75;**
25:6
 Discretion to apply, none, **13:80**
 Double patenting, **3:4**
 Element-by-element analysis required,
7:61; 20:41; 22:16
 Element missing, **4:53**
 Ensnarement, **4:90; 7:121**
 Equivalence to non-means-plus-function
 limitation, **11:48**
 Equivalent, generally, **1:93**
 Equivalents versus, **5:32; 11:47**
 Estoppel, scope of, **1:119**
 Every claim limitation must be met,
9:131
 Evidence, **7:51**
 Exception, Graver Tank is exception not
 rule, **12:28**
 Experts, **1:164**
 Fact question, **5:28; 9:108; 10:10**
 File wrapper estoppel, **9:108**
 Findings on function, **3:39**
 Foreseeability, **6:52; 6:64; 18:106**
 FRCP 8(a)(2), **14:91**
 FRCP 12(b)(6), **14:91**
 FRCP 56(c), **8:27**
 Function, **5:26; 6:37; 19:84; 21:28**
 Function-way-result test, **19:52; 19:199**
 Generalized testimony, **3:80**
 Graver Tank, **12:28; 13:39; 16:11**
 Hatch-Waxman Act, **9:438**
 Human, infringement of human product
 by structurally different nonnatural
 one, **7:28**
 Hypothetical claim, **23:17**
 Hypotheticals, **14:18**
 Identity, complete identity not required,
14:1
 Independent claims, **5:6; 18:65**
 Inducement, **14:91**
 Inducing infringement, **13:28**
 Information disclosure statement, **5:31**

DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS**—Cont'd**

Infringement
generally, **4:35; 13:55; 20:6**
see also other entries throughout this topic

Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act, **1:337**
equivalence, **12:7; 13:28**
human product by structurally different nonnatural one, **7:28**
inducing infringement, **13:28**
insubstantial differences, **22:47**
inventorship, **4:125**
judgment of invalidity must be vacated when no infringement, **5:6**
method claim, **13:186**
Inspection of patentee's product, **16:15**
Insubstantial differences, **1:84; 2:101; 3:86; 4:50; 4:62; 5:30; 9:225; 15:16 to 15:18; 19:97; 19:135; 20:57; 21:33; 22:47; 23:41; 26:6**
Interchangeability, **12:42; 13:91**
Inventorship, **4:125**
Judgment as a matter of law, **5:44**
Judgment of invalidity must be vacated when no infringement, **5:6**
Jury instructions, **19:227**
Jury verdict, **8:47**
Limitations and restrictions
generally, **11:45**
equivalence to limitation, **16:133**
equivalence to non-means-plus-function limitation, **11:48**
every claim limitation must be met, **9:131**
patentee has duty to submit evidence for limitations not literally met, **7:51**
Literal scope of claims, outside of, **5:6; 7:51**
Matter of law, judgment as, **5:44**
Meaningful claim limitations, not to be used to erase, **3:51**
Means-plus-function claims, **1:125; 4:50; 9:215; 11:48**
Narrowing amendment, **6:70; 7:80; 8:87; 19:162**
1952 Patent Act, survives, **23:42**
Numerical ranges, effect of, **1:115**

DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS**—Cont'd**

Obviousness, **3:178**
One-to-one correspondence not required, **5:39; 6:39**
Outside literal scope of claims, **5:6; 7:51**
Patentability, **8:60; 12:51**
Patent Act of 1952, **23:42**
Patentee has duty to submit evidence for limitations not literally met, **7:51**
Pen and pencil analogy, **18:29**
Perspective, **12:69**
Presumption, **8:60; 21:11**
Prior art, **7:40; 9:118; 12:78; 13:93; 20:61**
Prosecution history, **9:108**
Prosecution history estoppel, **1:164; 6:48; 6:64; 9:186; 9:377; 12:62; 15:29; 16:27; 20:69; 20:89; 21:77; 22:37**
Public, unclaimed disclosed material dedicated to, **13:75**
Recapture, surrendered, cannot recapture what has been, **13:63; 13:95**
Replacement with another claim, cancellation of claim and, **13:106**
Reverse Doctrine of Equivalents (this index)
Rewriting dependent claim into independent form, **18:65**
Same location, substitute need not be in exact, **26:4**
Sec. 112(6) equivalent, **9:149**
Sec. 112 equivalency, **16:2**
Separate patentability, **7:77**
Serving same function is very different ways, **1:66**
Spectrum of effect, **9:108**
Submission of evidence, **7:51**
Substantial difference, **16:40**
Substantiality of differences standard, **1:82; 8:47; 19:94**
Substantiality test, **6:26; 18:39; 23:40**
Substantial reason, **6:41; 8:60**
Substation of features, **14:45**
Substitute need not be in exact same location, **26:4**
Summary judgment, **2:20; 2:66; 2:114; 4:62; 8:40; 11:46; 12:42; 20:13; 22:21; 23:64**

DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS

—Cont'd

- Surrendered, cannot recapture what has been, **13:63; 13:95**
- Tangential, **3:130; 18:74; 18:77**
- Three-part inquiry, **22:10**
- Timing, **23:63**
- Two components viewed to serve as one element, **18:62**
- Unclaimed disclosed material, **13:75; 25:6**
- Unclaimed subject matter, **10:30**
- Validity, judgment of, **5:6**
- Verdict, **16:14**
- Vitiation, **1:267; 3:178; 18:106**
- Wilson hypothetical claim, **3:52; 10:15; 11:22; 23:20**
- Witnesses, generalized testimony, **3:80**
- Written description, **1:164**

DOCTRINE OF IMPOSSIBILITY OF PERFORMANCE

- Excuse, **8:43**

DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE

- Oral testimony, **3:49**
- Thesis, weight accorded testimony in conflict with, **13:34**

DOCUMENTS

- Discovery, documents pertaining to ADR proceeding, **8:37**
- Responses possible, document request, **2:27**
- Retention policy, **13:168**
- Sec. 287, documents not marked, **4:12**
- Summary judgment, trial by documents, **19:51**

DOLBY LABORATORIES LICENSING CORPORATION V. UNIFIED PATENTS, LLC

- 2025, **4:137**

DOMESTIC INDUSTRY

- International Trade Commission (ITC), **12:105**

DOMINATING PATENT

- Anticipation, **18:20**
- Overbreadth, **21:10**

DOMINATION

- Generally, **5:49**

DOMINATION—Cont'd

- Double patenting, **9:45**

DOUBLE PATENTING

- Generally, **7:111; 9:45; 14:96; 19:246**
- Affirmative defenses, **3:4**
- Anticipation, **3:4; 21:76**
- Applications, two non-related, **1:115**
- Concession, terminal disclaimer as concession of obviousness, **15:6**
- Design, **3:4**
- Design patent, **19:8**
- Disclaimer, **15:6**
- Disclosure, **9:45; 9:307; 19:226**
- Doctrine of equivalent, **3:4**
- Domination, **9:45**
- FRCP 8(c), **3:4**
- Hatch-Waxman Act, **21:76**
- Inducement, **5:132**
- Later developed processes, **20:92**
- Law question, **9:190**
- Monopoly, **9:45**
- Obviousness (this index)
- Prior art, **9:45**
- Purpose, **1:80**
- Reissue, **7:115**
- Same invention, **7:75**
- Sec. 101, **9:463**
- Sec. 121, **7:115**
- Separate and patentably distinct inventions, **7:22**
- Terminal disclaimer as concession of obviousness, **9:384; 15:6**
- Two limitations, **3:4**
- Use of applicant's own invention disclosure as prior art against him, **9:45**
- Validity, **8:7**
- Variation amount, **5:103**

DPCA

- Drug Price Competition Act (DPCA) (this index)

DRAFTING CLAIMS

- Generally, **11:11**

DRAGON INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LLC V. DISH NETWORK L.L.C.

- 2024, **4:136**

INDEX

DRASTIC REMEDY

- Mandamus writ, **9:180**
- Preliminary injunction, **9:95**

DRAWINGS

- Generally, **8:150**
- Claim interpretation, **16:82**
- Description, **3:101**
- Design patent, **9:137**
- Inequitable conduct, **11:4**
- Over reliance, **11:71**
- Physical exhibit, **16:36**
- Precise proportions, do not define, **8:74**
- PTO fact findings, **9:80**
- Speak louder than words, **9:137**

“DRIVE DEMAND” FORMULATION

- Irreparable injury, **7:122**

DRUG APPLICATION

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

DRUG PRICE COMPETITION ACT (DPCA)

- Generally, **4:40; 7:55**
- Extension of patent term, **7:18; 13:77**
- Sec. 271(e)(1), **20:26**

DRUG PRICE COMPETITION AND PATENT TERM RESTORATION ACT (DPCPTRA)

- Generally, **3:109; 13:77**

DRUG PRODUCT

- Patent term extension, **16:125**

DRUGS

- Medicare Prescription Drug, Improvement, and Modernization Act, **20:78**
- Sec. 271(e)(1), **1:175; 5:3**

DUE CARE

- Anticipation, **18:20**
- Clearly erroneous standard, **19:23**
- Notice of infringement, **3:96**
- Summary judgment, **1:35**

DUE PROCESS

- Generally, **18:27**
- Claim selection procedure, **11:66**
- Fraudulent inducement liability, not relevant to, **18:69**

DUE PROCESS—Cont’d

- FRCP 15(c), **6:11**
- Secondary considerations, **5:131**
- Self-executing statutes, **18:33**

DUKE UNIVERSITY V. SANDOZ INC.

- 2025, **4:138**

DUPLICATE LITIGATION

DOCTRINE

- Generally, **1:375**

DUPLICATION

- Anticipation, **19:107**

DURDEN CASE

- Method claims, **9:98**

“EACH AND EVERY” LIMITATION

- Interference, **25:11**

“EACH CLAIM”

- Sec. 263, **15:6**
- Sec. 1498, **12:11**
- Separate invention, **10:8**

“EACH MOTION”

- Summary judgment, **5:48**

“EACH PATENT”

- Property, **11:35**
- Validity, **5:45**

“EACH STATUTORY CLAIM CLASS”

- Chemical process, **9:20**

EARLIER ADJUDICATION

- Blonder-Tongue, **1:13**

EARLIER FILING DATE

- Generally, **13:53**
- CIP, **5:20; 20:35**
- Sec. 120, **12:99; 18:85; 20:33; 20:88; 26:12**

EARLIER PATENT

- Prosecution estoppel, **12:3**

EARLIER SUIT

- Infringement, **16:35**

EARLIER WRITINGS

- After-the-fact testimony of inventor, **14:12**

EARLY DISCLOSURE

- Interference, **7:13**

ECOFACITOR, INC. V. GOOGLE LLC
 2024, **5:157**
 2025, **5:159**

ECONOMIC POSITION
 Prejudice, **7:30**

ECONOMIC PREJUDICE
 Prejudice, **1:67**

EDUCATION OF INVENTOR
 Inequitable conduct, **15:3**

EDWARDS LIFESCIENCES CORPORATION V. MERIL LIFE SCIENCES PVT. LTD.
 2024, **5:158**

EFFECTIVE AMOUNT
 Generally, **7:75**
 Claim interpretation, **1:122**

EFFECTIVE DATE
 Reexamination, **13:79**
 Reference, sec. 102(e) reference, **9:110**
 Sec. 102(e) reference, **9:110**

EFFECTIVE FILING DATE
 Interference, **19:144**
 Sec. 112, **18:4**

EGENERA, INC. V. CISCO SYSTEMS, INC.
 2025, **5:160**

EGREGIOUSNESS
 Damages, enhanced, **5:54**

EIC
 Board's exercise of discretionary authority, **7:23**
 Sec. 1.645(b), **1:60**

8 CIR
 Sec. 43(a), **10:15**

EJUSDEM GENERIS
 Contract interpretation, **20:38**

ELABORATING TERSE CLAIM LANGUAGE
 Claim interpretation, **5:50**

ELECTION
 Sec. 120, **12:10**
 Voiding, **3:61**

ELEKTA LIMITED V. ZAP SURGICAL SYSTEMS, INC.
 2023, **5:156**

ELEMENT-BY-ELEMENT ANALYSIS
 Doctrine of equivalents, **7:61; 20:41; 22:16**

ELEMENTS
 Generally, **8:43**
 Defined, **4:35**
 Doctrine of equivalents, **4:53**
 Equitable estoppel, **13:44**
 Infringement, **19:111**
 Inspection of patentee's product, **16:15**
 Laches, **13:44; 23:45**
 Reduction to practice, **13:105**
 Sec. 282, **6:10**

11 USC § 1141
 Bankruptcy discharge, **2:21**

ELEVENTH AMENDMENT
 Generally, **3:79; 7:56; 18:66**
 Immunity, state, **2:120; 9:128**
 Inventorship, **24:3**
 Nonresidents, not limited to suits by, **10:11**
 State as defendant, **18:40**
 State immunity, **2:120; 9:128**

EMBELLISHMENT
 Prior art, noting differences from, **4:6**

EMBODIMENT
 Generally, **5:19; 12:3; 26:2**
 Claim interpretation, **1:233; 7:57; 7:77; 10:23; 14:34; 16:54; 19:196; 22:12; 22:30; 22:35; 23:49**
 Comparing claims with accused device, **13:9**
 Computer program, **9:164**
 Enablement, **3:103**
 Exclusion of preferred embodiment, claim interpretation, **1:233**
 Parallel, **1:132**
 Patent misuse, **23:9**
 Preferred embodiment, scope of invention, **1:207**
 Reduction to practice, **19:144**
 Sec. 271, **10:17**
 Verdict, **16:14**

INDEX

EMERGING TECHNOLOGIES

Statutory subject matter, **9:308**

EMINENT DOMAIN

Reasonable royalty, **8:56**

Valuation determinations, **8:56**

EMPLOYMENT

Executive Order 10096, **8:10**

Motion to remand, **19:45**

Ownership, **2:73**

Preliminary injunction, denial of, **12:16**

Title dispute, **6:15**

ENABLEMENT AND ENABLEMENT REQUIREMENT

Generally, **1:150; 1:362; 2:70; 2:90;
2:103; 2:192; 3:114; 5:152; 8:57;
8:130; 9:259; 9:283; 9:404; 11:57;
12:13; 13:243; 16:181; 18:72;
19:59; 19:152; 19:181; 19:304;
22:7; 23:59**

Abbreviated new drug application
(ANDA), **3:169**

Anticipation, **1:202; 2:82; 9:291;
13:120**

Anticipatory reference, **2:82**

Best mode, **2:90; 3:31; 9:177; 12:80**

Biological processes, factual premises
for, **5:66**

Claim construction and interpretation,
22:49

Commercial marketplace, not success in,
3:104

Date of filing, determined at, **5:45**

Description, **14:101; 21:9**

Determined at date of filing, **5:45**

Disclosure, **1:102; 1:167; 10:23**

Embodiments, inoperative, **3:103**

Experiment, **3:169; 9:177; 23:77**

Factual premises for biological
processes, **5:66**

Factual underpinnings, **21:36**

Filing, determined at date of, **5:45**

Germ of idea not sufficient, **7:50**

How to use, **14:4**

Indefiniteness, **16:60; 20:121**

Inequitable conduct, **20:101**

Inoperative, **9:222**

Inoperativeness, **3:103; 14:12**

Interference, **3:28; 4:8; 13:3**

Jury, **1:14; 5:110**

ENABLEMENT AND ENABLEMENT REQUIREMENT—Cont'd

Later broader claims of previous
nonenabled claims, **1:78**

Law question, **1:80; 1:117; 1:127;
9:150; 9:154; 9:210; 16:47**

Means-plus-function, **5:124**

Objective factors, **9:375**

Obviousness, **14:101**

One mode required, **1:131**

Only as of issue date of patent, **9:53**

Open claim language, **13:174**

Patent must be enabled, **1:197; 4:67**

Pioneering, **16:80**

Plant patents, **9:259**

Practice invention without undue
experimentation, **9:177**

Prior art reference, **9:305; 19:207**

Priority, **19:304**

Review, standard of, **2:79**

Scope of claim, **14:27; 19:205**

Sec. 101, **18:6**

Sec. 102(b), **9:18**

Sec. 112, **1:167; 1:252; 1:304; 2:34;
3:14; 9:83; 12:80; 13:56; 14:8;
17:1; 19:21; 21:14; 23:8**

Sec. 112(1), **1:200; 6:20; 9:113; 9:115;
9:134; 9:142; 9:143; 13:55;
16:141; 19:51**

Sec. 145, **7:9**

Specifications, **23:77**

Summary judgment, **2:144; 14:75;
15:26; 21:46**

Time to be satisfied, **21:39**

Undue experimentation, **1:44; 2:99;
9:177; 9:305; 19:201**

Utility, versus, **9:319; 16:60**

Validity of claim, **19:206**

Verbatim findings of counsel adopted,
8:22

Written description, **9:476; 22:49**

Written description vs., **1:200; 19:236;
20:119; 21:46; 21:47**

ENFORCEMENT AND ENFORCEABILITY

Generally, **13:69**

Agreement on TRIPS, **22:36**

Antitrust, **21:45**

Arbitration agreement, **16:136; 22:55**

Attorney fees, **4:20**

ENFORCEMENT AND

ENFORCEABILITY—Cont'd

Consent of co-owners, **19:264**
 Contracts, **3:107**
 FRCP 59(e), **19:42**
 Inequitable conduct, **7:101; 8:12; 19:30**
 International Trade Commission, **22:29**
 Judicial estoppel, **23:21**
 Lear distinguished, **8:11**
 On-sale bar, **13:42**
 Res judicata effect, **6:17**
 Restrictions, **13:42**
 Sanctions, **4:20**
 Sec. 262, **19:264**
 Seizure, **4:20**
 Settlement and settlement agreement, **2:138; 8:48; 9:159**
 Single use only restriction on sale of patented device, **13:42**
 Validity, **12:40**

ENGLISH GRAMMAR

Sec. 112, **9:40**

ENHANCED DAMAGES

Generally, **9:125; 19:289; 19:336.50**
 Accounting phase, **11:15**
 Attorney fees, **1:43**
 Discovery, newly discovered prior art, **21:3**
 Discretionary, **15:14**
 Egregiousness of defendant's conduct, **5:54**
 Intervening rights, **21:3**
 Newly discovered prior art, **21:3**
 Prejudgment interest, **21:3**
 Principal considerations same as willfulness, **19:101**
 Prior art, newly discovered, **21:3**
 Seagate test, **8:137**
 Sec. 252, **21:3**
 Sec. 284, **1:62; 2:30; 2:40; 18:29**
 Subject matter jurisdiction, **25:1**
 Two-step analysis, **10:21**
 Willful infringement, **21:3; 23:85**
 Willfulness, **12:47**

ENHANCEMENT

Prior art, noting differences from, **4:6**

ENSNAREMENT

Doctrine of equivalents, **4:90; 7:121**

ENTIRE MARKET VALUE RULE

Generally, **9:275; 11:32**
 Anticipated collateral sales vs. reasonable royalty rate, **18:35**
 Apparatus, value of entire, **6:36**
 Collateral sales, **18:35**
 Demand, **20:50**
 Patented feature is reason for demand, **20:50**
 Reasonable royalty rate, **12:97; 18:35; 22:43**
 Value of entire apparatus, **6:36**

ENTIRE PATENT

Assertion of only certain claims, **3:46**

ENTIRETY

Direct infringement, "control" by one party over entire process, **1:222**
 Graver Tank, **20:6**
 References considered, **16:4**

ENTITLEMENT

Generally, **9:243**
 Estoppel, **23:30**
 ITC, **5:37**
 Sec. 120, **11:8**

EQUAL, NOT EQUAL TO SAME THING

Preliminary injunction, **4:5**

EQUAL, THINGS EQUAL TO EACH OTHER

Preliminary injunction, **4:5**

EQUITABLE CONDUCT

Inequitable Conduct (this index)

EQUITABLE DEFENSE

Generally, **6:14**
 Assignor estoppel doctrine, **19:47**
 Damages, **2:19**

EQUITABLE ESTOPPEL

Generally, **6:53; 6:103; 7:141; 10:49; 19:252; 22:28**
 CAFC jurisdiction, **13:14**
 Clearly erroneous standard, **19:23**
 Cross-appeals, **18:98**
 Delay, unreasonable, **8:50**
 Elements, **13:44**
 Government, **26:8**
 Implied license, **13:67; 19:35; 23:55**

INDEX

EQUITABLE ESTOPPEL—Cont'd

- Inventorship, **16:131**
- Jury verdict, **13:4**
- Misleading conduct, **1:201; 19:108**
- Performance of government contract, **8:8**
- Prejudice, **19:252**
- Summary judgment, **8:140; 19:108**
- Three-part test, **2:61; 5:53**
- Timeliness of appeal filing, **2:5**

EQUITABLE ISSUES

- Jury trial, **2:61**

EQUITABLE REMEDY

- Restitution, **20:34**

EQUITABLE TOLLING

- Appeal, of time for, **7:32**
- Limitation of actions, **23:38**
- Patent term adjustment, **14:74**

EQUITIES WEIGHED

- Assignor estoppel, **3:46**

EQUITY POWERS

- Sec. 112, **19:4**

EQUIVALENCE AND EQUIVALENTS

- Generally, **3:39; 12:26; 16:174; 16:175; 23:35**
- Amendment, effect of, **12:1**
- Doctrine of Equivalents (this index)
- Fact finding, **7:12**
- Fact question, **5:7; 19:59**
- Infringement, **8:51; 23:40**
- Insubstantial differences, **1:93; 19:114**
- Interchangeable device, **11:22**
- Invention, **19:34**
- Jury verdict, **19:5**
- Means-plus-function claim, **9:96; 21:44**
- More pertinent art, **5:7**
- Present, not, **10:10**
- Presumption of validity, **5:7**
- Processes, **3:87**
- Sec. 112, **8:7; 11:10; 20:6**
- Sec. 282, **18:6**
- Separate patentability, **6:42**
- Validity, presumption of, **5:7**

EQUIVALENTS, DOCTRINE OF

- Doctrine of Equivalents (this index)

EQUIVOCAL OPINION OF COUNSEL

- Willful infringement, **23:26**

ERRONEOUS JURY INSTRUCTIONS

- Indirect infringement, **3:173**
- Special verdict, **14:7**

ERRONEOUS STATEMENT

- Claim interpretation, **2:80**

ERROR

- Appeal and review, **19:16**
- Claim interpretation, **9:94**
- Obviousness, **12:79**
- Reissue, **8:64; 19:110; 19:137**
- Sec. 287, **4:12**

ERROR IN RECORD

- Prosecution history, **22:23**

ESCAPEX IP, LLC V. GOOGLE LLC

- 2025, **5:161**

ESCROW

- Arising under jurisdiction, **3:21**
- Case or controversy, **3:21**
- Declaratory judgment, **3:21**
- Future royalty payments, **3:21**
- Interlocutory, **3:21**
- Preliminary injunction, **3:21**
- Review, scope of, **3:21**
- Royalty, future, **3:21**
- Sec. 1292(d)(2), **3:21**
- Stay of patent action, **9:91**

ESSENCE

- Combination patent, **13:15**
- Inspection of patentee's product, **16:15**

ESSENTIAL ELEMENTS

- Claim interpretation, **1:119**
- Heart, **5:10**
- New legal test, not, **3:101**

ESSENTIALLY FACTUAL

- Indefiniteness, **2:99**

ESSENTIALLY THE SAME

- Claim preclusion, **1:170; 2:159**

ESTIMATED COST SAVINGS

- Sec. 284, **8:4**

ESTOPPEL

Generally, **2:98; 3:222; 5:116; 8:40; 9:216; 12:3; 22:62; 23:14**

See also Waiver (this index)

Argument-based estoppel, **19:320**

Assignor estoppel, **19:241**

Business methods, **3:202**

Claim construction, **19:320**

Claim interpretation, **19:15**

Covered business methods, **3:202**

Design patent, **1:318**

Doctrine of equivalents, **1:119**

Elements thereof, **7:30**

Entitlement to priority date of parent application, **23:30**

Equities weighed, **3:46**

Exhaustion of appeals, **2:143**

File Wrapper (this index)

FRE 103(a)(1), **23:27**

Hatch-Waxman Act, **9:438**

Interference (this index)

Inter partes review, **1:344**

ITC, **25:2**

Laches, **1:48; 19:38; 22:8**

Marking estoppel, **6:86**

Privity, **9:118; 13:88**

Prosecution History Estoppel (this index)

Regulation, **19:63**

Sec. 101, **19:320**

Sec. 285, **19:320**

Standing, **1:344**

Statutory estoppel, **1:344**

Summary judgment, **10:4**

Three-part test, **8:32**

Three requisite elements, **1:67**

**ETHANOL BOOSTING SYSTEMS,
LLC V. FORD MOTOR
COMPANY**

2025, **5:162**

EVERY CLAIM

Generally, **23:35**

Doctrine of equivalents, **9:131**

Infringement, **1:52; 1:84; 19:111; 23:40**

**EVERYDAY MECHANICAL
CONCEPTS**

Judicial notice, **9:127**

Notice, judicial notice, **9:127**

“EVERY SUCH OFFENSE”

Civil penalty for false marking, **6:72**

EVIDENCE

As to particular evidence, see more specific topics throughout this index

Generally, **3:49; 9:29; 9:481; 10:18; 12:24; 13:9; 13:28; 13:45; 13:53; 14:2; 16:36; 18:7; 23:18**

Additional evidence at trial, **19:232; 21:36**

Admissibility of Evidence (this index)

Affidavit, **9:23**

APA, **8:34**

Appeal and review, **6:12; 11:32**

Attorney argument not substitute for substantive evidence, **7:33**

Burden of Persuasion and Quantum of Proof (this index)

Burden of Proof (this index)

Business records exception, **3:67; 13:71**

CAFC, **18:3**

Chasm, Sec. 145, Sec. 146, **20:125**

Chemical, **9:60**

Choice of law, **1:92; 13:121; 15:14; 19:142**

Circumstantial Evidence (this index)

Claim construction and interpretation, **1:79; 4:23; 5:53; 6:37; 16:13; 23:11**

Clear and Convincing Evidence (this index)

Conception, **9:244**

Conclusory statement, **2:80**

Contributory vs. direct infringement, **18:11**

Corroboration, **1:159; 2:118; 5:40**

Counsel's arguments, **3:3**

Counsel's statements, **19:6**

Credibility of witnesses, **19:57**

Delay, **23:27**

De novo, **11:32**

Design patent, **19:8**

Destruction of documents, **5:1**

Disclosure, duty of, **12:52**

Discretion of court, admissibility is within, **3:57**

Doctrine of equivalents, **7:51**

Document retention policy, **13:168**

Exception, business records, **13:71**

INDEX

EVIDENCE—Cont'd

Expert opinion on obviousness, **13:53**
Expert or Opinion Evidence (this index)
Extrinsic Evidence (this index)
Good cause under 37 CFR Sec. 1.617(b)
 justifying, **8:35**
Hearsay, **1:70**
Identity of invention, **20:20**
Inequitable conduct, **2:68; 2:103; 5:42;**
 7:46; 13:19; 15:43; 20:106
In limine, **21:41**
Integration, **13:76**
Interference, **2:70; 14:3**
Invention, **19:34**
Inventorship, **19:132; 21:42**
ITC, **23:55**
JMOL, **19:126**
JNOV, **6:6; 13:4; 13:13; 25:4**
Jurisdiction, **1:76**
Jury verdict, **3:75; 4:18**
Linking evidence in general, **13:103**
Mandamus, **9:41**
Means-plus-function claim, **3:83**
Newly discovered, **1:101; 19:235**
New trial, **22:26**
Objective Evidence (this index)
Obviousness (this index)
Post-trial motions, **18:3**
Prejudice, **18:39**
Preliminary injunction, **8:2**
Presumptions (this index)
Prima facie obviousness, **9:99; 9:152**
Prosecution laches, **3:155**
PTO initial rejection, **7:19**
Quality vs. quantity, **12:37**
Reduction to practice, **13:110**
Rejection, **7:19**
Retired, **14:11**
Review, standard of, **13:71**
Scientific opinion, within reasonable
 range of difference of, **2:79**
Sec. 1.324, **23:55**
Sec. 102(b), **9:7; 9:18**
Sec. 102(e), **1:22**
Sec. 112, **19:7**
Sec. 112(2), **19:125**
Sec. 112 vs. validity, **19:125**
Sec. 145, Sec. 146, chasm, **20:125**
Sec. 252, **19:4**
Sec. 287, **4:12**

EVIDENCE—Cont'd

Sec. 1292(a)(1), **23:13**
Secondary considerations, **13:17; 13:45**
Skill in the art, level of, **9:23**
Special province of trier of fact, **18:12**
Spoliation, **8:120**
Substantial Evidence (this index)
Summary judgment, **14:33**
Technological evidence, **14:32**
Thesis, **13:34**
35 USC § 146, **19:232**
Unexpected results, **9:197**
Validity, **4:19; 13:169; 19:125**
Verbatim findings of counsel adopted,
 8:22
Weight and Credibility of Evidence (this
 index)
Witnesses (this index)

EXACT COMPOUNDS

Chemical compounds, **21:33**

EXACT IDENTITY

Verdict, **16:14**

EXAMINATION

Generally, **8:42**
Prosecution history estoppel, **8:13;**
 8:47; 18:40
Reexamination (this index)
Review, Board must, **9:2**
Subject matter jurisdiction, lack of, **6:19**

EXAMINER

Appellate review, **9:64**
Claim interpretation, **9:94; 20:72**
Common occurrence, **17:4**
Deposition
 abuse of discretion, **23:5**
 discovery, **23:5**
 inequitable conduct, **23:5**
 materiality, **23:5**
 occurring, when, **23:5**
Excuse, **11:3**
FRE 706, **7:21**
Infringement, **20:72**
Interference, **4:21**
Materiality, **12:43**
Obviousness, **11:42**
Prosecution history estoppel, **12:49**
Sec. 112, **16:10**
Sec. 121, **2:140**

EXAMINER—Cont'd

37 CFR Sec. 1.196(a), **9:106**
Validity, **3:77**

EXCEPTIONAL CASE

Generally, **2:112; 5:79; 5:149; 6:61; 9:280; 10:35; 17:7**
Attorney fees, **1:62; 2:85; 4:83; 4:128; 9:316; 9:377; 9:455; 9:483; 11:16; 12:24; 12:32; 14:58; 15:45; 18:9; 19:92; 20:87; 20:115; 23:65**
Bad faith, **13:69**
Basis, **8:75**
Burden of proof, **15:45**
Claim construction, **16:13**
Clear and convincing evidence required, **9:161**
Critical date, **18:9**
Damages, **3:180**
Declaratory judgment, **1:159**
Enhanced attorney fees, **12:110**
Exceptional finding, **3:84**
Factors to be considered, **13:91**
Fact question, **13:46**
Frivolous infringement claims, **8:122**
Inconsistent jury findings, **2:10**
Inequitable conduct, **13:19; 15:13; 16:78; 18:9; 18:55**
Invalidity, **3:180**
Judgment must be considered, **16:59**
Laches or delay, **3:180**
Litigation misconduct, **5:63; 17:9; 18:64; 20:87**
Merely losing, **11:18**
Misconduct, litigation, **13:197; 18:64**
Negligence, **18:9**
Prosecution aggressiveness, **13:116**
Purpose of, **1:105**
Sale, **3:180**
Sec. 102(b), **9:93**
Sec. 271(a), **3:180**
Sec. 285, **1:201; 2:33; 2:181; 5:14; 5:109; 6:13; 8:130; 9:455; 13:2; 13:175; 14:88; 15:3; 15:45; 19:52; 19:269; 20:151; 21:75**
Simple negligence not enough, **18:9**
Timeliness of appeal filing, **2:5**
Two-step process, **5:45**

EXCEPTIONAL CIRCUMSTANCES STANDARD

Mandamus, **1:302; 9:63**

EXCEPTIONAL FINDING

Exceptional case, **3:84**

EXCEPTIONAL SKILL IN THE ART

Obviousness, **14:67**

EXCEPTIONS, EXCLUSIONS, AND EXEMPTIONS

Generally, **5:8; 8:40; 9:110; 13:10**
Anticipation, **1:33; 1:98**
Claim interpretation, **14:34; 19:138; 22:12**
Crime fraud exception, **21:58**
Doctrine of equivalents, **12:28**
Evidence, **8:111; 13:71**
Experimental use, **3:142; 5:50; 8:98**
Final judgment rule, **20:28**
FRCP 13(a), **9:430; 16:81**
FRCP 19, **9:71**
FRCP 56(c), **8:27**
Good cause exception under APA, **14:17**
In banc hearing, **1:52**
ITC, **8:28; 9:118; 19:222**
Law of the case doctrine, **7:36; 13:61**
Mandamus, **9:63**
Noerr, **6:27**
On-sale bar, **19:140**
Patent ambiguity, **9:160**
Patent prosecution bar, **4:94**
Public use, **14:35**
Reverse doctrine of equivalents, **19:24**
Sec. 102(b), **19:140**
Sec. 271(e)(1), **9:299**
Sec. 287, **4:12**
Sec. 337, **3:23; 25:9; 25:10**
Secondary considerations, **13:17**
Statutory subject matter, **19:112**

EXCLUSIONARY RIGHTS

Preliminary injunction, **12:111**

EXCLUSIONS

Exceptions, Exclusions, and Exemptions (this index)

EXCLUSIVE ENTERPRISE

Standing, **9:301**

EXCLUSIVE JURISDICTION

Sec. 207(a)(2), **14:9**
Standing, **16:64**

INDEX

EXCLUSIVE LICENSEE

Generally, **21:87**
Immunity, **1:190**
Standing, **1:190; 1:196; 13:157;**
19:223; 23:67

EXCLUSIVE VENDOR

Sec. 284, **11:18**

EXCUSABLE DELAY

Jury verdict, **13:4**

EXCUSE

Doctrine of impossibility of performance, **8:43**
PTO examiner's lapse, **11:3**

EXECUTION

Considerations involved, **19:49**
Written agreement, **23:21**

EXECUTIVE ORDER 10096

Generally, **8:10**

EXEMPLIFICATIONS

Costs, **11:51**

EXEMPTIONS

Exceptions, Exclusions, and Exemptions
(this index)

EXHAUSTION OF PATENT RIGHTS

Generally, **1:133; 6:76; 8:134; 9:440;**
10:45; 12:76; 13:139; 15:25
Defense of, **5:93**
First sale doctrine, **13:67**
Preliminary injunctions, **12:102**
Repair vs. reconstruction, **10:27**
Sale of patented article, **12:107**
Sales of product, **20:105**
Specific claims, reservation, **11:72**

EXHIBIT

Design patent, **18:63**
Drawing, **16:36**
New interference rules, **8:3**

EX PARTE TEST

Admit, party's responsibility to, **3:10**
Appeal, **3:10**
CAFC jurisdiction, **9:63**
Divest court, **3:10**
Evidentiary weight, **3:10**
Expenses award, **3:10**
Fair trial, **3:10**

EX PARTE TEST—Cont'd

FRCP 37(c), **3:10**
FRCP 56(e), **3:10**
Hearsay, **9:150**
Perfect one, not, **3:10**
Summary judgment, **3:10**

EXPECTATION

Generally, **9:100; 9:191**
Closest art, compared with, **9:111**
Established by factual evidence not
argument, **9:174**
Factual evidentiary inquiry, **9:197**
Obviousness, **9:52; 9:228; 9:250;**
12:55; 16:108
Obvious to try, **1:44**
On-sale bar, **5:35**
Prima facie obviousness, **9:86**
Secondary considerations, **16:4**
Showing of nonobviousness, **9:44**
Unexpected Results (this index)

EXPENSES AWARD

Ex parte test, **3:10**

EXPERIENCE

Attorneys' fees, award by special
master, **19:65**
Claim construction, **8:52**

EXPERIMENTAL USE

Generally, **14:52; 19:91**
Design patent, **3:81**
Exception, narrow, **3:142; 5:50; 8:98**
Experimental stage, **19:107**
Factors, **1:119; 21:16**
Inequitable conduct, **5:137**
Invention, **7:12**
Lease, **13:123**
Narrow exception, **5:50**
On-sale bar, **1:59; 1:177; 1:179; 2:178;**
5:64; 5:137
Prima facie case of public use, **1:71**
Public use, **2:178; 14:35**
Ready for patenting, **5:64**
Reduce to practice, **7:12**
Review, standard of, **13:109**
Sec. 102(b), **7:12; 12:30**
Sec. 285, **5:137**
Totality of circumstances standard, **2:57;**
12:45; 16:44

EXPERIMENTS

Generally, **19:113**
 Claim interpretation, **6:37**
 Diligence, **19:144**
 Enablement, **3:169; 9:177; 23:77**
 Experimental use, **19:107**
 Reduction to practice, **26:11**
 Sec. 112(1), **10:23**
 Sec. 282, **6:10**
 Undue experimentation, **10:23; 23:11**

EXPERT

Experts (this index)

EXPERT OR OPINION EVIDENCE

Generally, **9:113; 13:10; 14:9; 19:38; 21:13**
 Admissibility, **1:42; 1:43; 7:29**
 Claim interpretation, **3:111; 9:77; 13:86; 19:16; 19:279; 19:291; 22:40**
 Claims construed, **9:77; 22:40**
 Claims must be construed same way, **23:11**
 Clarify patented technology, **1:104**
 Costs award, **19:77; 20:87**
 Damages, **22:43**
 Disclosure, **3:141; 18:102**
 Fees of expert witness, **13:175; 15:48**
 FRE 702, **19:209**
 FRE 705, **19:38**
 FRE 706, **7:21; 13:161**
 Imported product, **7:96**
 Infringement, **3:90; 9:320; 14:18; 18:43; 19:242**
 Motivation to combine, **23:68**
 Obviousness, **1:235; 13:53; 19:244**
 Patent attorney, **5:32**
 Reasonable royalty, **19:279**
 Removal of expert testimony, **2:80**
 Sec. 252, **19:4**
 Summary judgment, **1:6; 3:20; 3:150**
 Waiver, **19:279**

EXPERTS

Generally, **5:5; 8:160; 11:90; 14:50; 16:11; 19:340; 21:17**
 Appointment, **13:163**
 Doctrine of equivalents, **1:164**
 Fee award, **13:175**
 Infringement, **9:125; 13:28**
 Issue preclusion, **4:9**

EXPERTS—Cont'd

Non-attorney, **15:42**
 Prima facie obviousness, **2:25**
 Report, **20:160**
 School, still in, **23:11**
 Sec. 145, **7:9**
 Sec. 285, **5:14**
 Summary judgment, **3:1; 8:14**

EXPIRED PATENT

Interference, **7:102**
 Reexamination proceedings, during, **9:424**
 Royalties, **11:79**
 Standing, **11:78**

EXPLANATORY NOTES

Binding effect, **20:38**

EXPRESSIO UNIUS

Maxim, **4:30**
 Statutory interpretation, **1:57**

EXPRESSLY REDEFINE CLAIM TERMS

Claim interpretation, **5:48**

EXPRESS TERMS

Consent judgment, **14:28Z**

EXTENSION OF TERM

Calculation of extension, **23:70**
 Drug Price Competition Act (DPCA), **7:18**
 Medical device, **16:117**
 Obviousness-type double patenting, **9:112**
 Patent term
 generally, **14:95**
 restoration, **13:77**
 Sec. 156, **6:3**
 Sec. 156(a)(4), **8:25; 15:35; 16:125**
 Sec. 156(f), **16:125**
 Sec. 156(g), **23:70**

EXTRANEOUS CLAIM LIMITATION

Generally, **9:154**

EXTRATERRITORIAL ACTIVITIES

Generally, **18:54**
 Infringement, **16:138**
 Sec. 271(a), **13:135**
 Subject matter jurisdiction, **12:82**

INDEX

EXTRATERRITORIAL INJUNCTION

Generally, **9:271**

EXTRATERRITORIALITY

Sec. 271(f)(2), **23:93**

EXTRINSIC EVIDENCE

Anticipation, **19:51**

Appellate review, **1:294**

Claim interpretation, **2:62; 4:51; 4:59; 5:36; 11:43; 14:30; 16:53; 19:115; 20:77; 23:79; 25:3**

Dictionary, **22:19**

Indefiniteness, **2:156**

Latent ambiguity vs. patent ambiguity, **9:160**

EYE THERAPIES, LLC V.

SLAYBACK PHARMA, LLC

2025, **5:163**

FACILITATION

Permission, versus, **20:54**

FACT FINDING

Generally, **8:31**

Board, **9:195**

CAFC, **18:3**

Equivalence, **7:12**

FRCP 52(a), **1:18; 12:6; 13:16; 19:4**

ITC, **1:10; 8:28**

Judge role, **10:15**

Jury role, **10:15**

Jury verdict presumed, supporting generally, **2:15**

added features, **2:15**

ceiling, not, **2:15**

infringement, do not avoid, **2:15**

interrogatories or written opinion not required, **2:15**

lost profits, **2:15**

Panduit, **2:15**

royalty established, **2:15**

timely objection to instructions, **2:15**

New evidence introduced, **6:9**

Obviousness, **1:4**

Review, standard of, **4:41; 9:217; 15:18**

Sec. 112, **8:7**

FACT-LAW QUESTION

See also Law Question (this index)

Best mode, **3:31**

Claim construction, **13:78**

FACT-LAW QUESTION—Cont'd

JNOV, **22:4**

Obviousness-type double patenting, **9:52**

FACT QUESTION

See also Law Question (this index)

Analogous art, **8:42; 9:121; 9:154; 10:15**

Anticipation, **7:34; 8:49; 9:96; 9:111; 9:154; 9:363; 13:45; 20:11; 20:56**

Best mode, **14:8; 20:35**

Claim construction, **26:1**

Cross-appeal, **18:2**

Damages, **3:96; 5:71; 6:26; 13:45; 15:10; 21:18**

Description, **1:118; 9:177**

Doctrine of equivalents, **5:28; 9:108; 10:10**

Equivalence and equivalents, **5:7; 19:59**

Exceptional case, **13:46**

Indirect infringement, **13:190**

Infringement, **3:101; 7:10; 7:37; 8:51; 19:19; 21:17**

Inherency, **9:31; 9:172**

Interference, **3:32; 4:8**

JNOV motion, denial of, **13:13**

Known or used by others, **3:2**

Literal infringement, **12:1**

Marking, **7:66**

Motion for new trial, **23:10**

Obviousness, **9:182; 9:217; 23:52**

Reference, **9:119; 9:133; 9:148; 9:166; 9:169; 19:56**

Sec. 112, **8:7**

Utility, **13:28**

Verbatim findings of counsel adopted, **8:22**

Well-understood, routine and conventional, skilled artisan, **1:311**

Willful infringement, **7:37; 8:52; 13:45; 16:40**

Willfulness, **3:96**

Written description, **6:20; 7:112; 21:14**

Written findings and conclusions prepared by prevailing party, **21:2**

FACTUAL DETERMINATION

Anticipation, **20:63**

APA, **8:34**

Review, standard of, **4:56**

FACTUAL EVIDENCE

Expectation, unexpected results, **9:197**
 Obviousness conclusion, **9:15**
 Unexpected results, **9:174; 9:197**

FACTUAL UNDERPINNING

Administrative board's decision, **2:37**
 Enablement, **21:36**

FAILURE TO STATE CLAIM

State Claim, Failure to (this index)

FAIR TRIAL

Ex parte test, **3:10**

FALSE ADVERTISING

Choice of law, **2:132**

FALSE AND FORGED DOCUMENTS

Fraudulent conduct, **6:22**
 Inequitable conduct, **7:34**

FALSE PATENT MARKING

Generally, **1:23; 19:278**
 America Invents Act, **16:134**
 Misuse, **10:42**
 Sec. 292, **1:23; 2:151; 3:118; 9:329; 12:23; 19:224; 19:262**

FALSE STATEMENTS

Inventorship, **16:61**

FAST MOVING INDUSTRY

CCPA decisions, **9:74**

FATAL WOUND, STAUNCHING

Sec. 102(b) on-sale bar, **4:16**

FAULTY JURY INSTRUCTION

Remand, when appropriate, **7:27**

FCR 7(A)

Corporation appearance by nonlawyer, **18:15**

FCR 12

Generally, **21:22**

FCR 35

In banc rehearing, **1:52**

FCR 36

Generally, **21:27**

FCR 38

Frivolous appeal, **8:37**

FDA

Generally, **1:83; 7:141**
 Conduct before, **5:95**
 Delay in approval, **20:100**
 Infringement, **1:85**
 Obviousness, FDA approval, **1:235; 1:236**
 Patent term extension, **15:35; 23:70**
 Use code, counterclaim to force correction, **14:68**

FEATURES ADDED

Infringement not avoided, **14:8**

FEDERAL CIRCUIT LAW

Generally, **6:17**

FEDERAL COMMON LAW

Choice of law, **18:38**

FEDERAL COURTS

Jurisdiction, **23:77**
 state universities, **21:63**

FEDERAL FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

Generally, **2:54; 13:107**
 Court of Appeals of Federal Circuit, **1:332**
 Delisting, **1:120**
 International Trade Commission, **1:332**
 Jurisdiction, **1:332**
 Sec. 271(e)(1), **3:182**

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

Sovereign immunity, **3:95**

FEDERAL LAW

Sec. 261, **18:58**

FEDERAL NONNUCLEAR ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT (FNERDA)

Research performed under government contract, **6:18**

FEDERAL PATENT CODE

Generally, **6:17**
 Certified question, **6:17**
 Preemption, **3:68**
 Sec. 1292(c)(1), **6:17**

FEDERAL QUESTION JURISDICTION

Sec. 291, **1:11**

INDEX

FEDERAL RULES

Spirit, **3:24**

FEDERAL RULES OF APPELLATE PROCEDURE

See entries beginning: FRAP

FEDERAL RULES OF CIVIL PROCEDURE

See entries beginning: FRCP

FEDERAL RULES OF EVIDENCE

See entries beginning: FRE

FEDERAL UNFAIR COMPETITION CLAIMS

Preemption, **26:7**

FEDERAL VACANCIES REFORM ACT

Preemption, **1:376**

FERTILE SOURCE OF ERROR

Inequitable conduct, **6:5**

FEW MACHINES HAVE NO UTILITY

Prima facie obviousness, **9:17**

FFDCA

Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act
(this index)

FICTITIOUS FACTS

Stipulation, **13:68**

FIELD OF ENDEAVOR TEST

Analogous art, **9:256**

FIELD OF USE

Standing of licensee, **9:301**

FILE BRIEF

Generally, **7:23**

FILE HISTORY ATTORNEY

Claim interpretation, **9:94**

FILE HISTORY ESTOPPEL

Anticipation definition, **4:15**

Claim interpretation, **18:29**

FILE WRAPPER

Doctrine of equivalents, **9:108**

Estoppel, **21:66**

Inventor's theory, **6:10**

Prosecution history estoppel, **4:26**

Summary judgment, **10:13**

FILING

CIP (continuation-in-part application.)
Continuation-in-Part Application
(this index)

Complaint, jurisdiction, **7:38; 13:59; 19:66**

Counterclaim, immunity, **19:141**

Disclaimer, reissue, **22:15**

First-filed suit rule, **6:89; 7:25**

Interference, **16:9**

Late filing, Board, **18:56**

Motions

Executive Order 10096, **8:10**

FRCP 41(a)(1), **5:18**

Only as of issue date of patent, **9:53**

Party's argument will not be addressed,
10:18

Performance of government contract,
filing application, **8:8**

Reexamination, **9:180**

Timeliness of

appeal dismissal, **10:3**

broadening reissue, **9:3**

first business day after weekend or
holiday, filing made on, **23:28**

reissue, broadening reissue, **9:3**

FILING DATE

CIP, **5:20; 20:35; 20:59**

Claim Construction and Interpretation
(this index)

Description, **19:120**

Earlier Filing Date (this index)

Enablement, **5:45**

First business day after weekend or holi-
day, **23:28**

Interference, **6:20; 19:144; 19:164**

Mandamus, **9:54**

Microbiology field, **9:53**

On-sale bar, **1:97; 4:93; 20:102**

Priority filing date, **9:258**

Sec. 102(d), **9:136**

Sec. 111, **19:32**

Sec. 112, **18:4; 23:11**

Sec. 119, **9:143**

Sec. 120, **5:104; 11:8; 20:33**

FINAL DECISION

Appeal without-prejudice dismissal,
8:82

Director of Board of Patent Appeals and
Interferences, **2:150**

FINAL DISPOSITION

FRCP 54(b), **1:289; 8:55**

FINALITY

Appealability, **13:23**
 Appellate jurisdiction, **9:300**
 Law of the case doctrine, **19:14**

FINAL JUDGMENT

Generally, **14:40; 16:90; 16:177; 19:175; 23:60**
 Cohen collateral order exception, **20:28**
 Collateral order, Cohen collateral order exception, **1:302; 20:28**
 Covered business method review, **9:415; 21:71**
 Dismissal, **16:62**
 Exception, Cohen collateral order exception, **20:28**
 Form, consent to, **20:98**
 FRCP 60(b)(2), **19:14**
 Interference estoppel by judgment, **23:14**
 Jurisdiction, **18:104**
 Nullification, **9:354**
 Order staying case, **19:110**
 Partial summary judgment, **3:86**
 Preliminary injunction, **9:304**
 Reexamination, **5:25; 6:84; 6:85; 9:353**
 Sec. 1292(c)(2), **13:8**
 Stay, **9:415**
 Staying, order staying case, **19:110**
 Summary judgment, **21:29**
 Withdrawal of claims, **19:233**

FINAL ORDER

Summary judgment, denial of, **12:41**

FINDINGS

Generally, **8:22; 13:12**
 Attorney fees, **3:46**
 Board, **9:195**
 Claims court, **3:49**
 Clearly erroneous standard, **9:80**
 Doctrine of equivalents, **3:39**
 FRCP 41(b) motion, FRCP 50 vs. FRCP 41(b) motion, **12:11**
 FRCP 50 vs. FRCP 41(b) motion, **12:11**
 FRCP 52(a), **3:45; 12:13; 13:16; 16:25**
 Improper, **21:2**
 Interference, **4:11; 7:48**
 Is obvious, **18:22**

FINDINGS—Cont'd

Issue preclusion, **4:9**
 ITC, **1:17; 8:28**
 Jury verdict, **20:39**
 Motion, FRCP 50 vs. FRCP 41(b), **12:11**
 Preliminary injunction, denial of, **12:16**
 Review, standard of, **7:27; 7:33; 9:217**
 Sec. 112, **8:7**
 Sec. 271(e)(1), **5:13**

FINES

Sanctions (this index)

FINESSE WIRELESS LLC V. AT&T MOBILITY LLC

2025, **6:111**

FINE TUNING

Offer for sale, **19:130**

FINJAN LLC V. SONICWALL, INC.

2023, **6:108**

FINTIV, INC. V. PAYPAL HOLDINGS, INC.

2025, **6:112**

FIRST-FILED

Generally, **6:89; 7:25; 17:2**
 Customer suit exception, **19:230**
 Stay order, **11:1**

FIRST IDENTIFY CLAIMED FUNCTION

Means-plus-function claim, **12:62; 13:100**

FIRST MENTIONED IN REPLY BRIEF

Issue on appeal, **23:23**

FIRST SALE DOCTRINE

Generally, **6:59**
 Exhausts patent rights, **13:67**
 Foreign products, **10:27**
 Timeliness of appeal filing, **2:5**

FITNESS FOR INTENDED USE

Bright-line test, **6:23**

FIXED IDEAS

Conception, **13:72; 20:65**

FIXED SUM

Attorney fees award, **19:57**

INDEX

FLAGRANT MISREPRESENTATIONS OF RECORD

Conduct of counsel, **16:9**

FLAWED OPINION OF COUNSEL

Willful infringement, **19:92**

FMC CORPORATION V. SHARDA USA, LLC

2025, **6:113**

FNERDA (FEDERAL NONNUCLEAR ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT)

Research performed under government
contract, **6:18**

FOCUS ON ONE FACET

Invention to be considered as a whole,
18:28

FOCUS PRODUCTS GROUP INTERNATIONAL, LLC V. KARTRI SALES CO., INC.

2025, **6:114**

FOOD, DRUG, AND COSMETIC ACT

Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act
(this index)

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

FDA (this index)

FORCE OF LAW

MPEP, **18:1**

Sec. 6(a), **23:15**

FOREIGN CORRUPT PRACTICES ACT

Sec. 292, qui tam provision, **2:151**

FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Generally, **8:42; 12:13**

Burying reference in prior art statement,
13:69

Choice of law, **6:78**

Claim interpretation, **3:7**

Damages, **20:23**

Date of invention, **9:61**

Declaration, **19:118**

Discovery, **3:65**

First sale doctrine, **10:27**

FRCP 52(a), **13:16**

FOREIGN COUNTRIES—Cont'd

German Geschmacksmuster as prior art
reference under Sec. 102(a), **9:120**

Interference, **6:20; 6:66**

ITC, **13:20**

Jurisdiction, **7:60; 22:36**

MPEP, **16:6**

New prior art not considered by PTO,
5:11

Offer for sale, infringement, **8:129**

Ownership, **1:172; 9:238**

Personal jurisdiction, **1:181; 1:186;
1:189; 2:142; 8:79; 14:15**

Preliminary injunction, **19:32**

Prior art, German Geschmacksmuster as
prior art reference under Sec.
102(a), **9:120**

Reference, **9:120; 17:1**

Reissue, claim construction, **1:209**

Sec. 102(a), **9:120**

Sec. 102(g), **19:10**

Sec. 104, **8:30**

Sec. 112, **17:1**

Sec. 119, **2:125; 6:66; 9:143; 19:144**

Sec. 271(f), **21:52**

Subject matter jurisdiction, **12:81**

Summary judgment, **20:38**

FOREIGN SALES

Patent exhaustion, **12:107**

FORESEEABILITY

Generally, **8:43**

Damages, **7:63; 13:79**

Doctrine of equivalents, **6:52; 6:64**

Prosecution history estoppel, **4:96**

Unexpected Results (this index)

FORESEEABILITY PLUS TEST

Personal jurisdiction plus something
more, **1:221**

FORFEITURE

Generally, **9:492; 12:27**

FORGERY

Fraudulent conduct, **6:22**

FORM

Final judgment, **20:98**

Jury verdict, **22:4**

FORM 8

Complaint, **11:73**

- FORM 16**
Complaint, **13:142**
- FORM 18**
State claim, motion to dismiss for failure to, **12:114**
- FORMER**
See index topics beginning: “Prior”
- FORM-OF-CLAIM REQUIREMENT**
Sec. 1.153, **9:137**
- FORUM NON CONVENIENS**
Generally, **2:116; 8:136**
Public interest factors, **13:58**
- FOUND**
Abuse of discretion, **2:27**
- FOUNDRY ARRANGEMENT**
Semiconductor chip, **9:145**
- FRAP**
Sec. 1927, **1:41**
- FRAP 2**
Summary disposition of appeal, **10:20**
- FRAP 3**
Notice of appeal, **9:317**
- FRAP 3(c)**
FRAP 4(a)(4), **4:25**
Notice of appeal, **2:46**
- FRAP 4**
Timeliness of appeal filing, **9:317**
- FRAP (4)**
Generally, **19:170**
- FRAP 4(a)**
FRCP 7(b)(1), **18:25**
Timeliness of appeal filing, **2:5**
- FRAP 4(a)(2)**
Appeal and review, **16:110**
- FRAP 4(a)(4)**
Generally, **11:38**
Appeal and review, **10:14**
FRAP 3(c), **4:25**
Notice of appeal, **10:14**
Renders of no effect any prior notice of appeal, **10:14**
- FRAP 4(a)(5)**
Generally, **20:132**
- FRAP 25**
CD-ROM, **25:5**
- FRAP 28(a)(6)**
Generally, **7:60**
- FRAP 28(e)**
Generally, **12:11**
Admissibility of evidence, failure to argue, **12:11**
Citation to record, need for, **12:22**
- FRAP 28(g)**
Page limit, circumvention of, **12:22**
- FRAP 30(b)**
Raising issues, only issues raised in appellant’s statement may properly be presented on appeal, **6:10**
- FRAP 35**
Generally, **9:182**
- FRAP 36**
Collateral estoppel, **16:160**
- FRAP 38**
Design patent, **19:8**
Frivolous appeal, **1:28; 2:31; 3:40; 3:42; 4:36; 5:14; 6:16; 13:43; 14:16; 16:4; 18:24; 18:27; 19:42; 19:57; 19:87**
Infringement, **12:22; 16:4**
Injunctions, **16:29**
Jury verdict, **3:17**
Meaning, **16:4**
Purpose, **16:29**
Representative claims, **16:4**
Review, standard of, **16:29**
Sanctions, **9:102**
Settlement agreement, **19:1**
- FRAP 39**
Costs award, **11:24**
- FRAP 39(a)**
FRAP 39(b), **18:19**
- FRAP 39(b)**
FRAP 39(a), **18:19**
- FRAP 39(c)**
Appeal, reimbursable costs on, **3:29**

INDEX

FRAP 41

Cause for stay, **1:349**

FRAP 47.6(b)

Generally, **2:72**

FRAP 50

Generally, **9:185**

FRAP 289(c)

Generally, **5:37**

FRAUD

Generally, **12:3**

Abused, much, **16:25**

Antitrust, **3:83; 14:25; 16:48**

Fraud upon the court, **1:163**

Inequitable conduct, **5:5; 6:4; 6:5; 10:2; 11:4; 18:19**

Intent, specific intent to deceive, **6:28**

Interference, **4:21**

Jury, **1:16**

Law of the case doctrine, **19:14**

Malpractice, **12:96**

Obviousness, **22:1**

Ownership, **13:150**

Patent prosecution, applied to, **3:83**

Sec. 282, **8:23**

Sec. 285, **15:3**

Specific intent to deceive, **6:28**

FRAUDS, STATUTE OF

Settlement agreement, **19:40**

FRAUDULENT CONCEALMENT

Generally, **19:93**

FRAUDULENT CONDUCT

False and forged documents, **6:22**

FRAUDULENT INDUCEMENT

Due process clause, **18:69**

FRAUDULENT NON-DISCLOSURE

Preemption, **21:30**

FRAUNHOFER-GESELLSCHAFT ZUR FORDERUNG DER ANGEWANDTEN FORSCHUNG E.V. V. SIRIUS XM RADIO INC.

2025, **6:115**

FRCP

Generally, **5:78; 19:16**

All civil actions, generally, **3:38**

Choice of law, **19:16**

FRCP—Cont'd

CIT, procedural rule corresponds to
FRCP, **5:18**

Interpretation, **23:34**

New trial, motion for, **18:111**

FRCP 4

Personal jurisdiction, **13:181**

FRCP 4(k)(2)

Generally, **19:212; 19:215**

Personal jurisdiction, **13:234**

FRCP 7(b)(1)

FRAP 4(a), **18:25**

FRCP 8

Statement of claim, **9:356**

FRCP 8(a)(2)

Doctrine of equivalents, **14:91**

FRCP 12(b)(6), **14:91**

Inducement, **14:91**

Short and plain statement of claim,
11:73

FRCP 8(c)

Affirmative defense, **3:24**

Double patenting, **3:4**

FRCP 11

Generally, **1:121**

Attorney's inquiry reasonable under
circumstances, **18:95**

Bad faith, **4:88**

Choice of law, **22:14**

Infringement analysis, **22:22**

Review, standard of, **1:42; 8:75; 16:76;
19:87**

Sanctions, **1:41; 3:150; 5:109; 9:125;
18:24; 18:95**

FRCP 12(b)

Generally, **2:69; 18:54**

Joint infringement, **12:112**

Rule 12(b)(1) versus Rule 12(b)(6), **8:66**

FRCP 12(b)(1)

Rule 12(b)(6) versus, **8:66**

Subject matter jurisdiction, lack of, **1:7**

FRCP 12(b)(4)

Generally, **8:45**

Claims court, **13:56**

FRCP 12(b)(6)

Generally, **1:45; 1:143; 3:95; 3:229.50; 16:62; 16:81; 21:38; 24:3**

Claim construction and interpretation, **15:56**

Dismissal, **1:42; 3:147; 7:90; 19:237; 23:29**

Doctrine of equivalents, **14:91**

FRCP 8(a)(2), **14:91**

Inducement, **14:91**

Motion to dismiss, **1:54; 1:248; 2:41; 19:237; 23:29**

Res judicata, **7:99**

Rule 12(b)(1) versus, **8:66**

State claim, failure to, **2:41; 7:99; 8:102; 19:237; 23:29**

State claim, motion to dismiss for failure to, **2:41; 7:99; 8:102; 12:114; 19:237; 23:29**

FRCP 12(b)(7)

Dismissal, **1:45**

Dismissal without prejudice, **21:56**

FRCP 12(f)

Materials outside pleadings, consideration of, **4:13**

FRCP 12(g)(2)

Venue, **9:447**

FRCP 12(h)(1)(A)

Venue, **9:447**

FRCP 13(a)

Generally, **7:56; 21:24; 22:18**

Compulsory counterclaim, **2:36**

28 USC § 2202, exception of, **16:81**

FRCP 15

FRCP 21, **11:18**

Motion to amend pleadings, **3:24**

FRCP 15(a)

Generally, **6:27; 6:28; 11:58**

Amending pleading, **20:5; 20:24**

Busy court need not allow to be imposed upon by presentation of theories seriatim, **20:5**

FRCP 21, **4:28**

FRCP 15(b)

Generally, **19:105**

Amendment of pleadings, **2:40**

Choice of law, **19:105**

FRCP 15(c)

Adding party, amendment of complaint to add party, **6:11**

Advocacy, **6:11**

Amendment of complaint to add party, **6:11**

Bed of its own making, **6:11**

Complaint, amendment of complaint to add party, **6:11**

Corporate officers and directors, **6:11**

Due process, **6:11**

Personal liability, **6:11**

Road tryout, not, **6:11**

Scattergun approach, **6:11**

Trial should be main event, **6:11**

FRCP 16

Pretrial order, **19:14**

FRCP 19

Joinder of patentee with exclusive licensee, **9:71**

FRCP 19(a)

Generally, **1:68**

Dismiss, motion to dismiss, **22:8**

Involuntary joinder, **11:19; 19:264**

Motion to dismiss, **22:8**

Standing, **9:302**

Voluntariness, involuntary joinder, **11:19; 19:264**

FRCP 19(b)

Patent holding subsidiary, **4:49**

FRCP 21

Generally, **1:135; 13:101**

Appellate jurisdiction, lack of, **1:31**

FRCP 15, **11:18**

FRCP 15(a), **4:28**

Mandamus review, **9:359**

FRCP 24

Motion to intervene, **3:38**

FRCP 24(b)

Intervention, **8:36**

Motion to intervene, **8:36**

FRCP 25(a)

Alter ego, **13:25**

In personam jurisdiction, **13:25**

Piercing corporate veil, **13:25**

Venue, **13:25**

INDEX

FRCP 26

- Abuse of discretion defined, **8:9**
- Appellate review, standard for, **8:9**
- Burden, heavy burden, **8:9**
- Defined, abuse of discretion defined, **8:9**
- Disclosure, **3:141; 18:102**
- Discovery, **23:76**
- Discretion, abuse of discretion defined, **8:9**
- Heavy burden, **8:9**

FRCP 26(a)

- Disclosure of written expert report, **13:183**

FRCP 26(c)

- FRCP 45(d), **13:37**

FRCP 26(c)(7)

- Choice of law, **1:19**

FRCP 26(e)

- FRCP 37(b), **18:22**

FRCP 36

- Imposition of discovery sanctions, **18:94**

FRCP 37

- Abuse, discovery abuse, **7:23**
- Attorney, pro se lawyer, **16:71**
- Choice of law, **16:71; 21:69**
- Discovery abuse, **7:23**
- Dismissal of action, **18:24**
- Pro se lawyer, **16:71**
- Regional circuit law, **21:69**

FRCP 37(a)(4)

- Abuse of discovery, **13:48**
- Discovery abuse, **13:48**

FRCP 37(b)

- Discovery sanctions, **20:4**
- Dismissal of complaint for failure to comply with discovery deadlines, **23:34**
- FRCP 26(e), **18:22**
- Sanctions, **14:14**

FRCP 37(c)

- Ex parte test, **3:10**

FRCP 41(a)

- Voluntary dismissal without prejudice, **18:76**

FRCP 41(a)(1)

- Voluntary dismissal when neither answer nor summary judgment motion filed, **5:18**

FRCP 41(a)(1)(B)

- Inducement, **1:279**
- Sec. 1498, **1:279**

FRCP 41(b)

- Generally, **11:35**
- Findings, **12:11**
- Sec. 102(b), **19:31**

FRCP 42(b)

- Appellate jurisdiction, lack of, **1:31**
- Mandamus, **9:41**

FRCP 45

- Quashing of discovery of nonparty, **11:24**

FRCP 45(d)

- FRCP 26(c), **13:37**

FRCP 49(a)

- Generally, **2:49; 7:27**
- Jury verdict, **19:5**
- Special verdict, **19:37; 23:1**
- Validity of claims not infringed, **19:21**
- Waiver of jury trial, **19:21**

FRCP 49(b)

- Inconsistent jury findings, **1:50**
- Jury instructions, **19:60**
- Jury verdict, **13:4**

FRCP 50

- Findings, **12:11**
- Motion for judgment as matter of law, **7:27**

FRCP 50(a)

- Generally, **1:71; 2:49; 5:77; 10:35; 13:72**
- Directed verdict motion, **2:31**
- JMOL, **2:48**
- Judgment as a matter of law, **2:34**
- Jury, **11:12**

FRCP 50(a)(1)

- Generally, **3:98; 5:21**
- JMOL, **16:106**

FRCP 50(b)

- Generally, **6:98; 7:27; 8:52; 14:25**

FRCP 50(b)—Cont'd

JMOL motion, **13:54**
 JNOV, prerequisite for, **23:25**
 JNOV motion, **1:43**
 Motion for judgment, **2:33**

FRCP 51

Generally, **1:101; 5:73; 18:70; 19:60; 19:185**
 Choice of law, **5:60**
 Jury instructions, **12:20**
 Means-plus-function, **12:106**

FRCP 52

Generally, **20:40**

FRCP 52(a)

Generally, **11:32; 18:63**
 Adopted findings, **12:13**
 Appeal and review, **3:45; 12:6; 16:25**
 As a whole, invention, **12:6**
 Blonder-Tongue, **1:13**
 Claim interpretation, **3:7**
 Clear, meaning clear in specification, **12:6**
 Conclusions of law, **3:45**
 Contributory infringement, **7:82**
 Damages, increased, **1:18**
 Damages methodology, **19:4**
 Disclosure, use of inventor's testimony to supplement, **12:6**
 Fact findings, **12:6; 19:4**
 Factual findings, **1:18; 13:16**
 Findings, **3:45; 12:13; 13:16; 16:25**
 Foreign proceedings not relevant, **13:16**
 FRCP 65, **4:14**
 Lexicographer, **12:6**
 Meaning clear in specification, **12:6**
 Need for findings, **1:52**
 Preliminary injunction, **3:12; 15:5; 16:26**
 Remand necessary when inadequate factual findings, **1:59**
 Review, standard of, **3:39**
 Royalty offered when coupled with infringement charge, **1:18**
 Specification, meaning clear in, **12:6**
 Specific factual findings, failure to make, **13:16**
 Summary judgment, **20:26**
 Trial court, **3:45**
 Willful infringement, **1:18**

FRCP 52(a)—Cont'd

Witnesses, **12:6**

FRCP 52(b)

Generally, **7:88**

FRCP 52(c)

Generally, **25:7**

FRCP 53(e)

Generally, **6:26**

FRCP 54

Generally, **11:85; 16:87**
 Entry of single judgment order for all claims not necessary, **6:16**

FRCP 54(b)

Generally, **14:40; 19:155; 19:301**
 Certification, **19:141; 19:191; 23:24**
 Final disposition, **8:55**
 Motion in limine, **21:41**

FRCP 54(d)

Generally, **11:58**
 Costs award, **4:32; 15:32**

FRCP 54(d)(1)

Generally, **18:55; 19:190**

FRCP 56

Generally, **4:79; 14:18**
 High degree of confidence and trust between PTO and patent applicants, **10:5**
 Material information defined, **13:158**
 Summary judgment, **2:29; 9:89; 13:36; 16:28; 16:32; 19:44**

FRCP 56(c)

Generally, **2:52; 3:103; 19:135**
 Claim differentiation, **8:27**
 Claim interpretation, **8:27**
 Doctrine of equivalents, **8:27**
 Exclusion, expansion of right to exclude, **8:27**
 Expansion of right to exclude, **8:27**
 Infringement, summary judgment of noninfringement, **3:52; 9:131**
 Summary judgment, **3:36; 3:52; 4:26; 8:27; 9:131; 11:25; 16:35; 18:28; 21:13**
 Term thereof, **8:27**

FRCP 56(d)

Partial summary judgment, **7:5**

INDEX

FRCP 56(e)

Generally, **19:135**
Ex parte test, **3:10**
Summary judgment, **3:1**

FRCP 56(f)

Generally, **19:93**
Abuse of discretion, **13:154**
Choice of law, **14:50**
Rejection of submissions, **2:80**
Submissions, rejection of, **2:80**
Summary judgment, oppose, **11:7**
Summary judgment appropriateness, **19:20**

FRCP 59

Generally, **11:38; 12:43; 12:61; 21:43**
Order ambiguous, **19:50**
Willful infringement, **3:26**

FRCP 59(a)

Generally, **1:101**

FRCP 59(e)

Generally, **1:102; 6:98; 13:123**
Limitations, **19:42; 19:58**
Mootness, **19:42**
Motion for prejudgment interest, **10:14**
Post-judgment motion, **2:46; 4:25**
10 day limit on modifying judgment, **19:42**
Time limit, **19:58**
Vacating judgment of invalidity and unenforceability when noninfringement finding undisturbed, **19:42**

FRCP 60

Generally, **11:38**

FRCP 60(a)

FRCP 60(b), **21:19**
Post-judgment relief, **16:37**

FRCP 60(b)

Generally, **5:78; 7:32; 22:23**
Appeal, untimely, **3:5**
Choice of law, **6:49; 13:93**
Consent, **23:23**
Damages, **1:20**
Default judgment, **9:144**
FRCP 60(a), **21:19**
Injunction, **23:23**
Judgment, relief from, **1:29; 13:59**
Master, **16:54**

FRCP 60(b)—Cont'd

Modification of injunction under consent under entered pursuant to settlement, **23:23**
Motion, **2:43; 6:22; 9:144**
Post-judgment relief, **16:37**
Set aside, motion, **6:22**
Settlement, **23:23**
Untimely appeal, **3:5**

FRCP 60(b)(2)

Final judgment, relief from, **19:14**

FRCP 60(b)(3)

Fraud upon court, **1:163; 3:229**

FRCP 60(b)(6)

Generally, **6:49**
Choice of law, **6:49**
Motion to modify consent judgment, **3:29**

FRCP 61

Generally, **1:101; 19:94**
Harmless error, **4:7**

FRCP 65

FRCP 52(a), **4:14**
Injunction, **7:3**

FRCP 65.1

Motion to execute on bond, **2:30**

FRCP 65(d)

Generally, **1:75; 1:88; 9:270; 15:20**
Injunction, **1:53; 5:4**

FRCP 68

Generally, **19:99**

FRCP 79(a)

Separate document, **5:45**

FRCP 391(c)(1)

Advisory jury, **11:69**

FRCP FORM 18

Pleading requirements, **19:237**
Sample complaint for direct patent infringement, **9:356**

FRE 103(a)(1)

Estoppel, **23:27**

FRE 403

Generally, **13:53; 13:81; 25:4**

FRE 403—Cont’d

Dead inventor’s videotape deposition,
13:4

Discretion of court, 7:5

FRE 407

Generally, 16:40

FRE 408

Generally, 14:18

FRE 501

Privileges, 9:362

FRE 701

Generally, 19:59

FRE 702

Generally, 13:121; 19:209

Damages award, 12:88

FRE 705

Expert opinion, 19:38

Prima facie case of infringement, 19:59

FRE 706

Generally, 20:62

Appointment of expert, 13:163

Examiners as expert witnesses, 7:21

Expert or opinion evidence, 13:161

FRE 801(C)

Hearsay, 23:27

FRE 803(6)

Generally, 23:101

FRE 803(24)

Generally, 3:67

FRE 804(B)(5)

Generally, 3:67

FREEDOM TO LICENSE

Co-inventors, 19:98

FREEMAN-WALTER-ABELE TEST

Generally, 1:95; 19:112

FRESHUB, INC. V. AMAZON.COM, INC.

2024, 6:110

FRIVOLITY OR FRIVOLOUSNESS

Mandamus, 9:68

Rehearing, request for, 9:97

FRIVOLOUS APPEAL

Generally, 14:19

Appellate jurisdiction, 3:11

Attorney fees, 16:20; 18:11; 20:16

CAFC, 2:11

Clear-cut grounds, based on, 19:90

FCR 38, 8:37

FRAP 38, 1:28; 2:31; 3:40; 3:42; 4:36;

5:14; 6:16; 13:43; 14:16; 16:4;

18:24; 18:27; 19:42; 19:57; 19:87;

23:89

JNOV, 22:4

Jury verdict, 3:17

New argument, 13:46

Non-final order, 18:11

Pro se litigant, 2:38

Sanctions, 3:150; 5:96; 13:71

Settlement agreement, 19:1

Standard, 19:127

Unsupported allegation, 1:52

Venue, 23:98

FS.COM INC. V. INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

2023, 6:109

FULL AND FAIR OPPORTUNITY TO LITIGATE

Collateral estoppel, 2:50; 16:57

FUNCTIONAL ASPECTS

Design patent, 5:21

FUNCTIONALITY

Construction, 2:154

Design patent, 12:32; 18:29

Preliminary injunction, 2:16

Suggestion or motivation to modify,
must be, 9:101

FUNCTIONAL LANGUAGE

Apparatus claims, 20:110

Claim interpretation, 1:124

FUNCTIONAL LIMITATION,

Means-plus-function claim, 23:54

FUNCTIONAL RECITATION

Generally, 9:201

FUNCTIONAL RELATIONSHIP

Obviousness, 9:32

FUNCTIONAL REQUIREMENTS

Preliminary injunction, 3:34

INDEX

FUNCTION-WAY-RESULT TEST

Doctrine of equivalents, **19:52; 19:199**

FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE

Sec. 101, **1:95**

FUTILITY

Interference, **13:31**

FUTURE ACTS AND MATTERS

Claims must be construed same way, **23:11**

Escrow, **3:21**

Interference, **18:49**

Lost profits, **19:137**

Lost sales, **6:74**

Sec. 286, **19:27**

FUTURE LINK SYSTEMS, LLC V. REALTEK SEMICONDUCTOR CORPORATION

2025, **6:116**

GALDERMA LABORATORIES, L.P. V. LUPIN INC.

2024, **7:145**

GENERALIZED TESTIMONY

Doctrine of equivalents, **3:80**

GENERAL VERDICT

Generally, **12:20; 19:259**

CAFC, **18:3**

GENERIC, TRADEMARK

Patent misuse, **23:9**

GENERIC CLAIM

Generally, **1:44**

Premarketing approval, Sec. 271(e)(1), **3:159**

Sec. 102(e), **9:28**

GENERIC FORMULA

Chemical compound, **9:148**

GENUINE ISSUE

Design patent, **16:17**

GENUS

Generally, **9:126**

Claim preamble, **3:22**

Interference, **9:88**

Obviousness, **3:167**

Species, **2:107; 18:40**

Written description, **2:143; 2:144**

GERM

Enablement, **7:50**

GERMAN GESCHMACKSMUSTER

Prior art reference under sec. 102(a), **9:120**

GIST

Additional components, **12:18**

Heart, **22:7**

Heart of invention, **23:11**

GLOBAL HEALTH SOLUTIONS LLC V. SELNER

2025, **7:147**

GOOD CAUSE

Evidence, **8:35**

Exception under APA, **14:17**

Later submission of evidence, **8:35**

New interference rules, **8:3**

GOOD FAITH

Additional components, **12:18**

Administrative law, **13:70**

Anticipation, **18:20**

Common law definition thereof, **1:64**

Contract law, **12:39**

Explanation of failure to disclosure, **6:80**

FRCP 11, **4:88**

Induced infringement, invalidity, **3:185**

Inequitable conduct, **11:3; 13:138**

Inventorship, **3:59**

Notice, **7:92**

PTO rejection of claims, **1:43**

Summary judgment, **16:54**

GOOGLE LLC V. ECOFACTOR, INC.

2024, **7:146**

GORHAM

CIP, **12:17**

Continuation, **12:17**

Design patent, **12:29; 15:5; 16:33; 19:8**

Design patent infringement, **2:33**

Infringement, generally, **12:32**

Novelty must be appropriated, **12:17**

Summary judgment, **1:35**

Trade dress, **12:17**

GOVERNING LAW

Conflict of Laws (this index)

GOVERNMENT

Contract, **4:59**
 Equitable estoppel doctrine, **26:8**
 FNERDA, **6:18**
 Just compensation, **8:116; 12:27**
 Prejudgment interest, **19:83**
 Regulation, **19:63**
 Sec. 207(a)(2), **14:9**
 Sec. 1498, **9:398; 20:18**
 Sec. 2412(b), **13:48**

GOVERNMENT CONTRACT

Patent right clause, **8:8**
 Sovereign act doctrine as defense, **8:41**

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Executive Order 10096, **8:10**

GOVERNMENT LIABILITY

Method claims, **26:10**

GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

Administrative law, **13:70**
 Regulations, **19:78**

GRAHAM

Generally, **9:170; 13:17**
 Obviousness, **2:8; 3:30; 19:244**
 Rule 131 affidavit, **7:19**
 Secondary considerations, **13:17**

GRAMMATICAL STRUCTURE AND SYNTAX

Interference, **1:117**

GRAVER TANK

Abstractions, **20:6**
 Doctrine of equivalents, **12:28; 13:39; 16:11**
 Entirety of technology test, **20:6**
 Inventing around, **20:6**
 Same result, **20:6**

GROSS NEGLIGENCE

Inequitable conduct, **3:104; 6:4; 8:26; 14:8**
 Intent to mislead, **2:68**

GUARANTEE

Same invention-type, **19:39**

GVR ORDER

Generally, **6:39; 8:65**

H. LUNDBECK A/S V. LUPIN LTD.

2023, **8:166**

HAEC VERBA

Description, **3:103**

“HALF THE PRACTICE OF A DECENT LAWYER”

Root or roots, **1:20; 12:24; 16:4**

HARD AND FAST RULE

Claim differentiation, **19:157**

HARDWARE AND SOFTWARE

Interchangeability, **15:16**

HARMFUL ERROR

JNOV, **22:4**
 Procedural errors, **4:37**

HARMLESS ERROR

Claim interpretation, **19:15**
 FRCP 61, **4:7**
 Summary judgment, **3:1**

HARMONIZATION

Enforcement, **22:36**

HARM TO REPUTATION

Adequacy of monetary damages, **18:32**

HARSH REMEDY

Dismissal, **7:52**

HATCH-WAXMAN ACT

Generally, **1:120; 5:144; 13:144**
 Anticipation, **21:76**
 Claim construction and interpretation, **19:314**
 Doctrine of Equivalents (this index)
 Double patenting, **21:76**
 Obviousness, **21:76**
 Patent information, **14:62; 14:63**
 Subject matter jurisdiction, **3:159; 19:247**

HAVING

Generally, **3:96**

HAWK TECHNOLOGY SYSTEMS, LLC V. CASTLE RETAIL, LLC

2023, **8:167**

HD SILICON SOLUTIONS LLC V. MICROCHIP TECHNOLOGY INC.

2025, **8:169**

HEADINGS

Statutory interpretation, **7:25**

INDEX

HEARING

Generally, **1:41**
Markman hearing, **5:100**
Panel hearing or rehearing en banc,
11:67

HEARSAY

Generally, **1:70**
Ex part proceeding, use in PTO proceeding,
9:150
FRE 801(c), **23:27**
PTO ex part proceeding, use in, **9:150**

HEART

Essential elements, **5:10**
Gist, **22:7; 23:11**
Inspection of patentee's product, **16:15**
Obviousness, **16:41**
Sec. 102(g), **19:10**

HEAVY BURDEN

FRCP 26, **8:9**
Obviousness question, **16:19**
Reasonable royalty, **8:51**
Validity, **23:48**

HEAVY LINES

Sec. 1.84, **9:137**

HEAVY PRESUMPTION

Claim interpretation, **5:70; 18:67; 20:63**

HIGH DEGREE OF CONFIDENCE AND TRUST BETWEEN PTO AND PATENT APPLICANTS

Generally, **10:5**
Materiality, **10:5**
Rule 56, **10:5**

HIGHLY RELEVANT PRIOR ART

Inequitable conduct, **13:69**

HINDSIGHT

Claim differentiation, **11:2**
Claim interpretation, **19:15**
Combination patent, **13:15**
Infringement, **7:10**
Obviousness, **3:103; 3:109; 4:91; 5:47;**
9:274; 13:185; 15:42; 16:4; 19:92;
21:8
Reference, **9:16**
Template, use as, **9:114**
Use as template, **9:114**

HIP, INC. V. HORMEL FOODS CORPORATION

2023, **8:168**

HIRED TO INVENT

Standing, **10:47**

HISTORY ATTORNEY

Claim interpretation, **9:94**

HOLDER OF LEGAL TITLE

Standing, **1:68**

HOLDING OF PATENT

Collateral estoppel, **4:3**

HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC. V. 3G LICENSING, S.A.

2025, **8:170**

“HOW TO DO IT”

Sec. 145, **7:9**

“HOW TO MAKE”

Interference, **13:3**

“HOW TO USE”

Enablement, **14:4**

HUMAN

Doctrine of equivalents, **7:28**

HYATT V. STEWART

2025, **8:171**

HYBRID NATURE

Interference, **3:6**

HYBRID SEC. 102

Anticipation, **9:104**

HYPOTHETICAL CLAIM

Generally, **21:32**
Anticipated by single prior art reference,
1:115
Doctrine of equivalents, **23:17**
Wilson, **9:146**

HYPOTHETICAL COMBINATIONS

Claim differentiation, **11:2**

HYPOTHETICAL INVENTOR

Ordinary skill, hypothetical person for,
defined, **19:26**

HYPOTHETICAL JUDICIAL STATEMENTS

Collateral estoppel, **1:3**

HYPOTHETICAL NEGOTIATION

Reasonable royalties, **12:90; 16:129**
 Sec. 284, **1:296**

IDEAS

Generally, **10:8**
 Analysis begins with claims, **10:8**
 Conception, **13:72; 20:65**

IDENTICAL ACTS AND MATTERS

Claim preclusion, **13:65**
 Issue preclusion, **9:232**
 Means-plus-function claim, **11:32**
 Means without substantive change,
12:25
 Product-by-process claims, **9:58; 9:81**
 Reexamination, **6:8**

IDENTIFIABLE BENEFIT

Useful, **10:25**

**IDENTIFICATION OR
 DESCRIPTION**

Description (this index)

IDENTIFIED, FUNCTION MUST BE

Means-plus-function, **1:125**

IDENTIFY FACTS

Summary judgment, **22:21**

IDENTIFY FUNCTION

Means-plus-function claim, **1:125; 7:67;**
7:79; 12:66

IDENTITY

Anticipation, **20:20**
 Applicable, where, **20:20**
 Claim construction, **5:2**
 Claim differentiation, **11:2**
 Clearly erroneous standard, **20:20**
 Court can decide validity differently
 from PTO on same evidence, **20:20**
 Doctrine of equivalents, **14:1**
 Evidence, **20:20**
 Law question, **9:90**
 Verdict, **16:14**

IDENTITY OF INVENTION

Anticipation, **7:33**

**IF CLAIM LIMITATION OR
 EQUIVALENT**

Present, not, **10:10**

IGNORANCE

Mandamus, **9:57**
 Reissue, **9:84**

IGT V. ZYNGA INC.

2025, **9:529**

IMMEDIATE APPEAL

28 USC § 1291, **11:10**
 Sec. 1292(a)(1), **23:13**

IMMUNITY

Antitrusts, Noerr immunity, **3:46; 5:108**
 Counterclaim, filing of counterclaim,
19:141
 Eleventh Amendment, **2:120; 9:128**
 Exclusive immunity, **1:190**
 Filing of counterclaim, **19:141**
 Nonresidents, not limited to suits by,
10:11
 Sovereign Immunity (this index)
 Strictly construed, **10:19**

IMMUNOGEN, INC. V. STEWART

2025, **9:530**

IMMUTABLE FIXED RULE

Claim differentiation, **4:17**

**IMPLICATES INEQUITABLE
 CONDUCT**

Intentional interference with contractual
 relations, **4:54**

IMPLICATIONS

Appeal, **5:41**
 Narrow vs. broad claims, **13:39**
 Statutory construction, **18:34**

IMPLICIT DECISIONS

Mandate, **12:47**

IMPLICIT REPEALS

Statutory construction, **6:30; 19:80**

IMPLIED GOOD FAITH

Contract law, **12:39**

IMPLIED-IN-FACT CONTRACT

Generally, **20:40**
 Choice of law, **20:40**
 Contract law, **12:38**

IMPLIED LICENSE

Generally, **8:59**
 Clearly erroneous standard, **19:23**

INDEX

IMPLIED LICENSE—Cont'd

- Contributory infringement, **13:21**
- Defense to infringement, **1:100**
- Direct infringement, **13:21**
- Equitable estoppel, **13:67; 19:35; 23:55**
- Factors, **23:41**
- Inducing infringement, **13:21**
- Infringement, **7:62; 13:21**
- Law question, **3:56**
- Public use, **26:13**
- Repair, **4:1; 11:36**
- Restrictions, upon unrestricted sale of unpatented article, **13:21**
- Sec. 287, **4:12**
- Third party production, **3:147**
- Timeliness of appeal filing, **2:5**

IMPLIED ORDER

- Method claims, **9:234**

IMPLIED WAIVER

- Standard setting organization, **3:206**
- Standard setting organizations, **8:120**

IMPORTS

- Expert testimony, **7:96**
- Sec. 337 (this index)

IMPROVEMENT

- Claim interpretation, **20:8**
- Comprising, **3:37**
- Obviousness, **18:23**
- Refining, **13:8**
- Secondary considerations, **9:82**
- Special master's decision, **13:24**
- Surprising results, **9:118**

INCENTIVE

- Generally, **9:96**
- Modification, **9:51**
- Subject matter jurisdiction, **25:1**

INCEPT LLC V. PALETTE LIFE SCIENCES, INC.

- 2023, **9:522**

INCLUDING

- Generally, **20:51**

“INCLUDING” AND “COMPRISING”

- Claim interpretation, **12:83**

INCONSISTENCY

- Generally, **2:47**

INCONSISTENCY—Cont'd

- Agency's interpretation of own regulations, **22:9**
- Injunction, **16:5**
- Jury, **1:14**
- Jury findings, **2:10**
- Jury verdicts, **13:105; 18:14**
- Procedural issue, **8:21**

INCORPORATION BY REFERENCE

- Generally, **1:101; 8:143; 13:80; 20:56; 24:4**
- Amendment, **8:113**
- Anticipation, International Trade Commission, **1:238**
- Disclosure-dedication to public, **19:233**
- Interference, **8:113; 8:119**
- Inter partes review, **8:143**
- Obviousness, **16:164**
- Particularity, **26:12**
- Reasonable examiner standard, **8:124**
- Sec. 102(b), **1:101**
- Sec. 120, **4:122**
- Specification, **16:128**

INCREASED DAMAGES

- Clearly erroneous standard, **19:23**
- Injunction, **16:5**
- Willful infringement, **15:14**

INCREASING SUPERSEDEAS BOND

- Sec. 1291, **19:42**

INCYTE CORPORATION V. SUN PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRIES, INC.

- 2025, **9:537**

INDEFINITENESS

- Generally, **7:144**
- Certainty and Definiteness (this index)

INDEMNIFICATION AGREEMENT

- Deterrent effect of patent laws, **8:24**

INDEPENDENT CLAIMS

- Generally, **3:41; 9:123; 12:28; 14:12**
- Chemical process, **9:20**
- Claim construction, **26:1**
- Claim differentiation, **5:60; 9:237**
- Court must state burden of persuasion and quantum of proof required, **18:7**
- Dependent claims, **10:26; 13:100**

INDEPENDENT CLAIMS—Cont'd

Doctrine of equivalents, **5:6; 18:65**
 Infringement, **23:35**
 Sec. 282, **13:55**
 Substantial evidence test, **19:43**
 Validity, **5:45; 8:7; 19:86**

INDEPENDENT RIGHT

Property, **11:35**

INDEXING

Public accessibility, **22:42**

INDIRECT INFRINGEMENT

As to infringement, generally. Infringement (this index)
 Generally, **4:75**
 Anticipation, **21:73**
 Claim construction, **16:153**
 Inequitable conduct, **21:73**
 Question of fact, **13:190**
 Summary judgment, **3:36**
 Verdict form, **16:153**

INDUCED INFRINGEMENT

Generally, **1:129; 1:142; 2:195; 3:96; 4:80; 5:10; 6:59; 7:135; 8:24; 18:133; 19:295; 19:322; 20:157**
 Active inducement, **5:102**
 Case or controversy, **1:319**
 Claim construction, **5:98**
 Competition, **18:48**
 Contributory infringement, **8:24; 9:356**
 Damages, **9:410**
 Declaratory judgments, **1:319**
 Direct infringement, **1:222; 5:63; 5:102; 12:104**
 Direct or circumstantial evidence, **2:130**
 Divided infringement, **1:222**
 Doctrine of equivalents, **13:28; 14:91**
 Double patenting, **5:132**
 Due process clause, **18:69**
 FRCP 8(a)(2), **14:91**
 FRCP 12(b)(6), **14:91**
 FRCP 41(a)(1)(B), **1:279**
 Good faith belief invalidity, **3:185**
 Implied license, **13:21**
 Inference, **1:202**
 Infringement, **8:24**
 Injunctions, **22:59**
 Intent, **1:133; 13:135; 19:217**
 Intent for infringement cases, **23:87**

INDUCED INFRINGEMENT—Cont'd

Interference, **18:48**
 Jurisdiction, **22:59**
 Knowingly, **1:222; 7:103; 23:3**
 Limitation to actions by single entity, **1:222**
 Manual, instructions in, **13:186**
 Obviousness, **8:24**
 Operational differences over prior art, lack of, **8:24**
 Personal liability, invoke, **19:92**
 Pre-issuance inducement, **14:18**
 Prior art, **8:24**
 Sec. 172(b), **26:2**
 Sec. 271(b), **1:157; 7:103; 8:24; 11:60; 16:22**
 Sec. 271(c), **8:24**
 Sec. 1498, **1:279**
 Snuggle use doctrine, **19:79**
 Specific intent, **18:79**
 Tortious interference and unfair competition, versus, **18:48**
 Unfair competition, **18:48**
 Written description, **22:59**

INDUCEMENT

Anticipation, **5:138**
 Contributory infringement, **7:130**
 Damages, **5:138**
 FRCP 46, **15:57**
 Obviousness, **7:130**
 Utility, **7:130**

INDUSTRIAL AND COMMERCIAL BUYERS

Design patent infringement, **1:165**

INDUSTRY REQUIREMENT

Design patent, Sec. 1337, **3:154**
 Validity, **19:206**

INDUSTRY STANDARD

Infringement, **6:77**
 Patent misuse, **16:126**

INEQUITABLE CONDUCT

Generally, **1:9; 1:116; 1:131; 1:138; 2:43; 2:139.50; 3:234; 4:72; 4:79; 5:65; 6:60; 7:138; 9:272; 10:31; 11:58; 13:250; 16:105; 18:117; 19:19; 23:55; 23:59**
 Abuse of discretion, **18:78**
 Affidavit, **7:34**

INDEX

INEQUITABLE CONDUCT—Cont'd

Anticipation, **1:25; 18:20; 21:73**
 Antitrust, **6:5; 14:21**
 Appeal and review, **6:4; 23:47**
 Attorney, **15:3**
 Attorney fees, **1:193; 8:18; 10:2; 13:19; 18:43; 20:97**
 Balancing materiality and intent, **6:5**
 Batch process, continuous vs., **10:2**
 Blonder-Tongue, **1:13**
 Burden of proof, **19:92**
 Candor with PTO, **12:55**
 Cited prior art, **8:29**
 Claim interpretation, **19:15**
 Claim terms, **18:116**
 Clear and convincing evidence, **1:71; 7:68; 13:141; 15:3; 19:38**
 Collateral estoppel, **4:3**
 Commercial success, **11:4**
 Consider, **6:4**
 Continuous vs. batch process, **10:2**
 Contracts, **4:54**
 Contributory infringement, **1:210**
 Costs of action, **1:193**
 Culpable intent, **5:16; 16:32; 20:25**
 Cumulative prior art, **7:1**
 Cumulative reference, **19:51**
 Deception. Intent to Deceive (this index)
 Decisions, **1:25; 11:4**
 Declaration, **9:378; 13:129**
 Design, **6:4**
 Design patent, **7:59; 16:1**
 Disclosure, **3:98; 6:13; 19:128**
 Discretion of court, **7:33; 13:38; 13:45**
 Distinguished from fraud, **1:25**
 Drawings of hypothetical devices, **11:4**
 Education of inventor, **15:3**
 Enablement, **20:101**
 Enforceability, **1:210; 7:101; 8:12; 19:30**
 Evidence, **2:68; 2:103; 5:42; 7:46; 13:19; 15:43; 20:106**
 Examiner's deposition, **23:5**
 Exceptional case, **13:19; 15:13; 16:78; 18:9; 18:55**
 Experimental use, **5:137**
 False, **7:34**
 Fertile source of error, **6:5**
 Fraud, **5:5; 6:4; 6:5; 10:2; 11:4; 18:19**
 Good faith, **11:3; 13:138**

INEQUITABLE CONDUCT—Cont'd

Gross negligence, **3:104; 6:4; 8:26; 14:8**
 Highly relevant prior art, withholding, **13:69**
 Induced infringement, **5:102**
 Inference, **1:3; 1:102; 12:92**
 Infringement, **6:4; 7:10**
 Intent, **1:169; 1:257; 2:33; 2:68; 4:54; 5:16; 6:4; 6:5; 7:34; 7:46; 9:378; 13:19; 13:91; 13:141; 16:32; 20:25**
 Interference, **4:21; 4:54**
 Invalidity and noninfringement, declaratory judgment, **20:133**
 Inventorship, **16:48**
 Jury, **1:14; 1:16; 2:49**
 Knowledge of reference, **13:101**
 Law of the case doctrine, **19:14**
 Litigation misconduct, **1:112; 1:180**
 Maintenance fees, **14:70; 21:40**
 Manifest injustice, **14:58**
 Material, **2:85**
 Materiality (this index)
 Mention, failure to, **6:4**
 Mere knowledge of reference, **13:101**
 Misrepresentations, **8:85**
 Misrepresentations or omissions material to patentability, **15:49**
 Motion to compel discovery, **19:17**
 Negligence, gross, **6:4; 14:8**
 Nondisclosure of known prior art, **1:3**
 Non-final judgment, **1:237**
 Obviousness, **1:231; 18:84; 19:202; 22:1**
 Omissions, **7:46**
 On-sale bar, **5:137; 12:30**
 Other circumstances may support, **19:26**
 Patentability, **18:116**
 Patent prosecution, **6:42**
 Per se materiality rule, none, **12:20**
 Petition to make special, **7:29**
 Presumption, **13:19**
 Printed publication, **15:34**
 Prior art, **7:1; 8:29; 8:62; 12:30; 19:128**
 Process, continuous vs. batch, **10:2**
 Procurement, **13:19**
 Prosecution irregularities, **3:149; 13:81**
 PTO, **1:203; 7:19; 9:43; 10:2; 12:55; 12:85; 16:114; 19:118**

INEQUITABLE CONDUCT—Cont'd

Raised on appeal, must review if, **23:47**
Reasonableness of examiner's rejection,
1:3
Reference, **6:80; 13:101; 19:51**
Reissue, **8:26**
Relevant prior art, withholding highly
relevant prior art, **8:62**
Resubmitting references, **1:92**
Review, standard of, **2:59; 3:72; 6:50;**
9:35; 10:31; 11:11; 13:84; 14:19;
14:54; 18:37; 18:40; 20:39
Sec. 102(b), **5:80; 9:7; 13:35**
Sec. 112, **8:7**
Sec. 282, **8:23**
Sec. 285
generally, **16:59**
attorney fees, **5:137; 18:43**
Secondary considerations, **4:10; 11:4**
Separate nonjury trial, **7:1**
Several patents, one of, **12:3**
Sham litigation, **8:98**
Skill, level of, **15:3**
Special, petition to make, **7:29**
Standard of review, **19:202**
Starting point, **7:1**
Summary judgment, **2:24**
Surprising results, **11:4**
Synergism, **11:4**
Threshold intent, **6:4**
Threshold level, **1:44; 21:36**
Translation, **1:154**
Two step analysis, **1:89**
Two-step analysis, **16:61; 16:70**
Unclean hands doctrine, **3:35**
Unfair competition, **16:48**
Very material omissions require less
evidence to show intent, **7:46**
Walker process, **3:71; 14:21; 14:25**
Withheld prior art, **8:29; 8:62; 12:30**
Withholding reference, **6:80**
Witnesses, **11:4**

INFERENCE

Inequitable conduct, **1:3; 1:102; 12:92**
Intent to deceive, **13:69**
Intent to induce infringement, **1:202**
Intent to mislead, **8:51; 20:35**
Opinion of counsel, **5:30**
Sec. 285, **5:14**

INFERIOR INFRINGEMENT

Special verdict, **23:1**

**INFORMATION DISCLOSURE
STATEMENT**

Doctrine of equivalents, **5:31**
Interpret scope of claims, used to,
7:113
Prior art, no admission material, **1:122;**
18:86

INFRINGEMENT

Generally, **1:137; 1:147; 1:161.50;**
1:356; 2:94; 2:109; 2:114; 2:162;
2:195; 3:99; 3:232.50; 5:62; 5:65;
6:55; 9:287; 9:477; 10:10; 10:36;
12:72; 13:52; 13:53; 13:125;
14:45; 14:48; 14:51; 14:73; 16:87;
16:91; 16:93; 16:95; 16:178; 18:2;
18:13; 18:62; 19:53; 19:159;
19:168; 20:77; 23:18; 23:96
Abbreviated new drug application
(anda), **6:65; 19:247**
Abbreviated new drug application
(ANDA), **2:146; 13:233**
Access validity not examiner's potential
act, **20:72**
Actual controversy required, **20:26**
Actual notice, **12:61**
Add elements, avoided if, **9:186**
Additional components, **12:18**
ANDA, **1:252; 2:88; 2:146; 6:65**
Appeal and review, **2:95**
Appellate jurisdiction, **3:11**
Appropriate, when, **23:35**
ARO, **13:29**
As a whole, visual appearance, **3:100**
Asserted equivalents need not be known,
20:6
Assignor estoppel doctrine, **19:47**
Attorney fee on appeal, **18:19**
Attorneys, **12:22**
Attribution, **20:141**
Avoidance, inefficiency does not avoid,
6:26
Awareness of material prior art insuf-
ficient by itself, **7:10**
Bankruptcy, **8:94**
Basic, **20:6**
Blonder-Tongue, **1:13**
Burden of proof, **1:123; 7:31; 13:179;**
13:194

INDEX

INFRINGEMENT—Cont'd

Capable of modified to operate infringing means, **20:56**
Capable of operating in infringing mode, **6:74**
Careful consideration, **12:29**
Case or controversy, **7:10**
Chemical case, **13:46**
Chemical compound, **5:29**
Choice of law, **22:18**
Circumstantial evidence, **12:90**
Claim, **8:61**
Claim construction and interpretation, **2:82; 2:129; 3:7; 6:93; 16:35; 19:15; 19:167; 19:242; 23:58; 23:88; 26:1**
Claim differentiation, **6:93; 23:88**
Claimed method, sometimes embodies, **2:52**
Claim preclusion, **1:170**
Claims must be construed same way, **23:11**
Clear and convincing evidence, **3:158**
Collateral estoppel, **1:3; 1:155; 25:10**
Commercial product, **1:124**
Composition of process or product undisputed, **4:51**
Computer claims, **19:220**
Contempt, **11:17**
Contributory Infringement (this index)
Copyright, **16:110**
Costs on appeal, **1:20**
Counterclaim, **13:179**
Court can observe with its own eyes, **9:4**
Customer end user as parties at trial, no necessity to have, **18:11**
Damages, **5:121; 13:146; 16:40; 16:135; 19:92; 22:35**
Declaratory judgment, **13:194; 19:81**
Defense, practicing the prior art not, **5:60**
Dependent claim, **10:26; 13:100; 13:147; 23:17**
Design patent, **1:165; 3:98; 3:100; 8:126; 11:25; 12:8; 15:5; 15:11; 19:8; 19:85; 21:4**
Device alterable so as to infringe, **8:46**
Direct Infringement (this index)
Disclosure, not measure of what is discloses, **9:4**
Divided infringement, **1:270; 1:271**

INFRINGEMENT—Cont'd

Doctrine of equivalents, **4:125; 7:121**
Doctrine of Equivalents (this index)
Earlier suit, preclusive effect on claim construction of, **16:35**
Elements, every claim element must be present, **19:111**
Ensnarement, **7:121**
Equivalency, **8:51**
Equivalent, **23:40**
Every claim, **1:52; 1:84; 19:111; 23:40**
Evidence, **3:158; 8:120; 14:33; 18:11**
Examiner, **20:72**
Expert, technical, **9:125**
Expert testimony, **3:90; 9:320; 14:18; 18:43; 19:242; 19:291**
Extraterritorial production, **16:138**
Fact question, **3:101; 7:10; 8:51; 19:19; 21:17**
Factual findings to support jury verdict presumed, **2:15**
FDA approval, **1:85**
Features added, **14:8**
File wrapper, **10:13**
Final assembler theory, **1:361.50**
First to file, **6:89**
Foreign patent, **22:36**
Foreign sales, **8:129**
FRAP 38, **12:22; 16:4**
FRCP 11, **22:22**
FRCP 49(a), **19:21**
FRCP 59(e), **19:42**
FRE 705, **19:59**
Gorham, **12:32**
Hindsight, **7:10**
Implied license, **7:62; 13:21**
Imported product, **2:80; 11:60**
Improper to compare claims with patent's preferred embodiment or patentee's commercial embodiment, **1:52**
Indefiniteness, **13:57**
Independent v. dependent claims, **23:35**
Induced Infringement (this index)
Industry standard, **6:77**
Inefficiency does not avoid, **6:26**
Inequitable conduct, **6:4; 7:10**
Intent not required, **9:118**
International Trade Commission, **1:17; 3:198; 5:98; 25:2**

INFRINGEMENT—Cont'd

Inventorship, **4:125**
 Inventor's theory, **6:10**
 ITC, **1:17; 25:2**
 JNOV, **6:6; 22:4**
 Joint infringement, **1:195; 1:222; 2:124; 13:159; 13:160**
 Jurisdiction, **7:73**
 Jury verdict, **8:47; 19:5; 20:25**
 Law question, **12:31; 13:64; 13:74**
 License, implied, **7:62**
 Limitations, **23:40; 25:3**
 Literal Infringement (this index)
 Lost profits, **13:45; 16:135; 26:4**
 Manufacture, pre issuance manufacture, **10:23**
 Markush claim, **1:155; 19:299**
 Means-plus-function claim limitation, **3:46**
 Minor differences, **16:33**
 Mixed question, **19:19**
 Modified device, **2:119**
 Mootness, **11:23**
 Motion, **12:36; 23:10**
 New trial, **8:51**
 Nonobviousness, **7:10**
 Nonparty's motion to quash discovery subpoena, **20:17**
 Notice and knowledge
 generally, **1:62; 3:96; 13:42; 20:6**
 awareness of material prior art insufficient by itself, **7:10**
 declaratory judgment, versus, **19:101**
 due care, duty of, **3:96**
 knowledge, asserted equivalents need not be known, **20:6**
 marking, **4:89**
 marking as constructive notice, **6:78**
 notice, actual notice, **12:61**
 sufficiency, **11:70**
 Novelty must be appropriated, **12:17**
 Observation, court can observe with its own eyes, **9:4**
 Obviousness, **18:23; 19:11; 19:19**
 Occurs at place where sales are made, **14:15**
 Offer for sale, **8:129**
 Only claims may be, **5:6**
 Patent misuse, **8:14; 23:9**
 Pioneer invention, **20:6**

INFRINGEMENT—Cont'd

Pleading, **9:356**
 Preclusive effect on claim construction of earlier suit, **16:35**
 Pre issuance manufacture, **10:23**
 Preliminary injunction, **1:40; 1:155**
 Prior art, **5:60; 7:10; 19:19**
 Process, **1:12; 4:51**
 Product, composition of process or product undisputed, **4:51**
 Prosecution history, **5:84; 13:126**
 Prosecution history estoppel, **22:8**
 Reconsideration, new theory, **7:113**
 Remand for clarification, **10:38**
 Replication of patented technology, **13:173**
 Review, standard of, **3:43; 5:36; 9:254; 16:11**
 Reviewability, **2:31**
 Sale of spare parts after patentee fully compensated, **11:10**
 Sales, **8:129**
 Sample is potent witness, **9:4**
 Sanctions on counsel, **12:22**
 Sec. 102(b), **19:31**
 Sec. 112(6), **9:215**
 Sec. 112(6), invoking, **16:51**
 Sec. 112 equivalency, **16:2**
 Sec. 271(a), **23:53**
 Sec. 271(b), **8:24**
 Sec. 271(c), **6:23**
 Sec. 271(e)(1), **5:13**
 Sec. 271(g), **13:105**
 Sec. 285, **3:42; 3:212**
 Sec. 337, **3:23**
 Separate patentability, **8:52**
 Settlement on product, effect of, **16:40**
 Special master's decision, **1:207; 13:24**
 Special verdict, **23:1**
 Spoliation of evidence, **8:120**
 Standard essential patent, **7:136**
 Standing, **13:170; 19:154**
 Statutory notice under Sec. 287(b)(5), **13:41**
 Step-two analysis, **20:63**
 Strict liability offense, **10:21**
 Structure, no dispute concerning, **7:57**
 Substantial evidence, **25:10**
 Substitute, **7:63**
 Success on merits, likelihood of, **7:50**

INDEX

INFRINGEMENT—Cont'd

- Summary judgment, **1:35; 1:79; 2:29; 3:36; 3:52; 3:189; 4:75; 4:113; 5:10; 8:40; 9:131; 14:14; 16:20; 16:88; 16:155; 21:28; 21:46; 23:58**
- Superiority of accused product, **19:38**
- Switching not establish noninfringing substitute during past infringement, **7:63**
- Technical expert, **9:125**
- Technological advance, **22:32**
- Technologic equivalency are fact questions, **8:51**
- Two-part analysis, **2:83**
- Two-step analysis, generally, **1:118; 1:134; 2:62; 2:78; 3:66; 3:105; 4:66; 5:26; 6:47; 7:40; 7:67; 8:77; 9:269; 10:28; 10:32; 11:44 to 11:46; 12:42; 12:49; 12:65; 12:70; 13:112; 13:118; 14:32; 14:46; 15:12; 15:17; 16:66; 16:77; 16:82; 18:46; 18:51; 18:57; 19:103; 19:135; 19:158; 23:49; 24:2; 26:6**
- Two-step inquiry, **2:74**
- Two-step process, **14:14; 18:30; 23:35**
- Two-step test, **13:75**
- Unfair competition, **19:87**
- Use of system, **3:156**
- Vacate, **7:8**
- Validity, **1:113; 1:169; 7:61; 8:49; 12:45; 15:15; 16:74; 18:39; 19:86; 20:72**
- Venue, **8:53**
- Vicarious liability, **4:75**
- Visual appearance as a whole, **3:100**
- Willful Infringement (this index)
- Withdrawn claims, **7:10**
- Within United States, **12:81**
- Witnesses, **9:4**
- Written description, **1:252; 6:93; 9:453**

INGENICO INC. V. IOENGINE, LLC
2025, **9:538**

INGREDIENTS

- Claim construction and interpretation, **13:125**

INGURAN, LLC V. ABS GLOBAL, INC.
2023, **9:523**

INHERENCY

- Generally, **5:61; 6:40; 7:81; 9:212; 9:242; 9:486; 12:36; 13:94; 16:172**
- Anticipation (this index)
- Certain thing may result is not sufficient, **9:140**
- Circumstances insufficient, may result from set of, **3:103**
- Composition, discovery of inherent properties, **20:11**
- Defense, sovereign act doctrine as defense, **8:41**
- Descriptive matter, recognition that missing descriptive matter is necessarily present, **5:56**
- Disclosure, **25:12**
- Discovery, **20:11**
- Escrow, **3:21**
- Fact question, **9:31; 9:172**
- Must necessarily be present, **20:59**
- Necessary function, **2:143**
- Necessary present, **20:47**
- Obviousness, **5:136; 8:147; 16:140; 19:303; 20:67**
- Old composition, **20:11**
- On-sale bar, **19:113**
- Privity, **11:14**
- Recognition that missing descriptive matter is necessarily present, **5:56**
- Sec. 112(1), **18:52**
- Sec. 120, **11:8**
- Sovereign act doctrine as defense, **8:41**
- Unexpected properties, **8:147**
- Written description requirement, **13:53**

IN-HOUSE COUNSEL

- Attorney fees award, **16:24**

IN BANC HEARING

- Correction of panel opinions, **16:107**
- Exception not rule, **1:52**
- FCR 35, **1:52**
- Malpractice, **2:152**

IN CAMERA DOCUMENT INSPECTION

- Generally, **17:3**

IN FIRST INSTANCE

- Claim words, **5:7**

IN HAEC VERBA

Written description, **12:54; 16:65**

IN LIGHT OF SPECIFICATION

Claim interpretation, **1:108**

IN LIMINE

Evidence, **21:41**

“IN THIS COUNTRY”

Sec. 102(g), **1:111**

IN TOTO

Generally, **8:31**

IN VIVO

Generally, **1:44**

Interference, **3:28**

INITIAL BURDEN TO SHOW

Summary judgment, **22:18**

INITIAL CONSIDERATION OF EVIDENCE

Preliminary injunction, **8:2**

INJUNCTIONS

Generally, **1:240; 2:189; 5:8; 5:125; 11:28; 13:136; 16:19; 16:142; 18:14**

Anti-suit injunction, **19:239**

Appealability of interlocutory order having injunction effect, **7:21; 13:219**

Biosimilar products, **1:291**

Broad discretion, **10:23**

Broadening scope, **19:48**

Claim construction, **20:149**

Claims must be construed same way, **23:11**

Communication regarding rights, **7:92**

Considerations involved, **19:49**

Contempt, **1:156; 1:234; 2:119; 5:119; 11:17; 14:69; 16:25**

Damages, **1:20; 1:262**

Design, **20:15**

Discretion, broad discretion, **10:23**

Discretionary, **2:157; 15:14**

Extraterritorial, **9:271**

FRAP 38, **16:29**

FRCP 60(b), **1:173; 23:23**

FRCP 65, **7:3**

FRCP 65(d), **1:53; 5:4**

Inconsistency, **16:5**

Increased damages award, **16:5**

INJUNCTIONS—Cont’d

Induced infringement, **22:59**

Interlocutory decision, **12:41; 16:116**

Irreparable Harm or Injury (this index)

Jurisdiction, **1:234; 19:9; 22:50; 22:59**

Jury trial, **20:55**

Licenses, **22:37**

Means-plus-function, **20:149**

Non-parties, **1:75**

Party enjoined, **16:5**

Patent misuse, **23:9**

Permanent injunction, **1:308; 5:110; 12:88; 19:329**

Preliminary Injunction (this index)

Res judicata, continuing conduct, **1:229**

Review, standard of, **3:56; 15:6**

Same parties and same issues requirement, **9:116**

Sec. 112, **1:304; 19:4**

Sec. 271(e)(1), **5:3; 5:13**

Sec. 283, **10:17; 18:18**

Sec. 337, **19:222**

Sec. 1292(a)(1), **23:13**

Stay, **5:2; 9:91**

Tailoring permanent injunction, **5:110**

Territoriality of U.S. patent laws, **13:181**

Third parties, **1:296**

Willful infringement, **9:323; 16:5**

Written description, **22:59**

INJURY

Standing, **3:177; 4:116**

Standing criteria, **1:45; 4:116**

INLAND DIAMOND PRODUCTS CO. V. CHERRY OPTICAL INC.

2025, **9:539**

INLINE PLASTICS CORP. V. LACERTA GROUP, LLC

2024, **9:526**

INNOVATION

Obviousness, **18:15**

INOPERABLE

Utility, **5:56**

INOPERATIVE

Enablement, **9:222**

Utility, **9:222**

INOPERATIVE EMBODIMENTS

Enablement, **3:103**

INDEX

INOPERATIVENESS

Enablement, lack of, **14:12**
Utility, lack of, **6:9**

IN PERSONAM

Personal Jurisdiction (this index)

INQUIRE, DUTY TO

Patent ambiguity doctrine, **3:48**

IN RE: CELLECT, LLC

2023, **9:516**

IN RE COUVARAS

2023, **9:517**

IN RE ENTRESTO

2025, **9:531**

IN RE FLOAT ‘N’ GRILL LLC

2023, **9:518**

IN RE FOREST

2025, **9:532**

IN RE GESTURE TECHNOLOGY PARTNERS, LLC

2025, **9:533**

IN RE GOOGLE LLC

2023, **9:519**

IN RE KOSTIC

2025, **9:534**

IN RE PERSONALWEB TECHNOLOGIES LLC

2023, **9:520**

IN RE RIGGS

2025, **9:535**

IN RE STINGRAY IP SOLUTIONS, LLC

2023, **9:521**

IN RE XENCOR, INC.

2025, **9:536**

INSPECTION

Generally, **16:15**
Concept, no claim on, **16:15**
Doctrine of equivalents, **16:15**
Elements, interchangeability of elements, **16:15**
Essence, **16:15**
Heart of invention, **16:15**
In camera document inspection, **17:3**

INSPECTION—Cont’d

Interchangeability of elements, **16:15**
Pioneer invention, **16:15**

INSTITUTION

Inter partes review, **1:328**

INSTRUCTIONAL LIMITATION

Sec. 101, printed matter, **11:64**

INSTRUCTIONAL MANUAL

Template, claimed invention used as, **9:123**

INSTRUCTIONS TO JURY

Jury Instructions (this index)

INSUBSTANTIAL DIFFERENCES

Doctrine of equivalents, **1:84; 2:101; 3:86; 4:62; 5:30; 9:225; 15:16 to 15:18; 19:97; 19:135; 20:57; 23:41; 26:6**
Equivalence, **1:93**
Equivalency, **19:114**

INSURANCE POLICY

Choice of law, **21:31**

INTEGRAL

Generally, **8:58; 9:199**

INTEGRATION

Parol evidence, **13:76**

INTEL CORPORATION V. PACT XPP SCHWEIZ AG

2023, **9:524**

INTELLECTUAL TECH LLC V. ZEBRA TECHNOLOGIES CORPORATION

2024, **9:527**

INTENT

All facts and circumstances considered, **11:13**
Bright-line test, **6:23**
Broadened reissue, **9:109**
But one factor for rejecting, **9:39**
Claim preamble, **1:103; 2:101; 9:79**
Deceive. Intent to Deceive (this index)
Dedication to public of unclaimed subject matter, **20:74**
Direct infringement, **9:118**
Disclosure, duty of, **12:52**
Fraud, **6:28**

INTENT—Cont'd

Implicates inequitable conduct, **4:54**
 Inducement, **1:133; 7:88; 13:135; 19:217**
 Inequitable conduct, **1:169; 2:33; 2:68; 4:54; 5:16; 6:4; 6:5; 7:34; 7:46; 9:378; 13:19; 13:91; 13:141; 16:32; 20:25**
 Infringement, direct, **9:118**
 Jurisdiction, **3:27**
 Materiality, **12:93; 14:19**
 Mislead. Intent to Mislead (this index)
 Performance of government contract, **8:8**
 PTO, **7:19; 9:43**
 Reduction to practice, **13:72**
 References, **12:43**
 Rejection, **9:39**
 Sec. 102(g), **11:9**
 Sec. 282, **12:5**
 Sec. 285, **5:14**
 Statutory construction, **7:24; 7:55; 8:39; 8:45; 13:60**
 Willful infringement, **18:14**
 Written agreement is executed, **23:21**

INTENT TO DECEIVE

Generally, **11:58**
 Affidavit ipso facto material, **18:37**
 Clear and convincing evidence, **1:187**
 Coinventors, **1:106**
 Conjecture alone does not show intent to deceive, **9:125**
 Deception, specific intent to deceive, **6:28**
 Inequitable conduct, **1:178; 1:180; 1:187; 3:98; 5:87; 8:42; 11:23; 12:85; 15:42; 19:208**
 Inferred, can be, **13:69**
 Misrepresentation, **6:28**
 Negligence, **19:59**

INTENT TO MISLEAD

Generally, **13:80**
 Culpability. inferential culpability doctrine, **20:35**
 Disclosure, **8:51; 14:19**
 Factors involved, **3:72**
 Gross negligence alone insufficient, **2:68**
 Inference, not inferred solely from information not disclosed, **8:51**

INTENT TO MISLEAD—Cont'd

Inferential culpability doctrine, **20:35**
 Materiality, **12:30; 12:43**
 Mere denial, sufficiency thereof, **19:128**
 Not inferred solely from information not disclosed, **8:51**

INTERCHANGEABILITY

Generally, **8:47**
 Doctrine of equivalents, **13:91**
 Equivalent device, not necessarily, **11:22**
 Hardware and software, **15:16**
 Inspection of patentee's product, **16:15**

INTEREST OF JUSTICE

Sec. 1651, **3:14**

INTEREST RATE

Generally, **4:6**

INTERFERENCE

Generally, **2:118; 4:11; 4:21; 4:132; 8:67; 9:163; 9:198; 13:10; 13:105; 15:1; 18:124; 19:10; 19:149**
 Abuse of discretion, permissive rules reviewed for, **5:68**
 Actual reduction to practice, evidence of, **14:3**
 Administrative Procedure Act, **9:263**
 Affidavit describing work of third party at reasonably contemporaneous time, **9:23**
 All issues of patentability and priority decided in one proceeding, **16:16**
 Already known, no teaching required of what is, **3:6**
 Ancillary to priority, **13:31; 16:16**
 Animal testing, **3:28**
 Anticipation, **3:32**
 Appeal and review, **4:11; 5:68; 7:26; 7:74; 12:99; 13:119**
 Art class, examiner's search of, **4:21**
 Best mode, **4:8; 13:3**
 Board has no authority to dissolve interference, **16:7**
 Broadest interpretation, **9:88**
 Broadest reasonable interpretation, **18:56**
 Burden, junior party's burden, **15:1; 19:70**
 Burden of proof, **2:47; 2:107; 4:8; 5:52; 13:31; 16:36**

INDEX

INTERFERENCE—Cont'd

Burden to show date of invention, senior party's, **2:96**
Challenges, **13:3**
Chemical case, **3:28**
Chemical compound, **15:1**
Civil action, **18:49; 19:232**
Claim construction and interpretation, **1:5; 1:182; 2:172; 9:88**
Clearly erroneous standard, reviewed under, **4:11**
Conception, **3:15; 9:244; 15:1; 19:240**
Construction and interpretation, **7:49; 7:74; 9:130**
Continued, proceeding not to be, **13:31**
Co-pending application, standard of proof for, **2:70**
Copies, **3:92; 4:8**
Counts, **7:49; 7:74; 9:49; 9:88; 9:141; 9:230; 13:31; 19:151**
Dates, effective filing dates, **8:122; 19:144**
Default judgment awards, **1:60**
Delay, long delay in filing, **16:9**
Delusion to cite sentence as precedent, **3:6**
Derivation, **4:11**
Disclaimer, statutory, **7:45**
Disclosure, **3:25; 7:13**
Discretion of Commissioner to declare, **2:67**
Dissolve, motion to, **16:7**
"Each and every" limitation, **25:11**
Early disclosure of inventions, **7:13**
Effective filing dates, **8:122; 19:144**
Enablement, **3:28; 4:8; 13:3**
Estoppel
 judgment, by, broadest interpretation, **23:14**
 section 141, **2:165**
 section 146, **2:165**
Evidence, **2:70; 14:3**
Examiner's search of art class, **4:21**
Expired patent, **7:102**
Fact question, **3:32; 4:8**
Filing, long delay in filing, **16:9**
Filing date, **6:20; 8:122; 19:144; 19:164**
Findings, **4:11; 7:48**
Foreign countries, **6:20**
Fraud, **4:21**
Futility, exercise in, **13:31**

INTERFERENCE—Cont'd

Future use of non-contested priority in civil action, **18:49**
Genus, **9:88**
Grammatical structure and syntax, **1:117**
How to make, **13:3**
Hybrid nature, **3:6**
Implicates inequitable conduct, **4:54**
Incorporation by reference, **8:113; 8:119**
Inducing infringement, **18:48**
Inequitable conduct, **4:21; 4:54**
In vivo, **3:28**
Interpretation thereof, **9:130**
Inurement, **3:94**
Inventorship, **3:15; 19:109**
Inventorship proof, **5:73**
Joint inventors deemed single party, **4:31**
Joint vs. sole inventorship, **19:72**
Junior party's burden, **15:1; 19:70**
Lapse, procedural, **5:57**
Late claiming, **3:25**
Law question, **4:8**
Long delay in filing, **16:9**
Lost count, **9:88**
Motions, untimely challenges not raised during motions period, **13:3**
Motion to dissolve, **16:7**
Necessary findings must be expressed with sufficient particularity, **7:48**
New Interference Rules (this index)
New practice, **16:16**
New rules. New Interference Rules (this index)
Obviousness, **18:89**
Overlapping dates, **3:54**
Particularity, **7:48**
Patentability, **9:230; 16:16; 18:44; 23:44**
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), **7:102**
Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT), **6:66**
Pending applications, **13:31**
Permissive rules reviewed for abuse of discretion, **5:68**
Phantom count, **9:49**
Physical embodiment must meet every limitation of count, **3:25**
Preamble, **4:8**
Pre-critical date claiming, **16:132**

INTERFERENCE—Cont'd

Preliminary statement with two distinct nonoverlapping dates, **3:54**
 Prima facie case of priority, **7:13**
 Priority, **2:107; 3:6; 3:82; 6:20; 7:13; 7:100; 8:30; 8:78; 9:88; 11:65; 13:31; 15:1; 16:16; 18:49; 19:90; 19:240**
 Prior possession of invention vitiates any contention, **4:11**
 Procedural lapse, **5:57**
 Production specifications, not, **4:8**
 Provocation, **18:88**
 Public disclosure, **3:25**
 Public policy, **7:13**
 Raisable against patent in interference, **13:3**
 Raising issues, **13:3**
 Reasonable diligence, **2:13**
 Reduction to practice, **3:25; 12:2; 14:3**
 Reexamination v. litigation, **4:8**
 Review, standard of, **5:46**
 Sec. 1.633(g), **11:27**
 Sec. 1.640, **3:32**
 Sec. 1.662(b), **7:23**
 Sec. 13(b), **2:93**
 Sec. 102(b), **25:11**
 Sec. 112, **3:6; 3:28**
 Sec. 135(b)(1), **1:220**
 Sec. 135(c), **3:29**
 Sec. 136, **4:27**
 Sec. 146, **1:42; 3:6; 3:53**
 Sec. 146 appeal, **7:26**
 Sec. 291, **1:11; 7:102; 11:23; 19:149**
 Sec. 1346(b), **3:6**
 Sec. 2201, **13:41**
 Senior party, **2:96; 15:1**
 Specifications, **1:182; 2:172; 4:8; 19:151**
 Stated time period, acts within, **15:1**
 Statutory disclaimer, **7:45**
 Subsequent litigation, effect of prior interference on, **2:36**
 Sufficiency of disclosure, **3:25**
 Third party inventorship, **3:6**
 Tie, if, **15:1**
 Timeliness, **16:132**
 Time period, acts within, **15:1**
 Underlying facts found by Board, **4:11**
 Utility, **6:33**

INTERFERENCE—Cont'd

Warranty, breach of, **1:58**
 Withdrawal, **9:217**
 Written description, **1:182; 2:172; 7:123; 11:65; 18:88; 25:11**

INTERLOCUTORY

Escrow, **3:21**

INTERLOCUTORY APPEAL

Collateral order doctrine, **4:129**
 Jurisdiction, **16:184**
 Sec. 1292(b), **10:43; 14:9**
 Sec. 1292(c)(2), **9:6; 13:61**

INTERLOCUTORY DECISION

Cohen tripartite test, **19:71**
 Preliminary injunction when seeking permanent injunction, **12:41**

INTERLOCUTORY ORDER

Generally, **7:21**
 Appealability, **17:3; 18:75; 20:5**
 CAFC jurisdiction, **5:85; 13:219**
 CAFC jurisdiction limited, **13:219; 22:2**
 Leave to file counterclaim, **2:43**
 Preliminary injunction, **11:19**
 Question certified, not confined to precise, **21:24**
 Sec. 1292(a)(1), **16:116; 18:16; 23:13**
 Sec. 1292(b), **9:97**
 Sec. 1292(c)(1), **16:116**
 Sec. 1292(c)(2), **10:12**
 Stay order, **19:230**

INTERLOCUTORY PARTIAL JUDGMENT

Appealability, **7:16**

INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS MACHINES CORPORATION V. ZILLOW GROUP, INC.

2025, **9:540**

INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

Generally, **6:56; 6:63; 11:54; 22:28**
 Access by party's in-house counsel to proprietary information of its competitor, **13:40**
 Anticipation, **1:17; 1:238**
 Appeal and review, **1:129; 1:254; 3:191; 6:2; 7:104; 7:105; 19:25**
 Arbitration, **9:380**

INDEX

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

COMMISSION—Cont'd

Articles, **19:280**
Attorneys, **13:40; 23:55**
Burden of proof, **19:25**
CAFC jurisdiction, **1:15**
Choice of remedy, **3:198**
Claim construction and interpretation, **5:98; 9:513; 12:87; 19:196**
Collateral estoppel, **20:41**
Competitors, **13:40**
Consent order, **4:108**
Contract law, **13:20**
Criticality, **1:17**
Deference, entitled to, **5:37**
Dismissal, prior, **25:2**
Domestic disclosure communication, **1:224**
Domestic industry, **2:200; 12:105**
Enforcement proceedings, **22:29**
Entitled to deference, **5:37**
Estoppel to assert patent, **25:2**
Evidence, **2:117; 8:28; 10:27; 23:55**
Exclusions, **8:28; 9:118; 19:221; 19:222**
Factual findings, **1:10; 3:225; 8:28**
FDCA, **1:332**
Foreign law, **13:20**
Infringement, **1:17; 3:198; 5:98; 25:2**
Initial determination, appeal and review, **1:254**
Invalidity, **13:242**
Inventor's admission of invention by another, **1:8**
Issue preclusion, **2:17**
Jurisdiction, **1:332; 3:183**
Law question, **13:20**
License agreement, **9:379; 20:53**
Limited exclusion order, **8:28**
Modification of orders, **3:73**
Mootness during appeal, **20:6**
New and surprising result, **1:17**
Orders, modification of, **3:73**
Parties, purpose of, **13:20**
Penalties, **4:130; 14:65; 15:52**
Pendency, appeal pendency, **19:25**
Presumption of validity, **19:25**
Prior dismissal of earlier infringement suit, effect of, **25:2**
Process patents, **1:184**

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

COMMISSION—Cont'd

Rescission, **4:130**
Requirements, **25:2**
Review, standard of, **3:59; 7:52; 8:28; 8:86; 19:25**
Review of initial determinations on matters other than temporary relief, **7:105**
Sec. 102(g) prior invention under pre-AIA law, **1:224**
Sec. 211.54(a), **1:15**
Sec. 271(e)(1) exempt purpose, **1:184**
Sec. 282, **19:25**
Sec. 337, **1:15; 2:12; 3:23; 5:98; 12:5; 18:26; 19:25; 20:105; 21:64**
Sec. 337(a), **1:39**
Sec. 337(c), **6:14**
Sec. 1337, **3:154; 25:2**
Sec. 1337(c), **8:28**
Sec. 1337(d), **8:28**
Sec. 1337(e), **8:28**
Self-initiated investigation, terminating, **2:17**
Standard of review, **2:117**
Substantial evidence, **2:117; 8:28**
Summary determination, **8:58**
Tariff Act, **13:11**
37 CFR Sec. 1.321, **13:20**
Validity, **19:25**

INTERNET

Abstract ideas, Sec. 101, **1:285; 9:437; 13:188**

INTER PARTES REEXAMINATION

CAFC, **18:103**
Jurisdiction of Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, **2:150**
Subpoena, **1:232**
Third parties, **3:138**

INTER PARTES REVIEW

Generally, **1:266; 1:268; 1:316; 1:339; 1:349 to 1:351; 1:354; 2:176; 2:194; 3:234; 3:238; 3:242; 4:119; 6:95; 7:132; 9:401; 9:441; 9:443; 13:199; 13:203; 13:252; 15:54; 16:146; 16:179; 19:291; 19:308; 19:338; 21:84; 23:95**
Administrative agencies, **19:282**
Amendment of claims, **1:305; 1:371; 3:237; 8:164**

INTER PARTES REVIEW—Cont'd

America Invents Act, **19:282**
 Anticipation, **5:139; 11:80; 11:81; 23:86**
 Broadest reasonable interpretation, **3:201; 4:112; 9:400; 9:448; 17:13**
 Burden of proof, **1:305**
 Cancellation of claims
 generally, **16:154**
 motion to amend to request, **14:78**
 Claim construction, **1:328; 8:149; 9:489**
 Claims, amendment of, **1:305**
 Conception, **1:323**
 Conception and reduction to practice, **18:110**
 Consolidation, **19:284**
 Constitutionality, **13:246.50; 19:325**
 Contested cases, **1:232; 13:213**
 Deposition, **1:338**
 Disclaimers, **1:326; 1:327**
 Discontinue, **13:213**
 Errors, **12:120**
 Estoppel, **1:345**
 Expiration of patent, **9:424**
 Incorporation by reference, **4:122**
 Indefiniteness, **19:323**
 Institute review, **8:143**
 Institution, **1:328; 9:469**
 Joinder, **6:104; 14:86**
 Jurisdiction to review, **9:425**
 Mandamus, **9:385; 9:469; 9:498.70**
 Multiple proceedings, **9:512**
 Obviousness, **1:278; 1:295; 1:321; 1:326; 2:173; 3:201; 4:123; 5:134; 5:135; 5:139; 8:139; 9:418; 9:426; 9:428; 13:222; 14:99; 16:166; 19:334; 22:56**
 Party in interest, **1:324; 23:97**
 Patent and trademark office (PTO), **19:282**
 Potential claim unpatentable, **8:142**
 Privity, **23:86; 23:94**
 Proposed substitute claims, **9:418**
 Ranges, **5:134**
 Rehearing en banc, **13:214**
 Review proceedings, **7:119**
 Sanctions, **2:174; 3:237**
 Sec. 101, **14:99**
 Sec. 120, **4:122**
 Sec. 314, **8:143; 19:260**

INTER PARTES REVIEW—Cont'd

Sec. 314(d), **8:143; 9:390; 9:418**
 Sec. 315(b), **1:324**
 Sec. 316(a)(3), **21:74**
 Sovereign immunity, **19:305**
 Standard of review, **9:418**
 Standing, **1:345; 1:361; 10:50; 16:157**
 Substitution of claims, **9:421**
 Supplemental information, **21:74**
 Takings, **3:228; 3:231**
 Third-party petition, **3:194**
 Time barred, **12:115; 23:94**
 28 USC § 1295, **1:327**
 Unpatentable claims, **2:173; 16:152**
 Validity of claims, **4:114**
 Written description, **11:80; 13:252**

INTERPRETATION

Generally. Construction and Interpretation (this index)
 Claim Construction and Interpretation (this index)

INTERRELATIONSHIP OF ISSUES

Defenses, **20:5**

INTERROGATORIES

CAFC, **18:3**
 Contention interrogatories, **23:76**
 Directed to facts, **23:7**
 JNOV, **23:4**
 Obviousness, **5:7**
 Special Interrogatories (this index)

INTERVENING RIGHTS

Indefiniteness, **16:161**
 Protection of investments, **10:51**

INTERVENTION

Generally, **23:26**
 Absolute intervening rights, **13:168; 19:137**
 Amicus curiae, **9:67**
 Enhanced damages, **21:3**
 Ex parte reexamination, **13:176**
 FRCP 24, **3:38**
 FRCP 24(b), **8:36**
 Motion, **1:68**
 Patent misuse, **23:9**

INTESTACY

Ownership, **1:172**

INDEX

INTRINSIC EVIDENCE

Claim construction and interpretation,
1:140; 5:53; 11:40; 16:53; 16:58;
18:51; 19:111; 19:115; 20:117

INTRINSIC RECORD

Claim interpretation, **11:53; 22:31**

INUREMENT

Generally, **3:82; 7:64**
Corroboration, **14:83**
Derivation, **3:82**
Interference, **3:94**
Requirements, **3:94**

INVALIDITY

Validity (this index)

INVENTION SECRECY ACT

Claim against government, **8:116**
Sec. 183 use of invention, **8:117**

INVENTIVE CONCEPT

Generally, **1:355**

INVENTOR

Generally, **6:10; 19:62**
Analogous art, **19:36**
Attorney fee award, **8:18**
CAFC jurisdiction, **9:63**
Claim differentiation, **6:10**
Combinations, **6:10**
Construed by those skilled in art, **6:10**
Corroboration, need for, **8:30**
Design patent, **8:81**
Disavowal of feature, **16:151**
Disclosure, **1:8**
Discovery of new property or use of
known composition, **9:104**
Feature, disavowal of, **16:151**
File wrapper, **6:10**
First inventor, Sec. 102(a)(2), **7:98**
Infringement, literal, **6:10**
ITC, **1:8**
Jury verdict, **19:5**
Literal infringement, **6:10**
Presumption, none, **1:8**
Prima facie obviousness, **9:17**
Prior art under Sec. 102(g) and Sec. 103,
1:8
Public use, **14:36**
Rebuttal, **1:8**
Reissue, **9:84**

INVENTOR—Cont'd

Scientific principles, **6:10**
Sec. 282, **1:8**
Sec. 337, **1:8**
Skilled in art, construed by those, **6:10;**
20:126
Testimony, **8:106**

INVENTORSHIP

Generally, **2:194; 2:201; 3:215; 4:74;**
4:126; 5:73; 5:148; 7:79; 7:110;
7:143; 20:159
Appeal and review, **21:42**
Claim preamble, **19:210**
Conception, **2:99; 2:164; 6:35; 19:72;**
19:195; 20:126; 21:55
Concerned party, **3:93**
Contribution, **6:50**
Correction, **6:35; 6:79; 16:131; 19:195;**
19:218; 20:68
Corroborating evidence, **19:132; 21:42**
Declaratory judgment, **12:86**
Deference, **21:42**
Disclosure to public, **6:83**
Doctrine of equivalents, **4:125**
Eleventh Amendment, **24:3**
Equitable estoppel, **6:103**
Evidence, **19:132; 21:42**
False statements, **16:61**
Good faith error, **3:59**
Inequitable conduct, **16:48**
Infringement, **4:125**
Interference, **3:15; 5:73; 19:72; 19:109**
Joint inventor, **8:81; 22:54**
Laches or delay, **16:131**
Large number of individuals, **3:76**
Law question, **1:106; 3:83**
Means-plus claim, **23:55**
Nonjoinder, **14:59; 16:50**
Ownership, **5:40**
Presumption that correct, **6:35**
Private right of action, challenge, **8:115**
Provisional application, **5:88**
Reissue, **3:83**
Review, standard of, **5:40**
Sec. 102(b), **19:7**
Sec. 256, **12:86**
Standing, **19:272**
Third party, filed in name of, **1:102**
Touchstone, conception is, **2:99**
Unclean hands doctrine, **16:131**

INVENTORSHIP—Cont’d
Willful infringement, **2:164**

INVITED ERROR
JNOV, **23:4**

INVOCATION
Means-plus-function claim, **3:66; 25:3**

IOENGINE, LLC V. INGENICO INC.
2024, **9:528**

IPSISSIMIS VERBIS TEST
Anticipation, **1:10**

IQE PLC V. NEWPORT FAB, LLC
2025, **9:541**

IQRIS TECHNOLOGIES LLC V. POINT BLANK ENTERPRISES, INC.
2025, **9:542**

IRONBURG INVENTIONS LTD. V. VALVE CORPORATION
2023, **9:525**

IRREPARABLE HARM OR INJURY
Evidence, **18:26**
License, **8:46**
Permanent injunction, **4:102; 7:122; 18:93**
Preliminary injunction, **1:169; 1:225; 3:34; 18:21; 19:14**
Presumption, **1:110; 14:9; 18:32; 19:94**
Procedural issue, **8:21**

IS OBVIOUS
Combination, **18:22**
Findings prepared by prevailing party, **18:22**
Improper, **18:22**
Patentable, **18:22**

ISOLATED DNA MOLECULES
Patentability, **1:228; 9:383**
Subject matter jurisdiction, **1:214**

ISOLATION
Claims do not live in, **11:11**

ISSUANCE
Judicial notice, **8:40**
Preliminary injunctions, standard for issuance, **11:67**
Reexamination, **9:239**

ISSUANCE—Cont’d
Reissue (this index)
Sec. 283, **18:18**

ISSUE DATE
Sec. 112, **9:53**
Sec. 153, **5:17**

ISSUE FEE
Small entity, **4:52**

ISSUE JURISDICTION
Generally, **20:34**

ISSUE PRECLUSION
Collateral Estoppel (this index)

ITC
International Trade Commission (this index)

“IT WOULD BE OBVIOUS”
Verbatim findings of counsel adopted, **8:22**

JANSSEN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC. V. TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC.
2024, **10:55**
2025, **10:56**

“JAWBONING” AT LICENSING NEGOTIATIONS
Generally, **19:61**

JAZZ PHARMACEUTICALS, INC. V. AVADEL CNS PHARMACEUTICALS, LLC
2025, **10:54**

JEPSON CLAIM
Generally, **5:28; 11:40; 13:15; 18:44**
Claim preamble, **5:63**
Copying while lauding prior art, **13:15**

JIAXING SUPER LIGHTING ELECTRIC APPLIANCE, CO., LTD. V. CH LIGHTING TECHNOLOGY CO., LTD
2025, **10:58**

JMOL
Judgment as Matter of Law (this index)

JNOV
Judgment Notwithstanding Verdict (JNOV) (this index)

INDEX

JOINDER

America Invents Act, **9:359**
Choice of law, **9:268**
FRCP 19, **9:71**
FRCP 19(a), **11:19; 19:264**
Inter partes review, **14:86**
Inventorship, **16:50**
Involuntary plaintiff, **9:302; 14:9; 15:9**
Owner, **19:194**
Sovereign immunity, **7:134**

JOINED

Generally, **7:49**

JOINT DEVELOPMENT EXCEPTION

On-sale bar, **2:23**

JOINT INFRINGEMENT

Claim construction, **1:195**
Control or direction over process,
13:159; 13:160
FRCP 12(b), **12:112**
Performance of different steps by each
infringer, **2:124**

JOINT INVENTORS

Generally, **16:48**
Collaboration required, **5:40; 6:35;**
22:39
Deceptive intent, **1:106**
Freedom to license, **19:98**
Interference, **4:31**
Inventorship, **8:81; 22:54**
License, freedom to license, **19:98**
Non-joinder, **14:59**
On-sale bar, **2:85**
Ownership, **9:303**
Physically work together or at same
time, **20:68**
Presumption named properly, **7:79**
Requirements, **16:50**
Same time, **20:68**
Scope of claims first, **5:73**
Sec. 116, **22:39**
Sec. 256, **22:54**
Sec. 262, **8:5**

JOINT INVENTORSHIP

Interference, **19:72**
Sec. 116, **2:48**

JOINT LIABILITY

Attorney fee award, **8:18**

JOINT MOTION TO DISMISS

Vacation of lower court decision, **20:95**

JOINT MOTION TO VACATE

JUDGMENTS BELOW

Settlement agreement, **21:22**

JOINT VENTURES

Patent misuse, research joint ventures,
16:126

JPML

Judicial Panel on Multi-District Litiga-
tion (this index)

JUDGE

CAFC, **18:3**
Claim interpretation, **5:36**
Disqualification, **1:65; 16:19**
Fact finding, **10:15**
Improper, **16:25**
Judicial disqualification, **16:19**
Presumed jury fact findings, **10:15**
Qualification, judicial, **16:19**
Recusal, **1:65**
Sec. 284, **2:31**
Sec. 455, **8:14**
Weight and credibility of testimony,
19:54

JUDGMENT AS MATTER OF LAW (JMOL)

Generally, **3:106; 5:54; 5:65; 5:71;**
6:62; 9:237; 12:72; 13:99; 13:100;
13:103; 13:105; 13:118; 13:122;
14:45; 16:86; 18:41; 18:58; 18:64;
18:70; 19:123; 19:166; 20:52;
20:63; 20:81; 21:44; 22:23; 23:56;
25:7; 26:11
Anticipation, **23:87**
Appropriate, when, **3:75; 12:43; 13:64**
Choice of law, **2:91; 19:137**
Claim interpretation, **21:39**
Discretion of court, **26:9**
Doctrine of equivalents, **5:44**
Evidence, effect of, **19:126**
Experimental use, **5:50**
FRCP 50(a), **2:34; 2:48; 13:194**
FRCP 50(a)(1), **16:106**
FRCP 50(b), **13:54**
Jury findings, **2:45**
Jury verdict, **11:28**
Method claims, **13:195**

**JUDGMENT AS MATTER OF LAW
(JMOL)—Cont'd**

Motion, **1:101; 13:54; 13:64; 13:194**
 New construction, **8:84**
 Obviousness, **1:171; 1:178; 2:136**
 Prevailing party, **3:161**
 Raising issues, **8:84**
 Reissue, **4:64**
 Review, standard of, **2:91; 3:96; 5:21; 5:30; 6:46; 12:45; 12:61; 13:75; 13:85; 13:101; 14:21; 14:25; 18:62; 20:41**
 Substantial evidence, **10:40**
 Wide discretion to trial judge, **26:9**

**JUDGMENT NOTWITHSTANDING
VERDICT (JNOV)**

Appeal and review
 generally, **13:38; 21:5; 22:4**
 standard of review
 generally, **4:2; 12:31; 22:2**
 motion, **6:36; 9:186; 13:13; 13:34; 19:12**
 new trial motions, **19:60**
 Attorney arguments, **23:4**
 Co-owners' right to relief, **23:4**
 Counsel arguments, **23:4**
 Cross-appeal, **22:4**
 Damages, **23:4**
 Directed verdict, **22:4**
 Evidence rules, **13:4**
 Fact, infringement mixed fact-law question, **22:4**
 FRCP 50(b), **23:25**
 Frivolous appeal, **22:4**
 Harmful error, **22:4**
 Infringement mixed fact-law question, **22:4**
 Instructions, **23:4**
 Interrogatories, **23:4**
 Invited error, **23:4**
 Jury and jury trials, **1:14; 19:7; 19:16; 23:17**
 Jury findings, **18:29**
 Jury instruction, **22:2**
 Jury verdict, **3:17; 13:17; 19:56; 20:15**
 Law, infringement mixed fact-law question, **22:4**
 Law question, **13:38**
 Means-plus-function claim language, **4:4**

**JUDGMENT NOTWITHSTANDING
VERDICT (JNOV)—Cont'd**

Motion
 generally, **19:37; 23:7**
 Altwater, **6:6**
 best mode, **13:13**
 claim ambiguity, **13:13**
 claim construction, **6:6**
 Court error, **6:6**
 directed verdict, **4:32; 19:41**
 evidence, **6:6; 13:13; 25:4**
 extrinsic evidence, **13:13**
 fact question, **13:13**
 fair, **6:6**
 FRCP 50(b), **1:43**
 infringement, **6:6**
 jury and jury trials, **9:125; 13:39**
 jury instruction, **6:6**
 jury verdict, **5:7**
 limitations and restrictions, **13:13**
 nonasserted claims, **6:6**
 objection, timely, **6:6**
 perfect, not, **6:6**
 review, standard of, **6:36; 9:186; 13:34; 19:12**
 review limited to sufficiency of evidence, **13:13**
 same meaning, words to be given, **13:13**
 substantial evidence, **6:6**
 substantial rights must be affected, **6:6**
 timely objection, **6:6**
 verdict, **16:14**
 New trial, **4:4; 13:4; 19:16; 23:4**
 Objections, **22:2; 23:4**
 Obviousness, **13:38; 20:15**
 Post-trial motions, **1:50**
 Presumption of validity, **22:2**
 Prevailing party, **22:4**
 Procedural, **13:4**
 Sec. 112 equivalent, **4:4**
 Sec. 284, **23:4**
 Submission, **23:4**
 Substantial evidence, **15:2**
 Summary judgment, **10:4**
 Timely objection, **22:2**
 Validity, presumption of validity, **22:2**

JUDGMENTS

Generally, **19:171**

INDEX

JUDGMENTS—Cont'd

- See also Orders (this index)
- Adding party, **15:13**
- Affirmed on any ground supported by record, **19:86**
- Appealability (this index)
- Appeal and Review (this index)
- Appropriate, when, **14:13**
- Assignor estoppel doctrine, **19:47**
- Choice of law, **19:95**
- Claim interpretation, **19:16**
- Considerations involved, **19:49**
- Cross-appeal to reverse validity or infringement, **18:2**
- Dann Amendment, **19:30**
- Doctrine of equivalents, **5:6**
- Enforcement, court's power, **1:83**
- Exceptional case, **16:59**
- FRCP 50, **7:27**
- FRCP 54, **6:16**
- FRCP 59(e), **19:42**
- FRCP 60(b), **1:29; 13:59**
- Interference estoppel by judgment, **23:14**
- Judgment as Matter of Law (JMOL) (this index)
- Judgment Notwithstanding Verdict (JNOV) (this index)
- No form of words necessary, **16:74**
- Opinions or findings, **19:42**
- Settlement agreement, **21:22**
- Special master's decision, **13:24**
- State court decision, **19:45**
- Vacation of Judgments (this index)
- Validity, **2:169; 14:1**
- Verdict, **16:14**

JUDICIAL BIAS

- Generally, **16:29**

JUDICIAL CAPACITY

- Issue preclusion, **20:41**

JUDICIAL DECISION

- Retroactive application, **23:33**

JUDICIAL ERROR

- Article III, **19:55**

JUDICIAL ESTOPPEL

- Generally, **2:116; 4:43; 11:43; 12:3; 13:122; 14:30; 19:169; 21:24; 23:3**

JUDICIAL ESTOPPEL—Cont'd

- Choice of law, **21:24**
- Enforceability of unexecuted settlement agreement, **23:21**

JUDICIAL FUNCTION

- Judicial legislation, **5:3**

JUDICIAL INQUIRY

- Unambiguous, if language of statute is, **23:29**

JUDICIAL LEGISLATION

- Judicial function, **5:3**

JUDICIAL NOTICE

- Generally, **9:139**
- Delivery, **11:24**
- Everyday mechanical concepts, **9:127**
- Issued patent, **8:40**
- Mail delivery, **11:24**
- Mechanical concepts, everyday, **9:127**
- MPEP, **9:374**
- Proper subject matter, **6:10**
- Stay of execution of judgment and injunction pending appeal, **19:49**
- Time required for mail delivery, **11:24**

JUDICIAL PANEL ON MULTI-DISTRICT LITIGATION (JPML)

- Generally, **7:6**
- Consent, parties cannot confer by, **7:6**
- Consolidated pretrial proceedings governed by Sec. 1407(a), **7:6**
- Jurisdiction, transfer divests, **7:6**
- Sec. 1651, **9:128**
- Transfer divests jurisdiction, **7:6**

JUDICIAL POWER

- Generally, **3:57**

JUDICIAL REDRAFTING

- Summary judgment, **2:29**

JUDICIAL REVIEW

- Proper respondent, **19:89**
- Restriction of access to, **1:72**

JUNIOR PARTY'S BURDEN

- Interference, **15:1; 19:70**

JURISDICTION

- Generally, **1:281; 1:352; 2:197; 3:121; 8:144; 11:74; 13:248; 16:184;**

JURISDICTION—Cont'd

19:155; 19:337; 20:83; 21:89;
22:53
Accounting remains only, 16:72
Adversariness, lack of, 7:8
Agreement depriving court, 21:14
ANDA, 1:135; 3:132
Antitrust claims, 3:69
Appellate Jurisdiction (this index)
Arising under, 3:27
 constitutionality, 13:191
Assumption that party will establish
 contested, 4:44
Bankruptcy court, 9:213
Board of Patent Appeals and Interfer-
 ences, 2:150
Case jurisdiction, issue jurisdiction
 versus, 20:34
Challenge to PTO determination in
 reexamination proceeding, 19:46
Claims not asserted by patentee, 23:26
Complaint, determined at time filed,
 7:38; 13:59; 19:66
Constitutionality, 13:191; 18:34
Contempt, 1:263
Counterclaim, 4:57; 7:73
Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit
 (CAFC) (this index)
Covenant not to sue, 18:81
Declaratory judgment, 1:27; 2:122;
 8:109; 13:194; 19:192; 23:9
Design in public domain, 12:48
Discretion of court to assume pendent
 jurisdiction, 11:20
Dismissal (this index)
Disputed facts resolved in favor of
 petitioner, 5:27
Evidence outside pleadings,
 consideration of, 1:76
Federal, 22:5; 23:77
 state universities, 21:63
Final judgment rule, 18:104
Foreign defendant, 7:60
Foreseeability plus test, 1:221
Induced infringement, 22:59
Infringement, 7:73
In personam, 4:49; 9:226; 18:45; 22:11;
 26:5
Injunctions, 1:234; 19:9; 22:50; 22:59
Intentions may change over time, 3:27
International Trade Commission, 3:183

JURISDICTION—Cont'd

Inter partes review, 1:377
Issue jurisdiction vs. case jurisdiction,
 20:34
Judicial Panel on Multi-District Litiga-
 tion (JPMDL), 7:6
Law question, 16:43; 19:66
Legal malpractice, 1:160
Mandamus, 9:41; 9:63; 9:292; 23:92
Non-final appeals from Patent Office,
 9:422
Nunc pro tunc order, 13:59
Only accounting remains, 16:72
Out-of-state defendant, 7:60
Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT), 2:116
Pending appeal, 19:9
Personal jurisdiction, 1:284
Personal Jurisdiction (this index)
Post-trial injunction pending appeal,
 denial of stay of, 19:9
Preliminary injunction, 3:12
Raised at any time, 2:56
Reissue application, 9:47
Sanctions, 20:129
Sec. 41(a)(7), 13:32
Sec. 145, 9:394
Sec. 1267, 7:25
Sec. 1292(a)(1), 14:6
Sec. 1338(a), 1:160; 3:150; 4:22; 4:92
Settlement agreement, breach of, 7:54
State law claims, 12:91; 12:96; 13:180;
 21:60
State universities, federal courts, 21:63
Stay, 19:9
Stream-of-commerce plus theory, 1:221
Subject Matter Jurisdiction (this index)
Summary judgment and subject matter
 jurisdiction, 13:216
Time complaint is filed, determined at,
 7:38
Timely, inquiry is always, 15:8
Transfer, appeal transferred, 21:12
Walker process claim, 24:6
Well-pleaded complaint, 1:135; 1:160
Written description, 22:59

JURISDICTIONAL GRANTS
Sovereign immunity, 13:66

JURISDICTIONAL LIMITATION
Limitation of actions, 8:44

INDEX

JURISDICTIONAL RULES

Generally, **21:21**

JURISDICTIONAL STATUTE

Statutory construction, **3:60**

JURY AND JURY TRIALS

Antitrust, **1:16**

Appeal, reversal on, **5:41**

Attorneys' fees, **1:300**

Burden of proof, **1:16**

CAFC, **18:3**

Constitutionality, **16:8**

Damages, **1:16; 1:199; 2:80; 23:73**

Defenses, **20:55**

Dismissal, **3:19**

Enablement, **1:14; 5:110**

Equitable issues over objection, **2:61**

Fact findings of, **19:9**

Findings, **2:45; 7:27; 18:29**

Fraud, **1:16**

FRCP 49(a), **19:21**

FRCP 50(a), **11:12**

Inconsistent findings, **1:14**

Inequitable conduct, **1:14; 1:16; 2:49**

Injunction, **20:55**

Instructions, **1:14**

JNOV, **1:14; 19:7; 19:16; 23:17**

JNOV motion, **9:125; 13:39**

Law question, **1:14**

Materiality, **1:14**

Motion, JNOV, **9:125**

Non-advisory, **19:9**

Objection, **1:14; 2:61**

Obviousness, **1:16; 3:153; 18:84; 19:37**

Presumed jury fact findings, **10:15**

Presumption of validity, **1:16**

Priority claim, **1:199**

Prosecution history estoppel, **6:26**

Reissue, **1:16**

Relevant market, **1:16**

Reversal on appeal, **5:41**

Reverse doctrine of equivalents, **19:24**

Review, standard of, **2:34; 7:28; 23:25**

Review of verdict, **19:60**

Royalty rate, **20:147**

Sec. 102(e) v. sec. 102(g), **19:41**

Sec. 112, **17:1**

Seventh Amendment, **1:58; 3:71; 9:170; 13:64; 13:74; 19:195**

Special interrogatories, **1:16**

JURY AND JURY TRIALS—Cont'd

Special verdicts, **13:53; 20:50**

Substantial evidence standard, **18:14**

Synergism, **1:16**

Tainted jury, written description, **1:215**

Validity, **21:26**

Verdict (this index)

Waiver, **20:39**

JURY BIAS

Generally, **3:110**

JURY INSTRUCTIONS

Generally, **8:157; 13:53; 16:104; 19:165**

Anticipation, **10:4**

Directed verdict, **10:4**

Doctrine of equivalents, **19:227**

Error, **3:173; 9:317**

FRCP 49(b), **19:60**

FRCP 51, **12:20**

JNOV, **6:6; 22:2**

Meaning is requirement, **19:156**

New trial, **5:60**

Objection, **1:43; 13:38**

Prejudice, considered as a whole in determination, **10:15**

Prejudicial error, **2:31**

Remand, when appropriate, **7:27**

Review, standard of, **1:136; 4:32; 5:52; 10:4; 20:64**

Same invention, substantially, **10:4**

Special verdict, **6:88; 14:7**

Substantially same invention, **10:4**

Sufficiency, **2:143**

Timely objection, **13:38**

JUST COMPENSATION

Claim against government, **8:116; 12:27**

JUSTICIABILITY

Choice of law, **13:30**

JUSTICIABLE CONTROVERSY

Ability to supply relief, **1:69**

Declaratory judgment, **19:61**

JUSTIFICATION

Evidence, **8:35**

KESSLER DOCTRINE

Generally, **19:276**

Claim construction and interpretation, **19:309**

**K-FEE SYSTEM GMBH V.
NESPRESSO USA, INC.**
2023, **11:91**

KICKER
Panduit guidelines, **13:72**

KNOWLEDGE
Notice and Knowledge (this index)

KNOWLEDGE ECONOMY
Sec. 101, **6:71**

KUEHL
Method of using versus method of making, **9:103**

LABELING
See also Marking (this index)
Patent license, **12:14**

**LABORATORY CORPORATION OF
AMERICA HOLDINGS V.
QIAGEN SCIENCES, LLC**
2025, **12:126**

LABORATORY EXPERIMENTATION
Diligence, **19:144**

LACHES OR DELAY
Generally, **9:272; 9:377; 19:252; 19:267; 19:296**
Apportionment, **23:27**
Blonder-Tongue, **1:13**
Burden of proof, **23:46**
Claim preamble, **19:210**
Compound interest, **4:24**
Contribution, **23:27**
Damages, **2:19; 3:180; 23:27**
Defense, **8:114**
Discretion of court, **14:11**
Elements, **7:30; 13:44; 23:45**
Equitable estoppel doctrine, **8:50**
Estoppel, **1:48; 19:38; 22:8**
Evidence, **3:155; 23:27**
Exceptional case, **3:180**
FDA approval, **20:100**
Inequitable conduct, **3:149**
Interference, **16:9**
Intervening rights, evidence, **3:155**
Invalidity, **3:180**
Inventorship, **16:131**
Inventorship dispute, **12:109**
Jury verdict, **13:4**

LACHES OR DELAY—Cont'd

Laches, **5:53; 13:36; 19:151**
Maintenance fees, **18:33**
More than six years delay, **8:32**
Notice of other proceeding, **8:16**
Ownership, **19:204**
Patent term adjustment, **23:69**
Period of delay, **5:53**
Plaintiff's, **14:9**
Prejudgment interest, **21:20**
Prejudice, **19:252**
Preliminary injunction, **20:12**
Presumption of validity, **12:9**
Prosecution laches doctrine, generally, **19:181**
PTO proceedings, **1:42**
Reasonably prudent person standard, **18:33**
Resulting prejudice, **13:44**
Review, standard of, **5:30; 5:53; 8:50**
Sale, **3:180**
Sale during laches period, **15:14**
Sec. 102(e) v. sec. 102(g), **19:41**
Sec. 271(a), **3:180**
Separately, each patent treated separately even if related, **19:76**
Simple v. compound interest, **4:24**
Standard, **19:154**
Summary judgment, **1:36; 8:140; 10:4; 23:45**
Totality of circumstances, **3:155**
Trademark infringement, willfulness, **18:112**
Two-elements required, **8:34**
Unclean hands, **19:204**
Undue delay, **9:241**
Unexplained delay, **19:151**
Unreasonable delay, **1:54; 3:149; 12:21; 13:36; 19:151**
Waiver due to failure to file belated preliminary motion, **7:26**

LANGUAGE

See also Claim Language (this index)
Claim interpretation, **18:68; 20:71**
Claim preamble, **13:164**
Consisting of claim language, **13:7**
Indefiniteness, **16:47**
Rewrite claim language, **18:68**
Statutory construction and interpretation, **6:29; 11:33; 12:37; 19:67**

INDEX

LANHAM ACT

- Generally, **19:185**
- Review, standard of, **9:249**
- Sec. 43(a), **12:23**
- Willful infringement, **3:26**

LAPSE

- Excuse, **11:3**
- Interference, **5:57**

LARGE NUMBER OF REFERENCES

- Obviousness, effect on, **9:114**

LATCHES

- Prosecution, **8:161**

LATE CLAIMING

- CAFC, **18:3**
- Interference, **3:25**

LATE FILINGS

- Board, **18:56**

LATENT AMBIGUITY

- Contract, **3:48**
- Extrinsic evidence, **9:160**

LATENT PROPERTIES

- Generally, **9:111**

LATE PAYMENT

- Maintenance fees, **6:51**

LATER BROADER CLAIMS

- Enablement, **1:78**

LATER DEVELOPMENTS

- Double patenting, **20:92**
- Skill, level of, **19:34**

LATER REFERENCE

- Prior art reference relevant for all that it discloses, **9:117**

LATER SUBMISSION OF DATA

- New interference rules, **8:3**

LATER SUBMISSION OF EVIDENCE

- Good cause under 37 CFR Sec. 1.617(b) justifying, **8:35**

LAW-FACT QUESTION

- Best mode, **3:31**
- Claim construction, **13:78**

LAW FIRM

- Disqualification of attorney, **5:12**

LAW OF OBVIOUSNESS

- All-purpose criteria for applying, none, **9:99**

LAW OF THE CASE

- Generally, **2:40; 3:8; 3:40; 19:57; 20:58**
- Accounting phase, **11:15**
- Appellate court need not explicate rationale for its ruling, **20:34**
- Applicable, when, **8:56**
- Applicable, when not, **12:59**
- Better term than fraud, **19:14**
- Cross-appeal, **7:28**
- Damages, **20:23**
- Evolving claim construction, **15:42**
- Exceptions, **7:36; 13:61**
- Finality, provides, **19:14**
- Fraud, better term than, **19:14**
- Inequitable conduct, **19:14**
- Prima facie case, **20:114**
- Reissuance, **1:276**
- Sec. 102(b), **19:31**
- Sec. 271(e)(1), **13:206**
- Sec. 271(g), **13:206**
- Special circumstances exception, **13:61**
- Summary judgment, **2:29; 10:4**

LAW QUESTION

- See also Fact Question; Fact-Law Question (this index)
- Abandonment, **1:111**
- Actual reduction to practice, **4:27**
- All elements rule, **10:7**
- Blonder-Tongue, **1:13**
- CAFC jurisdiction, **20:2**
- Claim construction, **1:50; 1:77; 4:23; 8:74; 13:45; 13:54; 13:78**
- Claim differentiation, **11:2**
- Claim identity, **9:90; 19:59**
- Claim interpretation, **2:52; 4:17; 5:22; 8:52; 9:131; 12:33; 13:29; 13:80; 16:40; 18:30; 19:56; 20:25; 23:16**
- Claim preclusion, **2:159; 8:76**
- Claims, scope of, **7:4**
- Conception, **2:47; 2:96; 6:18; 6:20**
- Contract construction and interpretation, **1:56; 1:57; 3:70; 4:41; 4:42; 8:33; 9:132; 9:145; 9:159; 11:29; 17:5; 23:36**
- Count interpretation, **3:54; 4:31**
- Court's jurisdiction, **19:66**

LAW QUESTION—Cont'd

Declaratory judgment, **19:265**
 Derivation vs. priority of invention,
 16:36
 Double patenting, **9:134; 9:190**
 Enablement, **1:80; 1:117; 1:127; 9:150;**
 9:154; 9:210; 16:47
 Identity, claim identity, **9:90**
 Implied license, **3:56**
 Indefiniteness, **9:328**
 Infringement, **12:31; 13:64; 13:74**
 Interference, **4:8**
 Inventorship, **1:106; 3:83**
 ITC, **13:20**
 JNOV, **13:38; 22:4**
 Jurisdiction, **16:43**
 Jury, **1:14**
 Means-plus-function claim, **11:47;**
 19:119
 Motion to compel discovery, **19:17**
 Motion to dismiss, **2:54**
 Obviousness
 generally, **1:171; 7:46; 9:24; 9:172;**
 9:216; 10:15; 12:40; 14:2;
 16:48; 18:23; 18:41; 19:36;
 21:8; 22:1; 23:7
 determination, **2:141; 9:100**
 double patenting, **9:134**
 On-sale bar, **2:31; 7:71; 12:60**
 Ownership, **11:33**
 Personal jurisdiction, **8:69**
 Priority, **3:53**
 Procedural issue, **8:21**
 Prosecution history estoppel, **13:63;**
 23:25
 Public use, **1:159; 2:57**
 Reduction to practice, **2:96; 4:27; 5:34;**
 9:163; 19:70
 Reexamination, **20:43**
 Reissue, **9:188**
 Repair, **4:1**
 Res judicata, **21:29**
 Sec. 145, **7:9**
 Stare decisis, **13:53**
 Statutory construction and interpreta-
 tion, **1:74; 2:67; 4:40; 9:166;**
 9:200; 10:18; 13:49; 19:102
 Statutory terms, interpretation of, **9:120**
 Stay pending clarification of law, **1:204**
 Substantial evidence vs. clearly errone-
 ous, **20:1**

LAW QUESTION—Cont'd

Summary judgment, **1:35; 7:66; 20:10**
 Undue experimentation, **5:45**
 Validity, **14:8**

**LEAHY-SMITH AMERICA INVENTS
 ACT**

America Invents Act (this index)

LEAR

Generally, **6:45; 19:105**
 Blonder-Tongue, **20:9**
 Contract damages, breach of, **18:8**
 Damages, breach of contract, **18:8**
 Enforceability of settlement agreements
 when patent later held invalid, **8:11**

LEASE

Experimental use, **13:123**

LEGAL CONCLUSION

Definiteness, **1:118**
 Indefiniteness, **9:253**
 Printed publication, **3:101**

LEGAL TITLE

Standing to recover money damages,
 1:46

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

Statutory construction, **7:35**

LEXICOGRAPHER

Generally, **2:81; 6:10; 9:254; 13:124**
 Claim construction and interpretation,
 1:132; 2:81; 9:254; 13:124; 26:1
 Dismissal, **3:19**
 FRCP 52(a), **12:6**
 Inventor as, **13:18**
 Inventor as own, **14:20**
 Ordinary meaning, **1:132**
 Patentability standard, **13:18**
 Patentee as own, **9:154; 10:13**
 Summary judgment, **2:24; 10:13**

LICENSE AGREEMENT

Bona fide purchaser, **18:61**
 Choice of forum clause, **23:2**
 Contract law, **15:9**
 Declaratory judgment, **7:79; 13:143;**
 19:192
 Defense, **6:102; 18:58**
 ITC, litigation includes, **20:53**
 Litigation includes ITC, **20:53**

INDEX

LICENSE AGREEMENT—Cont'd

- On sale bar, **16:86**
- Review, standard of, **19:104**
- Sec. 1631, **19:2**
- Subject matter jurisdiction, lack of, **1:7**
- Third party making product, **3:70; 3:145**

LICENSE BACK

- Assignor estoppel, **1:43**

LICENSE DEFENSE

- Burden of proof, **3:56; 9:118**

LICENSES

- Agreement. License Agreement (this index)
- Antitrust violation, **7:25**
- Assignment, **13:79; 13:87; 19:154**
- Burden of proof, **19:48**
- Co-inventors, **19:98**
- Comparability to hypothetical license at issue in suit, **12:97**
- Contempt, denial of, **16:23**
- Continuation patent, **9:369**
- Declaratory Judgments (this index)
- Domestic industry requirement, **9:370**
- Exclusive Licensee (this index)
- FRCP 19, **9:71**
- Implied License (this index)
- Injunctions, **22:37**
- International Trade Commission, **9:379**
- Invalidity of patent, licensee, **13:132**
- Irreparable harm, **8:46**
- Jawboning at licensing negotiations, **19:61**
- Labeling, licensee's manufacture with customer's labeling, **12:14**
- Marking, **13:75**
- Non-exclusive, **10:33**
- Nunc pro tunc assignments, **13:87**
- Patent misuse, **19:6**
- Reasonable royalty rate, **19:38**
- Review of decision on JNOV motion, **21:5**
- Royalty as compulsory license, **16:106**
Sec. 262, **8:5**
- Special master's decision, **13:24**
- Standing, **9:301; 13:133; 13:157; 15:9; 16:64; 18:35; 19:174; 20:45**
- Stay of patent action, **9:91**
- Subject matter jurisdiction, lack of, **1:7**

LIFE AND MEANING

- Claim preamble, **9:154; 22:41**

LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS

- Generally, **18:32**
- Preliminary injunctions, **1:169; 1:183**

LIMITATION OF ACTIONS

- Administrative proceeding does not toll statute unless proceeding is mandatory prerequisite to suit, **13:62**
- Claims court, **2:53; 3:55**
- Equitable tolling thereof, **23:38**
- Jurisdictional limitation versus, **8:44**
- Limitations, jurisdictional limitation versus, **8:44**
- Litigation misconduct, **9:284**
- Relation back doctrine, **1:350**
- Review, standard of, **12:46**
- RICO, **1:47**
- Sec. 286, **1:48; 19:27**

LIMITATIONS AND RESTRICTIONS

- Generally, **1:80; 8:71**
- Agency's authority limited by grant from congress, **11:26**
- All claim limitations must be considered, **9:153**
- Anticipation, **19:56**
- Appealable interlocutory order, **22:2**
- Appeal and review, **2:9; 7:2; 7:58; 9:59**
- Certified appeal, **6:17**
- Claim amendment, **13:27**
- Claim Construction and Interpretation (this index)
- Claim differentiation doctrine, **3:89; 9:370**
- Claim preamble
 - generally, **1:119; 7:16**
 - life and meaning, **9:154; 22:41**
 - reciting structural limitations, **1:198; 18:44**
 - series of limitations, **3:22**
- Claim preclusion, **13:65**
- Continuation-in-part applications, **16:112**
- Damages for breach of contract limited to those reasonably foreseeable, **8:43**
- Declaratory judgment, **10:6**
- Description, **12:50**
- Dismissal, **3:19**

LIMITATIONS AND RESTRICTIONS**—Cont'd**

Doctrine of Equivalents (this index)
 “Each and every” limitation, **25:11**
 Enforceability, **13:42**
 Every claim limitation or substantial
 equivalent must be present, **23:35**
 Extraneous claim limitation, **9:154**
 FRAP 28(g), **12:22**
 FRCP 59(e), **19:42; 19:58**
 Implied license, **13:21**
 Infringement, **23:40; 25:3**
 Instructional limitation added to method,
11:64
 ITC, **8:28**
 JNOV motion, denial of, **13:13**
 Judicial review, **1:72**
 Material, each claim limitation is, **12:28**
 Materiality, **1:220**
 Means-plus-function claim, **23:54**
 Negative limitation, **9:412; 12:108**
 Not raised below, **7:58**
 Obviousness, **16:4**
 Ordinary and accustomed meanings,
 terms given their, **12:33**
 Patent claims, **14:79**
 Patent Cooperation Treat (PCT), **8:70**
 Post-trial motions, **18:3**
 Present, not, **10:10**
 Prior art, added to overcome, **11:22**
 Prior art reference, **12:80**
 Prosecution history, **21:9**
 Prosecution history estoppel, **18:101;**
19:115
 Reasonable royalty figures urged by
 parties, **19:53**
 Reduction to practice, **3:82**
 Reexamination, **9:194**
 Reissue, **4:70; 22:15**
 Sec. 112(6), **9:149; 22:10**
 Sec. 121, **2:140; 7:16; 16:112**
 Sec. 141-145, **9:59**
 Sec. 171, **9:73**
 Sec. 271(e)(1), **5:3**
 Sec. 1491, **20:16**
 Sec. 1821(b), **1:62**
 Specification, limitation not required by,
9:118
 State immunity from suit under Eleventh
 Amendment, **10:11**

LIMITATIONS AND RESTRICTIONS**—Cont'd**

Statutory construction, **20:31**
 Structural equivalency, **9:96**
 Summary judgment, **20:13**
 Validity, **4:68**
 Written description, **9:412**

LIMITED EXCLUSION ORDER

ITC, **11:60**

LINGUISTICS

Motion, **9:233**

LINKING CLAIM

Reissue, **4:70**

LIQUIDATED DAMAGES

Challenges, **4:46**

LITERAL CLAIM SCOPE

Prosecution history estoppel, **2:77;**
23:54

LITERAL INFRINGEMENT

Claim construction, **2:139; 26:1**
 Claim does not read exactly on accused
 device, **14:14**
 Clearly erroneous standard, **19:23**
 Exact corresponding, **12:33**
 Fact question, **12:1**
 Function not relevant to, **20:39**
 Inventor’s theory, **6:10**
 Nonobvious, no requirement that
 accused device be, **2:49**
 Summary judgment, **2:22; 20:13**
 Willful infringement, **23:50**

LITERALLY MET

Doctrine of equivalents, **7:51**

LITERAL SCOPE

Doctrine of equivalents, **5:6**
 Prosecution history estoppel, **13:95**

LITERATURE OF THE ART

Relative terms in claims given broadest
 reasonable interpretation during
 prosecution, **9:36**

LITIGATION MISCONDUCT

Bad faith behavior, **13:167; 18:29**
 Exceptional case, **5:63; 13:197; 17:9;**
18:64
 Inequitable conduct, **1:112; 1:180; 8:98**

INDEX

LITIGATION MISCONDUCT—Cont'd

Jurisdiction, **1:160**
Review, standard of, **1:112**
Sanctions, **1:193; 2:121; 13:85**
Statute of limitations, **9:284**

LIVING THINGS

Statutory subject matter, **16:63**

LKQ CORPORATION V. GM GLOBAL TECHNOLOGY OPERATIONS LLC

2024, **12:124**

LOCAL RULE

Generally, **15:23**
Attorneys' fees, costs, **1:260**
Patent-ineligibility defense, **13:217**
Privilege, **4:47**

LONG DELAY IN FILING

Interference, **16:9**

LONG-FELT NEED

Generally, **5:5; 20:29**
Burden on patent challenger, **16:12**
CCPA decisions, **9:74**
Obviousness, **21:8**
Review, standard of, **19:12**

LOST COUNT

Interference, **9:88**

LOST PROFITS

Generally, **7:88; 10:34; 13:223**
Acceptable noninfringing substitutes,
13:45
Accounting phase, **11:15**
Anticipated profits, **13:131**
But for test, **5:54; 6:36; 7:47; 8:51;**
11:32; 13:121; 16:40; 16:161;
18:35; 20:52
Causal relation must be shown, **5:71**
Causation, **3:96; 13:79; 15:10**
Convoyed sales, **1:174**
Damages, **1:20; 1:59; 2:19; 2:40; 3:8;**
7:15; 7:63; 13:145; 13:157; 16:5;
16:135; 18:2; 19:52; 20:23; 23:3;
23:82
Factual findings to support jury verdict
presumed, **2:15**
Future lost profits, **19:137**
Infringement, **13:45; 26:4**
Issue preclusion, **4:9**

LOST PROFITS—Cont'd

Market niche, **13:8**
Market share, **3:62; 21:18**
Obviousness, **18:23**
Panduit, **3:2; 11:28; 16:40; 19:56**
Price erosion, **2:34**
Reasonable royalty, **1:308; 23:81; 23:99**
Sec. 271(f), **23:82**
Sec. 284, **2:31**
Sec. 1498, **13:35**
Speculative, **21:35**
Standing, **23:82**
Subject matter jurisdiction, **25:1**
Substitutes, **13:45**
Two-supplier market, **6:26**

LOST SALES

Sears, **21:11**

LUMP SUM ROYALTY PAYMENT

Damages, **9:235**

LUV N' CARE, LTD. V. LAURAIN

2024, **12:125**

MACHINE

Damages, **16:5**
Definition, **9:290**
Means-plus-function claims, **19:112**
Prima facie obviousness, **9:17**
Sec. 101, **19:112**

MACHINE-OR-TRANSFORMATION TEST

Sec. 101, **3:164; 9:308; 16:123; 21:62**

MAGEMA TECHNOLOGY LLC V. PHILLIPS 66

2025, **13:264**

MAIL DELIVERY

Judicial notice, **11:24**

MAINTENANCE FEES

Delay
generally, **9:470**
unavoidable, **18:33**
Failure to pay, **2:131**
Inequitable conduct, **14:70; 21:40**
Late payment, **6:51**
Payment, late, **6:51**
Reinstatement of lapsed patent, **3:38**
Sec. 285, **9:470**
Small entity, **21:40**

MALPRACTICE

Generally, **14:76**
 Alternative claim language disregarded, **13:184**
 Negligence, **21:60**
 Personal jurisdiction, filing patent application, **20:94**
 State law claims, **12:96; 13:180; 21:60**
 Subject matter jurisdiction, patent law issues, **23:71**

MALVERN PANALYTICAL INC. V. TA INSTRUMENTS-WATERS LLC
 2023, **13:254**

MANDAMUS

Generally, **9:6; 9:229; 9:515**
 Abandoned application, changing filing date on, **9:54**
 Antitrust and patent claims separated for trial, **9:41**
 Appealability, **2:2**
 Appeal and review, **9:41; 9:63**
 Attorney-client privilege, **9:184; 9:293**
 Attorney fees award, **9:68**
 Attorney misconduct, **9:57**
 Attorneys, counsel misconduct, **9:57**
 Burden, **9:193**
 Business damage, suit for, **9:76**
 CAFC jurisdiction, **9:54; 9:63**
 Changing filing date on abandoned application, **9:54**
 Clearly erroneous finding, **9:57**
 Commissioner's decision, **9:54**
 Consolidation, **19:284**
 Custom, **9:57**
 Damages, **9:76**
 Discovery orders, review, **9:362; 9:430**
 Discretionary exercise, **6:19; 9:430**
 Dismiss or transfer infringement suit, **9:432**
 Disregard law or ignore statute, courts not at liberty to, **9:57**
 District court jurisdiction, **9:41**
 Drastic remedy, **9:170; 9:180**
 Evidence, same, **9:41**
 Exceptional circumstances standard, **1:302; 9:63**
 Exclusive jurisdiction, **9:63**
 Filing date, **9:54**
 FRCP 21, **9:359**

MANDAMUS—Cont'd

FRCP 42(b), **9:41**
 Frivolity, **9:68**
 Ignore statute or disregard law, courts not at liberty to, **9:57**
 Inter partes review, **9:385; 9:469**
 Jurisdiction, **9:41; 9:54; 9:63; 9:292; 23:92**
 Mandate, **9:388**
 Patent prosecution bar, **4:94**
 Petitions, **2:2; 9:54**
 Privilege, attorney-client privilege, **9:184**
 Remand to state court, **9:68**
 Remedial sanction, **9:57**
 Review, standard of, **9:128**
 Same evidence, **9:41**
 Sanction, remedial sanction, **9:57**
 Sec. 1651, **2:2; 9:41; 9:54; 9:68; 9:71; 9:76**
 Sec. 1782, **9:406**
 Separated for trial, antitrust and patent claims, **9:41**
 Severance, **9:359**
 Standing, **9:313**
 State courts, **9:68; 9:76**
 Strong medicine, **9:11**
 Subject-matter jurisdiction, **9:68**
 Threats to sue, **9:76**
 Transfer venue, **9:76; 9:336; 14:60; 26:14**
 Two juries, prohibition against, **9:41**
 Untimely appeal, **3:5**
 Venue, **9:445; 9:447; 9:457; 9:462; 9:472; 9:480; 9:490; 9:493; 9:498.50; 9:515**
 Waiver, **9:447**
 Writ, generally, **3:85**
 Writ of mandamus, compelling production, **9:429; 9:490**

MANDATE

Appeal and review, **12:47**
 Damages, **18:105**
 Mandamus, **9:388**

MANDATORY STATUTES

Statutory construction, **5:17**

MANIFEST INJUSTICE

Attorney fees, **14:58**

INDEX

MANIFEST OR CLEAR ERROR

Appellate role, **4:6**

MANUAL OF PATENT EXAMINING PROCEDURE (MPEP)

Admission or acquiescence in rejection, **16:6**

Anticipation, foreign publication, **16:6**

Binding force, none, **19:46**

CAFC, **9:10**

CIP, filing, **16:6**

Commercially available, **16:6**

Describes procedures on which public can rely, **16:8**

Devices, published, **16:6**

Disclosure, **16:6**

Filing CIP, **16:6**

Force of law, **18:1**

Foreign publication, efficacy as anticipation, **16:6**

Judicial notice, **9:374**

Publication, **16:6**

Published devices, **16:6**

Rejection, **16:6**

Reliance, **16:6**

Sec. 706, **9:114**

Sec. 711.01, **5:57**

Sec. 714.19, **5:57**

Sec. 717.05, **2:103**

Sec. 1302.10, **13:100**

Sec. 2001.06(a), **12:61**

Sec. 2152, **9:110**

Sec. 2217, **17:2**

Standing to sue, **19:46**

MANUFACTURE

Definition, **9:290**

Infringement, **10:23**

Intervening rights, **13:168**

Jury verdict, **19:5**

Patent license, **12:14**

Reasonable royalty, **8:51**

MAQUET CARDIOVASCULAR LLC V. ABIOMED INC.

2025, **13:265**

MARKET DEMAND

Consumer behavior, **19:6**

MARKETING

Attorney, opinion of counsel, **3:72**

MARKET NICHE

Lost profits, **13:8**

MARKET POWER

Generally, **9:282**

Antitrusts, **9:219; 13:133**

MARKET RATE

Attorney fees award, **16:24**

MARKET SHARE

Lost profits, **3:62; 14:9; 21:18**

MARKET SUCCESS

Ultimate recognition, **9:90**

MARKET VALUE

Anticipated collateral sales vs. reasonable royalty rate, **18:35**

Patented feature is reason for demand, **20:50**

MARKING

Generally, **16:178**

Apparatus and method claims, **3:146**

Briefs, confidentiality markings, **9:337**

Civil penalty, false marking, **6:72**

Claim construction, **18:118**

Claim interpretation, **19:15**

Constructive notice of infringement, **6:78**

Damages, **4:89; 14:24; 18:2**

Estoppel, **6:86**

Fact question, **7:66**

Indications and usage, **2:152**

Licensees, **13:75**

Method claims, **3:146; 3:148**

No products to mark, **20:64**

Patent license, **12:14**

Rationale, **12:58**

Sec. 284, **14:24**

Sec. 287, **4:12; 8:4; 13:33**

Sec. 289, **14:24**

Sec. 292, **12:23**

Typographical error, manifestly obvious, **1:119**

Writ of mandamus, **9:329**

MARKUSH CLAIM

Claim construction, **13:218; 19:299**

Closed group, **1:122; 1:356**

Consisting, **7:85**

Co-pendency requirement, **9:105**

Defined, **13:218**

MARKUSH CLAIM—Cont'd

Infringement, **1:155**
 Sec. 121, not proper under, **9:105**

MASK WORKS

SCPA, **2:34**

MASS PRODUCTION

Sec. 112(1), **23:19**

MASTER

Generally, **19:38**
 Complex cases, **19:37**
 Damages, **20:19**
 Reliance upon his prior experience,
19:65
 Special Master (this index)

MATERIAL FACT

Executive Order 10096, **8:10**
 Review, standard of, **19:120**
 Summary judgment
 generally, **3:81; 6:26**
 absence of disputed issue of, **12:10**
 disputed questions of, **5:36**
 genuine issue, **1:103**
 initial burden to show, **22:18**

MATERIALITY

Generally, **2:113; 6:60; 9:283; 15:24**
 CFR 1.56(a), **9:43**
 Cumulative reference, **19:59**
 Design patent, **16:1**
 Each claim limitation, **12:28**
 Examiner, **12:43; 23:5**
 FRCP 12(f), **4:13**
 High degree of confidence and trust
 between PTO and patent applicants,
10:5
 Inequitable conduct
 generally, **1:3; 1:10; 1:257; 1:261;**
2:85; 7:1; 12:56; 13:80; 13:102;
13:141; 14:8; 19:122; 21:26
 but-for materiality, **20:106**
 every material omission requires less
 evidence to show intent, **2:68**
 intent, balancing, **6:5; 19:208**
 intent as essential element even when
 materially false affidavit
 involved, **7:34**
 misstatement, **12:93**
 omission, **4:84; 12:93; 16:112**
 per se materiality rule, none, **12:20**

MATERIALITY—Cont'd

Inequitable conduct—Cont'd
 reference, **6:80**
 requirement, **20:35**
 withheld art less material than cited
 prior art, **8:29**
 Intent, **12:30; 12:43; 14:19**
 Jury, **1:14**
 Limitations, **1:220**
 Post- and pre-critical date claims, **1:220**
 Process Patent Amendment Act (PPAA),
2:60; 5:23
 Prosecuting similar claims in separate
 patent, **4:72**
 PTO Rule 56, **13:158**
 Reasonable examiner, **2:103; 12:43;**
13:69
 Reference, **15:33; 19:59**
 Relevant, less, **2:68**
 Sec. 102(b), **13:35**
 Sec. 102(g), **11:9**
 Separate patent, **4:72**
 Summary judgment, **3:13**
 Surprising discovery, **16:105**
 Unclean hands doctrine, **18:40**

MATHEMATICAL ALGORITHM

Generally, **1:95**
 Definition, **9:42**
 Means-plus-function claim, **1:176; 9:42**
 Performing function, does not cover all
 means for, **9:42**
 Printed matter and substrate, **9:32**
 Sec. 101, **1:290; 9:308**

MATTER OF LAW

Generally, **5:50**
 Doctrine of equivalents, **5:44**
 FRCP 50, **7:27**
 Obviousness conclusion, **9:15**

**MAXELL, LTD. V. AMPEREX
 TECHNOLOGY LIMITED**

2024, **13:260**

MAXIM

Expressio unius, **4:30**

MAXIMUM RECOVERY RULE

Damages, **19:137**
 Remittitur, **21:23**

INDEX

MEANING

- About claim terminology, **5:20**
- Accustomed meaning. Ordinary and Accustomed Meaning (this index)
- Claim Construction and Interpretation (this index)
- Claim preamble, **9:154; 16:20; 22:41**
- Contract Construction and Interpretation (this index)
- Doctrine of equivalents, **3:51**
- FRAP 38, **16:4**
- FRCP 52(a), **12:6**
- Jury instructions, **19:156**
- Ordinary and Accustomed Meaning (this index)
- Prosecution history, **8:74**
- Statutory Construction (this index)
- Words (this index)

MEANINGFULNESS

- Claim interpretation, nonsensical result, **3:113**

MEANS-PLUS-FUNCTION

- Generally, **1:130; 3:123; 4:120; 4:131; 5:32; 5:129; 5:148; 6:55; 7:83; 9:118; 13:239; 14:43; 16:94; 19:300; 20:81; 20:157.90; 22:30**
- Accused device must perform identical function, **11:32**
- Act, versus, **19:100**
- Adequate disclosure, **1:99**
- Adequate structure, **2:83**
- All functions must be performed, **12:3**
- Claim, generally, **3:176; 5:118; 13:221; 18:17**
- Claim construction, **3:166; 5:110; 6:81; 9:199; 13:239; 16:138; 20:56; 20:149; 23:79**
- Claim differentiation, **18:17; 23:54**
- Claim language
 - express means-plus-function language, **2:137**
 - improper to narrow function beyond, **3:97**
- Clearly erroneous standard, **19:23**
- Clearly link structure with function, **13:118**
- Combination, **3:89**
- Component by component equivalence improper, **15:14**

MEANS-PLUS-FUNCTION—Cont'd

- Computer, general purpose, **1:176; 6:68; 20:116**
- Continuation application with narrower claims, **4:51**
- Contours of corresponding structure is law question, **19:119**
- Corresponding function, **10:36; 18:48**
- Corresponding structure, **1:114; 2:61; 2:123; 7:70; 11:42; 14:56; 19:119; 19:238**
- Court must state burden of persuasion and quantum of proof required, **18:7**
- Cross-appeal to reverse validity or infringement component of judgment, **18:2**
- Definite structure, **6:36**
- Determining meaning of means, **13:87**
- Disavowal of claim scope, **3:140**
- Disclosure, **2:134; 4:17**
- Doctrine of equivalents versus, **1:125; 4:50; 9:215; 11:48**
- Enablement, **5:124**
- Equivalent structure, **9:96; 21:44**
- Evidence, standard of proof, **3:83**
- Extend to all means, does not, **10:28**
- First identify claimed function, **12:62; 13:100**
- FRCP 51, **12:106**
- Functional limitation, import, **23:54**
- Function different from claim, improper to adopt, **3:102**
- Identical function, **11:32**
- Identify function, **1:125; 7:67; 7:79; 12:66**
- Import functional limitations, **23:54**
- Inconsistent construction, **20:56**
- Indefiniteness, **5:112; 9:330; 13:200; 18:107; 18:129; 26:15**
- Infringement, **1:289; 3:46**
- Injunction, **20:149**
- Inventorship, **23:55**
- Invocation, **3:66**
- Invoked, when, **25:3**
- JNOV, **4:4**
- Law question, **11:47; 19:119**
- Limitation, functional, **11:66; 23:54**
- Link structure in specification to recited function, **20:64**
- Machine claims, **19:112**

MEANS-PLUS-FUNCTION—Cont'd

Mathematical algorithm, **1:176; 9:42**
 Means, generally, **19:116**
 “Means” absent from claim, **16:138**
 Means for generally invokes, **15:12; 21:28; 22:17**
 Mechanism, **23:63**
 Multiple claim interpretation, may include, **9:225**
 Patentability, **4:97**
 Performance, **12:3; 12:26**
 Pioneer invention, **20:6**
 Plain meaning of claim, **2:31**
 Presumption with means, **1:134; 3:91; 5:51; 13:96; 18:107; 19:97; 23:51**
 Prior art, **6:75**
 “Program loading device,” **18:107**
 “Program recognition device,” **18:107**
 Proof, standard of, **3:83**
 Prosecution history, **4:51**
 Prosecution history estoppel, **3:84**
 PTO, construed same way in PTO as in litigation, **9:199**
 Review, standard of, **14:38**
 Review function and structure, **22:26**
 Scope, **3:78; 7:42; 13:84; 13:91**
 Sec. 101, **5:129**
 Sec. 112, **2:123; 16:11; 20:6; 23:63**
 Sec. 112(6), **1:51; 3:37; 9:130; 9:131; 9:149; 10:7; 10:13; 14:56; 18:107; 19:59; 22:10**
 Secondary considerations, **13:17**
 Specification, **6:36; 13:182; 20:64**
 Statements during prosecution related to structure, **1:77**
 Steps without function, **5:63**
 Structural analysis, **6:75**
 Structural equivalency, **9:96**
 Structural support absent, **5:114**
 Structure, **6:73; 7:70; 12:26; 22:26**
 Structure performing function, **20:91**
 Test, **23:50**
 Two patents, **2:77**
 Two-step analysis, **3:88**
 Two-step approach, **15:21**
 Use of means, **12:69; 16:51**
 Whereby clause, **12:62**
 Willful infringement, **18:17**
 Written description, **1:262**

MEANS WITHOUT SUBSTANTIVE CHANGE

Identical claims, **12:25**

MEASUREMENT OF PHYSICAL PROPERTY

Patentability, **9:247**

MECHANICAL CONCEPTS

Judicial notice, **9:127**

MECHANICAL MISFIT

Sec. 103, **15:4**

MECHANISM

Means-plus-function, **23:63**

MEDICAL DEVICES

Sec. 271(e)(1), **5:13; 16:117**

MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG, IMPROVEMENT, AND MODERNIZATION ACT

Case or controversy, **20:78**

MEDICINAL DRUG

Chemical, **9:60**

MEDTRONIC, INC. V. TELEFLEX INNOVATIONS S.A.R.L.

2023, **13:255; 13:256**

MEDTRONIC, INC. V. TELEFLEX LIFE SCIENCES LIMITED

2023, **13:257**

MEDYTOX, INC. V. GALDERMA S.A.

2023, **13:258**

MEETING OF THE MINDS

Generally, **23:21**

MEMORANDUM DECISION

Timeliness of appeal filing, **2:5**

MENTAL PROCESSES

Sec. 101 patentability. Abstract (this index)

MENTION, FAILURE TO

Inequitable conduct, **6:4**

MERCK SERONO S.A. V. HOPEWELL PHARMA VENTURES, INC.

2025, **13:266**

INDEX

MERCK SHARP & DOHME B.V. V. AUROBINDO PHARMA USA, INC.

2025, **13:267**

MERE DENIAL

Intent to mislead, **19:128**

MERE DISSEMINATION

Generally, **13:52**

MERE KNOWLEDGE

Inequitable conduct, **13:101**

MERE PROCEDURAL DEVICE

Presumption of validity, **13:53**

MERGED FIRMS

Disqualification of counsel, **16:18**

MERIT SYSTEM

Review, standard of, **8:48**

Standard of review thereof, **4:39**

METAPHYSICAL DOUBT, MORE THAN

Summary judgment, **10:32**

METHOD

Certainty and definiteness, **9:280**

Claim interpretation, **9:280**

Damages, **19:154**

FDA use code, patented method of use, **14:68**

Indefiniteness, **9:280**

Instructional limitation added, **11:64**

Kuehl, **9:103**

On-sale bar, sec. 102(b), **4:16; 13:212**

Sec. 102(b) on-sale bar, **4:16; 13:212**

Sec. 287(a), **3:96**

Summary judgment, **21:7**

METHOD AND APPARATUS CLAIM

Claim construction, **8:123; 9:280**

METHOD CLAIMS

Claim construction, method and apparatus claim, **8:123**

Computer-facilitated processes, **6:71**

Construction, **13:195**

ordinarily construed an order, **9:223**

Direct infringement, performance of all steps, **1:222**

Durden, **9:98**

Government liability, **26:10**

METHOD CLAIMS—Cont'd

Implied, order not implied, **9:234**

Infringement, **5:121; 13:53; 13:186**

JMOL, **13:195**

Joint infringement, **13:159; 13:160**

Make requirement, **7:99**

Marking, **3:146; 3:148**

Order not implied, **9:234**

Ordinarily construed an order, **9:223**

Sec. 271(a), **1:269**

METHODOLOGY

Damages, **1:105; 11:10; 12:90; 13:75**

MICROBIOLOGY FIELD

Deposit of cell sample line not required at time of filing, **9:53**

MILITARY AND STATE SECRETS PRIVILEGE

Generally, **3:122**

MILLER MENDEL, INC. V. CITY OF ANNA, TEXAS

2024, **13:261**

MINDS, MEETING OF

Generally, **23:21**

MINERVA SURGICAL, INC. V. HOLOGIC, INC.

2023, **13:259**

MINIMUM CONTACTS

Cease and desist letters, **18:45**

Personal jurisdiction, **1:70; 1:181; 5:67; 6:150; 20:94**

MINOR DIFFERENCES

Infringement, **16:33**

MINOR IMPROVEMENT

Surprising results, **9:118**

MINORITY

Claim interpretation, **5:71**

MIRROR WORLDS

TECHNOLOGIES, LLC V. META PLATFORMS, INC.

2024, **13:262**

MISLEAD, INTENT TO

Generally, **13:80**

Disclosure, duty of, **14:19**

Materiality, **12:30**

MISLEADING CONDUCT

Equitable estoppel, **19:108**

MISREPRESENTATION

Conduct of counsel, **16:9**
 Court's prior ruling, **19:57**
 Exceptional case, **8:122**
 Inequitable conduct, **8:85**
 Intent to deceive, **6:28**
 Prior art search, **7:29**

MISTAKE

Generally. Error (this index)

MISTAKE AT TRIAL

Jury verdict, **4:18**

MISTAKE OF FACT

Contract rescission, **4:34**

MISUSE OF PATENT

Patent Misuse (this index)

MITEK SYSTEMS, INC. V. UNITED SERVICES AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION

2025, **13:269**

MIXED QUESTION

Best mode, **3:31**
 Claim construction, **13:78**
 Infringement, **19:19**

MOBILE ACUITY LTD. V. BLIPPAR LTD.

2024, **13:263**

MODIFICATION

Combination, **9:51**
 Damages, **1:20**
 FRCP 60(b), **23:23**
 FRCP 60(b)(6), **3:29**
 Incentive, **9:51**
 ITC, **3:73**
 Obviousness, **9:51**
 Prior art, **9:51**
 References, **3:3; 9:51**
 Secondary considerations, **9:82**
 Summary judgment, **3:20**

MONDIS TECHNOLOGY LTD. V. LG ELECTRONICS INC.

2025, **13:270**

MONETARY DAMAGES

Harm to reputation, **18:32**

MONETARY DAMAGES—Cont'd

Preliminary injunction, **1:34**

MONETARY SANCTIONS

Abuse of discovery process, **13:6**
 Discovery, abuse of discovery process, **13:6**

MONOPOLY

Antitrust, **7:73**
 Double patenting, **9:45**
 Power, **9:214**

MOOTNESS

Generally, **16:43**
 Altwater, **13:46; 22:4**
 Burden, **8:155**
 Dismissal of complaint, **19:14; 19:200**
 Equivalence, **5:7**
 FRCP 59(e), **19:42**
 Infringement, **9:118; 11:23; 25:9; 25:10**
 ITC, **20:6**
 Partial settlement, **7:8**
 Possibility of, **13:41**
 Post-filing events, effect of, **19:55**
 Post-trial settlement of infringement issues, **11:23**
 Settlement, **1:237**
 Standing, **13:226**
 Test thereof, **8:54; 14:16**
 Vacation of judgment, **20:95**
 Validity, **1:113**

MORE PERTINENT ART

Dismissal, **3:19**
 Presumption of validity, **12:9**

MOTION IN LIMINE

FRCP 54(b), **21:41**
 Precluding testimony on issue not raised before the Board, **7:26**

MOTIONS

Abuse of discretion, **19:17**
 Add counts or parties, **3:43**
 Amend pleadings, **3:24; 7:33; 19:6**
 Amicus curiae, **9:67**
 Choice of law, **20:17**
 Claim interpretation, **8:84**
 Confidential information, **19:17**
 Conflict of laws, **19:45; 19:165**
 Contempt, **11:17**
 Default judgment, relief from, **9:144**

INDEX

MOTIONS—Cont'd

Denial, when appropriate, **7:33**
Directed verdict, **1:1; 4:32; 19:41**
Discovery, compel, **19:17**
Dismiss
 generally, **7:36; 8:44**
 FRCP 12(b)(6), **1:54; 1:248; 1:343**
 FRCP 19(a), **22:8**
 Question of law, **2:54**
 Section 101, **1:343**
 state a claim, failure to, **2:41**
 state claim, failure to, FRCP 12(b)(6),
 8:102; 19:237; 23:29
 subject matter jurisdiction, lack of,
 1:7
Dispositive motions with no material
 facts challenged, **8:10**
Disqualify trial judge, **8:12**
Dissolve, **16:7**
Employee's general knowledge, **19:45**
Execute on bond, **2:30**
Executive Order 10096, **8:10**
Findings, **12:11**
FRCP 12(b)(6), **2:41; 8:102; 19:237;**
 23:29
FRCP 15, **3:24**
FRCP 24, **3:38**
FRCP 24(b), **8:36**
FRCP 41(a)(1), **5:18**
FRCP 41(b), **12:11; 19:31**
FRCP 50, **7:27; 12:11**
FRCP 50(b), **2:33; 13:54**
FRCP 59(e), **10:14**
FRCP 60(b), **2:43; 6:22; 9:144**
FRCP 60(b)(6), **3:29**
FRCP 65.1, **2:30**
Inequitable conduct, **19:17**
Infringement, **12:36**
Interference, **13:3; 16:7**
Intervene, **1:68; 3:38; 8:36; 9:67**
JMOL, **1:101; 7:27; 13:54; 13:194**
Joint motion to vacate judgments below,
 21:22
Judgment, **2:33**
Judgment Notwithstanding Verdict
 (JNOV) (this index)
Jury, **9:125**
Jury verdict, **4:18**
Knowledge, trade secret in combination
 of known components, **19:45**

MOTIONS—Cont'd

Law question, **19:17**
Limitation of review, **13:13; 18:3**
Linguistic, substance not linguistic form,
 9:233
Modify consent judgment, **3:29**
New Trial (this index)
Particularity, failing in, **18:25**
Pendency, **12:36**
Pending, **19:45**
Petition for rehearing pending, **19:45**
Prejudgment interest, **10:14**
Preliminary motions, **7:26**
Publish CAFC decision, **9:1**
Quash discovery subpoena, **20:17**
Rehearing, **19:45**
Reissue proceeding, **12:36**
Remand, **9:38; 19:45**
Review, standard of, **9:186; 19:60**
Sec. 102(b), **19:31**
Sec. 455(a), **8:12**
Set aside judgment, **2:43; 6:22**
Settlement agreement, **21:22**
Stay, **11:1; 12:36**
Strike, **6:10**
Substance not linguistic form, **9:233;**
 19:86
Summary judgment, **5:48; 9:215; 10:4;**
 13:82; 23:16
Supplement record, **23:26**
Timeliness, **9:38; 16:37; 19:45**
Trade secret in combination of known
 components, **19:45**
Vacate, **16:19**
Voluntary dismissal when neither
 answer nor summary judgment
 motion filed, **5:18**
Waiver, **7:26; 10:15**

MOTIVATION

Generally, **9:114; 9:428**
Obviousness (this index)

MOT PERTINENT ART

Prior art, noting differences from, **4:6**

MOVABLE

Construction of term, **9:338**

MPEP

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure
(MPEP) (this index)

MULTI-COMPONENT PRODUCTS

Damages, **22:47**

MULTIPLE APPLICATIONS

Claim construction and interpretation, **14:47**

MULTIPLE CLAIM INTERPRETATION

Means-plus-function claim, **9:225**

MULTIPLE DEFINITIONS OF PHRASE

Claim construction, **7:28**

MULTIPLE DICTIONARY DEFINITIONS

Claim interpretation, **9:253**

MULTIPLE EMBODIMENTS

Claim construction and interpretation, **22:30**

“MURDERING Y, X ON TRIAL FOR”

Specious argument, **18:24**

MUTUAL MISTAKE

Contract, **2:44**

Contract rescission, **4:34**

NARROW CLAIM CONSTRUCTION

Prejudicial error, **14:2**

NARROW CLAIMS

Implications, **13:39**

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) § 706, **9:114**

NARROW EXCEPTION

Experimental use, **5:50**

NARROWING AMENDMENT

Claim interpretation, **8:80; 12:83; 19:210**

Prosecution history estoppel, **2:128; 6:70; 7:69; 18:77**

NATERA, INC. V. NEOGENOMICS LABORATORIES, INC.

2024, **14:111**

NATURAL LAW

Generally, **1:355**

NDA

New Drug Application (this index)

NEGLIGENCE

Exceptional case, **18:9**

Inequitable conduct, **6:4; 14:8**

Intent to deceive, **19:59**

Malpractice, **21:60**

NEGOTIATIONS

Damages, **12:90; 12:97; 16:129; 20:23**

Jawboning at licensing, **19:61**

Refusal to engage in settlement negotiations, **15:37**

Settlement negotiation privilege, **9:362**

NETFLIX, INC. V. DIVX, LLC

2023, **14:109; 14:110**

NEW ARGUMENT

Appeal, frivolous appeal, **13:46**

Frivolous appeal, **13:46**

NEW ART

Constitutionality, **16:8**

NEW BENEFIT OF OLD PRODUCT

Generally, **8:57**

NEW COMPOSITION

Prima facie obviousness, **9:17**

NEW CONSTRUCTION

JMOL, **8:84**

NEW COUNSEL

Reissue, **9:84**

NEW DRUG APPLICATION

Generally, **13:107; 14:33**

Abbreviated New Drug Application (ANDA) (this index)

CAPC, **3:132**

NEW EVIDENCE

Clearly erroneous, **6:9**

Rule 202, **9:288**

Sec. 145, **7:9; 8:118; 11:68**

NEW FACTUAL SITUATION

Squeezing into preestablished pigeonholes, **9:99**

NEW FEATURES

Accused machine’s commercial success, **23:7**

NEW GROUND

Rejection, **9:15; 9:22; 9:37; 9:127; 9:372**

INDEX

NEW INTERFERENCE RULES

Generally, **8:35**
Corroboration, **8:3**
Exhibit must be discussed, **8:3**
Good cause standard, **8:3**
Later submission of data, **8:3**
Prima facie showing, **8:3**
Reduction to practice, **8:3**
Right to make count, **3:53**
Sec. 1.671, **8:3**
Submissions, **8:3**
37 CFR Sec. 1.608, **8:3**
37 CFR Sec. 1.609, **8:3**
37 CFR Sec. 1.617, **8:3**

NEW ISSUE RAISED

PTO motion to remand, **9:130**

NEW JUDGMENT

Sec. 271(e)(1), **5:13**

NEW LEGAL TEST

Essential element test, **3:101**

NEWLY ADDED MATTER

CIP, **19:28**

NEWLY DISCOVERED EVIDENCE

Generally, **1:101**
New trial, **22:26**

NEWLY DISCOVERED PRIOR ART

Enhanced damages, **21:3**

NEWLY FOUND SEEDINGS

Plant patents, **9:355**

NEW MATTER

Generally, **19:121**
Sec. 132, **2:34**

NEW PRACTICE

Interference, **16:16**

NEW PRIOR ART

As whole, prior art as whole, **5:11**
Burden of proof more easily carried, **5:11**
Foreign references not well known, **5:11**
Operation of inventor's brain, **5:11**
Presumption of validity, **18:10**
Prior art as whole, **5:11**
Reference, **5:11**
Relevance, **5:11**
Secondary considerations, **5:11**

NEW PROPERTY

Claim construction, **5:2**
Discovery, **9:129**
Patentable, **9:104**

NEW QUESTION

Inter partes reexamination, substantial new question of patentability, **2:150**
Reexamination, **9:183; 9:314**

NEW RESULT

ITC, **1:17**

NEW RULES

Interference. New Interference Rules (this index)

NEW TRIAL

Generally, **3:123; 3:205; 18:14; 19:126; 19:156**
Choice of law, **5:56; 5:65; 13:101; 19:126**
Claim interpretation, **19:16**
Conflict of laws, motion for new trial, **19:165**
Discovery, newly discovered evidence, **22:26**
District court has wide discretion, **13:34**
Evidence, newly discovered, **22:26**
Grounds thereof, **21:27**
Infringement, **8:51**
JNOV, **4:4; 13:4; 23:4**
Jury instruction, **5:60**
Jury verdict, **3:17; 4:18**
Motion
generally, **21:39**
abuse of discretion, reviewed for abuse of discretion, **23:10**
choice of law, **5:56; 5:65**
claim interpretation, **19:16**
fact question, **23:10**
infringement, **23:10**
reviewed for abuse of discretion, **23:10**
willful infringement, **16:22**
Newly discovered evidence, **22:26**
New trial, timely motion for new trial, **18:25**
Retrial of infringement not necessarily validity, **8:51**
Review, standard of, **2:99; 5:54; 13:85; 14:25; 16:87; 19:60**

NEW TRIAL—Cont'd

Timeliness for JNOV, **19:16**
 Timely motion for new trial, **19:165**
 Validity, **8:51**
 Willful infringement, **3:26; 16:22**

NEW UNAPPRECIATED PROPERTY OF PRIOR ART

Patentable subject matter, **5:56**

NEW USE

Generally, **9:201**
 Discovery, **9:129**
 Patentable subject matter, **2:82**
 Prior art article, **9:48**

NEXSTEP, INC. V. COMCAST CABLE COMMUNICATIONS, LLC

2024, **14:112**

NEXUS

Burden on patent challenger, **16:12**
 Claims construed, **9:77**
 Commercial success, **2:76; 9:168; 18:28**
 Objective evidence of nonobviousness, **1:292; 12:43; 18:53**
 Obviousness, **1:292; 14:90; 18:15; 18:99**
 Prejudice, **8:32**
 Secondary considerations, **9:168; 9:331; 16:49; 19:36**
 Summary judgment, **3:1**

9 CIR

Generally, **16:21; 19:6**
 Appeal, scope of, **19:51**
 Dismissal of pendent state law claim for unfair competition, **22:2**
 Inconsistent verdicts, **18:14**
 Summary judgment, **3:1**
 Timeliness of appeal filing, **2:5**
 Verdicts, inconsistent, **18:14**

9 USC § 3

Arbitration, **18:13**

1952 PATENT ACT

Doctrine of equivalents, **23:42**

NOERR

Generally, **9:219; 14:21**
 Antitrust claim, **3:46; 20:127**
 Exception to, **6:27**

NOMINAL DAMAGES

Sec. 284, **12:24**

NONANALOGOUS ART

Reference, **9:16**

NONASSERTED CLAIMS

JNOV motion, **6:6**

NON-EXCLUSIVE LICENSES

Generally, **10:33**

NON-PARTIES

Appeal, standing to appeal, none, **19:48**
 Corroboration, **20:48**
 Injunction, **1:75**
 Issue preclusion, **9:296**
 Motion to quash discovery subpoena, **20:17**
 Sec. 102(g), **20:48**
 Standing to appeal, none, **19:48**
 Standing to oppose, **21:22**

NONSTATUTORY DOUBLE PATENTING

Sec. 101, **5:103**

NONSTATUTORY SUBJECT MATTER

Sec. 101, **9:30; 13:210**

NORMAL ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART

Inventive acts involved, **9:436; 19:72**

NOSE OF WAX

Jury verdict, **19:5**

NOTICE AND KNOWLEDGE

Generally, **13:89**
 Administrative Procedure Act (APA), **9:344**
 Amend defective notice, leave to, **4:25**
 Anticipation, **23:48**
 Appeal and review, **4:25; 9:169; 9:317; 10:14; 10:18**
 Best mode, **7:47**
 CAFC jurisdiction, **9:63**
 Chemical, **9:60**
 Claim interpretation, **8:112; 13:120**
 Combining references, **9:126**
 Constructive notice, **19:172**
 Contributory infringement, **19:79**
 Damages, **7:66; 19:154**
 Discovery, **9:129**

INDEX

NOTICE AND KNOWLEDGE—Cont'd

Everyday mechanical concepts, **9:127**
Evidence, **10:18**
FRAP 3(c), **2:46**
FRAP 4(a)(4), **10:14**
FRCP 49(a), **19:21**
Good faith, **7:92**
Hypothetical person of ordinary skill,
9:65
Inducing infringement, knowingly,
1:222; 7:103; 23:3
Inequitable conduct, **13:101**
Infringement (this index)
Judicial Notice (this index)
Laches, **8:16**
Letters to customers as infringement
threats, **13:41**
Operation, principle of, **14:4**
Ordinary skill, hypothetical person of,
9:65
Party's argument will not be addressed,
10:18
Patentable, **9:104**
Preliminary injunction, **3:12**
Prior art, **9:114**
Reconsideration, request for, **20:21**
Reference
 common knowledge of the art, **9:154**
 materiality, **6:80**
Remand, motion to, **19:45**
Sec. 1.56, **8:29**
Sec. 271(b), **13:124**
Sec. 282, **1:92; 5:1; 20:15**
Sec. 285, **5:14**
Sec. 287, **2:6; 4:12; 7:92; 13:33; 21:53**
Specification need not disclose what is
well known, **9:113**
Subject matter for judicial notice, **6:10**
Third persons, known or used by, **3:2**
35 USC § 282, pre-trial disclosure,
23:76
Timeliness, **2:5; 4:25**
Willful infringement, **3:80; 14:24**
Willfulness, **3:51; 3:96**

NOVELTY

See also Point of Novelty (this index)
Design patent infringement, **1:165**
Gorham infringement test, **12:17**
Specifications, applies to claims not,
20:67

NOVELTY—Cont'd

Summary judgment, **21:7**

NULLIFICATION

Final judgment, **9:354**

NUMBER OF PREVAILING PARTIES

Award of costs, **19:219**

NUMBER OF UNITS SOLD

Commercial success, **9:181**

NUMERICAL RANGES

Doctrine of equivalents, **1:115**

NUNC PRO TUNC

Jurisdictional defect, cannot be used to
cure, **13:59**

Licensee, **13:87**

Reduction to practice, **3:94**

OATH

Reissue, **4:69**

OBJECTION

Agency, **9:311**

Claim interpretation, **19:16**

JNOV, **6:6; 22:2; 23:4**

Jury and jury trials, **1:14; 2:61**

Jury instructions, **1:43; 13:38**

Partial summary judgment, **7:5**

Secondary considerations, **13:17**

Special verdict, **8:52**

Testing protocol, **14:4**

OBJECTIVE

Anticipation, **18:20**

Reasonable apprehension, **16:42**

Sec. 282, **6:10**

Secondary, **19:19**

OBJECTIVE CRITERIA

Obviousness, **11:55**

OBJECTIVE EVIDENCE

Generally, **9:168**

Must be commensurate with claimed
invention, **9:100**

Nexus, **12:43; 18:53**

Obviousness, **3:30; 21:8**

Probative, often most, **7:46**

Valid, inappropriate to declare, **4:19**

Verbatim findings of counsel adopted,
8:22

OBJECTIVE FACTORS

Prima facie obviousness, **9:86**

OBJECTIVE INDICIA

Secondary considerations, **14:2**

OBJECTIVE INTENT

Broadened reissue, **9:109**

OBJECTIVE STANDARD

Prosecution history estoppel, **1:96; 2:74; 13:80; 16:57**

OBSERVATION

Generally, **13:41**

Claims determine what infringes patent, **9:4**

OBSOLESCENCE

Presumption of validity, **9:21**

OBVIOUSNESS

Generally, **1:265; 1:348; 1:367; 1:378; 1:380; 2:182; 2:193; 3:78; 3:98; 3:184; 3:228; 4:81; 4:123; 5:135; 5:140; 5:154; 6:107; 7:83; 7:133; 9:243; 9:256; 9:260; 9:265; 9:413; 9:417; 9:439; 9:450; 9:456; 9:458; 9:460; 9:475; 9:514; 13:137; 13:189; 13:202; 13:225; 13:235; 13:246.70; 13:253; 14:42; 14:89; 14:100; 15:53; 15:55; 16:97; 16:158; 17:10; 18:15; 18:122; 18:126; 18:130; 19:251; 19:268; 19:273; 19:302; 19:310; 19:312; 19:319; 19:330; 20:126; 20:157.50; 21:79; 21:88; 22:57; 25:13; 25:14; 26:16**

Absolute predictability of success not required, **13:18**

Accepted wisdom, contrary to, **3:3**

Actual reports of failure, **2:101**

Adding features, **21:8**

Admission of prior art, **18:70**

Admissions, effect of inventor's, **9:125**

Advisory jury, **11:69**

All evidence to be considered, **1:80; 5:5; 18:15**

All-purpose criteria for applying, none, **9:99**

Analogous art, **4:127; 9:338; 11:70; 18:23**

ANDA, **6:91; 16:108; 19:271**

Anticipation, **1:255; 3:203; 4:15; 5:139; 9:442; 9:461; 10:8; 11:77;**

OBVIOUSNESS—Cont'd

13:204; 13:227; 20:67; 21:76

Apparatus and obvious methods of use suggested, **4:74**

Appeal and review, **7:2; 9:56; 15:40**

Applicant's disclosure cannot be used to fill in gaps, **9:29**

As a whole, **2:8; 2:171; 5:111; 7:17; 9:46; 9:179**

Attorney, **3:104**

Blocking patent, **1:314**

Blonder-Tongue, **1:13**

Blueprint, **9:90**

Broadest reasonable interpretation, **3:201**

Burden, **1:30; 14:71**

Burden of persuasion and quantum of proof required, **9:357; 18:7**

Cancellation of claims

generally, **16:154**

motion to amend to request, **14:78**

Case or controversy, **19:317**

Chemical cases, **9:44**

Chemical composition, **9:98**

Chemical compound, **5:90; 5:91**

Chemical process, **9:20**

Claim construction, **1:223; 2:183; 2:186; 3:178; 8:103; 9:397; 9:459; 19:11; 19:226; 19:243; 19:327; 20:8**

Claimed ranges, **9:277**

Claim preamble, **9:79**

Claims

generally, **2:171; 21:8**

as a whole, **1:166; 5:111; 18:71**

Clear and convincing evidence, **2:171; 14:9**

Clear error, **12:79**

Coextensiveness, **20:157.30**

Collateral estoppel, **10:3**

Combination

generally, **9:29; 13:15**

motivation to combine, **9:372; 23:68**

references, **1:4; 1:30; 3:138; 8:42; 9:121; 23:11**

suggestion to combine, **2:92**

Commercial embodiment, comparison with patentee's, **1:4**

Commercial success, **7:108; 9:154; 9:311; 13:166; 18:15; 18:83; 20:107; 23:75**

INDEX

OBVIOUSNESS—Cont'd

Common sense, **9:297; 9:450**
Comparative data, **9:56**
Composition claim, recitation in, **9:12**
Conclusion, **9:15**
Contemporaneous beliefs, **9:12**
Contrary to prior art teachings, **9:31**
Contributory infringement, **7:130**
Copying, **1:119; 12:116; 23:75**
Correctness, reviewed for, **9:15**
Corroboration, **5:133**
Covered business method review, **21:72**
Criticality of claimed range, **9:107**
Damages, **19:228**
Defenses, **16:4**
Dependent claim, **9:24; 16:4; 18:23; 19:245**
Derivation of invention, **3:204**
Description, **6:99; 14:101; 20:47**
Designer of ordinary skill, **12:32**
Design patent, **8:128; 9:120; 9:135; 9:178; 9:227; 12:17; 13:198; 16:17**
Desirability
generally, **9:260**
prior art, combination proposed, must suggest desirability of, **9:29**
Device on sale more than one year, **20:72**
Differences, **3:3; 3:41; 18:15**
Disclaimers, **1:326**
Disclosure, **9:107; 16:4; 19:243**
DNA, **9:248**
Doctrine of equivalents, **3:178**
Double patenting
generally, **1:250; 5:49; 5:55; 9:110; 9:194; 9:203; 9:211; 9:488; 16:112; 16:147; 19:246; 21:76**
absolute predictability, not, **9:52**
claim comparison, **16:122**
claim consideration, **1:166**
claim construction, **19:226**
claims “as a whole,” **5:111**
consonance, need for, **20:29**
disclosure, **9:45; 9:307; 19:226**
doctrines purpose is to prevent improper timewise extension of patent right, **9:112**
expectation, reference teaching requires only reasonable expectation of success, **9:52**

OBVIOUSNESS—Cont'd

Double patenting—Cont'd
extension, doctrines purpose is to prevent improper timewise extension of patent right, **9:112**
fact vs. law questions, **9:52**
judicial notice of MPEP, **9:374**
law question, **9:134**
lead compound selection, **15:41**
obviated by terminal disclaimer, **17:2**
predictability, not absolute, **9:52**
prosecution rate, **6:69**
PTO, review of decisions, **9:52**
reasonable expectation, **9:52**
reference composition, **15:38**
reference teaching requires only reasonable expectation of success, **9:52**
review of PTO decisions, **9:52**
same invention, **9:52**
Sec. 121, **19:59**
terminal disclaimer as concession, **15:6**
variation amount, **5:103**
Enablement, **14:101**
Established by factual evidence not argument, **9:15**
Evidence
all evidence must be considered, **5:5; 18:15**
commercial success and copying, **23:75**
established by factual evidence not argument, **9:15**
examiner, evidence not before, **11:42**
expert opinion, **13:53**
independent evidence of nonobviousness, **3:175; 13:185**
nexus, **1:292; 18:99**
objective evidence, **21:8**
strong evidence, **13:85**
substantial evidence, **3:208; 20:152**
weight and credibility of evidence, **1:30; 3:165; 13:84; 16:19; 16:137**
Examiner, evidence not before, **11:42**
Examiner's rejection, **9:427; 9:434**
Expectation, unexpected results, **1:168; 9:228; 9:250**
Expectation of success, reasonable, **12:55; 16:108; 16:109**

OBVIOUSNESS—Cont'd

Expert testimony, **1:235; 13:53; 19:244**
 Fact findings, **1:4**
 Fact question, **9:182; 9:217; 23:52**
 Facts needed, **3:104**
 Factual evidence, **9:15**
 Failure to satisfy burden of proving, **20:135**
 FDA approval, **1:235; 1:236**
 Four-part factual inquiry, **1:87; 1:92; 2:59; 3:83; 6:37; 9:181; 9:211; 9:231; 11:40; 13:90; 16:49; 18:47; 18:51; 18:53; 18:55; 19:119; 21:34; 23:47; 23:50; 25:7**
 Four-part test, **1:126; 13:116; 22:27**
 Fraud, **1:171; 22:1**
 Functional relationship, **9:32**
 Genus, **3:167**
 Graham factors, **2:8; 19:244**
 Guidelines, **16:4; 18:23**
 Hatch-Waxman Act, **21:76**
 Heart of invention, **16:41**
 Hindsight, **1:149; 3:103; 3:109; 5:47; 9:274; 13:185; 15:42; 16:4; 16:137; 19:92; 21:8**
 Hypothetical person, **2:8**
 Improvement, **18:23**
 Incorporation by reference, **16:164**
 Indefiniteness, **2:160**
 Independent evidence of nonobviousness, **13:185**
 Inducement, **7:130**
 Inducing infringement, **8:24**
 Inequitable conduct, **1:231; 18:84; 19:202; 22:1**
 Infringement, **7:10; 18:23; 19:11; 19:19**
 Inherency, **5:136; 8:147; 8:159; 16:140; 16:171; 19:303; 20:67**
 Innovation is always invention, **18:15**
 Interference, **18:89**
 Inter partes reexamination, **12:101**
 Inter partes review, **1:283; 1:295; 1:321; 1:326; 2:173; 3:201; 5:131; 5:134; 5:139; 8:139; 9:418; 9:426; 9:428; 11:86; 11:283; 13:222; 14:99; 14:104; 16:166; 20:153; 22:56**
 Interrogatories, **5:7**
 JMOL, **1:171; 1:178; 2:136**
 JNOV, **13:38; 20:15**
 Jurisdiction to review, **7:128; 9:425**

OBVIOUSNESS—Cont'd

Jury and jury trials, **1:16; 3:153; 18:84; 19:37**
 Known or used by others, **3:2**
 Large number of references, **9:114**
 Law question, **1:171; 2:141; 3:151; 7:46; 9:24; 9:100; 9:172; 9:216; 10:15; 11:75; 12:40; 14:2; 16:48; 18:23; 18:41; 19:36; 21:8; 22:1; 23:7**
 Lead compound, **21:58**
 Legal determination, **2:76**
 Limitations, **6:101; 16:4; 16:137**
 Literal infringement, **2:49**
 Long-felt need, **21:8**
 Lost profits, **18:23**
 Marketplace response, **20:107**
 Matter of law, **9:15**
 Minor changes, **9:166**
 Modification, **9:51**
 Motivation
 generally, **9:207; 11:49; 16:140; 22:26**
 combine, **7:127; 9:428**
 expert testimony, **23:68**
 fact question, **9:217; 23:52**
 modify prior art reference, **9:124**
 Multiple different patents, **16:156**
 New ground of rejection, **9:15; 9:127; 9:372**
 Nexus, **1:292; 6:101; 12:43; 14:90; 17:13; 18:15; 18:53; 18:99**
 Non-enabling reference may qualify as prior art on obviousness, **19:59**
 Non-technical arts, **13:166**
 Objective criteria, **11:55**
 Objective evidence, **1:255; 21:8**
 Objective indicia of nonobviousness, **11:69**
 Obvious to try, **9:66; 9:459; 14:37**
 Obvious to try distinguished, **11:63**
 On-sale bar, **20:50; 20:72**
 Opinion testimony, **1:30**
 Optimizing result-effective variable, **9:352**
 Ordinary skill, **2:8; 12:32; 19:231; 20:126**
 Others, failed attempts of, **1:101**
 Papesch, **9:9**
 Patentability, **9:66; 9:107; 19:59**
 Patent marking, **1:307**

INDEX

OBVIOUSNESS—Cont'd

Patent term extension, **14:95**
Per se obviousness rejection, **9:173**
Petition for rehearing en banc, **19:287**
PHOSITA (person having ordinary skill in the art), **9:436**
Pick and choose, **2:8**
Policy, **16:4**
Potential claim unpatentable, **8:142**
Predictability of success not required, **1:255**
Prejudicial error, **18:15**
Prerequisite is determining pertinent references, **19:154**
Presumptions, **1:4; 1:30; 13:99; 16:4**
Prevailing party, **19:259**
Prima facie cases
generally, **9:37; 9:167; 9:174; 9:197; 9:207; 9:245**
see also Prima Facie Obviousness (this index)
Prima facie showing, **1:283**
Printed matter, **16:169**
Printed matter and substrate, **9:32**
Prior art
generally, **2:157; 9:167; 9:371; 9:446; 15:43; 16:4**
admission of, **18:70**
combination proposed, must suggest desirability of, **9:29**
contrary to teachings, **9:31**
found or suggested, **19:59**
lack of suggestion, **9:148**
must be some teaching or suggestion in, **14:8**
reference, need for teaching, suggestion or motivation to modify, **9:124**
same as before PTO, **2:8**
scope and content, **18:92**
some suggestions or incentive in, **1:30**
specification, statement of purpose in, **9:19**
state of art at time invention made, **4:91**
suggestion, generally, **21:8**
teachings, generally, **9:19; 16:4**
though not, **1:30**
Prior suit, validity holding in, **7:17**
Privity, **11:14**
Process performable by person, **1:12**

OBVIOUSNESS—Cont'd

Proposed substitute claims, **9:418**
Prosecution history estoppel, **19:275**
PTAB, **9:403**
Question
apparatus distinctions not claimed in process claims, **16:19**
attorneys, counsel arguments, **16:19**
burden, heavy, **16:19**
CAFC, **18:3**
credibility, **16:19**
evidence, objective, **3:30**
Graham, **3:30**
heavy burden, **16:19**
jury verdict, **3:17**
law question, above
objective evidence, **3:30**
reissue, **3:30**
reject witness' testimony, **16:19**
review, standard of, **16:19**
Sec. 103, **1:294; 16:19; 23:84**
skill in the art, level of, **3:30**
witnesses, reject of testimony, **16:19**
Ranges of obviousness, **5:134; 9:352; 22:63**
Reasonable expectation of success, **8:131; 9:52; 12:55; 15:58; 16:140**
Rebuttal evidence, **9:99**
Recitation in composition claim, **9:12**
Reexamination, **4:109; 9:329; 9:351; 9:442; 18:99**
Reference (this index)
Rehearing, **2:161**
Rehearing en banc, **13:214**
Rejection, **9:15; 9:56; 9:173; 9:333**
Remand and reassignment, **20:104**
Research, weight, **13:84**
Review, standard of, **2:59; 9:26; 9:168; 9:174; 9:195; 9:202; 22:13**
Routine optimization, **9:449**
Rule 131 affidavit, **7:19**
Same invention-type, **19:39**
Same way for validity and infringement, **19:11**
Sec. 101, **14:99**
Sec. 102, **3:168**
Sec. 103, **3:168; 13:225**
Sec. 314(d), **9:418**
Sec. 102(g), **11:9; 20:126**

OBVIOUSNESS—Cont'd

Sec. 103, **9:27; 9:62; 9:103; 9:117; 9:139; 9:295; 15:4; 23:84**
 Sec. 112, **9:86**
 Sec. 171, **9:73**
 Sec. 282, **1:4**
 Secondary considerations, **3:175; 3:190; 6:99; 8:153; 9:331; 13:45; 13:253; 16:4; 16:168; 18:15; 19:11; 21:8; 23:66; 25:14**
 Separately argued, **18:23**
 Simultaneous inventions, **7:97**
 Single reference, **19:123**
 Skill in the art, level of, **2:197; 4:82; 15:19**
 Sophisticated inventions, not limited to, **16:4**
 Special master's decision, **13:24**
 Specification, **9:19; 9:56**
 Specificity, need for, **12:64**
 Standard of review, **9:418**
 Standing, **1:334; 7:129**
 Statement of purpose in specification not prior art, **9:19**
 Strong evidence showing nonobviousness, **13:85**
 Subject matter as a whole, **9:46; 9:436**
 Substantial evidence test, **9:394; 19:43**
 Substrate, **9:32**
 Suggestion, **9:124; 9:148; 9:204; 11:49; 14:8; 21:8; 22:26**
 Summary judgment, **8:14; 9:454; 12:15; 21:7**
 Superior work, **18:23**
 Teach away, **9:361; 19:234; 20:50**
 Teaching-suggestion-motivation test, **3:153**
 Test, **18:23**
 Third persons, failure of, **21:8**
 Time and timeliness, **4:91**
 Time invention made, **12:43; 19:227**
 Two-step analysis, **11:43**
 Underlying factual inquiries, but based on, **9:197**
 Unexpected properties, **8:147**
 Unexpected results, **7:108; 8:40; 9:15; 9:228; 9:250; 9:295; 19:211; 19:214**
 Unpatentable, **9:423**
 Unpatentable claims, **2:173; 16:152**
 Utility, **7:130**

OBVIOUSNESS—Cont'd

Validity (this index)
 Values, range of, **9:191**
 Verdict, **16:14**
 Vitiating, **3:178**
 Waiver, **9:439**
 Weight, years of research entitled to, **13:84**
 Weight and credibility of evidence, **1:30; 3:165; 13:84; 16:19**
 Willful infringement, **8:129; 18:23**
 Work better, **18:23**

OBVIOUS TO TRY

Generally, **9:99; 13:18**
 Chemical, **9:60**
 Claim construction, **9:459**
 Conventional knowledge, **2:133**
 Expectation of success, **1:44**
 Lack of written description, **11:62**
 Obviousness, **14:37; 16:107**
 Obviousness distinguished, **11:63**
 Standard, not, **9:26**
 Standard of patentability, **9:66**
 Test, improper, **9:167**
 Verbatim findings of counsel adopted, **8:22**

ODYSSEY LOGISTICS & TECHNOLOGY CORP. V. STEWART

2025, **15:64**

OFFER FOR SALE

Generally, **6:61; 8:69; 19:137; 20:46**
 Fine tuning, **19:130**
 Sec. 102(b) on-sale bar, **1:216; 13:212; 18:8**
 Sec. 271(a), **18:54; 20:46; 20:103**
 Sham affidavit doctrine, **17:12**

OFFICERS

Sec. 102(b), **13:35**

OFFSHORE PATENTED PROCESS

Generally, **11:54**

OLD COMBINATION REJECTION

Cross-appeal, **18:2**

OLD COMPOSITION

Discovery of inherent properties, **20:11**

INDEX

OLD PROCESS

Durden, **9:98**

OLD PRODUCT

Generally, **8:57**

OMISSIONS

Attorney, **4:36**

Best mode, unintentional omission, **8:87**

Inequitable conduct, **7:46**

Materiality, **12:93**

Reissue application, **9:294**

Statutory construction, **12:37**

Walker Process antitrust, **4:84**

180-DAY EXCLUSIVITY PERIOD

Abbreviated new drug application
(ANDA), **4:98**

ONE MODE

Enablement, **1:131**

ONE OR MORE THAN ONE

A, **5:44**

ONE-TO-ONE CORRESPONDENCE

Doctrine of equivalents, **5:39; 6:39**

ONLY AS OF ISSUE DATE OF PATENT

Enablement, **9:53**

ONLY DISCLOSE WHAT AWARE OF

Best mode, **7:47**

ONLY GOD WORKS FROM NOTHING

Generally, **9:86**

Sec. 282, **6:10**

ON-SALE BAR

Generally, **3:96; 8:127; 8:145; 8:152;
9:279; 10:53; 13:204; 16:44;
16:103; 20:145; 21:45**

Assignment of invention as sale, **13:87**

Bright lie rule, none, **3:83**

Burden of proof, **9:171; 12:98**

Claim not invalid under, **13:215**

Clear and convincing evidence, **2:23**

Clearly erroneous definition, **2:23**

Commercial offer for sale, **13:102;
19:113**

Commercial offer to sell, **5:72; 19:179**

Commercial sale, **13:122; 19:133**

Contracts, **26:8**

ON-SALE BAR—Cont'd

Enforceability, **13:42**

Exception, supplier, **19:140**

Expectation, **5:35**

Experimental use, **1:59; 1:177; 1:179;
2:178; 5:64; 5:137**

Factors, **13:84; 18:42**

Filing date, **1:97; 4:93; 20:102**

Incidental to experimentation, **1:113**

Inequitable conduct, **5:137; 12:30**

Inherency, **19:113**

Invention submission organizations,
8:62

Joint development exception, **2:23**

Joint inventors, between, **2:85**

Law question, **2:31; 7:71; 12:60**

License agreement, **16:86**

Method performed by hand, **4:16**

Obviousness, **20:50; 20:72**

Offer to sell, **18:8**

Pfaff test, **2:71**

Policy considerations, **16:49; 19:107**

Process, sale of, **11:52**

Public policy, **1:71**

Public use, **2:178**

Ready for patenting, **1:179; 1:216;
8:145; 9:310; 14:35; 19:139**

Reduction to practice, **16:52**

Research agreement, **5:76**

Review, standard of, **1:119; 22:20**

Sale contract, **26:8**

Sec. 102(b), **1:52; 2:7; 3:41; 3:142;
5:15; 5:64; 6:25; 9:5; 9:7; 9:93;
9:118; 9:279; 10:1; 11:10; 11:25;
13:212; 16:32; 19:7; 19:31; 19:54;
21:1; 21:16; 23:6**

Sec. 285, **5:137**

Submissions, **8:62**

Substantially completed with reason to
expect it will work, **5:35**

Sufficiently complete is improper test,
19:91

Summary judgment motion, **1:2**

Supplier exception, **19:140**

Totality of circumstances, **3:81**

Trademark declaration cannot establish
on-sale date, **16:25**

Triggering bar, **1:216**

True sale, **13:123**

Two-part test, **8:71; 18:59; 23:47**

OPERATIONAL DIFFERENCES

Inducing infringement, **8:24**

OPERATION OF INVENTOR'S

BRAIN

New prior art not considered by PTO, **5:11**

OPINION

Advisory opinion, **9:92; 20:2**

Attorneys (this index)

CAFC, **17:2; 19:42**

Dann Amendment, **19:30**

Expert opinion. Expert or Opinion Evidence (this index)

Sec. 112, **9:40**

Summary judgment, **8:17**

Witnesses, **1:30; 3:1**

OPINION TESTIMONY

Expert or Opinion Testimony (this index)

OPPORTUNITY

Generally, **19:57**

Collateral estoppel, **16:57**

OPTIS CELLULAR TECHNOLOGY, LLC V. APPLE INC.

2025, **15:65**

“OR”

Claim interpretation, **2:86; 19:145**

ORAL FINDINGS

Sec. 291, **1:11**

ORAL TESTIMONY

Anticipation, **5:47**

Conception, **16:70; 19:151**

Contemporaneous documentary evidence, **3:49**

Corroboration, **10:31**

Prior use, **3:2**

Public use, **10:31**

Review, standard of, **19:12**

Validity, **23:48**

ORANGE BOOK

Generally, **10:54**

Case or controversy, **20:78**

Listing of patents, **1:135; 20:100**

Patent information, **14:62**

Tying, **16:121**

ORDERS

See also Judgments (this index)

Final judgment rule, **19:110**

FRCP 59, **19:50**

GVR order, **6:39**

ITC, **3:73**

Sec. 1.640, **1:60**

Transfer orders, **6:34**

“ORDINARILY AWARDED”

Prejudgment interest, **1:38; 13:72; 19:92**

“ORDINARILY CONSTRUED”

Method claims, **9:223**

ORDINARY AND ACCUSTOMED MEANING

Generally, **1:126; 2:101; 2:104; 3:51; 4:60; 8:74; 10:24; 11:61; 15:17; 19:157; 20:56; 20:64; 23:58**

All limitations considered meaning, **12:33**

Broadening ordinary meaning, **13:156**

Heavy presumption claim, **20:63**

Heavy presumption terms, **5:70; 18:67**

Jury verdict, **19:5**

Presumption of ordinary meaning, **11:48**

Statutory construction, **8:61**

Strong presumption, **4:73**

Surrounding words, **12:95**

Used differently by inventor, **3:91; 7:31**

Written description, **18:46**

ORDINARY DESIGNER STANDARD

Design patent, **4:48**

ORDINARY MEANING

Ordinary and Accustomed Meaning (this index)

ORDINARY OBSERVER TEST

Anticipation, **9:321**

Design patent infringement, **1:151; 1:165; 5:89; 6:88; 9:321; 18:96**

Point of novelty test, **3:100**

ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART

Generally, **9:139**

Analogous art, **9:78**

Anticipation, **3:103**

Burden on patent challenger, **16:12**

Claim construction, **2:88; 5:110; 8:88; 8:112; 20:99**

INDEX

ORDINARY SKILL IN THE ART

—Cont'd

- Competency of Board, **9:65**
- Conception, **19:124**
- Factors, **9:168; 18:28**
- Hypothetical inventor defined, **19:26**
- Indefiniteness, **5:106**
- Obviousness, **2:8; 12:32; 19:231**
- Ordinary skill in the art, exercise of normal skill expected of person of, **9:436; 19:72**
- Prior art, **9:65; 9:114**
- Reliance upon, **9:141**
- Sec. 102(g), **11:9**
- Technical qualifications, **9:65**

ORGANIZATION OF INFORMATION

- Computer memory, **9:153**

ORIGINAL CLAIMS

- Part of patent disclosure, **14:8**
- Prior art, **9:90**

ORNAMENTALITY

- Design patent, **2:58; 8:62; 18:87**
- Summary judgment, **1:35**

OSSEO IMAGING, LLC V. PLANMECA USA INC.

- 2024, **15:63**

OVERALL SIMILARITY

- Design patent, **2:63**

OVERBREADTH

- Adequacy of support, **21:10**
- Dominating patent, **21:10**
- Principle of invention, **21:10**
- Reverse doctrine of equivalents, **21:10**
- Sec. 101, **21:10**
- Utility, **21:10**

OVERLAPPING DATES

- Interference, **3:54**

OVERRULING

- Generally, **21:24**
- Determining law, not appropriate source for, **4:16**

OVERSIGHT

- Sec. 455, **8:14**

OVERTURN

- Appeal and review, **23:33**

OVERTURN—Cont'd

- Claim construction, **16:13**
- Sec. 112, **19:7**

OWNERSHIP

- See also Title (this index)
- Assignment of claim, **12:84**
- Bright-line test, **6:23**
- Claim preamble, **19:210**
- Employer and employee, between, **2:73**
- Executive Order 10096, **8:10**
- Foreign law, **1:172; 9:238**
- Fraud in procurement, **13:150**
- Inventorship, versus, **5:40; 9:303**
- Joinder, **19:194**
- Laches, **19:204**
- Law question, **11:33**
- Springs from invention, **20:40**
- Standing, **1:172; 3:93; 9:303; 16:111**

OWN MERITS

- Rule 147, **12:10**
- Summary judgment, **5:48**

PACKET INTELLIGENCE LLC V. NETSCOUT SYSTEMS, INC.

- 2024, **16:193**

PAGE LIMIT

- FRAP 28(g), **12:22**

PALO ALTO NETWORKS, INC. V. CENTRIPETAL NETWORKS, LLC

- 2024, **16:194**

PANDUIT

- Generally, **6:26; 6:36; 18:35; 20:52**
- Acceptable substitutes, **3:8; 4:90**
- But for causation, not exclusive test for, **3:62**
- Damages, lost profits damages award, guidelines for, **16:40**
- Factual findings to support jury verdict presumed, **2:15**
- Kicker, none, **13:72**
- Lost profits, **3:2; 11:28; 16:40; 19:56**
- Substitutes, acceptable, **3:8**
- Two-supplier market test, **13:121**

PAPESCH

- Improper, **9:9**
- Obviousness, rebutting, **9:9**
- Rebutting obviousness, **9:9**

PAPESCH—Cont'd

Rejection, undue breadth, **9:9**
 Undue breadth rejection, **9:9**

PARALLEL

Embodiment, **1:132**

PARDON

False patent marking, **19:262**

PARENT APPLICATION

Estoppel, **23:30**
 Sec. 120, **8:19**

PARENT CASE

Filing of CIP, **23:30**
 Prosecution history, **13:100**

PARKERVISION, INC. V. QUALCOMM INCORPORATED

2024, **16:195**

PARKERVISION, INC. V. VIDAL

2023, **16:188**

PAROL EVIDENCE

Integration, **13:76**

PARTIAL JUDGMENT

Appealability, **7:16**

PARTIAL SETTLEMENT

Generally, **7:8**

PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Appealability, **3:9**
 Final judgment rule, **3:86**
 FRCP 56(d), **7:5**
 Object, failure to, **7:5**
 Preliminary injunction, **19:32**

PARTICULARITY

Incorporation by reference, **26:12**
 Interference, **7:48**
 Pleading, **9:329**
 Timely motion for new trial, **18:25**

PARTICULAR LANGUAGE

Statutory construction, **12:37**

PARTIES

Customer end user as parties at trial, no necessity to have—contributory vs.direct infringement, **18:11**
 Non-Parties (this index)
 Prevailing party, **9:266**

PARTIES—Cont'd

Real party in interest, inter partes review, **1:324; 23:97**
 Sec. 315(b), **1:324**
 Standing (this index)

PARUS HOLDINGS, INC. V. GOOGLE LLC

2023, **16:189**

PATENTABILITY

Generally, **3:172; 9:127; 9:129; 9:133**
 Abstract ideas, **1:95; 9:286**
 Claim interpretation, **11:49**
 Claims, **2:173**
 Design patent, **9:137; 11:25**
 Doctrine of equivalents, **8:60; 12:51**
 Inequitable conduct, **18:116**
 Interference, **9:230; 16:16; 18:44; 23:44**
 Inter partes review, **2:173**
 Jury, fact findings of, **19:9**
 Lexicographer, inventor as, **13:18**
 Man-made organisms, **1:228**
 Means-plus-function claim, **4:97**
 Measurement of physical property, **9:247**
 New unappreciated property of prior art, **5:56**
 New use known process, **2:82**
 Not dependent on how invention was made, **12:55**
 Obviousness, **2:173; 9:66; 9:107; 19:59**
 Physical property, measurement of, **9:247**
 Prima facie obviousness, **9:17**
 Printed matter, **9:32; 11:64; 13:232**
 Product-by-process claims, **9:81**
 Prosecution history estoppel, **9:199; 16:69**
 Reexamination, **9:183; 9:314**
 Sec. 1.1641, **9:141**
 Sec. 135(a), **9:116**
 Signal, **9:290**

PATENTABLE

Is obvious, **18:22**

PATENT ACT OF 1952

Generally, **9:136**
 Doctrine of equivalents, **23:42**

INDEX

PATENT AGENTS

Writ of mandamus, compelling production, **9:429**

PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (PTO)

Generally, **1:3; 1:60; 9:1; 9:150; 10:5; 11:11; 12:31; 13:45; 18:19**

Appeal and review, **9:2; 13:162; 16:134**

Articulated reason for decision, **12:64**

Assignee failing to record assignment, **1:60**

Attorneys, **12:75**

Authority limited by grant from Congress, **11:26**

Claim construction, **9:199**

Claim differentiation, **11:2**

Clearly erroneous standard, **12:2**

Construction and interpretation, **1:81; 9:337**

Controlling unless plainly erroneous or inconsistent with regulation, **22:9**

Deference, entitled to, **9:337; 11:27**

Defined, relationship, **9:34**

Delay in prosecution, **23:69**

Design Patent (this index)

Discipline, **2:121**

Entitled to deference, **11:27**

Examiners (this index)

Excuse, **11:3**

Fact findings, **9:80**

Good faith belief, **1:43**

Hearsay, **9:150**

Identity of invention, **20:20**

Inconsistency, **22:9**

Inequitable conduct, **1:203; 7:19; 9:43; 10:2; 12:55; 12:85; 16:114; 19:118**

Initial rejection, **7:19**

Interference, **7:102**

Inter partes review, **19:282**

Issue preclusion, **20:41**

Judicial review of PTO decision under Administrative Procedure Act, **16:134**

Jurisdiction, **19:46**

Materiality, standard of, **9:43**

Means-plus-function claim, **9:199**

Motion to remand, **9:130**

Objection to agency, **9:311**

Obviousness, **9:52; 9:56**

Own regulations, **12:75**

PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE (PTO)—Cont'd

Plainly erroneous, **22:9**

Presumption of validity, **19:235**

Prima facie obviousness, **9:140; 9:153**

Prior art, noting differences from, **4:6**

Regulation, **19:63**

Reissue, **19:110**

Relationship defined, **9:34**

Res judicata, **2:60**

Review, standard of, **3:50; 4:56; 4:69; 9:165; 9:196**

Rule making, **12:37**

Sec. 2(b)(2)(D), **2:121**

Sec. 32, **23:15**

Sec. 41(a)(7), **13:32**

Sec. 102(b), **9:7**

Sec. 103, **9:140**

Sec. 282, **12:6**

Statutory Construction and Interpretation (this index)

Subject matter jurisdiction, lack of, **6:19**

37 CFR Sec. 1.56, duty of candor and good faith to PTO, **1:203**

Timing requirement, failure to observe, **9:187; 11:31**

Treaties. Patent Cooperation Treaty (this index)

Weight given thereto, **20:28**

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY (PCT)

Interference, **6:66**

Jurisdiction, **2:116**

Revival, **5:127**

Time limits, **8:70**

PATENT MARKING

Generally, **1:352**

Obviousness, **1:307**

PATENT MISUSE

Generally, **13:130; 21:51**

Affirmative defense, **23:9**

Anticompetitive effects, **16:126; 19:227**

Claims, **23:9**

Commercial embodiment, **23:9**

Contributory infringement, **8:14**

Dismissal for failure to state claim, **10:42**

Industry standard, **16:126**

Injunction against small infringer, **23:9**

PATENT MISUSE—Cont'd

Intervening rights, **23:9**
 Lawsuit brought for improper purpose,
 7:33
 Licensing, **19:6**
 Scope of patent exceeded, **19:227**
 Sec. 2, **20:2**
 Trademark generic, **23:9**
 Tying, **16:121**
 Unenforceable until misuse purged, **2:61**

PATENT POLICY

Obviousness, **16:4**

PATENT POOLS

Tying, **16:121**

PATENT PROPERTY

Sec. 261, **10:4**

PATENT PROSECUTION

Bar, generally, **4:94**
 Fraud, **3:83**
 Inequitable conduct, **6:42**

PATENT RIGHT CLAUSE

Performance of government contract,
 8:8

PATENT TERM

Adjustment of Patent Term (this index)
 Computation of extension, **13:144**;
 23:70
 Deference to agency's interpretation,
 8:25
 Drug Price Competition Act (DPCA),
 7:18
 Drug Price Competition and Patent Term
 Restoration Act (DPCPTR),
 3:109; 13:77
 Extension, **14:95; 19:339**
 Extension, generally, **6:3; 7:18; 13:77**;
 13:120; 16:149
 Hatch-Waxman amendment, **13:144**
 Obviousness, **14:95**
 Restoration, **16:84**
 Sec. 154(b), **23:69**
 Sec. 156, **6:3; 21:6**
 Sec. 156(a)(4), **8:25; 16:125**
 Sec. 156(e)(2), **19:197**
 Sec. 156(f), **16:125**
 Statutory construction rules, **8:25**

**PATENT TERM RESTORATION ACT
 (PTR)**

Generally, **4:40; 7:55**
 Extensions, **13:77**

**PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL
 BOARD (PTAB)**

Obviousness, **9:403**

PATENT TYING

Generally, **9:276; 21:51**
 Choice of law, **9:276**

PCT

Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) (this
 index)

PENALTIES

Sanctions (this index)

PEN AND PENCIL ANALOGY

Doctrine of equivalents, **18:29**

PENDENT JURISDICTION

Appeal of unquantified sanctions order,
 15:39
 Lack of, **19:9**

PENDING ACTS AND MATTERS

Generally, **5:2; 11:20; 16:19**
 Choice of law, co-pending actions,
 12:67
 Considerations involved, **19:49**
 Declaratory judgment, **23:9**
 Document retention policy, **13:168**
 Interference, **13:31**
 ITC, **19:25**
 Motion, **12:36; 19:45**
 9 Cir, **22:2**
 Reexamination, **22:23**
 Sec. 2201, **13:41**
 Stay, **8:52**
 Suspension of proceedings on appeal,
 1:24
 Willfulness, **3:51**

PER ARTICLE

Sec. 292 penalty, **6:72**

PERFORMANCE

Generally, **8:43**
 Administrative law, **13:70**
 Constructive reduction to practice, **8:8**
 Equitable estoppel, **8:8**

INDEX

PERFORMANCE—Cont'd

- Filing of application is constructive reduction to practice, **8:8**
- Four elements, **8:8**
- Intent, **8:8**
- Mathematical algorithm, **9:42**
- Means-plus-function claim, **12:3; 12:26**
- Patent right clause, **8:8**
- Probability, invention performs its intended function beyond probability of failure, **8:8**
- Product-by-process claims, **9:81**
- Reduction to practice, **8:8**
- Sec. 102(g), **19:10**

PERMANENT IDEAS

- Conception, **13:72; 20:65**

PERMANENT INJUNCTION

- Generally, **10:54**
- Abuse of discretion, **1:219; 9:315; 14:84**
- Anticipation, **1:219**
- Causation, **7:122**
- Drive demand, **7:122**
- Interlocutory decision, **12:41**
- Irreparable injury, **7:122; 18:93**
- Sec. 271(e)(1), **5:13**
- Sunset provision, **1:219**

PERMISSIBLE

- Facilitation, **20:54**
- Interference, **5:68**
- Statutory construction, **8:54; 12:34**

PER SE MATERIALITY RULE

- Inequitable conduct, **12:20**

PER SE OBVIOUSNESS REJECTION

- Obviousness, **9:173**

PER SE RULE

- Clearly erroneous standard, **19:23**

PERSONALIZED MEDIA COMMUNICATIONS, LLC V. APPLE INC.

- 2023, **16:190**

PERSONAL JURISDICTION

- Generally, **3:120; 3:181; 7:53; 7:107; 12:57; 13:230; 14:81; 18:73; 20:82; 20:158; 21:91; 24:5**
- Additional activities beyond warning letter, **1:181; 3:131**

PERSONAL JURISDICTION—Cont'd

- Attorney-client relationship, **18:90**
- Cease and desist letters, **24:5**
- Choice of law, **1:70; 4:49; 8:69; 8:79; 9:226; 18:45**
- Consent, **8:79; 13:114**
- Contractual consent or waiver, **13:114**
- Federal circuit law, **19:215**
- Foreign countries, **1:181; 1:186; 1:189; 2:142; 8:79; 14:15**
- Foreseeability, **1:374**
- FRCP 4(k)(2), **13:234**
- Law question, **8:69**
- Malpractice claim based on filing patent application, **20:94**
- Minimum contacts, **1:70; 5:67; 6:150; 20:94**
- Negation requirement, **19:215**
- Nonconsenting party outside forum state, **8:79; 16:124**
- Review, standard of, **6:50**
- Rule 4(k), **13:181; 19:212; 19:215**
- Specific jurisdiction, **20:46**
- Stream of commerce plus theory, **1:221**
- Stream of commerce theory, **1:181; 2:46**
- Use, **13:153**
- Venue, **8:69**
- Waiver, contractual consent or, **13:114**

PERSONAL LIABILITY

- Generally, **12:119**
- FRCP 15(c), **6:11**
- Inducing infringement, **19:92**
- Motion for directed verdict, **1:1**
- Sec. 102(b), **13:35**
- Sec. 112, **15:2**

PERSPECTIVE

- Doctrine of equivalents, **12:69**

PERSUASION

- Burden of Persuasion and Quantum of Proof (this index)

PERTINENCY OF WITHHELD INFORMATION

- Known or used by others, **3:2**

PETITIONS

- Mandamus, **2:2; 9:54**
- Motion to remand, **19:45**
- Panel hearing or rehearing en banc, **11:67**

PETITIONS—Cont'd

Special, petition to make
generally, **7:57; 12:56**
claim interpretation, **7:57**
inequitable conduct, **7:29**
prosecution history estoppel, **7:57**

PFAFF TEST

Generally, **22:20**
On-sale bar, **2:71**

**PFIZER INC. V. SANOFI PASTEUR
INC.**

2024, **16:196**

PHANTOM COUNT

Interference estoppel, **9:49**

**PHILIP MORRIS PRODUCTS S.A. V.
INTERNATIONAL TRADE
COMMISSION**

2023, **16:191**

PHOSITA

Obviousness, person having ordinary
skill in the art, **9:436; 19:72**

**PHRASE, MULTIPLE DEFINITIONS
OF**

Claim construction, **7:28**

PHYSICAL EMBODIMENT

Interference, **3:25**

PHYSICAL EVIDENCE

Claim interpretation, **6:37**

PHYSICAL EXHIBIT

Corroboration, **2:96**
Drawing, **16:36**

PHYSICALLY COMBINABLE

Claims construed, **9:77**
Presumption of validity, **9:21**
Sec. 103, **15:4**

PHYSICALLY WORK TOGETHER

Co-inventors, **20:68**

PHYSICAL PROPERTY

Patentability, **9:247**

PHYSICAL SUBSTITUTION

Reexamination, **9:87**

PICK AND CHOOSE

Nonobviousness, **2:8**

PICK AND CHOOSE—Cont'd

Prima facie case, **9:37**

PIERCING CORPORATE VEIL

Generally, **8:53**
Alter ego doctrine, **13:50**
FRCP 25(a), **13:25**

PIONEER

Generally, **1:115**
Claim interpretation, **20:8**
Combinations, virtually all inventions
are, **13:1**
Enablement, **16:80**
Infringement, **20:6**
Inspection of patentee's product, **16:15**
Means-plus-function claim, **20:6**
Sec. 102(e) v. sec. 102(g), **19:41**
Sec. 120, **8:19**

PLAIN LANGUAGE

Claim differentiation doctrine, **13:105**

PLAINLY ERRONEOUS

Agency's interpretation of own regula-
tions, **22:9**

PLAIN MEANING

Claim construction or interpretation,
19:167; 21:9
Clear and unambiguous, where contract
provisions are, **1:56**
Means-plus-function claim, **2:31**
Sec. 156, **6:3**
Statutory construction and interpreta-
tion, **1:69; 3:50; 6:14; 9:138;**
9:149; 10:19; 12:19; 13:48; 17:5;
20:26; 23:32

PLANT PATENTS

Newly found seedlings, **9:355**
Public use, **4:107; 94:106**
Sec. 161, **9:355**

PLANTS

Enablement, **9:259**
Sec. 271, **10:17**
Single claim, **9:162**

**PLANT VARIETY PROTECTION ACT
(PVPA)**

Generally, **4:55; 13:114; 19:173**
Sec. 101, versus, **16:63**
Sexually reproduced variety, **9:162**

INDEX

**PLATINUM OPTICS TECHNOLOGY
INC. V. VIAVI SOLUTIONS INC.**
2024, **16:197**

PLEADED, MUST BE
Collateral estoppel, **4:3**

PLEADING
Form 18, **9:356; 19:237**
Infringement, **9:356**

PLURALITY
Can mean more than two, **4:61**
Mean more than two, can, **20:29**
At least two, **18:67**

POINT OF NOVELTY
Generally, **23:18**
Design patent, **2:106; 9:325**
Ordinary observer test, **3:100**

POSSESSION
Best mode, **5:55**
Description, **13:124**
Sec. 102(b), **9:18**

**POST- AND PRE-CRITICAL DATE
CLAIMS**
Materiality, **1:220**

POST-GRANT REVIEW
Standing, **1:320**

POST-JUDGMENT INTEREST
Generally, **20:49**
Choice of law, **20:49**
Sec. 1961(a), **7:27**
Sovereign immunity, **1:55**

POST-JUDGMENT MOTION
FRCP 59(e), **2:46; 4:25**

POST-JUDGMENT RELIEF
FRCP 60(b) vs. FRCP 60(a), **16:37**

POST-TRIAL INJUNCTION
Jurisdiction, lack of, **19:9**

POST-TRIAL MOTIONS
Claim interpretation, **8:84**
Evidence, no requirement to prove
validity, **18:3**
JNOV, **1:50**
Limitations, review limited, **18:3**
Review limited, **18:3**
Validity, no requirement to prove, **18:3**

POST-TRIAL SETTLEMENT
Mootness, **11:23**

POST VERDICT MOTIONS
Preserve ground, failure to, **5:22**

**POWERBLOCK HOLDINGS, INC. V.
IFIT, INC.**
2025, **16:201**

POWER GRIDS
Sec. 101, abstract ideas, **5:128**

PRACTICAL UTILITY
Generally, **6:33**
Sec. 101, **9:143**

PRACTICE
Enablement, **9:177**
Reduction. Reduction to Practice (this
index)
Sec. 287, **4:12**

PREAMBLE
Claim Preamble (this index)

PRECEDENTS
Stare Decisis (this index)

PRECISE PROPORTIONS
Drawings, **8:74**

PRECISION
Description, **6:33**
Primary reference, **8:62**

PRE-CLINICAL RESEARCH
Sec. 271(e)(1), **9:251**

PRECLUSION
See also Claim Preclusion (this index)
Infringement, **16:35**
Issue Preclusion (this index)
Motion in limine, **7:26**
Res judicata, **6:14**

PREDICTABILITY
Obviousness, **13:18**
Obviousness-type double patenting,
9:52

PREEMPTION OF LAWS
Generally, **8:66; 12:123; 21:49**
Biologics Price Competition and
Innovation Act of 2009, **1:303**
CAFC, **21:42**
Competition, **26:7**

PREEMPTION OF LAWS—Cont'd

Conflict preemption, **11:50**
 Disclosure, **21:30**
 Federal patent code and UCC, **3:68**
 Federal unfair competition claims, **26:7**
 Fraudulent non-disclosure state inventorship law, **21:30**
 State law, **21:30; 21:42**
 State law tort liability, **7:81**
 Tort liability, state law tort liability, **7:81**
 UCC, federal patent code and, **3:68**

PREFERENCE

Claim interpretation, **1:116; 5:31; 6:56; 7:57; 7:77; 16:54; 22:12; 23:49**
 Claims, scope of, **1:79**
 Comparing claims with accused device, **13:9**
 Summary judgment, **10:4**

PREJUDGMENT INTEREST

Generally, **5:54; 11:21; 19:38; 19:324; 20:49**
 Abuse of discretion, **3:96; 8:20**
 Award against government requires either contract or Act of Congress, **19:83**
 Compensatory purpose, **15:10; 23:73**
 Compound vs. simple interest, **18:35**
 Congress, **19:83**
 Damages, **2:15; 7:15; 16:5; 18:2**
 Delay in bringing suit, **21:20**
 Enhanced damages, **21:3**
 FRCP 59(e) motion to alter or amend judgment, **10:14**
 Government, **19:83**
 Ordinarily awarded, **1:38; 13:72; 19:92**
 Presumption of validity, **12:9**
 Prevailing party, **19:259**
 Purpose, **2:30**
 Rate, **21:18**
 Reviewed only for abuse of discretion, **8:20**
 Sec. 284, **4:7**
 Simple interest, **18:35**
 Time, withheld, when, **12:20**
 Withheld, when, **12:20**
 Witnesses, **14:5**

PREJUDICE

Generally, **1:54; 10:15; 18:39**
 Change in economic position, **7:30**

PREJUDICE—Cont'd

Choice of law, **8:82**
 Complaint dismissed for mootness in view of settlement of controversy, **19:14**
 Damages to proper focus, **8:50**
 Economic position, change in, **7:30**
 Economic prejudice, **1:67**
 Equitable estoppel, **19:252**
 Final decision, **8:82**
 Laches or delay, **19:252**
 Nexus required, **8:32**
 Reliance on delay not required, **13:44**

PREJUDICIAL ERROR

Jury instructions, **2:31**
 Narrow claim construction, **14:2**
 Obviousness, **18:15**

PRELIMINARY AMENDMENT

Four-factor test, **1:110**

PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIONS

As to injunctions, generally. Injunctions (this index)
 Generally, **1:366; 2:199; 5:8; 7:85; 11:89; 12:123; 13:226; 13:245; 14:41; 19:183; 20:124; 20:128; 20:140; 20:155**
 Abuse of discretion, **1:155; 1:169; 13:89**
 ANDA filing, **1:202**
 Appealability, **11:19**
 Appeal and review, **2:16; 3:12; 7:81; 8:2**
 Attorney, proposed by, **12:16**
 Balance of hardships, **1:169**
 Biosimilar products, **1:291**
 Burden of proof, **3:76; 5:92; 14:20; 19:235**
 Causal nexus requirement, **1:225**
 Choice of law, **13:89; 16:33**
 Claim construction and interpretation, **1:241; 3:135**
 Concurrent litigation, stay of concurrent litigation, **11:19**
 Confidential business information is property, **6:7**
 Counsel, proposed by, **12:16**
 Delay, **20:12**
 Denial, **4:5; 10:41; 14:10; 18:75; 20:12**
 Design patent, **1:226; 3:34; 20:93**

INDEX

PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIONS

—Cont'd

Discretion of court, **1:220; 2:60; 6:21; 8:81; 12:29; 23:20**
District court's discretion, **1:220; 8:81**
Doctrine of equivalents, **13:229**
Drastic remedy, **9:95**
Employee mobility, **12:16**
Equal, not equal to same thing, **4:5**
Equal, things equal to each other, **4:5**
Escrow, **3:21**
Evidence, **8:2**
Exclusionary rights, **12:111**
Exhaustion of patent rights, **12:102**
Factors, **6:15**
Final judgment, **9:304**
Findings, **12:16**
Foreign patent in foreign court, **19:32**
Four-factor test, **1:133; 3:34; 7:69; 8:2; 9:145; 10:26; 10:29; 13:88; 13:107; 13:114; 14:9; 15:20; 16:70; 18:26; 18:32; 18:65; 19:94**
FRCP 52(a), **3:12; 15:5; 16:26**
Functionality, **2:16; 3:34**
Infringement suit presumed in good faith, **1:40**
Initial consideration of evidence, **8:2**
Interlocutory decision, **12:41**
Interlocutory order, **11:19**
Irreparable harm, **1:169; 1:225; 3:34; 19:14; 20:12**
Irreparable injury, **18:21**
Issuance, standard for, **11:67**
Jurisdiction, **3:12**
Lawsuits, against filing, **1:40**
Likelihood of success on merits, **1:169; 1:183; 11:67**
Money damages, **1:34**
Notice and knowledge, **3:12**
Partial summary judgment, denial of, **19:32**
Preserve status quo, **1:34**
Presumption, **3:34; 20:12**
Priority filing date, **1:199; 5:88**
Procedural issue, **8:21**
Property, confidential business information is, **6:7**
Reissue, **1:259**
Restraining against use of stolen trade secrets, **6:7**

PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIONS

—Cont'd

Review, standard of, **7:70; 8:46; 13:89; 20:61**
Review on appeal, standard of, **2:62; 7:50; 8:71; 12:16; 16:46; 20:53; 22:16**
RICO, **6:7**
Same thing, not equal to, **4:5**
Sec. 1292(a)(1), **23:13**
Serious question, **1:40**
Stay of concurrent litigation, **11:19**
Stolen trade secrets, **6:7**
Summary judgment, **19:32**
Threshold issue, **12:16**
Trademark, **2:16**
Trade secrets, restraining against use of stolen secrets, **6:7**
Validity, **1:169; 18:21; 20:12**

PRELIMINARY MOTIONS

Generally, **7:26**

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

Interference, **3:54**
Purpose thereof, **7:26**

PREPONDERANCE OF EVIDENCE

Defined, **4:33**
Reexamination, **5:9**

PRESUMPTIONS

See also Burden of Proof (this index)
Attorney disqualification, **16:3**
Claim construction and interpretation, **1:161; 4:73; 4:74; 5:70; 9:94; 11:48; 18:67; 20:63**
Claim differentiation doctrine, **1:162; 3:80; 19:171**
Co-inventors, naming properly, **7:79**
Commercial success, **23:52**
Common law, **9:154**
Design patent, **19:8**
Different scope, **3:80; 11:48**
Doctrine of equivalents, **8:60; 21:11**
Evidence, **18:26**
Inequitable conduct, **13:19**
Inventor's admission of invention by another, **1:8**
Inventorship, **6:35**
Irreparable harm, **1:110; 18:26; 18:32; 19:94; 20:12**
Judge and jury roles, **10:15**

PRESUMPTIONS—Cont'd

Means-plus-function claims, **1:134; 3:91; 5:51; 13:96; 18:107; 19:97; 23:51**

No presumption re uncited art, **12:13**

Notice and knowledge, **9:114**

Obviousness, **16:4**

Ordinary meaning, **11:48**

Preliminary injunction, **3:34; 20:12**

Prosecution history estoppel, **2:66; 5:115; 6:39; 12:53; 19:146; 23:42**

Public officer perform their duties correctly, **1:55**

Regularity, **1:55**

Sec. 102(b), **9:7**

Sec. 282, **6:10; 8:23**

Special verdict, **20:50**

Summary judgment, **10:4**

Validity

- generally, **1:80; 3:41; 8:119; 19:37; 19:129; 19:189**
- admission as prior art, **18:10**
- anticipation, **19:37**
- Blonder-Tongue, **1:13**
- combining references, criterion for, **9:21**
- criterion for combining references, **9:21**
- delay, **12:9**
- destroyed, **13:81**
- equivalence, **5:7**
- evidence to be weighed, **14:10**
- irreparable harm, **14:9**
- ITC, **19:25**
- JNOV, **22:2**
- jury, **1:16**
- laches, **12:9**
- mere procedural device, **13:53**
- more pertinent art, effect of, **12:9**
- new prior art, effect of, **18:10**
- obsolescence need not necessarily defeat reference, **9:21**
- obviousness, **1:4; 1:30; 13:99**
- physically combined, not whether they can be, **9:21**
- prejudgment interest, **12:9**
- prior art, **18:10**
- process performable by person, **1:12**
- publication, **18:10**
- reference, **9:21**

PRESUMPTIONS—Cont'd

Validity—Cont'd

- Sec. 102(e), **1:22**
- Sec. 282, **9:21; 9:57; 9:80; 12:6; 13:87; 16:4; 18:6**
- substantive law, **19:36**
- summary judgment, **3:13**
- verbatim findings of counsel adopted, **8:22**
- weakened or destroyed, never, **13:81**
- Warner-Jenkinson, **9:209**
- Well-established common law principles not changed, **9:154**

PRETRIAL ORDER

- Choice of law, **19:149**
- FRCP 16, **19:14**

PRETRIAL PROCEEDINGS

- Judicial Panel on Multi-District Litigation (JPMDL), **7:6**

PRETRIAL STIPULATION

- Effect thereof, **11:28**

PREVAILING PARTY

- Generally, **9:266; 15:60**
- Costs, **2:179**
- JMOL, **3:161**
- Number of prevailing parties, **19:219**
- Obviousness, **19:259**
- Voluntary dismissal, **18:76**
- Willful infringement, **19:259**

“PREVIOUSLY DONE, SOMETHING NOT”

- Sec. 145, **7:9**

PRICE

- Selling lower priced product does not justify infringement, **16:33**

PRICE EROSION

- Damages, **22:26**
- Lost profits, **2:34**

PRIMA FACIE CASE

- See also Prima Facie Obviousness (this index)
- Appeal and review, **9:37**
- Experimental use, **1:71**
- Explained, **9:104**
- FRE 705, **19:59**
- Interference, **7:13**

INDEX

PRIMA FACIE CASE—Cont'd

- Lack of written description rejection, **8:101**
- New ground of rejection, **9:37; 9:127**
- Obviousness. Prima Facie Obviousness (this index)
- Pick and choose, cannot, **9:37**
- Prior art teachings, among, **9:37**
- Rebuttal, **9:150**
- Rejection, **9:37; 9:127**
- Sec. 112, **16:10**

PRIMA FACIE OBVIOUSNESS

- Generally, **9:37; 9:50; 9:167; 9:174; 9:197; 9:207; 9:245**
- As a whole, **9:86**
- Broadest possible construction, **2:25**
- Chemical composition, **9:98**
- Claims not argued separately, **9:98**
- Combining references, **9:123**
- Composition, **9:17**
- De novo review, **2:133**
- DNA, **9:133**
- Establish, burden to, **9:140**
- Evidence, **9:99; 9:152**
- Expectation, unexpected results, **9:86**
- Experts, disbelief by, **2:25**
- Factors in determining patentability of claims to new composition and its method of use, **9:17**
- Few machines have no utility, **9:17**
- Inventor, problem facing, **9:17**
- Law of the case, **20:114**
- Machines, **9:17**
- New composition, **9:17**
- Objective factors, **9:86**
- Patentability, **9:17**
- PTO's burden, **9:140; 9:153; 9:387**
- Rebuttal, **2:25; 9:99; 9:119; 9:152**
- References, combining, **9:123**
- Sec. 103, **9:115**
- Structural obviousness, **9:50**
- Structural similarity, **1:183; 9:126**
- Unexpected results, **9:86**
- Utility, few machines have no, **9:17**

PRIMA FACIE SHOWING

- New interference rules, **8:3**

PRIMARILY FACTUAL

- Description, **21:33**

PRIMARILY FUNCTIONAL

- Design patent, **16:21**
- Validity, **12:8**

PRIMARY REFERENCE

- Absence of precision in verdict, **8:62**

PRINCIPAL CONSIDERATIONS

- Enhanced damages award, **19:101**

PRINTED MATTER

- Generally, **9:402**
- As a whole, **9:32**
- Claim to be read as a whole, **9:32**
- Mathematical algorithm, **9:32**
- Need for substrate relationship, **9:153**
- Obviousness, **9:32; 16:169**
- Patentability, **9:32; 11:64; 13:232**
- Sec. 101, also extends to, **9:32; 11:64**

PRINTED PUBLICATION

- Generally, **7:125; 10:48; 13:246**
- Anticipation, **9:322; 9:327; 14:94**
- “Arranged as in the claim,” **14:56**
- Burden of proof, **13:72**
- Claim construction, **1:313**
- Claim preamble, **1:313**
- Corroboration, **14:94**
- Dismissal, **3:19**
- Inequitable conduct, **15:34**
- Legal conclusion, **3:101**
- Publicly accessible, **9:261; 9:386; 19:266**
- Sec. 102(b), **9:14; 9:18; 9:33; 11:60; 12:89; 14:8; 16:25**
- Technical paper, **13:11**

PRINTER MATTER REJECTION

- Generally, **9:262**

PRIOR ACTIONS

- Generally, **13:53**
- Issue preclusion, **9:151**
- Obviousness, **7:17**

PRIOR ADJUDICATION

- Collateral estoppel, **9:90**

PRIOR APPLICATION

- Continuation application, **19:105**

PRIOR ART

- Generally, **3:39; 4:6; 7:29; 9:48; 9:96; 9:103; 9:110; 9:114; 13:18; 13:28; 13:45; 16:97; 17:2; 19:34; 22:66**

PRIOR ART—Cont'd

Admission of own work, **18:70**
 Analogous art, **1:329**
 Anticipation (this index)
 Burden less easily carried, **4:6**
 Burden of proof more easily carried, **5:11**
 Chemical, **9:60**
 Claim interpretation, **1:103; 8:57; 13:63; 19:15**
 Claim preamble, **9:79**
 Collateral estoppel, **8:73; 13:105**
 Combining references, **9:126; 9:127; 16:109**
 Combining teachings, **9:74**
 Commercialization, lack of, **4:6**
 Cumulative references, **12:61**
 Disclaimer, **19:216**
 Disclose potential priority conflicts, **7:68**
 Dismissal, **3:19**
 Doctrine of equivalents, **7:40; 9:118; 12:78; 13:93; 20:61**
 Double patenting, **9:45**
 Embellishment, **4:6**
 Enablement, **9:305; 19:59; 19:207**
 Enhanced damages, **21:3**
 Enhancement, **4:6**
 Foreign country, patented in, **9:120**
 Highly Relevant Prior Art (this index)
 Improper, **1:10**
 Inducing infringement, **8:24**
 Inequitable conduct, **7:1; 8:29; 8:62; 12:30; 19:128**
 Information disclosure statement, **1:122; 18:86**
 Infringement, **5:60; 7:10; 19:19**
 Intrinsic, cited art as, **22:31**
 Inventor's admission of invention by another, **1:8**
 Jepson format, **13:15**
 Jury verdict, **3:17**
 Later reference, discredited by, **9:117**
 Limitations added to overcome prior art, **11:22**
 Litigated, claims not, **4:6**
 Means-plus-function claims, **6:75**
 Modification, **9:51**
 New prior art not considered by PTO, **5:11**
 New use for an old structure, **9:48**

PRIOR ART—Cont'd

Not pertinent art before PTO, **4:6**
 Obviousness (this index)
 Ordinary skill, hypothetical person of ordinary skill, **9:65**
 Original versus reissue claims, **9:90**
 Own work, admission of own work, **18:70**
 Patentable subject matter, **5:56**
 Presumption of validity, **18:10**
 Prima facie case, **9:37**
 Priority, disclose potential priority conflicts, **7:68**
 Product-by-process claim, **9:58**
 Prosecution history estoppel, **6:39; 20:29; 23:42**
 PTO, generally, **4:6**
 Public accessibility, **19:207; 22:42**
 Reexamination, **9:194; 9:200**
 Reference (this index)
 Reissue, **9:90**
 Relevancy of foreign patent prosecution, **13:69**
 Scientific formula, **9:48**
 Sec. 102, **19:257**
 Sec. 102(b), **4:84; 9:46; 9:150**
 Sec. 102(g), **5:2**
 Sec. 112(6), **1:91; 9:118; 11:28**
 Sec. 282, **6:10**
 Secondary considerations, **4:10**
 Secret Prior Art (this index)
 Structure, new use for an old structure, **9:48**
 Suggestion or motivation to modify, must be, **9:101**
 Summary judgment, **3:1; 3:20; 6:1; 21:7**
 Teaching or suggestion must appear in reference, **9:140**
 Technical paper, **13:11**
 Uncited, **3:90**
 Validity, **3:77; 4:6**
 Weight, must be given, **13:53**

PRIOR DECISION

Res judicata, **13:22**

PRIOR DISMISSAL

ITC, **25:2**

INDEX

PRIOR EXPERIENCE

Attorneys' fees, award by special master, **19:65**

PRIOR FILING

Earlier Filing Date (this index)

PRIOR INTERFERENCE

Subsequent litigation, effect of prior interference on, **2:36**

PRIOR INVENTION

Sec. 102(g), **9:158**

Third party, **12:55**

PRIOR INVENTOR

Sec. 102(g)(2), **4:65**

PRIORITY

Generally, **18:1; 19:152**

Anticipation, **5:142; 25:12**

Claim, **25:12**

Claim construction, **5:142**

Description, written description required, **19:120**

Enablement and enablement requirement, **19:304**

Estoppel, **23:30**

Foreign application filed earlier, **2:125**

Inherent disclosure, **25:12**

Interference, **2:107; 3:6; 3:82; 6:20; 6:66; 7:13; 7:100; 8:30; 8:78; 9:88; 11:65; 13:31; 15:1; 16:16; 18:49; 19:90; 19:240; 23:14**

Law questions, **3:53; 16:36**

Prior art, **7:68**

Reduction to practice, **8:108**

Reexamination, **9:340; 19:110**

Reissue, **9:294**

Sec. 111, **19:32**

Sec. 119, **9:143**

Sec. 119(a), **2:125**

Sec. 120, **20:88**

Sec. 135(a), **9:116**

Stay order, **11:1**

Written description required, **19:120**

PRIORITY FILING DATE

Generally, **1:376; 9:258**

On-sale bar, **20:102**

Preliminary injunction, **1:199; 5:88**

Sec. 120, **2:142**

Written description, **4:117**

PRIOR JUDGMENT

Damages, **20:23**

PRIOR MUST BE ENABLING

Inconsistent jury findings, **2:10**

PRIOR NOTICE

FRAP 4(a)(4), **10:14**

PRIOR POSSESSION

Interference, **4:11**

PRIOR RULING

Generally, **5:9; 19:57**

Factual differences must be material to prevent operation of collateral estoppel doctrine, **1:63**

PRIOR TO MARKETING

Opinion of counsel, **3:72**

PRIOR USE

Generally, **3:2**

PRIVATE FIRM

Attorney fees award, **16:24**

PRIVATE PARTY

Antitrust, **5:30**

PRIVILEGE

Generally, **11:56**

Appellate review, appropriate for, **9:184**

Attorney-Client Privilege (this index)

Local rule compliance, **4:47**

Mandamus writ, **9:184**

Settlement negotiation privilege, **9:362**

PRIVITY

Assignor estoppel, **9:118; 13:88; 19:47**

Attorneys fees, **11:14**

Bound by related party's acts, **5:4**

Inherent property, **11:14**

Inter partes review, **23:86; 23:94**

Obviousness, **11:14**

Related party, **5:4; 11:14**

Res judicata, **9:224**

Time-bar, **16:176**

Willful infringement, **11:14**

PROBABILITY

Performance of government contract, **8:8**

PROCEDURAL ERRORS

Harmful error must be shown, **4:37**

PROCEDURAL ISSUE

Choice of law, **8:21; 19:42; 20:4**
 Inconsistent positions, **8:21**
 Irreparable harm, **8:21**
 Law question, **8:21**
 Preliminary injunction, **8:21**
 Sec. 112, **8:21**

PROCEDURAL LAPSE

Interference, **5:57**

PROCEDURAL PRESUMPTION

Sec. 282, **6:10**

PROCEDURAL RULE

CIT, **5:18**

PROCESS

Abstract mental process, Sec. 101
 patentability. Abstract (this index)
 Chemical process, **9:20**
 Claim construction, **21:61**
 Costs on appeal, **1:20**
 Damages, **19:154**
 Definition, **9:20; 18:85**
 Equivalence, **3:87**
 Inequitable conduct, **10:2**
 Infringement, **4:51**
 International Trade Commission, **1:184**
 Obviousness question, **16:19**
 On-sale bar, **11:52**
 Performable by person
 generally, **1:12**
 abstract mental process, Sec. 101
 patentability. Abstract (this
 index)
 circumstantial evidence, **1:12**
 infringement, **1:12**
 inquiry essential into secondary
 considerations, **1:12**
 obviousness, most probative on, **1:12**
 presumption of validity, effect on,
 1:12
 uncited prior art, **1:12**
 Product-by-process claim, **1:52**
 Sec. 101, **3:164; 6:71; 9:308**
 Sec. 102(g), **19:10**
 Sec. 271, **10:17**
 Sec. 271(a), **18:79**
 Sec. 271(g), **2:97**
 Sec. 287, **8:4**
 Sec. 287(a), **3:96**

PROCESS—Cont'd

Subject matter jurisdiction, process
 claim, generally, **3:164**

**PROCESS PATENT AMENDMENT
 ACT (PPAA)**

Import, sell, or use, **14:20**
 Materially changed, **2:60; 5:23**

PROCUREMENT

Inequitable conduct, **13:19**

PRODUCT-BY-PROCESS

Generally, **9:466; 11:87; 19:51; 19:186;**
19:187
 Claim limitations, **1:52**
 How product is made not how it is used,
13:54
 Identical, performances of compounds,
9:81
 Patentability determined by product
 itself, **9:81**
 Performances of compounds identical,
9:81
 Prior art product identical, **9:58**
 Sec. 295, **14:31**
 Structures not necessarily identical, **9:81**

PRODUCTION DOCUMENTS

Generally, **3:14**

PRODUCTION SPECIFICATIONS

Interference, **4:8**

PROFESSIONAL CONDUCT

Settlement agreement, **19:40**

PROFITS

Design patent, **3:98**
 Lost Profits (this index)
 Sec. 289 election, **2:33**

PRO HAC VICE

Sanctions, **2:55**

**PROMPTU SYSTEMS
 CORPORATION V. COMCAST
 CORPORATION**

2024, **16:198**

**PROPER CLAIM CONSTRUCTION
 FIRST**

Anticipation, **20:67**

INDEX

PROPER NOTICE

Conversion of FRCP 12(b) motion into a FRCP 56 motion for summary judgment, **2:41**

PROPER STANDARD

Jury verdict, **3:75**

PROPERTY

Constitutionality, **16:8**
Each patent establishes independent right, **11:35**
Independent, each patent establishes independent right, **11:35**
Preliminary injunction, **6:7**

PRO SE APPEARANCE

Generally, **6:16**

PROSECUTION ESTOPPEL

Earlier patent, **12:3**

PROSECUTION HISTORY

Generally, **1:107; 13:28; 13:111; 19:146; 19:171; 21:91**
Additional components, **12:18**
Ambiguous, improper, **9:246**
Amendments, **5:44**
Arguments made therein, **3:75; 16:66; 19:111**
Arguments same weight as claim amendments, **5:44**
Claim construction, **1:298; 14:57**
Claim differentiation, **1:162**
Claim interpretation, **1:77; 2:77; 11:12; 12:31; 19:84; 23:51**
Continuation, parent case in construing, **13:100**
Disavowal of particular aspect of claim meaning, **8:74; 16:151**
Disclaimer, **2:155; 5:94; 13:209; 19:169; 19:193; 22:35**
Doctrine of equivalents, **9:108**
Error in record, **22:23**
Estoppel. Prosecution History Estoppel (this index)
Failure to satisfy burden of proving, **20:135**
Foreign prosecution, claim construction, **1:209**
Hatch-Waxman Act, **9:438**
Infringement, **13:126**
Limitations not present in issued claims, **21:9**

PROSECUTION HISTORY—Cont'd

Meaning, disavowal of particular aspect of claim meaning, **8:74; 21:70**
Means-plus-function, **4:51**
Other patents, relevance of, **13:128**
Parent case, **13:100**
Prior art, unpatentable in view of, **19:281**
Reissued patent, **6:37**
Relevance of other patents, **13:128**
Sec. 102(g) prior work, **5:2**
Sec. 1498, **12:11**
Subject matter relinquished or disclaimed, **1:116**
Wilson hypothetical claim, **19:84**

PROSECUTION HISTORY

ESTOPPEL

Generally, **1:131; 1:135; 1:142; 2:84; 2:109; 3:99; 4:51; 5:115; 5:144; 7:80; 7:107; 16:56; 19:84; 19:94**
Amendment, **2:9; 2:66; 2:128; 3:130; 4:73; 6:48; 7:69; 8:13; 8:47; 18:40; 19:146; 20:29**
Any claim amendment, **6:48**
Appeal and review, **2:9**
Argument based estoppel vs. amendment based estoppel, **4:73**
Cancellation of broader claim, **5:36**
Claim construction and interpretation, **15:30; 20:118; 26:1**
Claims statement made regarding, not limited to, **1:84**
Clarity, **6:39; 19:153**
Clear, presumption to overcome prior art if unclear, **23:42**
Close examination of reason for amendment, **8:13**
Commonly owned patents, **1:115**
Competition, **8:38; 23:41**
Consisting of claim language, **13:7**
Defining claim terms, distinguished from, **19:84**
Definition, **19:84**
Dependent claims, **8:105**
Design patents, **16:139**
Disclaimer with clarity, **19:153**
Distinguished from prosecution history defining claim terms, **19:84**
Doctrine of equivalents, **1:164; 6:48; 6:64; 9:186; 9:377; 12:1; 12:62; 15:29; 16:27; 16:174; 20:69;**

PROSECUTION HISTORY

ESTOPPEL—Cont'd

- 20:89; 21:77; 22:37**
- Estoppel context, **9:186**
- Examination, **8:13; 8:47; 18:40**
- Examiner's reliance unnecessary, **12:49**
- Explanation, prosecution only where no explanation, **9:209**
- File wrapper estoppel, **4:26**
- Foreseeability, **4:96**
- Indefiniteness, **1:21**
- Infringement determination, **22:8**
- Jury case, **6:26**
- Law question, **13:63; 23:25**
- Limitations, **19:115**
- Literal claim scope, **2:77; 13:95; 23:54**
- Means-plus-function, **3:84**
- Narrowing amendment, **2:128; 6:70; 7:69; 18:77**
- Objective standard, **1:96; 2:74; 13:80; 16:57**
- Obviousness, **19:275**
- Patentability, **9:199; 16:69**
- Petition to make special, **7:57**
- Policy-oriented limitations, **19:115**
- Presumption, **2:66; 5:115; 6:39; 12:53; 19:146; 23:42**
- Prior art, **6:39; 20:29; 23:42**
- Purpose, **3:86; 8:47**
- Reasonable competition, **8:38; 23:41**
- Reasons for allowance, **19:168**
- Rebuttable presumption, **12:53**
- Recapture, **16:40**
- Reexamination, **9:237**
- Relevance, **2:31; 23:54**
- Replacing claims, **13:105**
- Scope of claim limitations, **18:101**
- Sec. 102(e) v. sec. 102(g), **19:41**
- Sec. 120, **8:19**
- Similar limitation, applies to all claims with, **5:59**
- Source, **3:84**
- Special, petition to make special, **7:57**
- Specification, effect of advantages in, **22:16**
- Statutory requirements, related to, **12:59**
- Subject matter, prevents recapture of, **8:72**
- Substantial reason for related to patentability, **6:41**

PROSECUTION HISTORY

ESTOPPEL—Cont'd

- Summary judgment, **20:13**
- Summary judgment of non-infringement, **8:40**
- Surrender, **16:40**
- Tangentially rebuttable, **3:130; 9:326; 18:77**
- Vague assertions of patentability, **9:199**
- Viewed from standpoint of reasonable competitor, **8:38; 23:41**
- Voluntary, **16:79**
- Wilson hypothetical claim, **7:28**

PROSECUTION IRREGULARITIES

- Generally, **13:81**
- Inequitable conduct, **13:81**

PROSECUTION LACHES DOCTRINE

- Generally, **19:181**
- Laches or Delay (this index)

PROSECUTION RATE

- Double patenting, **6:69**

PRO SE LAWYER

- FRCP 37, **16:71**

PRO SE LITIGANT

- Failure to state claim, **13:142**
- Frivolous appeal, **2:38**

PROTECTIVE ORDER

- Confidential information, **13:40**
- unsealing, appeal and review, **1:239**
- Discovery of confidential information, **13:40**
- Patent prosecution bar, **4:94**

PROTESTED REISSUE

- Affidavit, **9:23**

PROVISIONAL APPLICATION

- Inventorship, **5:88**
- Written description as related to nonprovisional, **14:36**

PROVISIONAL REJECTION

- Sec. 102(e), **9:110**

PROVISUR TECHNOLOGIES, INC. V. WEBER, INC.

- 2024, **16:199**

INDEX

PS PRODUCTS INC. V. PANTHER TRADING CO. INC.

2024, **16:199**

PTO

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) (this index)

PUBLIC ACCESSIBILITY

Indexing, **22:42**

Printed Publication (this index)

Sec 102(b) printed publication, **11:60**

Sec 112 written description, **3:144**

Standing, **19:316**

PUBLICATION

Claim interpretation, **20:8**

Motion to publish CAFC decision, **9:1**

MPEP, **16:6**

Pre-issuance damages with no actual notice of patent, **18:113**

Presumption of validity, **18:10**

Printed Publication (this index)

PUBLIC CONCERN

Constitutionality, **16:8**

Validity of patent is matter of, **6:22**

PUBLIC DISCLOSURE

Interference, **3:25**

PUBLIC INTEREST

Generally, **3:229**

Forum non conveniens, **13:58**

Preliminary injunction, **1:169**

Sec. 282, **12:5**

Vacation of judgment, **15:36**

PUBLICLY ACCESSIBLE

Generally, **9:261; 20:150**

Indexing, **22:42**

PUBLIC OFFICER

Presumption of regularity, **1:55**

PUBLIC POLICY

Assignor estoppel bars validity challenge, **4:13**

Interference, **7:13**

On-sale, **1:71**

Public use bars, **12:45**

Reexamination, **2:64; 9:200**

PUBLIC SERVICE

Attorney fees, **10:2**

PUBLIC USE

Generally, **9:279; 12:72**

Anticipation, **16:167; 26:13**

Commercial use, secret commercial use, **11:12**

Confidentiality agreement, **1:174; 2:106**

Experimental use exception, **2:178; 8:98; 14:35**

Implied license, **26:13**

Inventor testing claimed features, **14:36**

Law question, **2:57**

On-sale bar, **2:178; 13:28**

Oral testimony, **10:31**

Plant patents, **4:107; 94:106**

Policy, **2:57**

Printed publication, publicly accessible, **9:261**

Proof, standard of, **1:71**

Public policy, **12:45**

Rule of reason, **1:159**

Sale, **7:21**

Sec. 102(b), **2:1; 2:45; 3:16; 4:84; 4:101; 8:23; 9:34; 9:75; 10:31; 13:35; 13:149; 20:14; 23:11**

Sec. 262, **8:5**

Sec. 284, **16:167**

Secret commercial use, **11:12**

Third party, **4:101**

Totality of circumstances, **12:45; 16:44**

Validity, **16:167**

Witnesses, oral testimony, **10:31**

PUBLIC UTILITIES

Power grid monitoring, abstract ideas, **5:128**

PUBLISHED DEVICES

MPEP, **16:6**

PUNISHMENT

Damages, **1:20**

PUNITIVE DAMAGES

Generally, **18:14**

Constitutionality of large award, **20:58**

Review, standard of, **18:58**

State law punitive damages, **9:161**

PURDUE PHARMA L.P. V.

COLLEGIUM

PHARMACEUTICAL, INC.

2023, **16:192**

PURELY LEGAL QUESTION

Claim interpretation, **3:84**

PURELY PROCEDURAL ISSUES

Choice of law, **12:58**

PVPA

Plant Variety Protection Act (this index)

QUALCOMM INCORPORATED V. APPLE INC.

2025, **17:14**

QUALIFICATION

Attorneys (this index)

Judge, **8:12; 8:14**

Judicial disqualification, **16:19**

Prior art on obviousness, non-enabling reference may qualify as, **19:59**

Technical qualifications, **9:65**

QUANTUM OF EVIDENCE

Generally, **14:2**

Burden of Persuasion and Quantum of Proof (this index)

Court must state, **18:7**

QUASHAL

Appealability, **8:9**

Choice of law, **20:17**

FRCP 45, **11:24**

QUASI-ESTOPPEL

Generally, **9:216**

QUESTION CERTIFIED

Interlocutory order, **21:24**

QUESTIONS

Fact Question (this index)

Law Question (this index)

QUI TAM ACTION

Retroactive elimination under AIA, **2:151**

Sec. 292 (this index)

RACKETEER INFLUENCED AND CORRUPT ORGANIZATIONS ACT

RICO (this index)

RAISING ISSUES

Ambiguity, patent, **9:132**

Appeal and review, **2:87; 7:58; 8:44; 13:85**

RAISING ISSUES—Cont'd

Argument not raised at trial, **13:45**

Collateral estoppel, **7:65**

FRAP 30(b), **6:10**

Inequitable conduct, **23:47**

Interference, **13:3**

JMOL, **8:84**

Jurisdiction, **2:56**

Motion in limine, **7:26**

PTO motion to remand, **9:130**

Sec. 282, **4:58**

Secondary considerations, **9:82**

Summary judgment, **2:71**

Waiver, **4:58; 6:16; 23:25**

RAI STRATEGIC HOLDINGS, INC. V. PHILIP MORRIS PRODUCTS S.A.

2024, **18:137**

RANGES

Inter partes review, **5:134**

Obviousness, **5:134**

READY FOR PATENTING

Experimental use, **5:64**

On-sale bar, **1:179; 8:145; 9:310; 14:35; 19:139**

REALTEK SEMICONDUCTOR CORPORATION V. INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

2025, **18:139; 18:140**

REAL WORLD CONSIDERATIONS

Generally, **13:45**

REASONABLE APPREHENSION

Generally, **6:35**

Objective, **16:42**

REASONABLE COMPETITION

Prosecution history estoppel, **8:38; 23:41**

REASONABLE DEBATE

Certificate of correction, **14:39**

REASONABLE DELAY

Laches, **19:151**

REASONABLE DILIGENCE

Generally, **13:105**

Interference, **2:13**

INDEX

REASONABLE DILIGENCE—Cont'd

Inter partes review, **1:338**

Preamble, **1:338**

Rule 131 affidavit, **1:344**

REASONABLE EXAMINER STANDARD

Incorporation by reference language,
8:124

Materiality, **12:43; 13:69**

REASONABLE EXPECTATION

Obviousness, **8:131; 9:52; 12:55;
16:140**

REASONABLE INTERPRETATION

Broadest Reasonable Interpretation (this
index)

Only one, **16:60**

Statutory construction, **13:83; 20:42**

REASONABLENESS OF EXAMINER'S REJECTION

Inequitable conduct, **1:3**

REASONABLE PATENT EXAMINER

Materiality, **2:103**

REASONABLE PRECISION

Description, **6:33**

REASONABLE ROYALTY

Generally, **1:152; 2:84; 24:7**

ANDA, **1:280**

Anticipated profit, **13:131**

Appeal is review and not trial de novo,
6:12

Apportionment of damages, **14:5**

Claim construction, **19:279**

Common sense estimation, **9:213**

Damages (this index)

Determined, when, **21:23**

Eminent domain, **8:56**

Entire market value rule, **12:97; 18:35;
22:43**

Established royalty as measure, **13:72**

Expert or opinion evidence, **19:279**

Heavy burden if no manufacture to
exceed, **8:51**

Industry-wide licensing agreement, **1:38**

License, willing licensor, **19:38**

Limitations, court not limited to figures
urged by parties, **19:53**

Lost profits, **1:308; 23:81; 23:99**

REASONABLE ROYALTY—Cont'd

Sec. 284, **2:6**

Waiver, **19:279**

Willing licensor, **19:38**

REASONABLY APPRISED

Indefiniteness, **15:21**

REASONABLY

CONTEMPORANEOUS

Evidence of level of skill in the art, **9:23**

REASONABLY FORESEEABLE

Damages, **8:43; 13:79**

REASONABLY PRUDENT PERSON STANDARD

Delay, unavoidable, **18:33**

REASONABLY RELATED

Safe harbor provision of Hatch-Wax-
man, **13:187**

REASONS OF ALLOWANCE

Prosecution history estoppel, **19:168**

REASSIGNMENT

Articulation of reasoning, **20:104**

REBUTTABLE PRESUMPTION

Prosecution history estoppel, **3:130;
12:53; 18:77**

REBUTTAL

Attorney disqualification, **16:3**

Inventor's admission of invention by
another, **1:8**

Obviousness, prima facie obviousness,
9:99

Papesch, **9:9**

Prima facie obviousness, **2:25; 9:99;
9:119**

RECAPTURE

Generally, **16:67**

Disclaimer, **8:96**

Doctrine of equivalents, **13:63**

Prosecution history estoppel, **16:40**

Reissue, **7:106; 9:335; 9:368; 13:54;
13:140; 13:165; 23:16**

RECAPTURE RULE

Certificate of correction, **3:187**

Written description, **3:187**

RECEIVERS

Standing, **13:148**

**RECENTIVE ANALYTICS, INC. V.
FOX CORP.**2025, **18:141****RECOMBINANT DNA**As to DNA, generally. DNA (this index)
Generally, **7:28; 9:128; 9:167; 18:40;
19:121**Deposit of DNA, **19:121**Encoding protein sequence, **9:167****RECONSIDERATION**Infringement, new theory, **7:113**New ground of rejection, **9:22**Rejection, new ground of, **9:22**Summary judgment, **10:4**Timely notice of appeal, **20:21****RECONSTRUCTION**Claim differentiation, **11:2**Exhaustion of patent rights, **10:27**Implied license to repair with sale, **11:36**

Repair (this index)

Replacement of worn part, **16:20**Template, use as template, **9:114**Use as template, **9:114****RECTIFY**Patent license, **12:14****RECUSAL**Generally, **2:55**Choice of law, **2:55**Judicial disqualification, **1:65****REDEFINING**Claim interpretation, **5:48**Claim terms during prosecution, **1:136****REDRAFTING CLAIM**Claim construction, **18:91**Claim preamble, **3:22****REDUCTION TO PRACTICE**Generally, **2:118; 11:10**Burden of production, **12:63**Conception, **9:407; 13:105; 19:124**Constructive interference, **8:67**Elements, **7:64; 13:105**Embodied in tangible form, **19:144**Evidence, standard of, **13:110**Experimental use, **7:12**Intended purpose, need to show device
works for, **13:72****REDUCTION TO PRACTICE—Cont'd**Interference, **3:25; 12:2; 14:3**Invention of claims, **16:70**Law question, **2:96; 4:27; 5:34; 9:163;
19:70**Limitations, includes all, **3:82**New interference rules, **8:3**Nunc pro tunc, **3:94**On-sale bar, **16:52**Performance of government contract,
8:8Priority of invention, **8:108**Reasonable diligence, **1:344**Reference, antedate, **9:341**Requirements, **20:70**Review, standard of, **19:90**Rule 131, **1:344**Sec. 102(g), **6:83; 19:10**Sec. 120, **9:13**Sec. 131, **9:407**Tangible form, embodied in, **19:144**Testing, **26:11**Two prong test, **5:46**Verbatim findings of counsel adopted,
8:22**REDUNDANT JUDGMENT**Declaratory judgment suit or
counterclaim as, **13:46****REEXAMINATION**Generally, **18:108**Amendment of claims, **3:102; 6:8;
16:115; 17:6; 20:4**Anticipation, **9:314; 9:340; 19:225**Broadening uses, reissue test, **8:68**Broaden term is not fatal, **1:90**Broadest reasonable interpretation, **9:87;
9:154; 9:255**CAFC jurisdiction, **7:8**Certificate, **9:239**Claim preclusion, **19:255**Commissioner not limited to prior art,
9:194Completed upon issuance of reexamina-
tion certificate, **9:239**Constitutionality, **10:16; 16:8**Court review of decision to institute,
9:206Damages, **12:50**District court cannot order party to file,
9:180

INDEX

REEXAMINATION—Cont'd

Effective date, **13:79**
Enlargement of claims question of law, **20:43**
Estoppel, **1:369**
Expiration of patent, **9:424**
Extrinsic evidence, **20:120**
Filing, district court cannot order party to, **9:180**
Final judgment rule, **5:25; 6:84; 6:85**
Identical to original claim, **6:8**
Incremental, **9:501**
Interference, **4:8**
Inter Partes Reexamination (this index)
Intervention, **13:176**
Issuance of certificate, **9:239**
Jurisdiction, **19:46**
Law question, **20:43**
Limitations, commissioner not limited to prior art, **9:194**
Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) § 2217, **17:2**
New claims, **19:255**
New question, **2:150; 9:183**
Obviousness, **4:109; 9:329; 9:351; 9:442; 18:99**
Parties, **9:180**
Patentability, **9:183**
Pending litigation, stay as result of, **22:23**
Physical substitution of one reference into structure of another, **9:87**
Possibility, **9:87**
Preponderance of the evidence standard, **5:9**
Prior art, **9:194; 9:200**
Priority, **9:340; 19:110**
Priority cannot be determined, **19:110**
Prosecution history estoppel, **9:237**
Public policy, **2:64; 9:200**
Reference, **9:87**
Reissue, **6:8; 8:68; 11:5**
Reissue versus, **9:151**
Rejection, adding new grounds, **9:344**
Request not litigation suit in court, **10:9**
Review of decision to institute, **9:206**
Rule 131 affidavit, **7:19**
Sec. 252, **12:25**
Sec. 282, **9:80**
Sec. 304, **19:46**

REEXAMINATION—Cont'd

Sec. 305, **9:151**
Stay, **8:52; 16:116; 19:49; 22:23**
Substantial new question of patentability, **2:150; 9:183; 9:314**
Substantively identical, amended claims, **6:8**
Substitution, **9:87**
Summary judgment, **3:192**
Termination, **1:282**
Third-party requester, **1:287**
35 USC § 252, **6:8**

REFERENCE

Admission from failed attempt to antedate reference, **3:54**
All that it fairly suggests, **9:148**
All that it teaches, **9:123**
Analogous art, **9:16; 9:78; 19:36**
Antedating Reference (this index)
Anticipation, **5:66; 7:48; 7:94; 7:99; 9:291; 13:85; 19:38; 19:201**
Chemical, **9:60**
Claims construed, **9:77**
Combination patent, **13:15**
Combining references
 express teaching, **9:119**
 obviousness, **3:138; 8:42; 9:121; 16:109**
 prima facie obviousness, **9:123**
 prior art, teaching or suggestion in, **9:126; 9:127**
 showing only components not overall appearance of design, **9:137**
Combining teachings, **9:74**
Commissioner's brief not prior art, **9:140**
Common knowledge of the art, **9:154**
Cumulative reference, **5:16; 18:40; 19:51; 19:59**
Design patent, **9:137**
Disclosure document, **15:28**
Earlier filing date, **5:104**
Effective date, **9:110**
Enabling reference may qualify as prior art on obviousness, **19:59**
Fact findings of PTO, **9:80**
Fact question, teachings of, **9:119; 9:133; 9:148; 9:166; 9:169; 19:56**
First-filed patent as prior art, **17:2**
Foreign countries, **9:120; 17:1**

REFERENCE—Cont'd

Hindsight analysis improper, **9:16**
 Incorporation by Reference (this index)
 Inequitable conduct, **13:101**
 In their entirety, **16:4**
 Intentionally withheld, cannot be, if
 PTO considers, **12:43**
 Later reference, discredited by, **9:117**
 Modification, **3:3; 9:51**
 New prior art not considered by PTO,
 5:11
 Notice and knowledge
 common knowledge of the art, **9:154**
 materiality, **6:80**
 Obviousness
 generally, **9:16**
 combining references, **3:138; 23:11**
 entirety, considered in its, **2:8**
 establishment, teaches away from
 claimed invention as a general
 rule cannot be used to, **9:152**
 large number of, **9:114**
 prerequisite is determining pertinent
 references, **19:154**
 prior art, **9:124; 19:59**
 reasonable expectation of success,
 9:52
 reference composition, **15:38**
 single reference, **19:123**
 teaching away, **3:151; 9:289; 9:361**
 Presumption of validity, **9:21**
 Prior art
 generally, **9:59; 12:61**
 combining references, **9:126; 9:127**
 combining teachings, **9:74**
 Commissioner's brief, **9:140**
 enabling reference, **19:59**
 first-filed patent, **17:2**
 later reference, discredited by, **9:117**
 limitations, **12:80**
 new prior art not considered by PTO,
 5:11
 obviousness, **9:124; 19:59**
 relevancy of foreign patent prosecu-
 tion, **13:69**
 Reexamination, **9:87**
 Relative terms, **9:36**
 Relevancy of foreign patent prosecution,
 13:69
 Rule 131 affidavit, **7:19**

REFERENCE—Cont'd

Sec. 1.56, **8:29**
 Sec. 102(b), **9:18**
 Sec. 103, **15:4**
 Sec. 103 rejection, **9:101**
 Sec. 112, foreign references, **17:1**
 Sec. 282, **5:1**
 Special master's decision, **13:24**

REFINING

Improving device, **13:8**

**REGENERON PHARMACEUTICALS,
INC. V. MYLAN
PHARMACEUTICALS INC.**

2025, **18:142**

**REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF
CALIFORNIA V. BROAD
INSTITUTE, INC**

2025, **18:143**

**REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF
MINNESOTA V. GILEAD
SCIENCES, INC.**

2023, **18:134**

REGIONAL CIRCUIT COURT

Choice of law, **24:1**

REGIONAL CIRCUIT LAW

Declaratory judgment, **19:22**

REGIONAL LAW

Motion to vacate, **16:19**

REGISTRATION

Declaratory judgment, **23:9**

Sec. 32, **23:15**

Statutory invention registration, **8:67**

REHEARING

Frivolous, **9:97**

Motion to remand, **19:45**

Obviousness, **2:161**

REINSTATEMENT

License agreement, **16:23**

Maintenance fee, failure to pay, **3:38**

REISSUE

Generally, **14:51**

Affidavit describing work of third party
 at reasonably contemporaneous
 time, **9:23**

Application, **9:47**

INDEX

REISSUE—Cont'd

Attorney fees award, **16:24; 18:82**
Attorneys, **9:84; 9:294**
Broadened claims, **9:192; 9:365; 17:6**
Cancelled original claim, **6:85; 9:364; 12:31**
Change, **9:10**
Claim construction in foreign prosecution, **1:209**
Claims construed, **6:100; 9:77**
Copying before patent issued, **11:5**
Dann Amendment, **19:30**
Dependent claims, **9:336**
Disclaimer filed and two-year limit, **22:15**
Double patenting, **7:115**
Error, **8:64; 19:110; 19:137**
Filing, **9:3; 22:15**
Foreign prosecution, claim construction, **1:209**
Ignorance of inventor, **9:84**
Inequitable conduct, **8:26**
Insight, new counsel's, **9:84**
Intervening rights to manufacture, **13:168**
Inventorship, **3:83**
Inventor's ignorance, **9:84**
JMOL, **4:64**
Jury, **1:16**
Law of the case, **1:276**
Law question, **9:188**
Limitation, disclaimer filed and two-year limit, **22:15**
Linking claim, **4:70**
Motion, **12:36**
New counsel's insight, **9:84**
Oath invalidating, **4:69**
Objective intent to claim is not criterion, **9:109**
Obviousness question, **3:30; 9:366**
Omissions, **9:294**
Preliminary injunctions, **1:259**
Prior art, **9:90**
Priority, **9:294**
Prosecution history, **6:37**
PTO error in two patents for same invention, **19:110**
Recapture rule, **7:106; 9:335; 9:368; 9:507; 13:54; 13:140; 13:165; 23:16**
Reexamination, **6:8; 8:68; 11:5**

REISSUE—Cont'd

Reexamination versus, **9:151**
Remedial statutes, **9:3**
Requirements, **14:23**
Restriction, **4:70**
Same invention, **19:110**
Sec. 26, **9:3**
Sec. 116, **9:3**
Sec. 121, **7:115**
Sec. 251
 generally, **2:4; 8:12; 9:69; 9:84; 9:85; 9:105; 9:138; 19:51**
 compelling patentee to seek no defect reissue, **7:21**
Sec. 252, **19:4; 19:13; 19:55; 23:26**
Sec. 252(2), **2:40**
Specify every different, **4:63**
Summary judgment, **8:17**
Suspend proceedings, **3:72**
Terminal disclaimer, withdrawal, **9:367**
37 CFR Sec. 1.175(a)(4), **9:25**
Two patents, **19:110**
Unrelated claims, **9:365**
Validity, oath, **4:69**
Willful infringement, **11:5**
Written description, **9:479**

REJECTION

Acquiescence of applicant, **12:31**
Appellate review, **9:64**
Common occurrence, **17:4**
Cross-appeal, **18:2**
Evidence of validity, **7:19**
Factfinder not obliged, **8:31**
FRCP 56(f), **2:80**
Grounds, **9:344**
Intent to claim, **9:39**
MPEP, **16:6**
New ground, **9:15; 9:22; 9:37; 9:127**
Obviousness, **9:56; 9:173; 9:333; 16:19; 17:2**
Papesch, **9:9**
Sec. 1.192(c)(7), **8:107; 13:108**
Sec. 1.196(a), **9:140**
Sec. 102(b), **9:18**
Sec. 102(e), **9:110**
Sec. 103, **9:101**
Sec. 112, **16:10**
Sec. 132, **3:32**
Sec. 145, **7:9**

REJECTION—Cont'd

37 CFR Sec. 1.196(a), **9:106**
 Timeliness, **9:38**
 Validity, evidence of, **7:19**

RELATED APPLICATIONS

Sec. 120, **12:10**

RELATED LITIGATION

Generally, **19:61**

RELATED PARTY

Privity, **5:4; 11:14**

RELATIVE TERMS

Generally, **9:36**

RELEVANCE

All that it teaches, **9:123**
 Anticipation, **19:154**
 Claim interpretation, **3:75**
 Due process clause, **18:69**
 Facts to be found by trial court, **18:25**
 Foreign patent prosecution, **13:69**
 Inequitable conduct, **8:62**
 Jury verdict, **18:25**
 Later reference, discredited by, **9:117**
 Materiality, **2:68**
 New prior art not considered by PTO,
 5:11
 Sec. 1498, **12:11; 15:4**
 Selection of transferee forum, **9:128**
 Subsequent patent, **8:40**
 Substantial evidence, **16:39**
 Transfer, selection of transferee forum,
 9:128

RELEVANT MARKET

Jury, **1:16**

RELITIGATING

Consent judgment, **5:8**

REMAND

Appealable, **9:31**
 Appropriateness, **7:37; 12:26**
 Assignor estoppel, **6:96**
 Attorney fees, **3:46**
 Clarification, **10:38**
 Damages, **18:105**
 Faulty jury instruction, **7:27**
 FRCP 52(a), **1:59**
 Jury instructions, faulty, **7:27**
 Mandamus, **9:68**

REMAND—Cont'd

Necessity of, **3:35**
 Non-party, **9:116**
 Notice and knowledge, **19:45**
 Scope, **5:43**
 Sec. 284, **2:31**
 Sec. 1367, **8:97**
 Sec. 1447, **8:97**
 Senior party introduces no evidence,
 2:26
 Timeliness, **9:38**

**REMBRANDT DIAGNOSTICS, LP V.
 ALERE, INC.**

2023, **18:135**

REMEDIAL SANCTION

Mandamus, **9:57**

REMEDIAL STATUTES

Reissue, broadening, **9:3**

REMITTITUR

Maximum recovery rule, **21:23**
 Review, standard of, **15:10**

REMOVAL

Assignor estoppel, **6:96**
 Expert opinion testimony, **2:80**
 Sec. 141, **9:116; 9:496**
 Sec. 1447(d), appeal and review, **22:46**

RENEWAL

Directed verdict, **14:1**

REPAIR

ARO, **19:56**
 Blonder-Tongue, **1:13**
 Combination, when component
 effectively spent, **19:79**
 Implied license defense, **4:1**
 Law question, **4:1**
 Reconstruction versus
 generally, **1:86; 4:1; 8:59; 10:27;**
 12:20; 13:42
 bright-line test, none therefore, **2:75**
 exhaustion of patent rights, **10:27**
 extent of change not its purpose,
 19:143
 implied license to repair with sale,
 11:36
 replacement of worn part, **6:67; 16:20**
 Three situations, **8:83**

INDEX

REPEAL

CAFC, **6:30**
Implication, by, **18:34**
Statutory construction, **6:30; 19:80**

REPEATED BITES AT THE APPLE, NO SUPPORT FOR

Repose, law reaches for, **2:26**

REPLACEMENT

Doctrine of equivalents, **13:106**
Prosecution history estoppel, **13:105**
Reconstruction vs. repair, **6:67; 16:20**

REPLICATION OF PATENTED TECHNOLOGY

Infringement, **13:173**

REPLY BRIEF

Generally, **1:351**
Fraud allegation, **12:3**
Raising issue for first time, **1:79; 12:3;
23:23**

REPOSE

Repeated bites at the apple, no support
for, **2:26**

REPREHENSIBLE CONDUCT

Appellant's demeaning trial court, **9:159**

REPRESENTATIVE CLAIMS

Generally, **2:57**
FRAP 38, **16:4**
Sec. 1.192(c)(7), **8:107**
Valid, inappropriate to declare, **4:19**

REPUDIATION

Generally, **4:59**

REPUTATION

Adequacy of monetary damages, **18:32**

RESALE

Review of decision on JNOV motion,
21:5

RESCISSION

Generally, **4:59**

RESEARCH

FNERDA, **6:18**
Obviousness, **13:84**
On sale bar, research agreement, **5:76**
Sec. 271(e)(1), **9:251; 9:299**

RESEARCH JOINT VENTURES

Patent misuse, **16:126**

RES JUDICATA

Generally, **8:92; 19:332**
Agency decision, effect of, **2:60**
Agreement, effect of, **4:71**
Application to patents not in complaint,
11:35
Claim preclusion, **19:255**
Collateral estoppel, **9:122; 16:35**
Complaint, application to patents not in,
11:35
Consent decree on validity and enforce-
ability, **6:17**
Continuing conduct, **1:229**
Enforcement, consent decree on, **6:17**
Issue preclusion, **4:9; 13:51**
Law question, **21:29**
Material differences in claim limitation,
14:64
Preclusion, **4:9; 6:14; 13:51**
Prior state court decision, **13:22**
Privity, **9:224**
Sec. 337, **3:23**
State court decision, prior, **13:22**
Summary judgment, **1:78**
Validity, consent decree on, **6:17**

RESPONSE

Discovery sanctions, **13:25**
Document request, **2:27**

RESTEM, LLC V. JADI CELL, LLC

2025, **18:144**

RESTITUTION

Attorney fees award improperly granted,
19:58
Equitable remedy, **20:34**

RESTORATION OF PATENT TERM

Generally, **16:84**

RESTRICTIONS

Limitations and Restrictions (this index)

RESUBMITTING REFERENCES

Inequitable conduct, **1:92**

RESULTING PREJUDICE

Delay, **13:44**

RETENTION OF DOCUMENTS

Preservation of evidence, **13:168**

RETIRED

Evidence, loss of, **14:11**

RETRIAL

Infringement, **8:51**

RETROACTIVITY

Constitutionality, **16:8**

Judicial decision, **23:33**

Not favored, **2:32**

Order, **1:46**

Standing, **8:63**

Statutory construction, **15:7**

RETROSPECTIVE EFFECT

Change in law, **7:25**

REVERSAL

Appropriateness, **12:26**

Damages award, **5:102**

Declaratory judgment, **9:92**

District Court decision, **9:1**

Jury and jury trials, **5:41**

State immunity from suit under Eleventh Amendment, **10:11**

Summary judgment, **8:17**

Validity, **7:8**

Willful infringement, **3:26**

REVERSE DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS

Generally, **1:131; 9:149; 13:9; 20:61**

Abbreviated new drug application (ANDA), **18:80**

Additional components, **12:18**

Burden of proof, **19:24**

Claim construction and interpretation, **3:7; 19:24; 19:51**

Claim differentiation, **11:2; 19:24**

Claim preclusion, **18:80**

Commercial embodiment, comparison with, **19:24**

Complexity exception, **19:24**

Exception, complexity, **19:24**

Jury, **19:24**

Lethal weapon, **19:24**

Overbreadth, **21:10**

Specification, **19:24**

Summary judgment, **19:24**

REVERSE PAYMENT

Settlement agreement, **9:309**

REVERSE SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

Antitrust, **6:87**

REVERSE VALIDITY

Cross-appeal, **18:2**

REVERSIBLE ERROR

Difficulty of showing, **19:57**

REVIEWABILITY

Appealability (this index)

REVIVAL

Abandoned patent, **1:177**

Patent cooperation treaty (PCT), **5:127**

REWRITTEN ACTS AND MATTERS

Claim interpretation, **16:91; 18:68**

Claims, rewritten to suit needs, **14:14**

Doctrine of equivalents, **18:65**

Validity, **1:119**

REX MEDICAL, L.P. V. INTUITIVE SURGICAL, INC.

2025, **18:146**

RICO

Preliminary injunction, **6:7**

Statute of limitations, **1:47**

RIGHT TO SUE

Standing, **19:154**

ROAD TRYOUT

FRCP 15(c), **6:11**

ROKU, INC. V. INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

2024, **18:138**

ROKU, INC. V. UNIVERSAL ELECTRONICS, INC.

2023, **18:136**

ROOTS

Half the practice of a decent lawyer, **1:20; 12:24; 16:4**

ROUTINE

Well-understood, Routine and Conventional (this index)

ROUTINE ASSESSMENT

Attorney fees, **18:12**

ROUTINELY BUILT

Conclusory statements, **9:113**

INDEX

ROUTINE OPTIMIZATION

Obviousness, **9:449**

ROYALTIES

Appeal is review and not trial de novo, **6:12**

Blonder-Tongue, **1:13**

Damages, **8:20; 9:235**

Escrow, **3:21**

Expired patent, **11:79**

Factual findings to support jury verdict presumed, **2:15**

FRCP 52(a), **1:18**

In lieu of injunction, **16:106**

Reasonable Royalty (this index)

Running royalty agreement, **23:73**

Sales to subsidiary, **9:159**

Sec. 1631, **19:2**

Stay of patent action, **9:91**

Unpatented components, may be based on, **5:26**

RUBIK'S CUBE CASE

Generally, **13:28**

RULE 11

Generally, **19:258**

RULE 27(1)

Generally, **6:57**

RULE 28(D)

Confidentiality markings in brief, **9:337**

RULE 60(b)

Discretion of court, **12:100**

RULE 129(B)(1)(II)

Generally, **8:165**

RULE 131 AFFIDAVIT

Generally, **17:2**

Antedating reference, **7:19**

Four-part Graham inquiry, **7:19**

Graham inquiry, four-part, **7:19**

Obvious determination, **7:19**

Reasonable diligence, **1:344**

Reduction to practice, **1:344**

Reexamination, **7:19**

Reference, antedating, **7:19**

RULE 147

Generally, **12:10**

Own merits, each claim considered on, **12:10**

RULE 196

Rule 198, **9:31**

RULE 198

Rule 196, **9:31**

RULE 202

New evidence, **9:288**

RULE OF REASON

Corroboration, **9:288; 11:41; 12:92; 13:72; 19:132**

Sufficient circumstantial evidence, **3:82**

RUMORS

Appellate jurisdiction, **3:11**

RUSCC 60(B) MOTION

Claims court, **3:40**

SAFE HARBOR

ANDA, Hatch-Waxman safe harbor, **13:187**

Drug product importation, **1:175; 16:117**

Sec. 121, **2:140; 19:246**

URAA, **2:54; 4:40**

SAGE PRODUCTS, LLC V. STEWART

2025, **19:358**

SALAZAR V. AT&T MOBILITY LLC

2023, **19:344**

SALES

Adjudicated infringer, **11:10**

Commercial success, **9:111**

Damages, future lost sales, **6:74**

Infringement, **8:129**

Infringement, selling lower priced product does not justify, **16:33**

Laches, **15:14**

Offer for sale, infringement, **8:129**

Public use, **7:21**

Royalty calculation, **9:159**

Sec. 271, **10:17**

Summary judgment motion, **1:2**

SALES CONTRACT

On-sale bar, **26:8**

SALIX PHARMACEUTICALS, LTD.

V. NORWICH

PHARMACEUTICALS INC.

2024, **19:353**

SAME BURDEN

Sec. 1498, **12:11**

SAME CLAIM

Claim interpretation, **1:106**

SAME CLAIM INTERPRETATION

Used for validity and infringement, **2:45**

SAME CONCEPTS

Sec. 287, **13:33**

SAME DESIGN

Sec. 171, **9:73**

SAME EVIDENCE

Identity of invention, **20:20**

Mandamus, **9:41**

SAME INVENTION

Double patenting, **7:75; 9:52**

Expiration of patent right is not
guarantee of right to use, **19:39**

Jury instructions, **10:4**

Obviousness-type, **19:39**

Obviousness-type double patenting,
9:52

Reissue, **19:110**

SAME ISSUES

Enjoining concurrent litigation, **9:116**

SAME LOCATION

Doctrine of equivalents, **26:4**

SAME MEANING

Claim interpretation, **19:15**

JNOV motion, denial of, **13:13**

SAME PARTIES

Enjoining concurrent litigation, **9:116**

SAME PHRASES

Sec. 287, **13:33**

SAME RESULT

Graver Tank, **20:6**

SAME TERMS

Claim interpretation, **1:106; 5:63; 6:43**

SAME THING, NOT EQUAL TO

Preliminary injunction, **4:5**

SAME TIME

Co-inventors, **20:68**

SAME WAY

Construed same way, **11:9; 23:11**

Obviousness, **19:11**

Sec. 102(g), **11:9**

SAMPLE AS WITNESS

Claims determine what infringes patent,
9:4

SANCTIONS

Generally, **1:364; 13:131; 13:135;**
19:188

Antitrust, **11:16**

Appeal and review, **13:71; 19:64**

Attorney fees, **12:36; 19:42; 20:115**

Choice of law, **19:114**

Confidentiality markings in briefs filed,
9:337

Demand therefor must be supported,
17:2

Discovery violation, **2:27; 18:94**

Dismissal without prejudice, **12:36**

Enforcement order, **4:20**

FRAP 38, **9:102; 23:89**

FRCP 11, **1:41; 3:150; 5:109; 9:125;**
18:24; 18:95

FRCP 37(b), **14:14; 20:4**

Frivolous appeal, **3:150; 5:96; 13:71**

Improper behavior in courtroom, **14:19**

Infringement, neither intent nor prepara-
tion constitutes, **12:22**

Inter partes review, **2:174**

ITC orders, violations, **14:65; 15:52**

Jurisdiction, **20:129**

Litigation misconduct, **1:193; 13:85;**
20:87

Mandamus, **9:57**

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO),
2:121

Pro hac vice, **2:55**

Respond, failure to, **13:25**

Review, standard of, **9:161**

Sec. 1.287(d)(2), **23:14**

Sec. 1.616, **1:60**

Sec. 284, **2:31**

Sec. 285, **19:57**

Sec. 292, **6:72**

Sec. 455, **8:14**

Sec. 1292(c)(2), **9:6**

INDEX

- SANDERLING MANAGEMENT LTD. V. SNAP INC.**
2023, **19:345**
- SANHO CORP. V. KAIJET TECHNOLOGY INTERNATIONAL LIMITED, INC**
2024, **19:354**
- SANOFI-AVENTIS DEUTSCHLAND GMBH V. MYLAN PHARMACEUTICALS INC.**
2023, **19:346**
- SATELLITE LITIGATION**
Generally, **3:42**
- SCATTERGUN APPROACH**
FRCP 15(c), **6:11**
- SCHOOL, EXPERT STILL IN**
Generally, **23:11**
- SCHWENDIMANN V. NEENAH, INC.**
2023, **19:347**
- SCIENCE**
Validity, **5:56**
- SCIENTIFIC FORMULA**
Prior art article, **9:48**
- SCIENTIFIC OPINION**
Evidence, **2:79**
- SCIENTIFIC PRINCIPLES**
Inventor's theory, **6:10**
- SCIENTIFIC THEORY**
Generally, **26:2**
- SCIENTIST**
Test results, **8:30**
- SCPA**
Mask works, **2:34**
- SCREENING**
Attorney disqualification, **16:3**
- SEAGATE TEST**
Enhanced damages, **8:137**
- SEAGEN INC. V. DAIICHI SANKYO COMPANY, LTD.**
2025, **19:359**
- SEALED DOCUMENTS**
Generally, **21:89**
- SEARCH**
Misrepresentation re prior art search, **7:29**
- SEARS**
Compco, **21:11**
Copying an article, **7:3**
Damages, **7:3; 21:11**
Lost sales caused by introduction of competitive product, **21:11**
- SEC. 1.**
Generally, **3:241; 8:67**
- SEC. 1.11(b)**
Sec. 1.195, **9:74**
- SEC. 1.28**
Generally, **4:52**
- SEC. 1.48**
Sec. 256, **19:76**
- SEC. 1.51(a)**
Generally, **5:57**
- SEC. 1.54(d)(1)**
Generally, **19:163**
- SEC. 1.54(d)(2)**
Generally, **19:163**
- SEC. 1.56**
Generally, **19:180**
Disclose references showing each known step, no obligation to, **8:29**
- SEC. 1.84**
Heavy lines show light direction, **9:137**
- SEC. 1.137**
Generally, **4:52**
- SEC. 1.153**
Form-of-claim requirement, **9:137**
- SEC. 1.192(a)**
Affidavit, **9:142**
- SEC. 1.192(c)**
Dependent claims not separately argued, **9:154**
- SEC. 1.192(c)(7)**
Generally, **13:108**

SEC. 1.192(c)(7)—Cont'd
 Representative claim, **8:107**

SEC. 1.195
 Sec. 1.11(b), **9:74**

SEC. 1.196(a)
 Rejection, grounds not specifically
 addressed by Board, **9:140**

SEC. 1.287(d)(2)
 Sanctions, **23:14**

SEC. 1.324
 Evidence, **23:55**

SEC. 1.601
 Generally, **9:240**

SEC. 1.601(c)
 Sec. 135(b), versus, **9:240**

SEC. 1.601(i)
 Generally, **1:107; 9:163**

SEC. 1.601(n)
 Generally, **1:107**

SEC. 1.616
 Sanctions, **1:60**

SEC. 1.633(a)
 Generally, **18:44**

SEC. 1.633(g)
 Interference, **11:27**

SEC. 1.640
 Interference, **3:32**
 Order to show cause, **1:60**

SEC. 1.640(b)
 Generally, **2:93**

SEC. 1.645(b)
 EIC has broad discretion on late filings,
1:60

SEC. 1.657(a)
 Generally, **2:96**

SEC. 1.662(b)
 Interference, **7:23**

SEC. 1.671
 New interference rules, **8:3**

SEC. 1.671(f)
 Generally, **2:96**

SEC. 1.1641
 Patentability considered, **9:141**

SEC. 2
 “Before the Office,” **2:121**
 Patent misuse, **20:2**

SEC. 2(b)(2)(D)
 Generally, **11:50**
 Disciplinary action, **2:121**

SEC. 6(a)
 Commissioner’s regulation if not incon-
 sistent have force of law, **23:15**

SEC. 10.57(b)
 Propriety of nondisclosure by attorney
 of another client’s application,
13:69

SEC. 13(b) CONDITION PRECEDENT
 Interference, **2:93**

SEC. 26
 Reissue, broadening, **9:3**

SEC. 32
 Generally, **11:50**
 “Before the Office,” **2:121**
 PTO registration of attorneys, **23:15**

SEC. 41(a)(7)
 Agency’s interpretation of statute, **13:32**
 Commissioner’s jurisdiction, **13:32**
 Complaint, well-pleaded, **13:32**
 Deference, entitled to, **13:32**
 District court, **13:32**
 Interpretation of statute, agency’s, **13:32**
 Jurisdiction, commissioner’s, **13:32**
 Well-pleaded complaint, **13:32**

SEC. 41(c)(1)
 Generally, **7:87**

SEC. 43(a)
 Competition, unfair, **15:5; 16:21**
 8 Cir, **10:15**
 Lanham Act, **12:23**
 Summary judgment, **3:1**
 Unfair competition, **15:5; 16:21**
 Willful infringement, **3:26**

SEC. 85
 Attorney fees award in contract action,
9:159

INDEX

SEC. 100

Generally, **19:174**

SEC. 100(d)

Generally, **1:68**

Patentee, **1:46**

SEC. 101

Generally, **1:277; 1:286; 1:322; 1:349; 1:368; 2:177; 2:191; 3:172; 3:213; 3:219 to 3:221; 3:232.70; 3:235; 3:239; 4:118; 5:146; 5:150; 5:153; 6:105; 9:393; 9:414; 9:416; 9:451; 9:465; 9:474; 9:487; 9:497; 9:498; 9:506; 9:511; 13:188; 14:98; 15:46; 16:178; 18:115; 18:125; 19:257; 19:306; 19:307; 19:328; 20:139; 21:81; 21:82; 21:86; 23:102; 24:8**

Abstract ideas, **1:95; 1:253; 1:285; 1:286; 1:290; 2:163; 3:143; 4:104; 5:128; 6:94; 9:286; 9:308; 13:188; 19:298; 19:301; 19:331; 20:143; 22:58**

Animals as patentable subject matter, **1:45**

Anticipation, **3:207**

Claim construction, **13:241; 19:320**

Computer-aided, **6:80; 19:292**

Computer-related limitations to significant part of invention, **1:251; 1:286; 2:147**

Correctness of inventor's theories, **18:6**

Covered business method review, **18:119; 20:154**

Damages, **6:97**

Definitions, **9:290**

Dismiss, motion to, **1:343**

DNA, **1:228; 1:245; 9:383**

Double patenting, **9:463**

Economic practice, **19:331**

Enablement, **18:6**

Estoppel, **19:320**

Failure to claim patent-eligible subject matter, **9:433**

Failure to state a claim, **2:167**

Indefiniteness, **2:175**

Infringement allegations, **7:118**

Internet, abstract ideas, **1:285; 4:104; 9:437**

Inter partes review, **14:99**

Issue preclusion, **22:61**

SEC. 101—Cont'd

Machine, **19:112**

Machine-or-transformation test, **9:308; 16:123; 21:62**

Man-made organisms, **1:228**

Mathematical algorithm, **9:308**

Means-plus-function claim, **4:97**

Nonstatutory subject matter, **9:30**

Obviousness, **14:99**

Overbreadth, **21:10**

Patent-ineligibility defense, **13:217**

Patent-ineligible subject matter, **1:310; 3:219; 3:227; 6:94; 9:431; 9:437; 13:210; 18:109**

Power grid monitoring, **5:128**

Practical utility requirement, **9:143**

Printed matter and substrate, **3:219; 9:32; 11:64**

Process claim, **3:164; 6:71; 9:308**

PVPA, **16:63**

Sec. 112, **18:6**

Sec. 285, **9:455**

Sovereign immunity, **21:78**

Standing, **9:452**

Statutory subject matter, **1:51; 3:164; 4:105; 6:82; 9:30; 9:154; 9:155; 9:286; 9:437; 13:178; 21:62**

Subject matter, **11:83**

Summary judgment, **2:175**

Utility, **2:34; 3:37; 5:7; 13:55; 14:4; 18:6; 20:25**

Vacation of summary judgment based on anticipation, **5:129**

SEC. 102

Anticipation, **9:104**

Classic test, **12:12**

Corroboration, **6:40**

Obviousness, **3:168**

Prior art, **19:257**

Public accessibility, **19:207**

SEC. 102(a)

Generally, **13:72; 13:122; 23:48**

First inventor, **7:98**

Foreign country, patented in, **9:120**

Known or used by others, **3:2**

Prior art reference, **9:120**

Third parties, **3:2**

SEC. 102(b)

Generally, **1:71; 3:96; 5:21; 5:77; 9:171; 13:122; 14:35; 14:44; 19:161; 23:48**

Additional references can be used for anticipation rejection to show possession by public, **9:18**

Analogous art, **19:7**

Anticipation, **7:99; 9:18; 9:129; 21:73**

Appeal, de novo review from PTO, **9:7**

Applicability, **19:31**

Complaint charging infringement of only certain claims, **19:31**

Court's role, **19:31**

Dates, obscuring, **2:1**

De novo review from PTO, **9:7**

Design patent, **20:32**

Disclosure, **9:18**

Enablement, **9:18**

Evidence, **9:7; 9:18**

Exception, supplier, **19:140**

Exceptional case, **9:93**

Experimental use, **7:12; 12:30**

Fatal wound, staunching, **4:16**

FRCP 41(b) motion, **19:31**

Incorporation by reference, **1:101**

Inequitable conduct, **9:7; 13:35; 21:73**

Infringement, **19:31**

Inventorship, **19:7**

Law of the case doctrine, **19:31**

Materiality, **13:35**

Method performed by hand, **4:16**

Motion, FRCP 41(b) motion, **19:31**

Offer to sell, **18:8**

Officers, **13:35**

On-sale bar, **1:52; 2:7; 3:41; 4:16; 5:15; 5:64; 6:25; 8:127; 9:5; 9:7; 9:93; 9:118; 9:279; 10:1; 11:10; 11:25; 16:32; 19:7; 19:31; 19:54; 21:1; 21:16; 23:6**

Patent applications not entitled to presumption of validity, **9:7**

Personal liability, **13:35**

Possession by public, **9:18**

Presumption of validity, **9:7**

Printed publication, **9:14; 9:18; 9:33; 12:89; 14:8; 16:25**

Prior art, **9:46; 9:150**

PTO, de novo review from, **9:7**

Public, possession of, **9:18**

SEC. 102(b)—Cont'd

Public use, **2:1; 2:45; 3:16; 8:23; 9:34; 9:75; 10:31; 13:35; 13:149; 20:14; 23:11**

References, **9:18**

Rejection, **9:18**

Sec. 1.195, **6:57**

Sec. 103, **2:1; 9:46**

Sec. 262, **8:5**

Skilled in art, failure by those, **9:18**

Staunching the fatal wound, **4:16**

Summary judgment, **1:2; 19:62**

Supplier exception, **19:140**

Technical paper, **13:11**

Third persons, activities of, **19:7**

Unfair competition, not, **3:16**

Validity, **9:7**

SEC. 102(c)

Anticipation, **5:65**

SEC. 102(d)

Generally, **2:90**

Filing date, **9:136**

Policy, **9:136**

Statutory bar, **9:136**

SEC. 102(e)

Generally, **9:212**

Actual commercial consequences, **19:41**

Anticipation, **20:115**

Commercial consequences, actual, **19:41**

Damages, jury damages award, **19:41**

Delay, **19:41**

Different inventive entities sharing common inventor, **1:22**

Disclosure of species anticipates generic claim, **9:28**

Effective date, **9:110**

Evidence before PTO on validity was material, **1:22**

Jury damages award, **19:41**

Laches, **19:41**

Pioneer, **19:41**

Presumption of validity, **1:22**

Prosecution history estoppel, **19:41**

Provisional rejection, **9:110**

Sec. 103 provisional rejection practice, **9:110**

Secret prior art, **19:41**

Separate steps, **19:41**

INDEX

SEC. 102(f)

Generally, **3:117; 9:471; 12:40; 15:11; 16:50; 19:125**

Derivation of invention, **14:10**

Sec. 103, **15:11**

SEC. 102(g)

Generally, **3:59; 3:94; 5:77; 13:72; 13:103; 18:63; 21:39**

Arguments, **5:2**

As a whole, **11:9**

Bad axiom, **11:9**

Claims construed same way, **11:9**

Companies, **14:7**

Corroboration of non-party inventors, **20:48**

Design around, **11:9**

Diligence irrelevant when not first to conceive, **14:7; 16:148**

Foreign country, imported product produced by process performed in, **19:10**

Heart of process invention, process is, **19:10**

Intent, **11:9**

In this country, **1:111**

Materiality, **11:9**

Necessary, when, **19:10**

Non-party inventors, corroboration of, **20:48**

Obviousness, **11:9; 20:126**

Ordinary skill, hypothetical person of, **11:9; 20:126**

People conceive, **14:7**

Performance, **19:10**

Prior art, **5:2; 20:126**

Prior invention, **9:158**

Priority, **26:11**

Process, **19:10**

Prosecution history, **5:2**

Reduction in practice in U.S., **19:10**

Reduction to practice, **6:83**

Same, claims construed same way, **11:9**

Sec. 103, **11:9**

Sec. 103 prior art, as, **5:2; 20:126**

Sec. 104, **19:10**

Secret prior art, **19:41**

Sufficient, **19:10**

Suppression or concealment, **16:9**

Tests, **19:10**

Third party invention, **14:7**

SEC. 102(g)—Cont'd

Utility for any purpose, **19:10**

SEC. 102(g)(2)

Generally, **13:103; 13:105; 18:63; 19:132**

Prior inventor, **4:65**

SEC. 103

Amendment of 1984, **11:23**

Claim interpretation, **20:8**

Design patent, **9:8**

Mechanical misfit, **15:4**

Obviousness, **1:294; 3:168; 9:27; 9:62; 9:103; 9:117; 9:139; 9:295; 13:225; 15:4; 16:19; 23:84**

Physically combining references, **15:4**

Prima facie obviousness, **9:115**

Prior art, **5:2; 9:46**

PTO's burden to establish, **9:140**

References, **9:101; 15:4**

Rejection on single reference device capable of being operated like claimed apparatus, **9:101**

Sec. 102(b), **2:1**

Sec. 102(e), **9:110**

Sec. 102(f), **15:11**

Sec. 102(g), **11:9**

SEC. 103(2)

Prior art, exclusion of, **9:110**

SEC. 104

Foreign activity, **8:30**

Sec. 102(g), **19:10**

SEC. 111

Claims not in patent, **19:32**

Priority filing date, **19:32**

SEC. 112

Generally, **5:57; 11:8; 16:89**

Able to produce standard, **15:2**

Abstract ideas, **18:85**

Amend claims, **20:6**

Appealed, decisions are, **9:40**

Best mode, **1:161; 1:194; 2:14; 4:2; 5:16; 19:21; 19:60**

Burden on patent challenger, **18:4**

Challenger, burden on, **18:4**

Chemical interference, **2:14**

Claim construction and interpretation, **4:23; 9:40; 9:339; 20:6**

SEC. 112—Cont'd

Claim differentiation, **16:2**
 Claim language itself, **9:72**
 Claims too broadly written, **9:104**
 Clear and concise, **15:2**
 Competitor's product, to cover, **20:6**
 Continuation case, effective filing date of, **18:4**
 Corporate officer, **15:2**
 Damages, **8:7; 19:7**
 Date, effective filing date of continuation case, **18:4**
 Definiteness, **1:161; 8:103; 16:114; 19:4**
 Description, **9:46; 9:85; 18:4; 18:40; 20:6**
 Detail required, **19:7**
 Disclosure, **13:10**
 Distinctiveness, **12:28; 16:2; 19:26; 21:17**
 Doctrine of equivalents, distinct from, **16:2**
 Effective filing date of continuation case, **18:4**
 Enablement, **1:167; 1:304; 2:34; 3:14; 9:83; 13:56; 14:8; 17:1; 21:14; 23:8**
 English grammar, read with precepts of, **9:40**
 Equity powers, **19:4**
 Equivalents, **8:7; 11:10; 20:6**
 Evidence, **19:7; 19:125**
 Fact question, **8:7**
 Factual finding, **8:7**
 Filing date, **18:4; 23:11**
 Finding, factual, **8:7**
 Foreign references, ignorance of, **17:1**
 Functionality, construction, **2:154**
 Indefiniteness, **1:21; 1:44**
 Inequitable conduct, **8:7**
 Injunctive relief, **1:304; 19:4**
 Interference, **3:6; 3:28**
 Issue date, only as of issue date of patent, **9:53**
 JNOV, **4:4**
 Jury, **17:1**
 Means-plus-function claims, **2:123; 16:11; 20:6; 23:63**
 Obviousness, **9:86**
 Only as of issue date of patent, **9:53**
 Opinions, not, **9:40**

SEC. 112—Cont'd

Overtake, easy, **19:7**
 Paragraphs 1, 2, 6 contrasted, **1:99**
 Personal liability, **15:2**
 Prima facie case of acquiescence in examiner's rejection for inadequate disclosure, **16:10**
 Procedural issue, **8:21**
 Records, failure to keep, **8:7**
 References, foreign references, ignorance of, **17:1**
 Sec. 101, **18:6**
 Sec. 120, **8:19**
 Single means claim, **9:40**
 Special verdict, **17:1**
 Statements out of context, improper to take, **9:86**
 Support, lack of, **9:86**
 Totality of circumstances, **15:2**
 Validity, claims construed to preserve, **20:6**
 Willful infringement, **15:2; 19:7**
 Written description, **1:252; 1:258; 8:101; 9:46; 18:4**

SEC. 112(1)

Generally, **2:90; 5:69; 7:57; 9:189; 10:24; 12:73**
 Best mode, **7:34; 20:33; 23:19**
 Description, written, **1:200; 9:125; 9:130; 19:254; 22:7; 23:25**
 Disclosure, sufficiency of, **23:30**
 DNA, **18:40**
 Enablement, **6:20; 9:113; 9:115; 9:134; 9:142; 9:143; 13:55; 16:141; 19:51**
 Experiment, undue experimentation, **10:23**
 Indefiniteness, **3:54**
 Inherently present, **18:52**
 Mass production specifications, inventor not required to supply, **23:19**
 Sources and techniques, **23:19**
 Specification, **3:54; 23:19**
 Undue experimentation, **10:23**
 Utility, **9:165**
 Written description, **1:200; 9:125; 9:130; 19:254; 22:7; 23:25**

SEC. 112(2)

Generally, **5:58; 9:189; 15:20; 19:131**
 Certainty and definiteness, **5:106**

INDEX

SEC. 112(2)—Cont'd

Clam indefiniteness, **2:45**
Definiteness, **3:37; 14:66; 14:72**
Evidence beyond specification, **19:125**
Indefiniteness, **13:55; 14:12**
Need to particularly point out and distinctly claim, **9:149**
Review, standard of, **9:240**
Specification, evidence beyond specification, **19:125**

SEC. 112(6)

Generally, **1:130; 9:130; 9:189; 12:66; 13:111; 19:131; 20:59**
Argument, **10:7**
Claim construction, means-plus-function claim, **6:81; 23:79**
Claim differentiation doctrine versus, **12:26**
Claim interpretation, prior art, effect on, **11:28**
Corresponding structure, **14:38; 14:56**
Doctrine of equivalents distinguished, **9:149**
Infringement, **9:215; 16:51**
Interpretation of means-plus-function claim limitation, **22:10**
Limitations and restrictions, **9:149; 22:10**
Means-plus-function, **1:51; 3:37; 6:81; 9:131; 9:149; 10:7; 10:13; 14:56; 14:66; 18:107; 19:59; 22:10; 23:79**
Prior art, **1:91; 9:118; 11:28**

SEC. 116

Generally, **16:50; 19:102**
Amendment of 1984, **11:23**
Claim broadened if broader in any respect, **9:3**
Claim interpretation, **19:15**
Inventorship, **8:115**
Joint inventorship, **2:48; 22:39**
Purpose of reissue statute, **9:3**
Reissue, purpose of reissue statute, **9:3**
Sec. 256, **9:3**

SEC. 117

Generally, **23:57**

SEC. 119

Acting on behalf of, **2:125**
Activity outside U.S., **19:144**

SEC. 119—Cont'd

Benefit of filing date of foreign priority application, **9:143**
Foreign countries, **6:66; 9:143; 19:144**
Sec. 120, **9:28**

SEC. 120

Generally, **2:90; 5:20; 9:205; 9:243; 13:193; 18:52**
Amendments, **8:19**
Application, **8:19; 12:10**
Benefit of earlier filing date, **12:99; 20:33**
Best mode, **8:19**
Chain of related applications, **12:10**
CIP, **9:73**
Computer, **8:19**
Constructive reduction to practice, **9:13**
Disclosure, sufficiency of, **11:8**
Earlier filing date, **2:142; 5:104; 12:99; 18:85; 20:33; 20:88; 26:12**
Election of species, **12:10**
Entitlement to earlier filing date, **11:8**
Filing date, **11:8; 20:33**
Incorporation by reference, **4:122; 26:12**
Inherent property, **11:8**
Parent application, **8:19**
Pioneer, **8:19**
Post-invention technology, **8:19**
Prosecution history estoppel, **8:19**
Reduction to practice, constructive, **9:13**
Related applications, chain of, **12:10**
Sec. 112, **8:19**
Sec. 119, **9:28**
Sec. 121, **18:1**
Serve different functions, **8:19**
Species, election of species, **12:10**
Submit claims, failure to, **2:68**

SEC. 121

Clear demarcation required, **7:75**
Double patenting, **7:115**
Markush claim rejection, **9:105**
Obviousness-type double patenting, **19:59**
Reissue, **7:115**
Restriction, requirement for, **2:140; 7:16; 16:112**
Sec. 120, **18:1**

- SEC. 121(1)**
Generally, **1:80**
- SEC. 121(2)**
Generally, **1:80**
- SEC. 121(3)**
Generally, **1:80**
- SEC. 121(4)**
Generally, **1:80**
- SEC. 122(a)**
Special circumstances exception, **8:135**
- SEC. 131**
Conception, **9:407**
Reduction to practice, **9:407**
- SEC. 132**
Generally, **20:59**
New matter, **2:34**
Rejection, reasons for, **3:32**
- SEC. 135(a)**
Board can decide both priority and patentability, **9:116**
- SEC. 135(b)**
Generally, **1:107; 2:93; 9:198**
Interference, **1:219; 1:220**
Sec. 1.601(c), **9:240**
- SEC. 135(c)**
Certiorari possibility, **3:29**
Interference settlement agreement, failure to file, **3:29**
- SEC. 136**
Interference, **4:27**
- SEC. 141**
Generally, **13:115**
Appeal and review, **9:59; 16:173; 22:44**
District court, **6:9**
Estoppel, **2:165**
Interference, **2:165**
Removal procedure, **9:116**
Sec. 146, **2:165; 9:116**
- SEC. 142**
Appellate review, no restriction on scope of, **9:59**
- SEC. 143**
Appellate review, no restriction on scope of, **9:59**
- SEC. 143—Cont'd**
Brief required, **9:116**
- SEC. 144**
Appellate review, no restriction on scope of, **9:59**
- SEC. 145**
Generally, **13:115; 14:92**
Admissibility of evidence, **8:111**
Appeal and review, **6:9; 9:59**
Assessment of costs on appeal, **14:4**
Attorneys fees, **8:162; 14:80**
CAFC, **6:9**
Costs of action imposed on patentee, **10:16**
Costs on appeal, assessment of, **14:4**
Crediting expert, **7:9**
De novo determination, **14:4**
Direct appeal, **6:9**
Disclosure, reject, **7:9**
Enablement, **7:9**
Expert, crediting, **7:9**
How to do it, **7:9**
Jurisdiction, **9:394**
Law question, **7:9**
New evidence, **7:9; 8:118; 11:68**
Previously done, something not, **7:9**
Reject disclosure of how to do it, improper to, **7:9**
Review, standard of, **13:115**
Sec. 146 actions, **20:11; 20:125**
Skilled at time of invention, **7:9**
Standing, **2:18**
- SEC. 146**
Generally, **23:44; 23:52**
Estoppel, **2:165**
Interference, **1:42; 2:165; 3:6; 3:53; 7:26**
Review, standard of, **20:125; 23:52**
Sec. 141, **2:165; 9:116**
Sec. 145, **20:11; 20:125**
- SEC. 151**
Generally, **4:52**
- SEC. 153**
Issue date, whether patent was validly issued on, **5:17**
- SEC. 154**
Generally, **4:106**

INDEX

- SEC. 154(b)**
Patent term adjustment, **23:69**
- SEC. 156**
Generally, **2:187; 8:61; 13:120**
Ambiguity, **21:6**
Congress, policy for, not courts, **6:3**
Extension of patent term, **6:3**
Patent term extension, **21:6**
Plain meaning rule, **6:3**
Statutory construction and interpretation, **6:3; 21:6**
Summary judgment, **1:139**
Term, extension of, **6:3**
Terminal disclaimers, **13:144**
- SEC. 156(a)**
Generally, **3:72**
- SEC. 156(a)(4)**
Extension of term, **16:125**
Patent term extension, **8:25; 15:35**
- SEC. 156(d)(1)**
Generally, **1:74**
- SEC. 156(e)(2)**
Patent term extension, **19:197**
- SEC. 156(f)**
Generally, **13:120**
Extension of term, **16:125**
- SEC. 156(g)**
Patent term extension, **23:70**
- SEC. 161**
Plant patents, **9:355**
- SEC. 171**
Aesthetics determination, **9:73**
Complete articles, not limited to designs for, **9:73**
Design, **9:73; 9:106**
Differences, whether are significant, **9:73**
Limitations, **9:73**
Obviousness, **9:73**
Same, designs same, **9:73**
- SEC. 172(b)**
Inducing infringement, **26:2**
- SEC. 183**
Use of invention, **8:117**
- SEC. 207(a)(2)**
Government as necessary party to suit by its exclusive licensee, **14:9**
- SEC. 210.30**
Generally, **7:52**
- SEC. 210.36**
Generally, **7:52**
- SEC. 211.54(a)**
ITC, **1:15**
- SEC. 236**
Generally, **16:50**
- SEC. 251**
Generally, **8:64**
Broadening reissue, **1:52**
Compelling patentee to seek no defect reissue, **7:21**
Reissue, **2:4; 7:21; 8:12; 9:69; 9:84; 9:85; 9:105; 9:138; 19:51**
Sec. 255, versus, **19:142**
- SEC. 252**
Discretion of trial court, **19:4**
Enhanced damages, **21:3**
Evidence not considered de novo, **19:4**
Expert witnesses, **19:4**
Reexamination, **12:25**
Reissue, **19:4; 19:13; 19:55; 23:26**
Sec. 255, versus, **19:142**
Summary judgment, **8:17**
- SEC. 252(2)**
Reissue patent, **2:40**
- SEC. 254**
Generally, **7:87; 14:39**
Certificate of correction, **19:56**
- SEC. 255**
Generally, **6:44; 14:39**
Clerical or typographical mistake, **19:142**
Sec. 251 versus, **19:142**
Sec. 252 versus, **19:142**
- SEC. 256**
Generally, **6:35; 6:44; 19:102; 23:55**
Correction of inventorship, **16:131**
Joint inventors, **22:54**
Sec. 1.48, **19:76**
Sec. 116, **9:3**

SEC. 261

Federal law, **18:58**
 Patent property, **10:4**
 Validity, patent not to be found valid,
10:4

SEC. 262

Enforcement and enforceability, **19:264**
 Joint inventor's freedom to license, **8:5**
 License, joint inventor's freedom to, **8:5**
 Public use, **8:5**
 Sec. 102(b), **8:5**

SEC. 263

Each claim must be evaluated, **15:6**

SEC. 271

Generally, **9:268**
 Sale of plant embodying patented process not sale of invention, **10:17**

SEC. 271(a)

Generally, **14:47**
 Damages, **1:270; 3:180; 8:138**
 Divided infringement, **1:270**
 Exceptional case, **3:180**
 Extraterritorial activities, **13:135**
 Inducement, **19:322**
 Infringement, testing, **23:53**
 Invalidity, **3:180**
 Laches or delay, **3:180**
 Method claim, **1:269**
 Offer for sale, **18:54; 20:46; 20:103**
 Process, **18:79**
 Sale, **3:180; 8:138**
 Sec. 271(e), **18:18**

SEC. 271(b)

Generally, **13:122; 13:136; 19:92; 20:54**
 Inducing infringement, **7:103; 8:24; 11:60; 16:22**
 Knowingly, **13:124**

SEC. 271(c)

Contempt, **16:25**
 Contributory infringement, **6:23; 18:79**
 Damages, **20:23**
 Inducing infringement, **8:24**

SEC. 271(d)(5)

Generally, **21:51**

SEC. 271(e)

Infringement, **6:65**
 Sec. 271(a), **18:18**

SEC. 271(e)(1)

Generally, **1:85**
 Abuse of discretion, **5:3**
 Appealability, **5:13**
 DPCA, **20:26**
 Drugs, restricted to drugs alone, not, **5:3**
 FDCA, **3:182**
 Findings, new judgment as negating,
5:13
 Generic drugs, **3:159**
 Infringement, **5:13**
 Injunction, **5:3; 5:13**
 International Trade Commission, **1:184**
 Law of the case, **13:206**
 Medical devices, infringement exception for, **5:13; 16:117**
 New judgment as negating prior findings, **5:13**
 Permanent injunction, when proper,
5:13
 Pre-clinical research, **9:251**
 Premarketing approval of generic drugs,
3:159
 Research, pre-clinical, **9:251**
 Research tool exception, **9:299**
 Restricted to drugs alone, not, **5:3**
 Reviewed under abuse of discretion standard, **5:3**
 Safe harbor for drug products, **1:175; 16:117**
 Sec. 271(g), **13:206**
 Threat of sale, **5:13**
 Willful contempt order, **5:13**

SEC. 271(e)(2)

Generally, **1:128; 7:55; 7:69; 20:78**

SEC. 271(e)(2)(A)

Generally, **2:74; 7:55; 13:137; 14:33**
 Abbreviated new drug application,
9:312

SEC. 271(e)(4)

Generally, **1:128; 7:81**

SEC. 271(f)

Generally, **5:77; 18:54**
 Combination, Sec. 271(f)(2), **16:141; 23:53**

INDEX

SEC. 271(f)—Cont'd

- “Component” of patented invention, **1:146**
- Damages, **23:82**
- Lost profits, **23:82**
- Outside United States, **21:52**
- Standing, **23:82**

SEC. 271(f)(1)

- Generally, **16:83**

SEC. 271(f)(2)

- Actual combination, not require, **23:53**
- Extraterritoriality, **23:93**

SEC. 271(g)

- Generally, **1:102; 2:60; 11:54**
- Importation, prohibits, **2:80**
- Inducement, **19:322**
- Infringement, when, **13:105**
- Law of the case, **13:206**
- Process patented, product which is made by, **2:97**
- Sec. 271(e)(1), **13:206**

SEC. 272

- Generally, **14:41**

SEC. 281

- Generally, **1:68**
- Patentee’s civil action for infringement, **1:222**
- Standing, **4:116**

SEC. 282

- Born valid, patents are, **6:10**
- Burden of proof, **9:80**
- Cited art considered by PTO, **12:6**
- Combination, **18:6**
- Combination of old elements, **6:10**
- Congress, intent as clear, **12:5**
- Defenses available, **16:50**
- Disclosure, statutory outer limits, **23:76**
- Each claim treated independently, **13:55**
- Elements, combination of, **6:10**
- Equivalency finding, **18:6**
- Experiment, failed, **6:10**
- Fraud, **8:23**
- Independently, each claim treated, **13:55**
- Inequitable conduct, **8:23**
- Intent of Congress is clear, **12:5**
- Inventor’s admission of invention by another, **1:8**

SEC. 282—Cont'd

- ITC, **19:25**
- Notice and knowledge, **1:92; 5:1; 20:15**
- Objective, **6:10**
- Obviousness, **1:4**
- Only God works from nothing, **6:10**
- Presumption, **6:10; 8:23; 9:21; 9:57; 9:80; 12:6; 13:87; 16:4; 18:6**
- Prior art, not, **6:10**
- Procedural presumption, **6:10**
- PTO, cited art considered by, **12:6**
- Public interest not involved, **12:5**
- Raised or waived, **4:58**
- Reexamination, **9:80**
- Reference, failure to notice, **5:1**
- Review, standard of, **18:6**
- Secondary considerations, **6:10**
- Statutory construction, **12:5**
- 30-day notice, **20:15**
- Valid, patent born valid, **12:5**
- Validity
 - generally, **6:10**
 - presumption of, **9:21; 9:57; 9:80; 12:6; 13:87; 18:6**
 - reexamination, **9:80**
- Waived or raised, **4:58**
- Waiver, **20:15**

SEC. 283

- Generally, **10:23**
- Contempt, **11:17**
- Discretion of court, **18:18**
- Injunction, **10:17; 18:18**
- Issuance of injunction is discretionary, **18:18**

SEC. 284

- Generally, **3:96; 10:21; 13:72; 13:79; 19:92; 21:23**
- Anticipation, **16:167**
- Convoyed sales, **2:31**
- Cost savings, estimated cost savings, **8:4**
- Damages, generally, **2:31; 4:6; 4:7; 8:4; 11:21; 12:4; 13:157; 19:29; 19:35; 19:53; 20:23**
- Design patent, **3:98**
- Enhanced damages, **1:62; 2:30; 2:40; 8:123; 18:29**
- Estimated cost savings, **8:4**
- Exclusive vendor as co-plaintiff, damages, **11:18**

SEC. 284—Cont'd

Hypothetical negotiation, **1:296**
 Infringement, willful, **4:32; 7:27**
 JNOV, **23:4**
 Judge, assignment of different, **2:31**
 Lost profits, **2:31**
 Marking statute, **14:24**
 Nominal damages, **12:24**
 Precision, not ascertainable with, **2:30**
 Prejudgment interest, **4:7**
 Public use, **16:167**
 Reasonable royalty, **2:6**
 Records, failure to keep, **2:30**
 Remanded cases, **2:31**
 Sanctions, **2:31**
 Sec. 285, **18:22**
 Sec. 1927, **2:31**
 Settlement agreement, breach of, **7:54**
 Validity, **16:167**
 Weight and credibility of evidence, **2:31**
 Willful infringement, **4:32; 5:19; 7:12; 7:27; 8:123; 19:57**

SEC. 285

Generally, **2:55; 3:221; 5:155; 6:53; 7:57; 7:114; 9:266; 11:10; 13:72; 15:60; 15:62; 19:311**
 Abuse of discretion, **2:170; 7:20**
 Appeal, award of attorney fees on, **4:16**
 Attorneys' fees, **2:170; 3:42; 3:196; 4:16; 4:32; 5:137; 7:20; 7:27; 8:18; 8:38; 8:130; 12:4; 13:38; 16:5; 18:121; 18:123; 19:3; 19:33; 19:35; 19:51; 19:58; 19:313; 23:6**
 Choice of law, **23:57**
 Claim construction, **1:5; 19:320**
 Dismissal of action, **3:42; 19:200**
 Estoppel, **19:320**
 Exceptional case, **1:299; 2:9; 2:33; 5:14; 5:109; 5:151; 6:13; 8:130; 9:316; 13:2; 13:175; 14:88; 15:3; 15:45; 19:52; 19:269; 20:151; 21:75**
 Experimental use, **5:137**
 Expert's report, **5:14**
 Fraud, exceptional case for reasons other than, **15:3**
 Inequitable conduct, **5:137; 16:59; 18:43**
 Inference drawn from party's failure to offer its expert's report, **5:14**

SEC. 285—Cont'd

Infringement, **2:170; 3:42; 7:20**
 Intent, **5:14**
 Jury trial, **1:300**
 Maintenance fees, **9:470**
 Notice and knowledge, **5:14**
 On-sale bar, **5:137**
 Purpose, **2:27**
 Sanctions, **19:57**
 Sec. 101, **9:455**
 Sec. 284, **18:22**
 Settlement agreement, breach of, **7:54**
 Should have known, **5:14**
 Willful infringement, **1:201; 2:170; 7:20; 15:6; 19:28**
 Willfulness, **2:34**

SEC. 286

Damages, **1:47**
 Future acts of others, **19:27**
 Liability arises when acts are committed, **19:27**
 Limitation of actions, **19:27**
 Statute of limitations, not, **1:48**
 Third persons, future acts of others, **19:27**

SEC. 287

Bifurcation, **4:12**
 Damages-notice, **4:12**
 Documents not marked, **4:12**
 Error harmless where no evidentiary basis for contrary verdict, **4:12**
 Excludable, **4:12**
 Implied license, **4:12**
 Marking, **4:12; 8:4; 13:33**
 Notice and knowledge, **2:6; 4:12; 7:92; 13:33**
 Patent marking notice, **13:33**
 Practice, **4:12**
 Process, marking not necessary for, **8:4**
 Same concepts, **13:33**
 Same phrases, **13:33**

SEC. 287(a)

Generally, **12:58; 13:75**
 Actual notice requirement, **21:53**
 Method or process, not applying to, **3:96**
 Patent marking, **1:58; 1:62**
 Process or method, not applying to, **3:96**

INDEX

- SEC. 287(b)(5)**
Letters to customers as infringement threats, **13:41**
- SEC. 289**
Damages, **14:77; 19:293**
Marking statute, **14:24**
Profits, **2:33**
- SEC. 291**
Change of circumstances, not defeated by, **1:11**
Claim construction, **1:5**
Federal question jurisdiction, **1:11**
Interference, **19:149**
Interfering patents, **1:11; 7:102; 11:23**
Oral findings sufficient, **1:11**
Subject-matter jurisdiction, lack of, **1:11**
- SEC. 292**
Generally, **3:118**
Constitutionality of AIA elimination of qui tam provision, **2:151; 3:195**
False patent marking, **1:23; 3:118; 9:329; 12:23; 19:224; 19:262**
Per article interpretation, **6:72**
- SEC. 295**
Generally, **14:31**
Product by process, **14:31**
- SEC. 303**
Constitutionality of procedures, **16:8**
- SEC. 304**
Reexamination in subsequent litigation, effect of, **19:46**
Sec. 305, **19:46**
- SEC. 305**
Reexamination, **9:151; 16:115**
Sec. 304, **19:46**
- SEC. 314(d)**
Appeal dismissal, **2:180**
Jurisdiction to review, **9:425**
Obviousness, **9:418**
Scope of review, **9:418; 13:236; 19:260**
Standard of review, **9:418**
- SEC. 315(b)**
Inter partes review, **1:324**
Real party in interest, **1:324**
- SEC. 315(c)**
Generally, **13:240**
- SEC. 316(a)(3)**
Inter partes review, **21:74**
- SEC. 329**
Covered business method review, **7:117**
- SEC. 335B(a)(1)**
Generally, **2:74**
- SEC. 337**
Generally, **19:106; 19:176; 19:177**
Appellate function, **3:23**
Commission findings, **3:23**
Contributory infringement, **19:222**
Defined, substantial evidence, **3:23**
Exclusion orders, **3:23; 25:9; 25:10**
Imports, exclusion order against, **3:23**
Infringement, no injury despite, **3:23**
Injunctions, **19:222**
Inventor's admission of invention by another, **1:8**
ITC, **1:15; 2:12; 3:23; 5:98; 12:5; 18:26; 19:25; 20:105; 21:64**
No injury despite patent infringement, **3:23**
Purpose, **3:23**
Res judicata, not, **3:23**
Substantial evidence, **3:23**
- SEC. 337(a)**
Generally, **13:107**
ITC, **1:39**
- SEC. 337(c)**
ITC, **6:14**
- SEC. 355(j)**
Generally, **1:128**
- SEC. 355(j)(2)**
Generally, **1:128**
- SEC. 355(j)(2)(A)(vii)**
Generally, **1:128**
- SEC. 355(j)(2)(A)(viii)**
Generally, **1:128**
- SEC. 355(j)(5)(B)(iii)(iii)**
Generally, **13:107**
- SEC. 455**
Judge disqualification, **8:14**

SEC. 455—Cont'd

Sanctions reserved for matters more serious than mere oversight, **8:14**
 Statute is self-enforcing and self-executing, **1:65**

SEC. 455(a)

Motion to disqualify trial judge, **8:12**

SEC. 553

APA, **1:45**

SEC. 703(c)

APA, **13:51**

SEC. 706(2)

APA, **13:50**

SEC. 1117(a)

Attorneys' fees, **18:121**

SEC. 1267

Supplemental jurisdiction, **7:25**

SEC. 1291

Increasing supersedeas bond, **19:42**

SEC. 1292

Appellate jurisdiction, lack of, **1:31**

SEC. 1292(a)(1)

Appealability, **18:11; 23:13**
 Beginning of patent term, needed more at, **23:13**
 Continue, evidence that status quo can, **23:13**
 Evidence that status quo can continue, **23:13**
 Immediately appealable interlocutory order denying injunction, **23:13**
 Injunctive relief, **16:116; 23:13**
 Interlocutory order, **18:16; 23:13**
 Jurisdiction, **14:6**
 Preliminary injunction, failure to seek, **23:13**

SEC. 1292(b)

Generally, **21:41**
 Appeal from interlocutory order, **9:97**
 Interlocutory appeal, **10:43; 14:9**
 Interlocutory order, appeal from, **9:97**
 Sec. 1292(c) certification, **17:3**

SEC. 1292(c)

Sec. 1292(b), **17:3**

SEC. 1292(c)(1)

CAFC has exclusive jurisdiction of appeals involving preliminary injunctions in patent cases, **5:8**
 Federal patent policy, **6:17**
 Sec. 1292(a), **16:116**

SEC. 1292(c)(2)

Appeal, interlocutory appeal, **9:6**
 Appealability of interlocutory order, **10:12**
 Appealable judgment, **13:5**
 Attorney, sanctioning counsel, **9:6**
 Final judgment, **13:8**
 Interlocutory appeal, **9:6; 13:61**
 Interlocutory order, appealability of, **10:12**
 Sanctioning counsel, **9:6**

SEC. 1292(d)(2)

Escrow, **3:21**

SEC. 1337

Generally, **16:51**
 ITC, **3:154; 25:2**

SEC. 1337(a)

Imported drug products, **1:175**

SEC. 1337(c)

Generally, **11:54**
 ITC, **8:28**

SEC. 1337(d)

ITC, **8:28**
 Limited exclusion order, **11:60**

SEC. 1337(e)

ITC, **8:28**

SEC. 1338

Generally, **22:5**
 Arising under jurisdiction, **3:14**
 Subject matter jurisdiction, **1:49; 11:20**

SEC. 1338(a)

Antitrust claim, **21:13**
 Arising under subject matter jurisdiction of distinct court, **1:53**
 Jurisdiction, **1:160; 4:22; 4:92**
 Subject matter jurisdiction, **1:7; 5:17**

SEC. 1338(b)

Dismissal for lack of subject matter jurisdiction, **13:58**

INDEX

- SEC. 1346(b)**
 - Interference, **3:6**
- SEC. 1355**
 - Generally, **19:106**
- SEC. 1367**
 - Supplemental jurisdiction, **8:97; 13:58; 14:82; 22:36**
- SEC. 1391(c)**
 - Sec. 1400(b), **22:6**
- SEC. 1400(b)**
 - Assuming control of litigation does not waive venue, **9:11**
 - Sec. 1391(c), **22:6**
 - Venue, **9:11; 9:445**
 - Waiver, **9:11**
- SEC. 1406(a)**
 - Venue, **9:447**
- SEC. 1407(a)**
 - Judicial Panel on Multi-District Litigation (JPMDL), **7:6**
- SEC. 1447**
 - Assignor estoppel, **6:96; 22:46**
- SEC. 1491**
 - Limited to claim court, **20:16**
- SEC. 1498**
 - Generally, **7:47; 15:4**
 - Claims court, **16:38**
 - Damages, **13:35**
 - Each claim element essential, **12:11**
 - FRCP 41(a)(1)(B), **1:279**
 - Government, acting by or for, **9:398; 20:18**
 - Inducement, **1:279**
 - Lost profits, **13:35**
 - Paramount, **20:16**
 - Prosecution history, **12:11**
 - Relevant, always, **12:11**
 - Relevant art field, **15:4**
 - Sales to government, **13:35**
 - Same burden, **12:11**
 - Skill, level of, **15:4**
- SEC. 1498(a)**
 - Generally, **8:56; 13:109**
- SEC. 1500**
 - Subject matter jurisdiction, **21:15**
- SEC. 1631**
 - Counterclaims, **19:2**
 - Defenses, **19:2**
 - Dismiss or transfer, **19:2**
 - License agreement, suit for royalties due under, **19:2**
- SEC. 1651**
 - All Writs Act, **9:157**
 - CAFC jurisdiction over JPML consolidation order, **9:128**
 - Interest of justice, **3:14**
 - Mandamus, **2:2; 9:41; 9:54; 9:68; 9:71; 9:76**
- SEC. 1657(b)**
 - Generally, **2:96**
- SEC. 1659**
 - Stay, **9:292**
- SEC. 1782**
 - Generally, **9:193**
 - Mandamus, **9:406**
- SEC. 1821(b)**
 - Limitation on award of expert witness fees, **1:62**
- SEC. 1927**
 - Generally, **7:126**
 - Comply with court rules, failure to, **10:10**
 - FRAP, **1:41**
 - Sec. 284, **2:31**
- SEC. 1961(a)**
 - Post-judgment interest, **7:27**
- SEC. 2201**
 - Declaratory judgment, **7:25; 9:89; 9:92; 10:6; 12:23; 13:41; 19:22; 19:55; 23:9**
 - Dismissal, **7:25; 13:41**
- SEC. 2201(a)**
 - Generally, **19:81**
- SEC. 2412(b)**
 - Costs and attorney fees award against government in Claims Court, **13:48**
- SEC. 2501**
 - Generally, **2:53**
- SEC. 2516(a)**
 - Generally, **19:83**

SEC. 2568(a)
 Generally, **19:173**

SEC. 7703
 APA, **2:32**

SEC. 7703(c)
 APA, **8:31; 11:26**

SECOND ACTION
 Claim preclusion, **8:76**

SECONDARY
 Objective, **19:19**

SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS
 Generally, **1:87; 2:59; 13:253; 16:48**
 Afterthought, **9:82**
 Anticipation definition, **4:15**
 Appeal, theory raised for first time on, **9:82**
 CCPA decisions, **9:74**
 Commercial success, **3:41; 9:82; 9:331**
 Cross-appeal to reverse validity or infringement component of judgment, **18:2**
 Description, **6:99**
 Due entirely to improvements and modifications made by others, **9:82**
 Evidence, **13:17; 13:45**
 Exclusion, **13:17**
 Expectation, unexpected result, **16:4**
 Function of patent claims, **9:82**
 Improvements, **9:82**
 Inequitable conduct, **4:10; 11:4**
 Instructions, **13:17**
 Means-plus-function claims, **13:17**
 Modification, **9:82**
 Must always be considered when present, **9:82**
 Must be considered, **9:70**
 Neutral factor, absence of, **13:17**
 New prior art not considered by PTO, **5:11**
 Nexus, **9:168; 9:331; 16:49; 19:36**
 Nonparty's motion to quash discovery subpoena, **20:17**
 Object, failure to, **13:17**
 Objective indicia, **14:2**
 Obviousness, **3:175; 3:190; 5:131; 6:99; 8:153; 9:331; 13:45; 16:4; 16:168; 18:15; 19:11; 21:8; 23:66**

SECONDARY CONSIDERATIONS
 —Cont'd
 Prior art, invention need not be superior to, **4:10**
 Raising issues, **9:82**
 Review, standard of, **9:207; 19:12**
 Sec. 282, **6:10**
 Settlement evidence excluded, **13:17**
 Summary judgment, **3:1; 8:14; 21:7**
 Theory raised for first time on appeal, **9:82**
 Third persons, **9:82**
 Unexpected results, **12:13; 16:4**
 Valid, inappropriate to declare, **4:19**
 Weight given thereto, **18:28**

SECOND BITE AT APPLE
 Generally, **12:31**

SECOND PROCEEDING
 Collateral estoppel, **7:65**

SECRET COMMERCIAL USE
 Public use bar, **11:12**

SECRET PRIOR ART
 Sec. 102(e) v. sec. 102(g), **19:41**

SEIZURE
 Enforcement order, **4:20**

SELECTION OF TRANSFEREE FORUM
 Relevant factors, **9:128**

SELF-EXECUTING STATUTES
 Due process, **18:33**

SELF-INITIATED INVESTIGATION
 ITC decision, **2:17**

SEMICONDUCTOR CHIP
 Foundry arrangement, **9:145**

SEMICONDUCTOR CHIP PROTECTION ACT (SCPA)
 Mask works, **2:34**

SENIOR PARTY
 Interference, **2:96; 15:1**
 Remand, when appropriate, **2:26**
 Testimony, right to stand on its position and take no, **2:47**

SENIOR SCIENTIST
 Test results, **8:30**

INDEX

“SEPARATE”

Appellate jurisdiction, lack of, **1:31**
Argued, claims not, **9:119**
Argued separately, **9:30; 9:173**
Claim differentiation doctrine, **1:92**
Compound and its properties are inseparable, **9:103**
Dependent claims not separately argued on appeal, **9:100**
Doctrine of equivalents, **7:77**
Double patenting, **7:22**
Each claim, **10:8**
Equivalence, **6:42**
FRCP 79(a), **5:45**
Inequitable conduct, **7:1**
Infringement, **8:52**
Laches, **19:76**
Mandamus, **9:41**
Materiality, **4:72**
Obviousness, **18:23**
Sec. 1.192(c), **9:154**
Sec. 102(e) v. sec. 102(g), **19:41**
Stand or fall together, claims not argued separately, **9:117**
Statutory construction, **1:72**
Statutory interpretation, **8:43**
Treated separately, **16:25**

SEPARATION OF POWERS

Generally, **1:376**

SEQUOIA TECHNOLOGY, LLC V. DELL, INC.

2023, **19:348**

SERIES OF LEGAL PROCEEDINGS

Sham litigation, **5:108**

SERIOUS QUESTION

Preliminary injunction, **1:40**

SET ASIDE

FRCP 60(b), **6:22**
Jury verdict, **3:173; 14:47**
New evidence introduced, **6:9**

SETTLEMENT AND SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

Generally, **19:1; 19:326; 20:80**
Antitrusts, **9:309**
Attorney, disqualification of counsel, **19:40**

SETTLEMENT AND SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT—Cont’d

Bad faith not requirement for breach thereto, **12:39**
Breach thereof, **7:54**
Choice of law, **1:100; 7:54; 16:99**
Complaint dismissed for mootness, **19:14**
Contracts, **3:107**
Discovery, settlement negotiation privilege, **9:362**
Disqualification of counsel, **19:40**
Enforcement thereof, **2:138; 8:48; 9:159**
FRAP 38, **19:1**
Frauds, Statute of, **19:40**
Frivolous appeal, **19:1**
Infringement, **16:40**
Interpretation, **10:9**
Joint motion to vacate judgments below, **21:22**
Judgment, joint motion to vacate, **21:22**
Judicial estoppel, **23:21**
Jurisdiction, **7:54**
Lear distinguished, **8:11**
Mootness, **11:23**
Motion, joint motion to vacate judgments below, **21:22**
Partial settlement may moot appeal, **7:8**
Professional conduct, local bar standards of, **19:40**
Refusal to engage in settlement negotiations, **15:37**
Reverse settlement, **6:87**
Sec. 284, **7:54**
Sec. 285, **7:54**
Secondary considerations, **13:17**
Vacation, **21:22**

SEVENTH AMENDMENT

Jury trial, right to, **1:58; 3:71; 9:170; 13:64; 13:74; 16:8; 19:195**

SEVERAL COMMON MEANINGS

Claim interpretation, **9:246**

SEVERAL PATENTS, ONE OF

Inequitable conduct, **12:3**

SEVERANCE

Mandamus, **9:359**

SEVERE REMEDY

Civil contempt, **13:1**

SEXUALLY REPRODUCED VARIETY

Plant Variety Protection Act (PVPA),
9:162

SHAM LITIGATION

Generally, **3:83; 14:25**
Affidavit doctrine, **17:12**
Inequitable conduct, **8:98**
Offer for sale, **17:12**
Series of legal proceedings, **5:108**
Two-tiered test, **6:27**
Winning lawsuit, **21:24**

**SHOCKWAVE MEDICAL, INC. V.
CARDIOVASCULAR SYSTEMS,
INC.**

2025, **19:360**

SHOP RIGHTS

Generally, **12:27**
Totality of circumstances evaluated,
13:52

SHOULD HAVE KNOWN

Sec. 285, **5:14**

SHOWING OF NONOBVIOUSNESS

Chemical cases, **9:44**
Expectation, unexpected results, **9:44**
Independent evidence of nonobvious-
ness, **13:185**
Relative effectiveness, **9:44**

**SIERRA WIRELESS, ULC V. SISVEL
S.P.A.**

2025, **19:361**

SIGNAL CLAIMS

Patentable subject matter, **9:290**

SIGNIFICANCE

Developments occurring after filing
date, **9:142**

**SIGRAY, INC. V. CARL ZEISS X-RAY
MICROSCOPY, INC.**

2025, **19:362**

SILENCE

Copying, **1:48**
Statutory construction, **6:24**

SIMILARITY

Chemical, **9:60**
Evidence of similar properties, **9:29**
Prima facie obviousness and structural
similarity, **1:183**
Prosecution history estoppel, **5:59**

SIMPLE INTEREST

Damages, delay, **4:24**
Delay damages, **4:24**
Prejudgment interest, **18:35**

**SIMPLE NEGLIGENCE NOT
ENOUGH**

Exceptional case, **18:9**

SIMPLICITY

Generally, **9:127**

SIMPLIFICATION OF REFERENCE

Combination patent, **13:15**

**SIMULTANEOUS ACTS AND
MATTERS**

Generally, **5:5; 12:13**
Appealability of sanctions, **19:64**
Conception, **13:105**
Obviousness, **7:97**

SINGLE CLAIM

Plant patents, **9:162**

SINGLE INVENTION

Generally, **9:103**

SINGLE MEANS CLAIM

Sec. 112, **9:40**

SINGLE REFERENCE

Obviousness, **19:123**

SINGLE USE

Contributory infringement, **19:79**
Enforceability, **13:42**
Inducing infringement, **19:79**

**SISVEL INTERNATIONAL S.A. V.
SIERRA WIRELESS, INC.**

2023, **19:349; 19:350**

SIXTH CIRCUIT

Choice of law, **1:42**

SKILL

Actual skill of inventor not pertinent,
19:34
Computer programmer, **14:8**

INDEX

SKILL—Cont'd

Inequitable conduct, **15:3**
Later developments not evidence, **19:34**
Patent attorney, **19:36**
Sec. 1498, **15:4**
Summary judgment, **12:15; 21:7**

SKILLED ARTISAN

Fact question, well-understood, routine and conventional, **1:311**

SKILLED IN THE ART

Claim interpretation, **3:75; 4:61; 4:66; 9:232; 20:8**
Claims speak to those, **5:19**
Disclosure of corresponding structure, **2:123**
Exceptional skill in the art, **14:67**
Factors, **5:5**
Indefiniteness, **9:156**
Inventor's theory, **6:10**
Obviousness, **4:82; 15:19**
Obviousness question, **3:30**
Sec. 102(b), **9:18**
Specification directed to, **9:125**

SMALL ENTITY

Issue fee, **4:52**
Maintenance fees, **21:40**

SMARTREND MANUFACTURING GROUP, INC. V. OPTI-LUXX INC.

2025, **19:363**

SMOOTH

Generally, **23:43**

SNAPPOWER V. LIGHTING DEFENSE GROUP

2024, **19:355**

SNIPR TECHNOLOGIES LIMITED V. ROCKEFELLER UNIVERSITY

2023, **19:351**

SOFTVIEW LLC V. APPLE INC.

2024, **19:356**

SOLE INVENTORSHIP

Interference, **19:72**

SOPHISTICATION

Combination patent, **13:15**
Obviousness, **16:4**

SO THAT

Generally, **23:43**

SOUTH

Generally, **20:34**
Precedent, **23:28**

SOVEREIGN ACT DOCTRINE

Inherent element of every government contract, **8:41**

SOVEREIGN ACTS

Defenses, **15:8**

SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY

Generally, **3:79; 3:115; 26:10**
Declaratory judgment suit, **7:25**
Federal government, **3:95**
Inter partes review, **18:128; 19:305**
Joinder, **7:134**
Jurisdictional grants, **2:190; 13:66**
Narrowly construed, **19:75**
Post-judgment interest, **1:55**
Sec. 101, **21:78**
State immunity from declaratory judgment suit, **7:25**
State universities, **21:63**
Strictly construed, **10:19**
Waiver, **13:48; 23:28**

SPECIAL, PETITION TO MAKE

Generally, **7:57; 12:56**
Claim interpretation, **7:57**
Inequitable conduct, **7:29**
Prosecution history estoppel, **7:57**

SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES EXCEPTION

Law of the case doctrine, **13:61**
Sec. 122(a), **8:135**

SPECIAL DEFINITION

Claim interpretation, **14:30**

SPECIAL DISPATCH

CAFC jurisdiction, **7:8**

SPECIAL INTERROGATORIES

Generally, **11:28; 14:1**
Appellate review, aid in, **8:84**
Jury, **1:16**
Unresolved deadlock, **2:49**

SPECIAL MASTER

As a whole, reference must suggest invention, **13:24**
 Authority to amend decision, **16:37**
 Claims court, **3:49**
 Damages, **20:19**
 Deference, **13:24**
 Improvement, **13:24**
 Infringement determination, **1:207; 13:24**
 Judgments not opinions are reviewed, **13:24**
 License, need for, **13:24**
 Obviousness, **13:24**
 Reference as a whole must suggest invention, **13:24**
 Reliance upon his prior experience, **19:65**

SPECIAL PROVINCE OF TRIER OF FACT

Weight and credibility of evidence, **18:12**

SPECIAL VERDICT

Generally, **13:53**
 Advantage thereof, **18:41**
 Erroneous jury instructions, **14:7**
 Form, **12:20**
 Forms, **19:9**
 FRCP 49(a), **19:37; 23:1**
 Hypothesize, **13:85**
 Inferior infringement, **23:1**
 Infringement, inferior infringement, **23:1**
 Jury instructions, **6:88; 14:7**
 Objections, waiver of objections, **8:52**
 Presume jury resolved facts in favor of verdict winner, **20:50**
 Review, standard of, **20:35**
 Sec. 112, **17:1**
 Waiver of objections, **8:52**

SPECIES

Claim preamble, **3:22**
 Disclosure of species, **2:107; 9:126**
 Genus, **2:107; 18:40**
 Sec. 102(e), **9:28**
 Sec. 120, **12:10**
 Written description, **3:106**

SPECIFICATIONS

Admissions, **16:109**
 Application, **9:189**
 Best mode, **9:357**
 Claim construction and interpretation, **1:134; 3:80; 5:2; 9:94; 12:68; 13:86; 13:104; 14:57; 18:68; 19:191; 19:196; 20:61; 21:9; 25:4**
 Declaratory judgment, **10:6**
 Disavowal of scope, **5:97**
 Disclosure, **5:16; 9:113**
 Dismissal, **3:19**
 Embodiments appearing in specification will not be read into claims, **5:19**
 Enablement, **23:77**
 FRCP 52(a), **12:6**
 Incorporation by reference, **16:128**
 Interference, **1:182; 2:172; 4:8; 19:151**
 Limitation not required by, **9:118**
 Means-plus-function claim, **6:36; 13:182; 20:64**
 Mere dissemination of invention's specifications is not infringement, **13:52**
 Novelty, **20:67**
 Obviousness, **9:19; 9:56**
 Only as of issue date of patent, **9:53**
 Primary basis for construing claims, **19:26**
 Prosecution history estoppel, **22:16**
 Reverse doctrine of equivalents, **19:24**
 Review, standard of, **19:12**
 Sec. 112(1), **3:54**
 Sec. 112(2), **19:125**
 Skilled in the art, **9:125**

SPECIFIC CLAIMS

Exhaustion of patent rights, reservation, **11:72**

SPECIFIC DEVICES

Issue preclusion, **11:35**

SPECIFIC FACTUAL FINDINGS

FRCP 52(a), **13:16**

SPECIFIC INTENT

Active inducement of infringement, **1:157**

SPECIFIC INTENT TO DECEIVE

Fraud, **6:28**

SPECIFICITY

Jury verdict, **8:52**

INDEX

SPECIFICITY—Cont'd

Obviousness, **12:64**

SPECIFIC JURISDICTION

Generally, **2:46**

Personal jurisdiction, **20:46**

SPECIFY EVERY DIFFERENT

Reissue, **4:63**

SPECIOUS ARGUMENT

Murder, x on trial for murdering Y,
18:24

SPECK V. BATES

2024, **19:357**

SPECTRUM OF EFFECT

Doctrine of equivalents, **9:108**

SPECULATIVE

Lost profits, **21:35**

SPIRIT

Federal Rules, **3:24**

SPRINGS FROM INVENTION

Ownership, **20:40**

SSI TECHNOLOGIES, LLC V. DONGGUAN ZHENGYANG ELECTRONIC MECHANICAL LTD.

2023, **19:352**

STANDARD ESSENTIAL PATENTS

Damages, **3:186**

STANDARD OF REVIEW

Appeal and Review (this index)

Jurisdiction to review, **9:425**

STANDARD SETTING ORGANIZATIONS

Disclosure, **17:9**

Implied waiver, **3:206; 8:120**

STANDING

Generally, **1:317; 1:353; 1:363;
1:363.50; 3:230; 5:79; 7:137;
16:74; 16:159; 19:174; 19:251**

All co-owners, **5:40**

All substantial rights, **9:233**

Antitrust claim, **9:89**

Appeal and review, **7:39; 19:48; 20:75**

Assignment, **1:153; 1:191; 1:196;
1:218; 1:264; 5:38; 13:87**

STANDING—Cont'd

Bankruptcy, **13:148**

Claim construction and interpretation,
1:264

Consent, **19:263**

Constitutionality, **13:191**

Co-owners, all, **5:40; 19:221**

Damages, **23:82**

Declaratory judgment, **16:113**

De novo review, **7:39**

Dismissal without prejudice, **20:96**

Divorce, **5:105**

Exclusive licensee, **1:190; 1:196;
13:157; 19:223; 23:67**

Exclusive ownership, **20:134**

Exclusive rights, licensee with exclusive
right to sell abroad, **15:9**

Exclusive territorial license, **16:64**

Expired patent, **11:78**

False patent marking, **19:262**

Hard termination date, **1:153**

Hired to invent, **10:47**

Holder of legal title must be joined in
action, **1:68**

Infringement, **13:170; 19:154**

Injury, **1:45; 3:177; 4:116**

Inter partes review, **10:50; 16:157**

Inventorship, **19:272**

Joining involuntarily, **9:302**

Legal title vs. equitable title, **1:46**

Licenses and licensees, **1:153; 9:301;
13:133; 15:9; 16:64; 18:35; 20:45**

Lost profits, **23:82**

Mootness, **13:226**

MPEP, **19:46**

Non-parties, **19:48; 21:22**

Obviousness, **1:334; 1:355; 7:129**

Ownership, **1:172; 3:93; 9:303; 16:111**

Patentee, **1:272**

Post-grant review, **1:320**

Preliminary injunction, **12:111**

Public accessibility, **19:316**

Qui tam plaintiff, **19:224; 19:262**

Receivers and trustees, **13:148**

Retroactive, **8:63**

Review, de novo review, **7:39**

Sec. 101, **9:452**

Sec. 145 review, parties entitled to, **2:18**

Sec. 271(f), **23:82**

Sec. 281, **4:116**

STANDING—Cont’d

Substantial rights, **6:54; 12:117; 19:128**
 Territorial license, exclusive territorial license, **16:64**
 Three elements, **16:75**
 Title, **12:58; 19:154**
 Vesting title and right to sue infringer, **19:154**
 Virtual assignment, **5:38**
 Waived, cannot be, **2:18**

“STAND OR FALL TOGETHER”

Generally, **9:117**

STARE DECISIS

Appropriate, when, **2:50**
 Law question, application is, **13:53**

STARTING POINT

Inequitable conduct, **7:1**
 Statutory construction, **11:33; 20:30**

“START WITH STATUTE ITSELF”

Statutory construction, **19:73**

STATE CLAIM, FAILURE TO

Dismissal, **3:19; 4:121; 7:36; 20:44**
 Form 18, **12:114**
 FRCP 12(b)(6), **2:41; 7:99; 8:102; 12:112; 12:114; 19:237; 23:29**
 Pro se litigant, **13:142**
 Review, standard of, **4:29**

STATE COURT

Eleventh Amendment, **10:11**
 Judgment, **19:45**
 Mandamus, **9:68; 9:76; 26:14**
 Patent questions, **3:14**
 Res judicata, **13:22**
 Sec. 1447, **8:97; 22:46**

STATE OF MIND

Best mode, **3:31**

STATES

Abuse of process, **1:42**
 Choice of law, **18:64; 18:66**
 Damages, **9:161**
 Dismissal, **22:2**
 Eleventh Amendment, **10:11; 18:40**
 Immunity
 declaratory judgment suit, **7:25**
 Eleventh Amendment, **2:120; 9:128; 10:11**

STATES—Cont’d

Jurisdiction in state law contract dispute, **12:91**
 Preemption, **21:30; 21:42**
 Stay of patent action, **9:91**
 Summary judgment, **12:15**

STATE SECRETS PRIVILEGE

Generally, **3:95**

STATE UNIVERSITIES

Jurisdiction, federal courts, **21:63**

STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS

Limitation of Actions (this index)

STATUTE OF MONOPOLIES

Statutory subject matter, **9:308**

STATUTORY CLAIM

Chemical process, **9:20**

STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION AND INTERPRETATION

Generally, **1:39**
 Absurd results to be avoided, **2:39**
 Administrative agency, **19:74**
 Ambiguity, **6:24; 7:55; 8:45**
 Appellate subject matter jurisdiction, **1:37**
 Applicable rules, **22:6**
 Application, **15:7**
 As a whole, **3:63; 19:77**
 Begins with, **6:29; 23:29**
 Broad statutory language, **20:31**
 Chevron deference, **4:45; 6:31; 13:77; 26:3**
 Conflicts, **2:35; 9:183; 20:36**
 Deference, **2:51; 4:30; 4:43; 6:24; 11:30; 11:39; 14:17; 14:22; 19:74; 19:82; 23:31**
 Definition, **8:61**
 Directory vs. mandatory statutes, **5:17**
 Expressio unius, **1:57**
 Headings, effect of, **7:25**
 Implication, repeals by, **18:34**
 Implicit repeals disfavored, **6:30; 19:80**
 Intent, **1:61; 7:24; 7:55; 8:39; 8:45; 13:60; 19:75**
 Judicial not agency function, **11:26**
 Jurisdictional statute begins with its language, **3:60**
 Language, **6:29; 11:33; 12:37; 19:67**

INDEX

STATUTORY CONSTRUCTION AND INTERPRETATION—Cont'd

Law question, **1:74; 2:67; 4:40; 9:166; 9:200; 10:18; 13:49; 19:102**
Legislative history, **7:35**
Mandatory vs. directory statutes, **5:17**
Meaning and effect, to give to all its parts, **19:69**
Omissions, **12:37**
Ordinary meaning, **8:61**
Particular language in statutory sec. omitted in another, **12:37**
Patent term extension, **8:25**
Permissible construction, **1:81; 8:54; 12:34**
Plain meaning rule, **1:69; 3:50; 6:14; 9:138; 9:149; 10:19; 12:19; 13:48; 14:9; 17:5; 20:26; 23:32**
Question at issue, **20:37**
Reasonable interpretation, **13:83; 20:42**
Regulations, conflict with, **9:183**
Repeals, **6:30; 18:34; 19:80**
Restrictive, **20:31**
Retroactive application, **15:7**
Review, standard of, **2:54; 3:58; 6:44; 9:162; 9:176; 13:59; 16:30; 19:88**
Sec. 156, **6:3; 21:6**
Sec. 282, **12:5**
Separate provisions to be construed together, **1:72; 8:43**
Silent statute, **6:24**
Starting point, **11:33; 19:73; 20:30**
Summary judgment, written description and enablement requirement, **21:46**
Terms, **8:61**
Tools therefore, **18:36**
Undefined terms given their ordinarily understood meaning, **8:61**

STATUTORY DISCLAIMER

Interference, **7:45**

STATUTORY INVENTION

Registration, **8:67**

STATUTORY NOTICE

Letters to customers as infringement threats, **13:41**

STATUTORY SUBJECT MATTER

Generally, **13:178**
Abstract principles, **21:57**
Business methods, **3:202; 9:308; 19:297**

STATUTORY SUBJECT MATTER—Cont'd

Business methods exception, **19:112**
Computer software, **9:175**
Living things, **16:63**
Sec. 101, **1:51; 3:164; 4:105; 9:30; 9:154; 9:155; 9:286; 9:437; 13:178; 21:62**
Signals, **9:290**

STATUTORY TERMS

Law question, **9:120**

STATUTORY TIME PERIODS

Two types, **23:28**

STAUNCHING THE FATAL WOUND

Sec. 102(b) on-sale bar, **4:16**

STAY

See also Vacation of Judgment (this index)
Clarification of law, **1:204**
Covered business method review, **2:158; 9:415; 22:48; 22:52**
Execution of judgment and injunction pending appeal
considerations involved, **19:49**
court actions, **19:49**
judicial notice of fact, **19:49**
reexamination, **19:49**
37 CFR Sec. 1.11(b), **19:49**
Final judgment, **9:415**
Final judgment rule, **19:110**
Injunction pending appeal, **5:2**
Interlocutory review, **19:230**
Jurisdiction, lack of, **19:9**
Motion, **12:36**
Order, **11:1; 14:40**
Patent action, **9:91**
Pending reexamination, **8:52**
Preliminary injunction, **11:19**
Reexamination, **8:52; 16:116; 22:23**
Sec. 1659, **9:292**

STEPS WITHOUT FUNCTION

Means-plus-function claim, **5:63**

STEP-TWO ANALYSIS

Infringement, **20:63**

STEBEN FOODS, INC. V. SHIBUYA HOPPMANN CORPORATION

2025, **19:364**

STIMULATION OF INVENTIONS

Generally, **1:45**

STIPULATED JUDGMENT

Claim construction, **10:37**

Consent decree, **8:6**

STIPULATION

Generally, **1:379**

Appealability, **10:37; 10:38**

CAFC jurisdiction, **20:2**

Fictitious facts, may not stipulate, **13:68**

Willful infringement, **12:24**

STOCK ACQUISITION

Motion for directed verdict, **1:1**

STOLEN TRADE SECRETS

Preliminary injunction, **6:7**

STREAM-OF-COMMERCE PLUS THEORY

Personal jurisdiction plus something more, **1:221**

STREAM OF COMMERCE THEORY

Personal jurisdiction over nonresident foreign defendant, **1:181; 2:46**

STRICT LIABILITY OFFENSE

Infringement, **10:21**

STRICTLY CONSTRUED

Waiver of sovereign immunity, **10:19**

STRIKE, MOTION TO

Addenda, **6:10**

STRIKING PLEADING

Appealability, **20:5**

STRONG EVIDENCE

Obviousness, **13:85**

“STRONG MEDICINE”

Mandamus, **9:11**

STRONG PRESUMPTION

Claim interpretation, **4:73**

STRUCTURAL EQUIVALENCY

Means-plus-function claim limitation, **9:96**

STRUCTURAL LIMITATIONS

Claim preamble, **18:44**

STRUCTURAL OBVIOUSNESS

Prima facie obviousness, **9:50**

STRUCTURAL SIMILARITY

Chemical, **9:60**

Prima facie obviousness, **1:183; 9:126**

STRUCTURE

Infringement, **7:57**

Means-plus-function claim, **5:114; 6:73; 7:70; 12:26; 20:91; 22:26**

Prior art article, **9:48**

Product-by-process claims, **9:81**

SUA SPONTE

Summary judgment, **9:146**

SUBJECTIVE GOOD FAITH

Anticipation, **18:20**

Blonder-Tongue, **1:13**

SUBJECT MATTER

Generally, **20:25; 21:17**

ANDA, **20:100**

Inventorship, conception, **21:55**

Judicial notice, **6:10**

Jurisdiction, **7:36; 13:66; 13:196**

Obviousness, **9:46; 9:436**

Prosecution history, **1:116**

Prosecution history estoppel, **8:72**

Statutory Subject Matter (this index)

Summary judgment, **3:13**

SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION

Generally, **7:36; 8:151; 13:66; 13:196; 16:162**

Actual case or controversy, **12:22; 19:250**

Anticipation of defense, asserted in, **1:7**

Appeal and review, **6:19**

Arising under, **3:18**

Arose out of agreement, **18:13**

Choice of law, **20:66**

Claims court, **2:41; 20:27; 21:21**

Contracting parties, **25:1**

Covenant not to sue, **4:95**

Declaratory judgment, **1:297; 1:301; 8:109; 16:130; 19:250**

Design around, **25:1**

Dismissal, **12:38**

Enhanced damages, **25:1**

Examination, **6:19**

Extraterritorial activities, **12:82**

INDEX

SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION

—Cont'd

Federal, **22:5**
FRCP 12(b)(1), **1:7**
Hatch Waxman amendments, **3:159**
Imported product, **12:81**
Incentive, **25:1**
Isolated DNA molecules, **1:214**
License, **1:7**
Lost profits, **25:1**
Malpractice, **23:71**
Mandamus, **9:68**
Motion to dismiss, **1:7**
Process claim, **3:164**
Sec. 291, **1:11**
Sec. 1338, **1:49; 11:20**
Sec. 1338(a), **1:7; 5:17**
Sec. 1338(b), **13:58**
Sec. 1500, **21:15**

SUBMISSIONS

CAFC, **18:3**
Doctrine of equivalents, **7:51**
FRCP 56(f), **2:80**
Good cause under 37 CFR Sec. 1.617(b) justifying, **8:35**
JNOV, **23:4**
New interference rules, **8:3**
On-sale bar, **8:62**
Sec. 120, **2:68**

SUBORDINATE

Appeal, Board failure to review all claims on, **9:2**

SUBPOENA

Choice of law, **20:17**
Inter partes reexamination, **1:232**

SUBSEQUENT LITIGATION

Generally, **2:36**
Sec. 304, **19:46**

SUBSEQUENT PATENT

Generally, **8:40**

SUBSTANCE NOT LINGUISTIC FORM

Motion, **9:233; 19:86**

SUBSTANTIAL DIFFERENCE

Doctrine of equivalents, **16:40**

SUBSTANTIAL EQUIVALENT

Generally, **12:1**

SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE

Generally, **1:117; 2:31; 2:34; 7:131; 13:103; 15:19; 20:1; 20:25**
Advisory jury, **18:14**
APA, **8:34**
Claim interpretation, **20:1**
Defined, **2:37; 4:33; 6:31; 6:32; 7:43; 7:44; 8:31; 9:231; 13:68; 20:22**
Definition, **10:31**
Independent substantiation, **19:43**
Infringement, **25:10**
ITC, **8:28**
JMOL, **10:40**
JNOV, **6:6; 15:2**
Jury verdict, **7:29**
Law question, **20:1**
Obviousness, **19:43**
Relationship between, **11:13**
Relevance, **16:39**
Review, standard of, **16:31**
Sec. 337, **3:23**
Test devised, **19:43**

SUBSTANTIALITY

Claim interpretation, **12:70**
Doctrine of equivalents, **1:82; 6:26; 8:47; 18:39; 19:94; 23:40**

SUBSTANTIALLY

Generally, **22:25; 26:9**
Claim interpretation, **12:61; 13:134**
Jury instructions, **10:4**
On-sale bar, **5:35**

SUBSTANTIAL NEW QUESTION

Reexamination, **2:150; 9:183; 9:314**

SUBSTANTIAL OPEN ISSUES

Contempt, **1:88**

SUBSTANTIAL QUESTION

Success on merits, likelihood of, **16:70**

SUBSTANTIAL REASON

Doctrine of equivalents, **6:41; 8:60**
Prosecution history estoppel, **6:41**

SUBSTANTIAL RIGHTS

JNOV motion, **6:6**
Standing, **6:54; 12:117; 19:128**

SUBSTANTIATION OF FEATURES

Doctrine of equivalents, **14:45**

SUBSTITUTE

Acceptable substitutes, **19:96**
 Appellate brief is no substitute for notice of appeal, **10:14**
 Applicant's disclosure cannot be used to fill in gaps, **9:29**
 Availability of acceptable noninfringing substitutes, **19:53**
 Disclosure, **9:29**
 Doctrine of equivalents, **26:4**
 Infringement, **7:63**
 Lost profits, **13:45**
 Panduit, **3:8; 4:90**
 Reexamination, **9:87**
 Untimely appeal, **3:5**

SUBSTRATE

Obviousness, **9:32**

SUCCESS

Attorney fees, **10:2**
 Commercial Success (this index)
 Reasonable expectation, **9:352; 12:55; 16:108; 16:109**
 Testing, **5:34**

SUCCESS ON MERITS, LIKELIHOOD OF

Infringement, nonmovant infringes, **7:50**
 Nonmovant infringes, **7:50**
 Preliminary injunction, **1:169; 11:67**
 Substantial question, **16:70**
 Validity and enforcement challenges, withstand, **1:110**

SUCCESSOR

Motion for directed verdict, **1:1**

SUFFICIENCY

Jury instructions, **2:143**
 Testimonial evidence alone, **7:11**
 Written description, **1:185**

SUFFICIENCY OF DISCLOSURE

Interference, **3:25**

SUFFICIENT CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE

Rule of reason, **3:82**

SUFFICIENT EXPLANATION

Board, **9:218**

SUFFICIENTLY COMPLETE

On-sale bar, **19:91**

SUFFICIENTLY SPECIFIC

Directed verdict motion, **23:17**

SUGGESTION

Generally, **9:96; 9:114; 9:148**
 Claim interpretation, **19:15**
 Claim preamble, **16:58**
 Combining references, **9:126; 9:127**
 Commissioner's brief not prior art, **9:140**
 Device, prior art, **9:101**
 Functional characteristic, **9:101**
 Modification, **9:51**
 Obviousness, **9:124; 9:148; 9:204; 11:49; 14:8; 21:8; 22:26**
 Prior art device, **9:101**
 References, combining, **9:126**
 Special master's decision, **13:24**
 Summary judgment, **3:20**

SUMMARY DETERMINATION

Collateral estoppel, **16:160**
 ITC, **8:58**

SUMMARY DISPOSITION OF APPEAL

FRAP 2, **10:20**

SUMMARY JUDGMENT

Generally, **1:141; 3:89; 7:86; 9:220; 9:237; 9:252; 9:267; 9:281; 12:71; 13:104; 13:123; 15:17; 16:77; 19:100; 19:159; 19:189; 21:48; 23:51**
 Abandonment as law question, **1:111**
 Abbreviated new drug application (ANDA), **2:88**
 Adjustment of patent term, **1:315**
 Affidavits, **19:99**
 Ambiguity, claim construction, **2:98**
 Analogous art, **21:7**
 Analogous prior art, **6:1**
 Appeal and review, **1:288; 2:29; 8:17; 21:29**
 Appropriateness, **1:6; 3:44; 4:34; 7:30; 13:63; 14:14; 19:79; 19:91; 20:32; 20:39; 21:25; 23:35; 25:4**
 As a whole, invention considered, **12:15**
 Attorneys' fees, **1:2; 2:71**
 Bankruptcy discharge, **2:21**

INDEX

SUMMARY JUDGMENT—Cont'd

Broadened reissue, **20:10**
Burden, viewed with trial burden,
13:90; 18:47
Burden of production, **12:63**
Burden of proof, **1:35; 10:4**
Burden to show, **22:18**
Care, approached with, **13:27**
Case or controversy, **7:7**
Claim construction or interpretation,
1:108; 1:256; 2:24; 2:78; 8:17;
11:53; 19:161; 20:10; 23:58
Claim differentiation, **11:44**
Claim management, **2:153**
Claims court, **16:30**
Combine references, suggestion to, **3:1**
Competition, state unfair competition
claim, **12:15**
Conclusory, **3:13; 20:62**
Conflicting views, **8:14**
Contributory or indirect infringement,
3:36
Court of International Trade standard,
20:38
Covenant not to sue, **1:306**
Cross-motions, **2:36**
Decision, justifies and detracts from,
1:126
Declaratory judgment, **7:7**
Defined, **20:10**
Dependent claims, **2:29**
Design patent, **1:35; 16:17**
Devoid, **13:98**
Directed verdict, JNOV over, **10:4**
Disclosure dedication, **20:74**
Discovery, right to, **1:35**
Discretion of court not to proceed, **7:7**
Dismissal, **3:19**
Disputed questions of material facts,
5:36
Divided infringement, **13:211**
Doctrine of equivalents, **2:20; 2:66;**
2:114; 4:62; 8:40; 11:46; 12:42;
20:13; 22:21; 23:64
Documents, trial by, **19:51**
Doubt resolved in favor of nonmovant,
9:215
Due care, duty of, **1:35**
Each motion on own merits, **5:48**
Eliminate factually unsupported claims,
15:15

SUMMARY JUDGMENT—Cont'd

Enablement, **1:127; 2:82; 2:90; 14:75;**
15:26
Enforcement of judgments, court's
power, **1:83**
Equitable estoppel, **19:108**
Estoppel, **1:48; 10:4**
Evidence, infringer provides evidence of
noninfringement, **14:33**
Exceptional case, **18:55**
Executive Order 10096, **8:10**
Ex parte test, **3:10**
Experts, **3:1; 8:14**
Expert testimony, **1:6; 3:20; 3:150**
Facts viewed most favorably for
nonmovant, **23:16**
File wrapper, infringement, **10:13**
Final judgment, appeal after, **21:29**
Final order rule, **12:41**
Foreign countries, Court of International
Trade standard, **20:38**
FRAP 47.6(b), **2:72**
FRCP 41(a)(1), **5:18**
FRCP 52(a), **20:26**
FRCP 56, **2:29; 9:89; 13:36; 16:28;**
16:32; 19:44
FRCP 56(c), **3:36; 3:52; 4:26; 8:27;**
9:131; 11:25; 16:35; 18:28; 21:13
FRCP 56(e), **3:1**
FRCP 56(f), **11:7; 19:20**
Good faith dispute regarding claims,
16:54
Gorham test, **1:35**
Granted by court sua sponte, **9:146**
Granting, standard for, **6:1**
Harmless error, **3:1**
Heavy presumption terms, **5:70**
Hypothetical vs. real person, **8:14**
Identify facts, **22:21**
Indefiniteness, **2:175; 5:141; 19:131**
Indirect infringement, **4:75**
Indirect or contributory infringement,
3:36
Inequitable conduct, **2:24**
Infringement, **1:79; 1:137; 3:189;**
16:20; 21:28
Inherent anticipation, **19:154**
Initial burden to show no material fact,
22:18
Interplay of prosecution history estoppel
and doctrine of equivalents, **8:40**

SUMMARY JUDGMENT—Cont'd

Interpretation, **8:17**
 Invalidity, **3:20**
 Inventorship, **2:99**
 JNOV over directed verdict, **10:4**
 Judicial redrafting, **2:29**
 Laches, **1:36; 10:4; 23:45**
 Law of the case, **2:29; 10:4**
 Law question, **1:35; 7:66; 20:10**
 Lexicographer, **2:24; 10:13**
 License agreement, **3:70**
 Limitations, **20:13**
 Literal infringement, **2:22; 20:13**
 Material, unnecessary fact not, **3:13**
 Material Fact (this index)
 Metaphysical doubt, more than, **10:32**
 Method patentable even though device using it is not, **21:7**
 Modification of prior art device, **3:20**
 Motion, **5:48; 9:215; 10:4; 13:82; 23:16**
 Nexus, **3:1**
 9 Cir, **3:1**
 Noninfringement, **2:22**
 Noninfringement of asserted claims, **4:113**
 Nonmovant, **13:82**
 Novel combination, **21:7**
 Obviousness, **8:14; 9:274; 9:454; 12:15; 21:7**
 Only facts affect outcome, **13:102**
 On-sale bar, **1:2; 7:71**
 Opinion, **8:17**
 Opinion testimony, **3:1**
 Ordinary and accustomed meaning, **2:104; 4:60**
 Ornamental v. functional obviousness, **1:35**
 Ownership, employer and employee, **2:73**
 Own merits, each motion on, **5:48**
 Partial Summary Judgment (this index)
 Patentee as own lexicographer, **10:13**
 Preference, **10:4**
 Preliminary injunction, **19:32**
 Presumption of validity, **3:13**
 Presumptions, **10:4**
 Prior art, **3:1; 3:20; 6:1; 21:7**
 Proper, when, **19:76**
 Prosecution history, **1:116**

SUMMARY JUDGMENT—Cont'd

Prosecution history estoppel, **2:74; 8:40; 8:72; 12:59; 16:79; 20:13**
 Purpose, **3:41**
 Raising attorney fees claim, **2:71**
 Real vs. hypothetical person, **8:14**
 Reconsidering motion, **10:4**
 Reconstruction versus repair, **19:143**
 Reexamination, **3:192**
 Reissue statute, **8:17**
 Res judicata, **1:78**
 Reversal, when required, **8:17**
 Reverse doctrine of equivalents, **19:24**
 Review, standard of, **1:67; 1:82; 1:87; 2:44; 2:52; 2:63; 4:29; 7:7; 7:35; 9:162; 15:12; 17:5; 18:33; 19:84; 22:7; 23:36; 23:43**
 “Rewritten” claims, **16:91**
 Sales, **1:2**
 Sec. 43(a), **3:1**
 Sec. 101, **2:175**
 Sec. 102(b), **1:2; 19:62**
 Sec. 156, **1:139**
 Sec. 252, **8:17**
 Secondary considerations, **3:1; 8:14; 21:7**
 Skill, level of, **12:15; 21:7**
 Standards for granting, **1:26; 6:1**
 Standing, **20:75**
 State unfair competition claim, **12:15**
 Statutory construction and interpretation, **1:74**
 Sua sponte, granted by court, **9:146**
 Subject matter easily discernible, **3:13**
 Suggested, must be, **3:20**
 Supplanting prior art device, **21:7**
 Synergism, **3:13**
 Taxable costs, **3:13**
 Tenets, **8:14**
 Testimony on claim terms, **12:25**
 Time, when appropriate, **2:153; 13:63**
 Transcript, **3:13**
 Trial by documents, **19:51**
 Unfair competition, **12:15**
 Validity, **1:35; 3:13; 20:10; 21:46**
 Validity, presumption of, **13:99; 19:129**
 Viewed with trial burden, **18:47**
 Walker Process, **12:15**
 Willfulness, **1:35; 1:222; 1:230**
 Witnesses, **12:25; 21:7**

INDEX

SUNSET PROVISION

Permanent injunction, **1:219**

SUPERIORITY

Infringement not avoided, **19:38**

Obviousness, **18:23**

SUPERSEDEAS BOND

Surety, **2:30**

SUPERVISORY AUTHORITY

Design patent, **16:17**

SUPPLANTING PRIOR ART DEVICE

Summary judgment, **21:7**

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

Inter partes review, **21:74**

SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION

Discretion of court declined, **7:39**

Sec. 1267, **7:25**

Sec. 1367, **8:97; 13:58; 14:82; 22:36**

SUPPLEMENT RECORD

Generally, **23:26**

SUPPLIER EXCEPTION

On-sale bar, **19:140**

Sec. 102(b), **19:140**

SUPPORT, LACK OF

Sec. 112, **9:86**

SUPPRESSION

Generally, **6:62**

Abandonment, **3:59; 6:33**

Purpose of patent system, **16:9**

Sec. 102(g), **16:9**

Unreasonable delay, **12:21**

Vacuum, does not operate in, **16:9**

SUPREME COURT

Generally, **1:52**

SURETY

Supersedeas bond, **2:30**

SURPRISING RESULTS

Improvement, minor improvement,
9:118

Inequitable conduct, **11:4**

Minor improvement, **9:118**

SURRENDER

Doctrine of equivalents, **13:63; 13:95**

SURRENDER—Cont'd

Prosecution history estoppel, **13:140;**
16:40

SUSPENSION

Pendency of earlier case involving same
patent, **1:24**

Reissue, **3:72**

SYNERGISM

Appellate standard of review, **7:2**

Combination, **19:36**

Declaratory judgment, **10:6**

Inequitable conduct, **11:4**

Jury, **1:16**

Summary judgment, **3:13**

TANGENTIAL

Doctrine of equivalents, **3:130; 9:377;**
18:74; 18:77

TANGENTIALLY

Prosecution history estoppel, **3:130;**
18:77

TANGIBLE FORM

Computer program, **9:164**

Reduction to practice, **19:144**

TARIFF ACT

ITC, **13:11**

TAXABLE COSTS

Summary judgment, **3:13**

TEACHING

Combining references, **9:119**

Commissioner's brief not prior art,
9:140

New prior art not considered by PTO,
5:11

Obviousness, **3:153**

Prior art, **9:96; 9:140**

Reference, **9:289**

Reference, must appear in, **9:140**

Requirement, **9:114**

TECHNICAL EXPERT

Infringement, **9:125**

Testimony, **16:11**

TECHNICAL PAPER

Prior art printed publication under Sec.
102(b), **13:11**

TECHNICAL QUALIFICATIONS

Ordinary skill, hypothetical person of, **9:65**

TECHNICAL TERMS

Claim integration, **13:91**
 Claim interpretation, **14:44; 16:56**
 Dictionary, **1:109**
 Indefiniteness, **13:80**

TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCE

Infringement, **22:32**

TECHNOLOGICAL ARTS TEST

Statutory subject matter, **9:308**

TECHNOLOGICAL EVIDENCE

Generally, **14:32**

TECHNOLOGIC EQUIVALENCY

Infringement, **8:51**

**TELEFONAKTIEBOLAGET LM
 ERICSSON V. LENOVO (UNITED
 STATES), INC.**

2024, **20:166**

TEMPLATE

Hindsight reconstruction, **9:114**
 Instructional manual, **9:123**

**TEMPORARY RESTRAINING
 ORDER (TRO)**

Generally, **12:16**

10-DAY LIMIT

FRCP 59(e), **19:42**

TERM

Generally. Patent Term (this index)
 Contract construction, **16:34**
 FRCP 56(c), **8:27**

TERMINAL DISCLAIMER

Certificate of correction, **10:44**
 Double patenting, **9:384; 15:6**
 Purpose, **9:110**
 Reissue, withdrawal of disclaimer, **9:367**
 Rejection, **17:2**
 URAA, **2:89**

TERMS

See also Claim Terms; Patent Term (this index)
 Law question, **9:120**
 Statutory construction, **8:61**

TERRITORIAL LICENSE

Standing, **9:301; 16:64**

TERSE CLAIM LANGUAGE

Claim interpretation, **5:50**

TEVA BRANDED

**PHARMACEUTICAL
 PRODUCTS R&D, INC. V.
 AMNEAL PHARMACEUTICALS
 OF NEW YORK, LLC**

2024, **20:167**

THESIS

Documentary evidence, weight accorded testimony in conflict with, **13:34**

THIRD PARTIES

Generally, **9:118**
 Attorney-client privilege, **19:60**
 Contempt, **20:54**
 Evidence of level of skill in the art, **9:23**
 Implied license, **3:147**
 Injunction, **1:296**
 Interference, **3:6**
 Inter partes reexamination, **3:138**
 Invention, **19:34**
 Inventorship, **1:102**
 License agreement, **3:70; 3:145**
 Obviousness, **21:8**
 Prior invention by, **12:55**
 Public use, **4:101**
 Reexamination, third-party requester, **1:287; 3:194**
 Sec. 102(a), **3:2**
 Sec. 102(b), **19:7**
 Sec. 102(g), **14:7**
 Sec. 286, **19:27**
 Secondary considerations, **9:82**

30-DAY NOTICE

Sec. 282, **20:15**

30-MONTH PERIOD

ANDA, **1:120; 5:95**

**30-PERCENT REASONABLE
 ROYALTY**

Damages, **20:19**

35 USC § 101

Abstract ideas, **1:333**
 Laws of nature, **1:333**
 Natural phenomena, **1:333**

INDEX

- 35 USC § 146**
 - Civil action for interference, **19:232**
- 35 USC § 252**
 - Reexamination, **6:8**
- 35 USC § 282**
 - Disclosure, statutory outer limit, **23:76**
- 35 USC § 1124(4)**
 - Generally, **16:100**
- 37 CFR SEC. 1.6(c)**
 - Generally, **7:45**
- 37 CFR SEC. 1.11(b)**
 - Stay of execution of judgment and injunction pending appeal, **19:49**
- 37 CFR SEC. 1.56**
 - Generally, **19:180**
 - Disclose references showing each known step, no obligation to, **8:29**
 - Duty of candor and good faith to PTO, **1:203**
- 37 CFR SEC. 1.56(a)**
 - Generally, **2:113; 16:98**
 - Materiality, **9:43**
- 37 CFR SEC. 1.105 (a)(1)**
 - Generally, **19:180**
- 37 CFR SEC. 1.142**
 - Generally, **7:75**
- 37 CFR SEC. 1.145**
 - Generally, **7:75**
- 37 CFR SEC. 1.175**
 - Generally, **14:23**
- 37 CFR SEC. 1.175(a)(4)**
 - No defect reissue application, **9:25**
- 37 CFR SEC. 1.191**
 - Board failure to review all claims on appeal, **9:2**
- 37 CFR SEC. 1.196(a)**
 - Examiner, ground of rejection not part of Examiner's decision, **9:106**
- 37 CFR SEC. 1.321**
 - ITC, **13:20**
- 37 CFR SEC. 1.608**
 - New interference rules, **8:3**
- 37 CFR SEC. 1.609**
 - New interference rules, **8:3**
- 37 CFR SEC. 1.617**
 - New interference rules, **8:3**
- 37 CFR SEC. 1.617(b)**
 - Good cause, **8:35**
- THREATENED INFRINGEMENT**
 - Appellate jurisdiction, **3:11**
- THREAT OF SALE**
 - Sec. 271(e)(1), **5:13**
- THREATS TO SUE**
 - Mandamus, **9:76**
- THREE-JUDGE PANEL**
 - State immunity from suit under Eleventh Amendment, **10:11**
- THREE-PART INQUIRY**
 - Doctrine of equivalents, **22:10**
- THREE-PART TEST**
 - Equitable estoppel, **2:61; 5:53**
 - Estoppel, **8:32**
- THREE REQUISITE ELEMENTS**
 - Estoppel, **1:67**
- “THREE SITUATIONS”**
 - Repair, **8:83**
- THRESHOLD INTENT**
 - Inequitable conduct, **6:4**
- THRESHOLD ISSUE**
 - Preliminary injunction, denial of, **12:16**
- THRESHOLD LEVEL**
 - Inequitable conduct, **1:44; 21:36**
- THRESHOLD QUESTION**
 - CAFC jurisdiction, **23:15**
- TIE**
 - Interference, **15:1**
- TIME AND TIMELINESS**
 - Generally, **18:1**
 - Abandonment, **4:65**
 - Agency, **9:187; 11:31**
 - Antedating Reference (this index)
 - Antitrust, **11:16**
 - Appeal and review, **4:25; 9:38; 9:317; 10:3; 11:38; 13:162; 16:37**

TIME AND TIMELINESS—Cont'd

Appellate jurisdiction, **2:5; 13:8**
 Application entitled to benefit of earlier filing date, **13:53**
 Attorney fees award, **7:54**
 Barred, inter partes review, **12:115; 23:94**
 Best mode belief, **1:246**
 Broadening reissue, **9:3**
 Business day, **23:28**
 CIP, **20:35; 20:59**
 Claim construction, **3:123; 22:18**
 Concealment, **4:65**
 Damages, date of hypothetical negotiation, **1:296; 12:97**
 Declaratory judgment, **3:134; 13:177; 19:250**
 Description, **19:120**
 Doctrine of equivalents, **23:63**
 Enablement, **5:45; 21:39**
 Equitable estoppel, **2:5**
 Estoppel, **23:30**
 Exceptional case, **2:5; 18:9**
 Factual findings to support jury verdict presumed, **2:15**
 False marking, civil penalty, **6:72**
 Filing Date (this index)
 First sale doctrine, **2:5**
 Foreign activities, **9:61**
 FRAP 4(a), **2:5**
 Implied license, **2:5**
 Interference, **8:122; 13:3; 16:132; 19:144**
 Inter partes review, **23:94**
 JNOV, **6:6; 22:2**
 Judicial notice, **11:24**
 Jurisdiction, **7:38; 13:8; 15:8**
 Jury instructions, **13:38**
 Memorandum decision, **2:5**
 Motion to remand, **9:38; 19:45**
 New trial, **19:16**
 9 Cir, **2:5**
 Notice of appeal, **4:25; 9:317**
 Notice of patent, **2:5**
 Obviousness, **4:91; 9:112; 12:43**
 Particularity, failing in, **18:25**
 Permanent injunction, sunset provision, **1:219**
 Priority analysis, **9:340**
 PTO motion to remand, **9:130**

TIME AND TIMELINESS—Cont'd

Raising argument, **3:32**
 Reconsideration, request for, **20:21**
 Reduction to practice, antedate of reference, **9:341**
 Rejection, **9:38**
 Remand, **9:38**
 Sec. 102(b), **2:1**
 Sec. 111, **19:32**
 Sec. 112, **18:4**
 Sec. 120, **12:99; 20:33**
 Trademark, **2:5**
 Trademark declaration cannot establish on-sale date, **16:25**
 Waiver, **10:15**
 Weekend or holiday, **23:28**

TIME LIMITS

FRCP 59(e), **19:58**
 Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT), **8:70**

TIME PERIOD

Interference, **15:1**

TITLE

See also Ownership (this index)
 Automatically vests in United States, **6:18**
 Employer-employee, **6:15**
 Standing, **5:105; 12:58; 19:154**

TOLLING

Appeal, of time for, **7:32**

TOP BRAND LLC V. COZY COMFORT COMPANY LLC

2025, **20:168**

TORT

Occurs at place where sales are made, **14:15**

TORTIOUS INTERFERENCE

Generally, **19:185**
 Inducing infringement, **18:48**

TORT LIABILITY

Preemption of laws, state law tort liability, **7:81**

TOTALITY OF CIRCUMSTANCES

Experimental use, **2:57; 12:45; 16:44**
 On-sale bar, **3:81**
 Public use, **12:45; 16:44**
 Sec. 112, **15:2**

INDEX

TOTALITY OF CIRCUMSTANCES

—Cont'd

- Shop rights, **13:52**
- Willful infringement, **1:58; 11:18; 11:56; 19:38**

TOUCHSTONE

- Inventorship, **2:99**

TRADE DRESS

- Choice of law, **9:161; 15:11**
- Gorham infringement test, **12:17**

TRADEMARK

- Declaration cannot establish on-sale date, **16:25**
- Declaratory judgment, **23:9**
- Patent misuse, **23:9**
- Preliminary injunction, **2:16**
- Timeliness of appeal filing, **2:5**

TRADE NAME

- Best mode, **18:5**
- Disclose supplier, failure to, **20:33**

TRADE SECRETS

- Generally, **15:22; 16:103**
- Choice of law, **12:65; 18:39**
- Contract, **18:14**
- Defined, **12:27**
- Motion to remand, **19:45**
- Preliminary injunction, **6:7**

TRANSCRIPT

- Summary judgment, **3:13**

TRANSFER

- Dismiss or transfer infringement suit, **9:432**

“TRANSFER FROM”

- Claim construction, **7:104**

TRANSFERS

- Action, transfer of, **18:40**
- Appeal and Review (this index)
- Choice of law, **24:1**
- Clear abuse of discretion, **9:381; 9:382**
- Judicial Panel on Multi-District Litigation (JPMDL), **7:6**
- Jurisdiction declined, **21:12**
- Orders, **6:34**
- Ownership, **9:303**
- Relevant factors, **9:128**
- Sec. 1631, **19:2**

TRANSFERS—Cont'd

- Stay order, **11:1**
- Venue, **7:93; 8:69; 8:110; 9:334; 9:336; 9:395; 14:60; 22:38; 26:14**

TREBLE DAMAGES

- Appeal is review and not trial de novo, **6:12**

TRIAL BY DOCUMENTS

- Summary judgment, **19:51**

TRIAL CONDUCT

- CAFC, **18:3**

TRIAL DE NOVO

- Appeal is review and not trial de novo, **6:12**

TRIAL JUDGE

- Sec. 455(a), **8:12**
- Weight and credibility of testimony, **19:54**

TRIER OF FACT

- Weight and credibility of evidence, **18:12**

TRINITY INFO MEDIA, LLC V. COVALENT, INC.

- 2023, **20:165**

TRO (TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER)

- Generally, **12:16**

TRUE INVENTOR

- Claim interpretation, **19:15**

TRUE SALE

- On-sale bar, **13:123**

TRUSTEES

- Standing, **13:148**

21 CFR 314.53(c)(3)

- Generally, **1:135**

21 CFR 314.53(f)

- Generally, **1:135**

21 CFR 355(c)(2)

- Generally, **1:135**

21 CFR 355(j)(2)(A)(vii)

- Generally, **1:135**

21 USC § 355

- Generally, **13:120**

28 USC § 1291
 Generally, **14:40**
 Immediate appeal, **11:10**

28 USC § 1292(b)
 Discretionary, **14:40**

28 USC § 1295
 Inter partes review, disclaimers, **1:327**
 Stay orders not final, **14:40**

28 USC § 1338
 Generally, **14:40**
 Arising under jurisdiction, **2:3**
 Jurisdiction, **20:83**

28 USC § 1361
 Generally, **8:92**

28 USC § 1498(a)
 Generally, **20:66**

28 USC § 1920
 Cost award, **9:342**

28 USC § 2202
 Generally, **16:81**
 FRCP 13(a), **16:81**

TWO-STEP ANALYSIS
 Infringement (this index)

TYING ARRANGEMENTS
 Generally, **9:282**

TYPOGRAPHICAL ERROR
 Marking, **1:119; 16:183**

**UCB, INC. V. ACTAVIS
 LABORATORIES UT, INC.**
 2023, **21:92**

ULTIMATE ARBITER
 CAFC, **18:3**

ULTIMATE LEGAL ISSUE
 Expert's opinion, **9:113**

ULTIMATE RECOGNITION
 Market success, **9:90**

UNCITED PRIOR ART
 Claim differentiation, **11:2**
 Prior art, **3:90**
 Process performable by person, **1:12**

**UNCLAIMED DISCLOSED
 MATERIAL**
 Doctrine of equivalents, **13:75**

UNCLAIMED ELEMENTS
 Claim interpretation, **6:58**

UNCLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER
 Best mode, **13:101**
 Dedication, intent, **20:74**
 Doctrine of equivalents, **10:30**

UNCLEAN HANDS DOCTRINE
 Generally, **7:124**
 Inequitable conduct, **3:35**
 Inventorship dispute, **16:131**
 Laches, **19:204**
 Materiality required, **18:40**

**UNCONTRADICTED EXPERT
 TESTIMONY**
 Generally, **21:13**

UNDEFINED TERMS
 Statutory construction, **8:61**

UNDERLYING FACTS
 Interference, **4:11**
 Obviousness, **9:197**

UNDERSTANDING
 CAFC jurisdiction, **9:63**
 Claim interpretation, **22:25**
 Discovery of new property or use of
 known composition, **9:104**
 Indefiniteness, **19:131**

UNDUE BREADTH REJECTION
 Papesch, **9:9**

UNDUE DELAY
 Laches, **9:241**

UNDUE EXPERIMENTATION
 Generally, **16:181; 23:11**
 Enablement, **1:44; 2:99; 9:177; 9:305;**
19:201
 Law question with facts, **5:45**
 Quantitative, not merely, **10:23**
 Sec. 112(1), **10:23**

UNEXPECTED BENEFIT
 Generally, **9:100**

UNEXPECTED PROPERTIES
 Obviousness, **8:147**

INDEX

UNEXPECTED RESULTS

- Generally, **9:191**
- Closest art, compared with, **9:111**
- Established by factual evidence not argument, **9:174**
- Factual evidence, **9:174; 9:197**
- Finding tantamount to nonobviousness, **7:108; 8:40**
- Obviousness, **1:168; 9:15; 9:228; 9:250; 9:295; 19:211; 19:214**
- Prima facie obviousness, **9:86**
- Secondary considerations, **12:13; 16:4**

UNEXPECTED SETTLEMENT

- Judicial estoppel, **23:21**

UNFAIR COMPETITION

- Generally, **15:25**
- Choice of law, **7:55; 16:48**
- Inducing infringement, **18:48**
- Inequitable conduct as, **16:48**
- Infringement, **19:87**
- Sec. 43(a), **15:5; 16:21**
- Sec. 102(b), **3:16**
- Sec. 337 (this index)
- Summary judgment, **12:15**

UNFOUNDED DEFENSES

- Anticipation, **18:20**

UNIFORM COMMERCIAL CODE (UCC)

- Preemption, **3:68**

UNIFORMITY OBJECTIVE

- Choice of law, **23:37**

UNILATERAL CONTRACT

- Contract law, **23:39**

UNITED CANNABIS CORPORATION V. PURE HEMP COLLECTIVE INC.

- 2023, **21:93**

UNITED SERVICES AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION V. PNC BANK N.A.

- 2025, **21:96**

UNITED STATES

- Site of infringement, **12:81**
- Sovereign interests, qui tam actions, **19:224**
- Title automatically vests in, **6:18**

UNITED STATES COURT OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE (CIT)

- Procedural rule corresponds to FRCP, **5:18**

UNITED THERAPEUTICS CORPORATION V. LIQUIDIA TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

- 2023, **21:94**

UNJUST ENRICHMENT

- Generally, **21:49**

UNPATENTED ACCESSORY SALES

- Generally, **11:21**

UNPUBLISHED CAFC OPINION

- Effect thereof, **17:2**

UNREASONABLE DELAY

- Abandonment, suppression or concealment, **12:21**
- Laches, **1:54; 13:36**

UNRELATED APPLICATIONS

- Prosecution, **13:108**

UNRESOLVED DEADLOCK

- Special interrogatories, **2:49**

UNSUPPORTED ALLEGATION

- Frivolous appeal, **1:52**

URAA (URUGUAY ROUND AGREEMENTS ACT)

- Generally, **13:77; 14:36**
- Offer to sell in United States, **20:103**
- Safe harbor provision, **2:54; 4:40**
- Terminal disclaimer, **2:89**

USE

- Infringement, **9:453**
- Not covered by patent, **14:63**
- Personal jurisdiction, **13:153**
- System use, infringement by, **3:156**
- Written description, **9:453**

USE CODE OF FDA

- Counterclaim to force correction, **14:68**

US FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

- FDA (this index)

US INVENTOR, INC. V. UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

2025, **21:97**

US SYNTHETIC CORP. V. INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

2025, **21:98**

UTILITY

Application, **18:1**
 Collateral estoppel, **9:143**
 Contributory infringement, **7:130**
 Design patent, **1:356**
 Enablement, **9:319; 16:60**
 Fact question, **13:28**
 Inducement, **7:130**
 Inoperable, **5:56**
 Inoperative, **6:9; 9:222**
 Interference, **6:33**
 Obviousness, **7:130**
 Overbreadth, **21:10**
 Practical, **6:33**
 Prima facie obviousness, **9:17**
 Public Utilities (this index)
 Sec. 101, **2:34; 3:37; 5:7; 13:55; 14:4; 18:6; 20:25**
 Sec. 102(g), **19:10**
 Sec. 112(1), **9:165**

VACATION OF JUDGMENT

See also Stay (this index)
 Altwater, **13:46**
 Claim construction, **1:5**
 FRCP 59(e), **19:42**
 Judgment of patent invalidity, **3:188**
 Mootness of case, **20:95**
 Public interest, **15:36**
 Regional law controls, **16:19**
 Settlement agreement, **21:22**
 Summary judgment based on anticipation, **5:129**
 Validity, **7:8; 10:10; 23:18**

VACATUR

Generally, **3:236**

VACUUM, CLAIMS NOT INTERPRETED IN

Generally, **9:58; 19:13**

VAGUE ASSERTIONS OF PATENTABILITY

Prosecution history estoppel, **9:199**

VAGUENESS

See index topics Ambiguity; Certainty and Definiteness (this index)

VALIDITY

Generally, **2:199; 3:59; 8:93; 9:253; 16:87; 21:32; 22:23**
 Altwater, **13:46**
 Anticipation, **1:340; 1:341; 16:167**
 Appeal and review, **7:61; 8:49; 8:62; 18:39; 21:26**
 Assignor estoppel, **21:38**
 Attorney fees, **10:2**
 Burden, heavy, **23:48**
 Burden of persuasion, **15:15**
 Burden of proof, **14:21; 20:35; 20:39; 21:25**
 Challenging each claim, **3:114**
 Claim by claim basis, **1:110**
 Claim construction and interpretation
 generally, **21:33**
 declared valid, **4:23**
 domestic industry requirement, **19:206**
 each claim presumed valid, **4:74**
 infringement, construed same way for, **1:131; 2:82**
 preserve validity, **18:50; 23:16**
 uphold if possible, **12:12**
 Claim itself recites incorrect science, **5:56**
 Claim preclusion, **8:76**
 Clear and convincing evidence, **5:49; 5:64; 19:132; 19:142**
 Collateral estoppel, **4:3; 8:73; 13:105**
 Consent judgment, **5:8**
 Copending application, **8:7**
 Counterclaim, **13:91**
 Cross-appeal, **18:2**
 Damages, **3:180; 12:45**
 Declaratory judgment, **1:312**
 Declare, inappropriate to
 evidence, objective, **4:19**
 objective evidence, **4:19**
 representative, unless claim is, **4:19**
 secondary consideration, **4:19**
 Dependent, independent versus, **8:7**

INDEX

VALIDITY—Cont'd

- Dependent claims as hedge against invalidity, **9:345**
- Design patent, **19:8**
- Determination to be vacated when infringement not present, **23:18**
- Dismissal, **16:54**
- Doctrine of equivalents, **5:6**
- Domestic industry requirement, **19:206**
- Double patenting, **8:7**
- Each claim has independent validity presumption, **3:41**
- Each patent independent, **5:45**
- Enforceability issue, **12:40**
- Equivalence, **5:7**
- Examiner, prior art before, **3:77**
- Exceptional case, **3:180**
- FRCP 49(a), **19:21**
- FRCP 56, **16:32**
- FRCP 59(e), **19:42**
- Heavy burden when only oral testimony, **23:48**
- Identity of invention, **20:20**
- Indefiniteness, **2:169**
- Independent, each patent as, **5:45**
- Independent of infringement, **19:86**
- Independent vs. dependent claim, **8:7**
- Infringement
 - access validity not examiner's potential act, **20:72**
 - appeal and review, **7:61; 8:49; 18:39**
 - burden of persuasion, **15:15**
 - eliminates need to consider, **12:45**
 - independent of, **16:74; 19:86**
 - lack of written description, **19:249**
 - validity, effect on, **1:113**
- Judgment, **2:169; 14:1**
- Jury verdict, **4:18; 8:62; 12:94; 21:26**
- Laches or delay, **3:180**
- Lack of written description, infringement, **19:249**
- Law question, **14:8**
- Lear distinguished, **8:11**
- Licensee, **13:132**
- Limitations, must construe dispute limitations first, **4:68**
- Mootness, **1:113**
- New trial, **8:51**
- Obviousness
 - generally, **18:47**

VALIDITY—Cont'd

- Obviousness—Cont'd
 - dependent claims, **9:24**
 - dependent claim validity, **16:4**
 - eliminates need to consider, **12:45**
 - holding in prior suit, **7:17**
 - same way for validity and infringement, **19:11**
- Oral testimony, **23:48**
- Patents born valid, **4:6**
- Post-trial motions, **18:3**
- Preliminary injunction, **18:21; 20:12**
- Presumption of
 - generally, **1:80; 19:37; 19:129**
 - irreparable harm, **14:9**
 - ITC, **19:25**
 - JNOV, **22:2**
 - mere procedural device, **13:53**
 - new prior art, effect of, **18:10**
 - obviousness, **13:99**
 - prejudgment interest, **12:9**
 - PTO, **19:235**
 - Sec. 282, **8:119; 9:21; 9:57; 9:80; 12:6; 13:87; 16:4; 18:6**
 - substantive law, **19:36**
 - summary judgment, **3:13**
 - verbatim findings of counsel adopted, **8:22**
- Primarily functional, **12:8**
- Prior art, **3:77; 4:6**
- Prior ruling upholding patent validity, **5:9**
- PTO initial rejection, **7:19**
- Public concern, matter of, **6:22**
- Public policy, **4:13**
- Public use, **16:167**
- Reexamination, **6:85**
- Regulation invalid when contrary to purposes of statute, **7:24**
- Reissue, **4:69**
- Rejection, **7:19**
- Remand and reassignment, **20:104**
- Res judicata effect, **6:17**
- Rewrite claim to preserve validity, not court's function to, **1:119**
- Science, claim itself recites incorrect science, **5:56**
- Sec. 271(a), **3:180**
- Sec. 102(b), **9:7**
- Sec. 112, **20:6**

VALIDITY—Cont'd

Sec. 153, **5:17**
 Sec. 261, **10:4**
 Sec. 282, **6:10; 9:80; 12:5**
 Sec. 284, **16:167**
 Standard of proof, **13:169**
 State immunity from suit under Eleventh Amendment, **10:11**
 Success on merits, likelihood of, **1:110**
 Summary judgment, **1:35; 20:10; 20:107; 21:46**
 Two-step analysis, **19:119**
 Vacation of judgment, **7:8; 10:10**
 Witnesses, **19:145; 23:48**

VALUE AND VALUATION

Anticipated collateral sales vs. reasonable royalty rate, **18:35**
 Bona fide purchaser, **8:63**
 Demand, patented feature is reason for, **20:50**
 Eminent domain, **8:56**
 Entire market value rule, **6:36**
 Obviousness, **9:191**

VARIED USE OF A TERM

Claim interpretation, **2:78**

VASCULAR SOLUTIONS LLC V. MEDTRONIC, INC.

2024, **22:70**

VENUE

Generally, **1:362.50; 2:196; 3:229.50; 9:499; 9:505; 9:508; 9:515; 10:46; 20:82; 22:64**
 Corporation, domestic, **20:137**
 Dismiss or transfer infringement suit, **9:432**
 Domestic corporation, **20:137**
 Frcp 12(g)(2), **9:447**
 Frcp 12(h)(1)(a), **9:447**
 FRCP 25(a), **13:25**
 Frivolous appeal, **23:98**
 Infringement, **8:53**
 Mandamus, **9:445; 9:447; 9:449; 9:457; 9:462; 9:472; 9:480; 9:491; 9:493; 9:510; 9:515**
 Personal jurisdiction, lack of, not properly transfer, **8:69**
 Sec. 1400(b), **9:11**

VENUE—Cont'd

Transfers, **7:93; 8:69; 8:110; 9:334; 9:336; 9:395; 9:447; 14:60; 22:38; 26:14**
 Waiver, **9:447**

VERBAL DIFFERENCES

Appellate standard of review, **7:2**

VERBATIM FINDINGS OF COUNSEL ADOPTED

Generally, **8:22**
 Anticipation, **8:22**
 Best mode, **8:22**
 Conception, **8:22**
 Enablement, **8:22**
 Evidence, objective, **8:22**
 Fact question, **8:22**
 It would be obvious, **8:22**
 Objective evidence, **8:22**
 Obvious to try, **8:22**
 Presumption of validity, **8:22**
 Reduction to practice, **8:22**
 Validity, presumption of, **8:22**

VERDICT

Generally, **12:74; 14:44**
 Advisory jury still need findings of fact, **20:39**
 Alternate legal theories, **13:97**
 Appeal and Review (this index)
 Choice of law, **13:105**
 Claim interpretation, **19:5**
 Claim preamble, **16:14**
 Combination patent, **3:17**
 Commercial embodiment comparison, **16:14**
 Conflict, **4:18**
 Defenses, **3:75**
 Delay, excusable, **13:4**
 Dimensions, **19:5**
 Directed Verdict (this index)
 Doctrine of equivalents, **8:47; 16:14**
 Equitable estoppel, **13:4**
 Equivalents, range of, **19:5**
 Evidence, **3:75; 4:18; 7:29**
 Exact identity, **16:14**
 Excusable delay, **13:4**
 Findings of fact, **20:39**
 Form, **22:4**
 FRAP 38, **3:17**
 FRCP 49(a), **19:5**

INDEX

VERDICT—Cont'd

FRCP 49(b), **13:4**
Frivolous appeal, **3:17**
Identity. exact identity, **16:14**
Improper, **16:14**
Indirect infringement, **16:153**
Infringement, **8:47; 19:5; 20:25**
Instruction, **4:18**
Insufficient, **3:17**
Inventor's claim interpretation, **19:5**
JMOL, **11:28**
JNOV, **3:17; 5:7; 13:17; 19:56; 20:15**
JNOV motion, **16:14**
Judgments reviewed, **16:14**
Jury trial, **16:14; 19:60**
Laches, **13:4**
Manufacturing tolerances, **19:5**
Mistakes at trial, not to cure, **4:18**
Motion, **4:18; 5:7**
New trial, **3:17; 4:18**
9 Cir law, **18:14**
Noninfringement, **1:50**
Nose of wax, **19:5**
Obviousness, **3:17; 3:153; 16:14**
Ordinary meaning, term given its, **19:5**
Primary reference, **8:62**
Prior art, distinguishing features in, **3:17**
Proper standard, **3:75**
Relevant facts to be found by trial court, **18:25**
Review, standard of, **2:49; 6:26; 8:51; 21:27**
Sec. 287, **4:12**
Set aside, **3:173; 14:47**
Special Verdict (this index)
Specificity thereof, **8:52**
Substantial evidence, **7:29**
Validity, **4:18; 8:62; 21:26**

VESTING OF TITLE

Infringement, **19:154**
United States, **6:18**

VICARIOUS LIABILITY

Infringement, **4:75**
Joint infringement, **13:159; 13:160**

VIDEOTAPE

FRE 403, **13:4**

VIRTEK VISION INTERNATIONAL ULC V. ASSEMBLY GUIDANCE SYSTEMS, INC.

2024, **22:71**

VIRTUAL ASSIGNMENT

Standing, **5:38**

VISIBLE, NOT REQUIRED TO BE

Design patent, **19:118**

VISUAL APPEARANCE AS A WHOLE

Infringement, **3:100**

VITALNESS

Administrative law, **4:38**

VITIATION

Claim construction, **3:178**
Doctrine of equivalents, **1:267; 3:178; 18:106**
Obviousness, **3:178**

VLSI TECHNOLOGY LLC V. INTEL CORPORATION

2023, **22:68**

VOICE TECH CORP. V. UNIFIED PATENTS, LLC

2024, **22:72**

VOIDING

Election, **3:61**

VOLUNTARY AND INVOLUNTARY ACTS AND MATTERS

Dismissal, **18:76**
FRCP 19(a), **11:19; 19:264**
FRCP 41(a)(1), **5:18**
Joinder, **9:302; 14:9; 15:9**
Prosecution history estoppel, **16:79**

VOLUNTEER

Amicus curiae, **1:41**

VOLVO PENTA OF THE AMERICAS, LLC V. BRUNSWICK CORPORATION

2023, **22:69**

WAIVER

Generally, **1:363; 9:246; 9:492; 18:66**
See also Estoppel (this index)
Belated preliminary motion, **7:26**

WAIVER—Cont'd

Claim construction and interpretation, **3:174; 3:200; 4:99; 9:234; 15:29; 19:16; 19:279**

Constitutional immunity, **3:33**

Defenses, **9:159**

Directed verdict, failure to timely move for, **10:15**

Eleventh amendment waiver, **18:66**

Expert or opinion evidence, **19:279**

FRCP 49(a), **19:21**

Implied waiver, standards setting organization, **3:206; 8:120**

Jury trial, **20:39**

Legal issues not raised at trial, **6:16**

Obviousness, **9:439**

Opening brief, raising issue in, **23:25**

Patent term extensions, **16:149**

Personal jurisdiction, **13:114**

Reasonable royalty, **19:279**

Sec. 282, **4:58; 20:15**

Sec. 1400(b), **9:11**

Sovereign immunity, **10:19; 13:48; 19:75; 23:28**

Special verdict, **8:52**

Standing, **2:18**

Time bar, **1:350**

Transfers, **9:447**

Venue, **9:447**

WALKER PROCESS

Generally, **3:69; 3:83; 3:230; 8:102; 9:221; 14:21; 14:25**

Antitrust, **1:25; 1:42; 4:84; 11:16; 18:97**

Inequitable conduct, **3:71; 14:21; 14:25**

Invalidity and noninfringement, declaratory judgment, **20:133**

Jurisdiction, **24:6**

Summary judgment, **12:15**

WARNER-JENKINSON

Presumption, **9:209**

WARRANTY, BREACH OF

Interference, **1:58**

WASH WORLD INC. V. BELANGER INC.

2025, **23:105**

WATERMAN

Generally, **15:9**

WEAKENED

Presumption of validity, **13:81**

WEBER, INC. V. PROVISUR TECHNOLOGIES, INC.

2024, **23:103**

WEEKEND OR HOLIDAY

Timely appeal, failure to file, **23:28**

WEIGHT AND CREDIBILITY OF EVIDENCE

Generally, **19:57; 22:27**

Agency regulations and pronouncements, **20:28**

Determinations, **4:41; 6:28**

Obviousness, **1:30; 3:165; 13:84; 16:19**

Reviewability, **8:31**

Sec. 284, **2:31**

Secondary considerations, **18:28**

Special province of trier of fact, **18:12**

Trial court, **14:10**

Trial judge, **19:54**

Trier of fact, special province of, **18:12**

WELL-ESTABLISHED COMMON LAW PRINCIPLES

Presumption, **9:154**

WELL-KNOWN AND ROUTINELY BUILT

Conclusory statements, **9:113**

WELL-PLEADED COMPLAINT

Generally, **1:76; 8:66; 12:44; 13:107; 19:55**

Counterclaim included, **2:31**

Jurisdiction, **1:135; 1:160**

Sec. 41(a)(7), **13:32**

Transfer of appeal, **7:14**

WELL-UNDERSTOOD, ROUTINE AND CONVENTIONAL

Fact question, skilled artisan, **1:311**

WHEREBY CLAUSE

Claim construction, **8:91; 20:29**

Means-plus-function claim, **12:62**

WHOLE INVENTION

Claim interpretation, statements describing whole invention, **22:32**

INDEX

WHOLE OF STATUTE TO BE CONSIDERED

Statutory construction, **19:77**

WIDE DISCRETION

JMOL, **26:9**

WILLFUL BLINDNESS

Inducement, **7:103**

WILLFUL CONTEMPT ORDER

Sec. 271(e)(1), **5:13**

WILLFUL INFRINGEMENT

Generally, **1:152; 2:33; 3:2; 6:59; 8:133; 13:126**

Actual knowledge of infringer, **14:24**
Actual notice creates affirmative duty, **3:80**

Advice of counsel, **14:5; 19:154**

Affirmative duty, **18:29**

Appealable issue, **3:26**

Attorneys (this index)

Avoidance of literal infringement factor, **23:50**

Bad faith not required, **10:21**

Burden, **16:22**

Clear and convincing evidence required, **16:129; 20:39**

Clearly erroneous standard, **19:23**

Conception, **2:164**

Copying, **8:47**

Damages (this index)

Designing around, **19:52**

Directed verdict, **16:22**

Enhanced damages, **21:3; 23:85**

Equitable estoppel, **1:201**

Equivocal opinion of counsel, **23:26**

Factors, **19:101**

Fact question, **7:37; 8:52; 13:45; 16:40**

Flawed opinion of counsel, **19:92**

FRCP 52(a), **1:18**

FRCP 59, **3:26**

Increased damages, **15:14**

Injunction, **9:323; 16:5**

Intent, **18:14**

Inventorship, **2:164**

Issue preclusion, **4:9**

Jury, fact findings of, **19:9**

Knowledge, actual knowledge of infringer, **14:24**

Lanham Act, **3:26**

WILLFUL INFRINGEMENT—Cont'd

Literal infringement, avoidance of, **23:50**

Means-plus-function, **18:17**

Motion for new trial, **16:22**

Negative finding reversed, **3:26**

New trial, **3:26; 16:22**

Notice, **3:80**

Obviousness, **8:129; 18:23**

Prevailing party, **19:259**

Privity, **11:14**

Reissue, **11:5**

Reversal, negative finding reversed, **3:26**

Review, standard of, **19:96**

Sec. 43(a), **3:26**

Sec. 112, **15:2; 19:7**

Sec. 284, **4:32; 5:19; 7:12; 7:27; 8:123; 9:323; 19:57**

Sec. 285, **1:201; 2:170; 7:20; 15:6; 19:28**

Stipulation, **12:24**

Totality of circumstances, **1:58; 11:18; 11:56; 19:38**

WILLFULNESS

Generally, **2:80; 9:275**

Abbreviated new drug application (ANDA), **7:81**

All relevant aspects given appropriate weight, **19:129**

Appeal is review and not trial de novo, **6:12**

Attorney fees award, **19:103; 20:122**

Attorneys, opinion of counsel, **21:18**

Bifurcated trial, **17:3**

Defenses prepared for trial after notice, **3:96**

Enhanced damages, **12:47**

Factors, **14:18**

Infringement. Willful Infringement (this index)

Notice and knowledge, **3:51; 3:96**

Pending patent, defendant's knowledge of, **3:51**

Question of fact, **3:96**

Relevance, **19:129**

Review, standard of, **5:54**

Sec. 285, **2:34**

Summary judgment, **1:35; 1:222**

WILLINGNESS

Licenses, **13:75; 18:35**
 Reasonable royalty rate, **19:38**

WILSON HYPOTHETICAL CLAIM

Generally, **13:93; 19:117**
 Doctrine of equivalents, **3:52; 10:15; 11:22; 23:20**
 Hypothetical claim, **9:146**
 Prosecution history, does not address, **19:84**
 Prosecution history estoppel, **7:28**

WISCONSIN ALUMNI RESEARCH FOUNDATION V. APPLE INC.

2024, **23:104**

WITHDRAWAL

Interference, **9:217**

WITHDRAWN CLAIMS

Final judgment, **19:233**
 Infringement, **7:10**

WITHHOLDING

Admissibility of evidence withheld during PTO examination, **8:111**
 Inequitable conduct, **1:187; 8:29; 8:62; 12:30**
 Known or used by others, **3:2**
 Prejudgment interest, **12:20**

WITHOUT NOTICE TO OTHER PARTY

CAFC jurisdiction, **9:63**

WITHOUT-PREJUDICE DISMISSAL

Choice of law, **8:82**
 FRCP 12(b)(7), **21:56**

WITNESSES

Claim interpretation, **10:22; 19:16; 22:17**
 Claims determine what infringes patent, **9:4**
 Conflicting testimony, credit one when, **7:47**
 Corroboration, need for, **8:30**
 Credit one when conflicting testimony, **7:47**
 Damages, **7:11**
 Doctrine of equivalents, **3:80**
 Evidence, loss of, **14:11**
 Expert or Opinion Evidence (this index)

WITNESSES—Cont'd

Factfinder not obliged to accept or reject witness' testimony in toto, **8:31**
 FRCP 52(a), **12:6**
 Inequitable conduct, **11:4**
 Inventor's declaration in conflict with prior deposition testimony, **19:62**
 Inventor's testimony, **8:106**
 Motion in limine, **7:26**
 Observation of witnesses, **13:41**
 Obviousness question, **16:19**
 Oral testimony, **5:47; 10:31; 16:70; 19:12; 19:151**
 Prejudgment interest, **14:5**
 Rule of reason, **11:41**
 Selection of one witness testimony over another, **14:5**
 Senior party, **2:47**
 Sufficient to establish damages, **7:11**
 Summary judgment, **12:25; 21:7**
 Test results, **8:30**
 These, **13:34**
 Trial judge is in best position to determine weight and credibility of testimony, **19:54**
 Validity, **19:145; 23:48**
 Writings, earlier, **14:12**

WONDERLAND SWITZERLAND AG V. EVENFLO COMPANY, INC.

2025, **23:106**

WORDS

Cases not cited for mere words, **19:38**
 Claim differentiation, **19:261**
 Considered, context surrounding, **1:136**
 Experienced in field of invention, **8:52**
 Has many meanings in Patent Act, **9:136**
 Means nothing outside claim, **16:11**
 Misappropriated, **12:3**
 No form of words necessary, **16:74**
 Ordinary meaning, **10:24**

“WORK BETTER”

Obviousness, **18:23**

WRIGHT

Generally, **9:98**

WRITTEN ACTS AND MATTERS

After-the-fact testimony of inventor, **14:12**
 Agreements, **3:64; 23:21**

INDEX

WRITTEN ACTS AND MATTERS

—Cont'd

Court's findings and conclusions prepared by prevailing party, **21:2**

Decision, **2:193.70**

Description, **2:196; 2:198; 9:502; 10:52; 14:108**

Description (this index)

Failure to meet requirements, **21:67**

WUHAN HEALTHGEN

BIOTECHNOLOGY CORP. V.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

COMMISSION

2025, **23:107**

**ZIRCON CORP. V. INTERNATIONAL
TRADE COMMISSION**

2024, **26:17**

ZYXEL COMMUNICATIONS CORP.

V. UNM RAINFOREST

INNOVATIONS

2024, **26:18**