

MUELLER ON
PATENT LAW

*Volume I: Patentability
and Validity*

MUELLER ON PATENT LAW

Volume I: Patentability and Validity

Janice M. Mueller

Patent Attorney and Co-Founder
Chisum Patent Academy

Professor of Law at University of Pittsburgh (2004–2011),
The John Marshall Law School (1999–2004),
and Suffolk University (1996–1999)

Copyright © 2020 Fastcase. All Rights Reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or utilized by any information storage or retrieval system, without written permission from the publisher. For information about permissions or to request permissions online, visit us at www.fastcase.com, or a written request may be e-mailed to our permissions department at support@fastcase.com.

Printed in the United States of America

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0

ISBN 978-1-949884-25-8

Summary of Contents

Table of Contents	vii	
About the Author	xxv	
Preface	xxvii	
Chapter 1	BASIC PRINCIPLES	1
Chapter 2	PATENT CLAIMS	53
Chapter 3	PATENT-ELIGIBLE SUBJECT MATTER	173
Chapter 4	THE ENABLEMENT REQUIREMENT	325
Chapter 5	THE BEST MODE REQUIREMENT	359
Chapter 6	THE WRITTEN DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION REQUIREMENT	381
Chapter 7	NOVELTY, NO LOSS OF RIGHT, AND PRIORITY [PRE-AMERICA INVENTS ACT OF 2011]	449
Chapter 7A	NOVELTY, NO LOSS OF RIGHT, AND PRIORITY [POST-AMERICA INVENTS ACT OF 2011]	651
Chapter 8	INVENTORSHIP	701
Chapter 9	THE NONOBVIOUSNESS REQUIREMENT	745
Chapter 10	THE UTILITY REQUIREMENT	915
Chapter 11	PATENT PROSECUTION PROCEDURES IN THE U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE	937
Chapter 12	DOUBLE PATENTING	1017
Glossary		1059
Table of Cases		1071
Table of Authorities		1187

Table of Statutes	1213
Index	1233

Table of Contents

About the Author	xxv
Preface	xxvii

Chapter 1	BASIC PRINCIPLES	1
§1.01	Patents in Context	2
	[A] Introduction	2
	[B] Patents as Strategic Business Assets	3
	[C] Patents and Global Trade	6
	[D] Patents and the Public Interest	7
	[E] Patents as a Form of Intellectual Property Protection	8
	[1] The Appropriability Problem of Public Goods	8
	[2] Intellectual Property Rights as an Incentive Mechanism	9
	[3] Intellectual Property Rights as an Exception to the General Rule of Competition by Imitation	10
§1.02	The Right to Exclude Conveyed by a Patent	11
	[A] Negative, Not Positive, Right	11
	[B] Blocking Patents	12
§1.03	Policy Justifications for Patent Protection	14
	[A] Natural Rights	14
	[B] Reward for Services Rendered	15
	[C] Monopoly Profits Incentive	15
	[D] Exchange for Secrets	16
§1.04	Economics of the Patent System	17
	[A] Patent Ownership Versus Monopoly Power	17
	[B] Cost/Benefit Analysis	19
	[1] Costs	19
	[2] Benefits	22
§1.05	The Term of a Patent	25
	[A] Length of Term	25
	[B] Patent Term Adjustment	27
§1.06	Sources of U.S. Patent Law	29
	[A] The Constitution	29
	[B] Federal Statutes and Regulations	31
	[C] Case Law	33

§1.07	Government Entities in the Patent System	34
	[A] The U.S. Patent and Trademark Office	34
	[B] U.S. Federal Courts	38
	[1] U.S. District Courts	38
	[a] Eastern District of Virginia	40
	[2] U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit	43
	[3] U.S. Supreme Court	47
	[C] U.S. International Trade Commission	51
Chapter 2	PATENT CLAIMS	53
§2.01	Introduction	55
	[A] Statutory Basis: 35 U.S.C. §112(b)	55
	[B] The Paramount Role of Patent Claims	55
	[C] Definition of a Patent Claim	56
	[D] Public Notice Function	58
	[E] Peripheral Versus Central Claiming	61
	[F] Fundamentals of Patent Claim Construction	62
	[1] “Own Lexicographer” Rule	62
	[2] Default Rule: “Ordinary and Customary” Meaning	66
	[3] Claim Interpretation in the USPTO: “Broadest Reasonable Construction” Rule	66
§2.02	Components of Patent Claims	72
	[A] Preamble	73
	[1] Introduction	73
	[2] Preamble Language as Claim Limiting	73
	[B] Transition	77
	[1] “Comprising”	77
	[2] “Consisting of”	80
	[3] “Consisting Essentially of”	81
	[4] Other Transition Terminology	82
	[C] Body	83
§2.03	Dependent Patent Claims	85
	[A] Statutory Basis: 35 U.S.C. §§112(c)-(e)	86
	[B] Claim Groupings	86
	[C] Multiple Dependent Claims	87
	[D] Claim Differentiation Principle	88
§2.04	Claim Definiteness Requirement	91
	[A] Statutory Basis: 35 U.S.C. §112(b)	91
	[B] Perspective for Determining Claim Definiteness	92
	[C] Definiteness Standard: <i>Nautilus v. Biosig</i> (U.S. 2014)	93

	[D] Representative Examples of Definite and Indefinite Claim Terms	104
	[1] Representative Examples of <i>Definite</i> Claim Terms	104
	[a] <i>Orthokinetics</i> (1986)	104
	[b] <i>Verve, LLC</i> (2002)	105
	[c] <i>Young</i> (2007)	106
	[d] <i>Hearing Components</i> (2010)	107
	[e] <i>Nautilus III</i> (2014)	107
	[f] <i>Sonix</i> (2017)	109
	[g] <i>One-E Way</i> (2017)	113
	[2] Representative Examples of <i>Indefinite</i> Claim Terms	116
	[a] <i>Datamize</i> (2005)	116
	[b] <i>Interval Licensing</i> (2014)	119
	[c] <i>Teva III</i> (2015)	122
	[d] <i>Dow Chemical II</i> (2015)	123
	[E] Judicial Correction of Harmless Errors in Claims	128
	[F] Use of Antecedent Basis in Patent Claims	132
	[G] Indefiniteness Standard in the USPTO	133
§2.05	Specialized Claiming Formats	137
	[A] Means-Plus-Function Claims	137
	[1] Functional Claiming Generally	137
	[2] Statutory Basis: 35 U.S.C. §112(f)	138
	[3] The Interpretation and Scope of Means-Plus-Function Elements	140
	[a] Scope-Narrowing	140
	[b] Corresponding Structure	141
	[c] Algorithms for Computer Structures	142
	[d] “Equivalents Thereof”	143
	[4] Presumptions Regarding “Means” Claim Elements	144
	[a] Claim Elements Including the Word “Means”	144
	[b] Claim Elements Not Including the Word “Means”	147
	[B] Product-by-Process Claims	154
	[C] <i>Jepson</i> Claims	160
	[D] <i>Markush</i> Claims	163
	[E] <i>Beauregard</i> Claims	166
Chapter 3	PATENT-ELIGIBLE SUBJECT MATTER	173
§3.01	Introduction	175
	[A] 35 U.S.C. §101: The First Door to Patentability	175
	[B] The Statutory Categories Within §101	177

	[C] Claiming the Inventive Concept Within the Statutory Categories	178
	[D] Exceptions to §101	179
§3.02	Processes Within §101	181
	[A] Definition of a Process	181
	[B] Process Versus Product	182
	[C] Computer-Implemented Processes: The Supreme Court’s <i>Benson</i> (1972)/ <i>Flook</i> (1978)/ <i>Diehr</i> (1981) Trilogy	183
	[D] Business Methods and the “Abstract Idea” Exception	185
	[1] Overview	185
	[2] Expansive View: <i>State Street Bank</i> (Fed. Cir. 1998)	186
	[3] “Mental Processes”	189
	[4] “Abstract Idea” Exception Narrows Business Method Patentability	191
	[a] <i>In re Bilski</i> (Fed. Cir. 2008) (<i>en banc</i>)	191
	[b] <i>Bilski v. Kappos</i> (U.S. 2010)	195
	[c] Two-Step Framework of <i>Mayo v. Prometheus</i> (U.S. 2012)	200
	[i] Step One—Claims Directed to Abstract Idea or Law of Nature?	201
	[ii] Step Two—Inventive Concept?	201
	[d] <i>Alice Corp. v. CLS Bank</i> (U.S. 2014)	202
	[i] Step One—Claims Directed to Abstract Idea or Law of Nature?	204
	[ii] Step Two—Inventive Concept?	205
	[e] Federal Circuit Decisions Applying “Abstract Idea” Exception to Process Patent Eligibility	208
	[i] Introduction	208
	[ii] Post- <i>Alice</i> Decisions Holding Inventions Patent-Ineligible	210
	[iii] Does <i>Mayo/Alice</i> Step Two Involve Questions of Fact?	215
	[iv] Representative Post- <i>Alice</i> Federal Circuit Decisions Holding Inventions Patent-Eligible	226
	[a] <i>DDR Holdings</i> (2014)	226
	[b] <i>Enfish</i> (2016)	229
	[c] <i>McRO</i> (2016)	234
	[d] <i>Bascom</i> (2016)	238
	[e] <i>Amdocs II</i> (2016)	242
	[f] <i>Thales Visionix</i> (2017)	247
	[g] <i>Visual Memory</i> (2017)	250

	[h] <i>Finjan</i> (2018)	252
	[i] <i>Berkheimer</i> (2018) and <i>Aatrix Software</i> (2018)	255
[E]	Methods of Treatment	261
	[1] Overview	261
	[2] Patent-Ineligible “Laws of Nature”	262
	[a] <i>Prometheus v. Mayo</i> (Fed. Cir. 2010)	262
	[b] <i>Mayo v. Prometheus</i> (U.S. 2012)	264
	[c] Unintended Consequences of the Supreme Court’s <i>Mayo</i> Decision	268
	[i] <i>Ariosa</i> (2015)	268
	[ii] <i>Genetic Technologies</i> (2016)	272
	[iii] <i>Cleveland Clinic</i> (2017)	273
	[iv] <i>Athena Diagnostics</i> (2019)	275
	[3] Representative Post- <i>Mayo</i> Federal Circuit Life Sciences Decisions Finding Patent-Eligible Subject Matter	281
	[a] <i>CellzDirect</i> (2016)	281
	[b] <i>Vanda</i> (2018)	285
	[c] <i>Endo</i> (2019)	288
§3.03	Machines Within §101	292
	[A] Definition of a Machine	292
	[B] Computer-Implemented Machines	293
§3.04	Compositions of Matter Within §101	294
	[A] Definition of a Composition of Matter	294
	[B] Structure Versus Properties: Newly Discovered Properties of Known Compositions	295
	[C] Products of Nature	296
	[1] Purified Forms of Natural Products	296
	[2] Genetic Materials	297
	[a] <i>Ass’n for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics</i> (U.S. 2013)	298
	[b] Post- <i>Myriad</i> (U.S. 2013) Federal Circuit Decisions	308
	[D] Spontaneously Generated Compositions	313
	[E] Life Forms	314
	[1] Foundation: <i>Diamond v. Chakrabarty</i> (U.S. 1980)	314
	[2] Multi-Cellular Organisms	315
	[3] Clones	316
§3.05	Manufactures Within §101	318
	[A] Definition of a Manufacture	318
	[B] Embedded Software	318
	[C] Electrical Signals	321

§3.06	Non-Eligible Subject Matter	322
§3.07	Remedies Exclusion for Medical/Surgical Procedures	323
Chapter 4	THE ENABLEMENT REQUIREMENT	325
§4.01	Introduction	325
	[A] The Disclosure Requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112(a)	325
	[B] Bargain/Exchange Theory	327
	[C] Enabling “How to Make” and “How to Use”	328
	[D] Filing Date as Measure of Disclosure Compliance/ New Matter Prohibition	329
	[1] Incorporation by Reference	331
	[2] Biological Deposits	332
	[3] Timing for Enablement Versus Novelty/ Nonobviousness	333
§4.02	Undue Experimentation	334
	[A] <i>Wands</i> Factors Framework	334
	[B] Predictability of the Technology	338
	[1] Generally Predictable Technologies	338
	[2] Generally Unpredictable Technologies	339
	[3] Exceptions to General Rule	342
	[C] Scope of Enabling Disclosure Versus Scope of the Claims	343
	[1] “Reasonable Correlation” Standard	343
	[2] “Full Scope” Enablement	345
	[D] Use of Working and Prophetic Examples	353
	[1] Types of Examples	353
	[2] Working Examples Not Mandatory	354
§4.03	Nascent and After-Arising Technology	356
Chapter 5	THE BEST MODE REQUIREMENT	359
§5.01	2011 Legislative Scale-Back of the Best Mode Requirement	359
§5.02	Best Mode as Enablement-Plus	361
§5.03	Unclear Policy Objectives	362
§5.04	No Best Mode Obligation in Many Foreign Countries	363
§5.05	Best Mode Compliance and Foreign Priority Claims	364
§5.06	Two-Step Analysis	367
	[A] Step One: Subjective Inquiry	367
	[1] Best Mode of the Inventor, Not Assignee	367
	[2] Multiple Inventors	368

	[B] Step Two: Objective Inquiry	370
	[1] Integrating Enablement with Best Mode	370
	[2] Proprietary Materials	370
	[3] Production Details and Routine Details	372
	[4] Manner of Identifying Best Mode	373
	[5] Concealment: Is Intent Required?	373
§5.07	Scope of the Best Mode Disclosure Versus Scope of the Claims	377

Chapter 6 THE WRITTEN DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION REQUIREMENT 381

§6.01	The Varied Meanings of “Written Description”	381
§6.02	Priority Policing Mechanism	384
§6.03	Policy Rationale	386
§6.04	“Inventor in Possession” Test	389
	[A] How the Specification Conveys Possession	389
	[B] Ambiguity in the Possession Test	398
§6.05	Written Description Versus Enablement	400
§6.06	Traditional “Time Gap” Situations Invoking Written Description Scrutiny	404
§6.07	Federal Circuit’s Expansion of the Written Description Requirement	413
	[A] <i>Regents of Univ. of Cal. v. Eli Lilly and Co.</i> (1997)	413
	[B] <i>Enzo Biochem., Inc. v. Gen-Probe, Inc.</i> (2002)	417
	[C] <i>Univ. of Rochester v. G.D. Searle & Co.</i> (2004)	418
	[D] <i>Carnegie Mellon Univ. v. Hoffmann-La Roche Inc.</i> (2008)	421
	[E] <i>Ariad Pharms., Inc. v. Eli Lilly and Co. (en banc)</i> (2010)	422
	[F] <i>AbbVie Deutschland v. Janssen Biotech</i> (2014)	431
	[G] <i>Amgen v. Sanofi</i> (2017)	437
§6.08	Conclusion	448

Chapter 7 NOVELTY, NO LOSS OF RIGHT, AND PRIORITY [PRE-AMERICA INVENTS ACT OF 2011] 449

	<i>Chapter Explanatory Note</i>	453
§7.01	Statutory Basis: 35 U.S.C. §102 (2006)	454
	[A] Burden of Proof on USPTO	456
	[B] Claim Interpretation in USPTO	457
	[C] Prior Art as Defined by §102	458
	[D] Lack of Novelty Versus Loss of Right	459
	[E] Persons Who Can Trigger the §102 Provisions	461

	[F] Geographic Limitations in §102	462
	[G] Temporal Limitations in §102	463
§7.02	Anticipation	464
	[A] Definition	464
	[B] Strict Identity Rule	464
	[1] “Four Corners”/Single Reference Rule	465
	[2] “Arranged as in the Claim”	465
	[a] Generally	465
	[b] Reference Not Anticipatory If It Must Be Distorted	467
	[3] Exceptions to the Single Reference/ “Four Corners” Rule	472
	[4] No Analogous Art Requirement for Anticipation	473
	[5] To “Suggest” Is Not Sufficient for Anticipation	474
	[C] Species/Genus Relationships	476
	[D] Question of Fact	483
§7.03	Inherent Anticipation	484
	[A] Generally	484
	[1] “Necessarily Present”	484
	[2] Reference Failing to “Necessarily Disclose”	485
	[3] Use of Extrinsic Evidence to Establish Inherency	487
	[B] Accidental Anticipation	491
	[C] Contemporaneous Recognition Not Required	492
§7.04	Enablement Standard for Anticipatory Prior Art	493
	[A] General Principle	493
	[B] Exception for Prior Art Compounds Lacking a Utility	494
§7.05	Anticipation Under §102(a)	496
	[A] Filing Date as <i>Prima Facie</i> Invention Date	496
	[1] References Having Effective Date Less Than One Year Before Applicant’s Filing Date	497
	[2] Antedating a Putative <i>Prima Facie</i> §102(a) Reference by Establishing an Earlier Invention Date	498
	[a] Generally	498
	[b] Relying on Inventive Activity Outside the United States Under 35 U.S.C. §104	500
	[c] Disclaiming Affidavits	501
	[B] “Known or Used by Others” Under §102(a)	501
	[C] “Patented” Under §102(a)	506
	[D] “Printed Publication” Under §102(a)	508
	[E] Strategies for Overcoming a §102(a) Anticipation Rejection	508

§7.06	Loss of Right/Statutory Bars Under §102(b)	510
	[A] Introduction	510
	[1] Filing Date	511
	[2] “Critical Date”	512
	[B] Grace Period	513
	[C] Policies Underlying the §102(b) Bars	514
	[D] “Patented” Under §102(b)	515
	[E] “Printed Publication” Under §102(b)	515
	[1] Public Accessibility	516
	[2] The Thesis Cases	518
	[3] Confidentiality Norms	518
	[4] Scientific or Technical Presentations	519
	[a] <i>Klopfenstein</i> (2004)	519
	[b] <i>Medtronic</i> (2018)	521
	[5] Internet Postings	524
	[a] <i>SRI Int’l</i> (2008)	524
	[b] <i>In re Lister</i> (2009)	525
	[c] <i>Jazz Pharms.</i> (2018)	526
	[d] <i>Acceleration Bay</i> (2018)	529
	[6] Trade Shows and Conventions	530
	[a] <i>GoPro</i> (2018)	530
	[b] <i>Nobel Biocare</i> (2018)	531
	[F] “Public Use” Bar of §102(b)	534
	[1] Foundation: <i>Egbert v. Lippmann</i> (1881)	536
	[2] Public Use by Third Parties	540
	[a] Generally	540
	[b] Corroboration of Oral Testimony	541
	[3] Non-Public “Public Use”	544
	[4] Ready for Patenting	546
	[G] “On Sale” Bar of §102(b)	553
	[1] Introduction	553
	[2] Policy Considerations	553
	[3] When Is an Invention Capable of Being Placed On Sale? <i>Pfaff v. Wells</i> (U.S. 1998)	555
	[4] Post- <i>Pfaff</i> Decisions Interpreting “Commercial Offer”	558
	[a] Decisions Finding No Commercial Offer	559
	[b] Decisions Finding Commercial Offer	562
	[c] Supplier Sales	565
	[d] Contingent Sales (Conditions Precedent)	574

	[5] Post- <i>Pfaff</i> Decisions Interpreting “Ready for Patenting”	579
	[a] Inventions Not Ready for Patenting	579
	[b] Inventions Ready for Patenting	581
	[H] Experimental Use Negation of the Statutory Bars	585
	[1] Meaning of “Negation”/Burden of Proof	585
	[a] “Negation” Not “Exception”	585
	[b] Assigning Burdens of Production and Proof	587
	[2] Foundation: <i>City of Elizabeth v. Nicholson Pavement</i> (U.S. 1878)	589
	[3] Experimental Use Factors	590
	[4] Must Experimental Use End with Actual Reduction to Practice?	594
	[5] Positioning Experimental Use Within the <i>Pfaff</i> Framework	596
	[I] Cannot Antedate a §102(b) Reference	598
	[J] Cannot Rely on Paris Convention Foreign Priority Date to Remove a §102(b) Reference	598
§7.07	Abandonment Under §102(c)	599
§7.08	Foreign Patenting Bar of §102(d)	601
	[A] Policy Basis Underlying the §102(d) Bar	601
	[B] Two Prongs of §102(d)	602
	[C] Meaning of “Patented” in §102(d)	603
§7.09	Description in Another’s Earlier-Filed Published Application or Patent Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)	604
	[A] Foundation: <i>Milburn v. Davis-Bournonville</i> (U.S. 1926)	605
	[B] Reference Patent or Application Claims Same Invention	607
	[C] Ameliorating the “Secret Prior Art” Problem of §102(e)	608
	[1] Issued U.S. Patent as §102(e) Prior Art	608
	[2] Published U.S. Patent Application as §102(e) Prior Art	609
	[3] Published Patent Cooperation Treaty Application as §102(e) Prior Art	609
	[D] Effective Date of §102(e) Prior Art	610
	[1] Earliest U.S. Filing Date	610
	[2] Reference’s Foreign Priority Date Is Not Applicable (<i>Hilmer</i> Rule)	611
	[E] Provisional §102(e) Rejections	611
	[F] Strategies for Overcoming a §102(e) Rejection	612
	[1] Generally	612
	[2] Corroboration for Declarations	612

§7.10	Originality Requirement and Derivation Under §102(f)	619
	[A] Originality	619
	[B] Derivation	620
	[C] Qualifying as an Inventor	620
	[D] Correcting Inventorship	621
§7.11	Prior Invention Under §102(g)	621
	[A] Introduction	621
	[B] The First-to-Invent Priority Rule	622
	[1] Statement of the Priority Rule	622
	[2] Reduction to Practice	623
	[a] Actual Reduction to Practice	623
	[b] Constructive Reduction to Practice	626
	[3] Abandonment/Suppression/Concealment	627
	[4] Conception	629
	[5] Diligence	632
	[C] Interference Proceedings Under §102(g) (1)	635
	[1] Burdens of Proof	635
	[2] Conducted Under 35 U.S.C. §135(a)	637
	[3] Time Bar Under 35 U.S.C. §135(b)	637
	[4] Reliance on Foreign Inventive Activity Under 35 U.S.C. §104	638
	[5] Examples: Applying the First-to-Invent Priority Rule in Interferences	640
	[D] Anticipation Under §102(g) (2)	641
	[1] Introduction	641
	[2] Prior “Making” by Another	643
	[3] “In This Country” Requirement	644
	[4] Inurement	644
	[5] Example: Applying the First-to-Invent Priority Rule in Anticipation	649

**Chapter 7A NOVELTY, NO LOSS OF RIGHT, AND PRIORITY
[POST-AMERICA INVENTS ACT OF 2011] 651**

	<i>Chapter Explanatory Note</i>	652
§7A.01	Statutory Text: Post-AIA 35 U.S.C. §102	656
§7A.02	Sense of Congress and Legislative History for Post-AIA 35 U.S.C. §102	658
§7A.03	Prior Art Under Post-AIA 35 U.S.C. §102(a)	659
	[A] Introduction	659
	[B] What §3 of the AIA Retained	661
	[C] What §3 of the AIA Changed	662

	[D] Presumptively Novelty-Destroying Events Under Post-AIA §102(a) (1)	666
	[1] Invention “Patented, Described in a Printed Publication, or in Public Use, [or] On Sale” Before Effective Filing Date	666
	[2] Invention “Other wise Available to the Public” Before Effective Filing Date	668
	[3] Does the AIA Permit Secret Prior Art?	669
	[a] Introduction	669
	[b] Must a Publicized Sale Disclose the Details of the Invention?	673
	[i] <i>Helsinn Healthcare v. Dr. Reddy’s</i> (D.N.J. 2016) (“ <i>Helsinn I</i> ”)	673
	[ii] <i>Helsinn Healthcare v. Teva</i> (Fed. Cir. 2017) (“ <i>Helsinn II</i> ”)	676
	[iii] <i>Helsinn Healthcare v. Teva</i> (U.S. 2019) (“ <i>Helsinn III</i> ”)	683
	[E] Presumptively Novelty-Destroying Events Under Post-AIA §102(a) (2)	686
§7A.04	Novelty-Preserving Exceptions Under Post-AIA 35 U.S.C. §102(b)	689
	[A] Introduction	689
	[B] Post-AIA §102(b) (1): Shields Against Post-AIA §102(a) (1) Presumptively Novelty-Destroying Events	690
	[1] “(A)-Type” Exceptions	690
	[2] “(B)-Type” Exceptions	693
	[C] Post-AIA §102(b) (2): Shields Against Post-AIA §102(a) (2) Presumptively Novelty-Destroying Events	693
	[1] “(A)-Type” Exceptions	694
	[2] “(B)-Type” Exceptions	695
§7A.05	Effective Date for AIA §3 “First Inventor to File” Amendments	696
§7A.06	Common Ownership Under Joint Research Agreements	698
Chapter 8	INVENTORSHIP	701
§8.01	Originality Requirement	702
§8.02	The Process of Inventing	704
	[A] Patent Law’s Construct of Inventing: A Two-Step Process	704
	[1] Conception	704
	[a] Definition	704
	[b] Scientific Certainty Not Required	708
	[c] Corroboration	709
	[d] Importance of Conception	710

	[2] Reduction to Practice	710
	[a] Actual Reduction to Practice	711
	[b] Constructive Reduction to Practice	711
	[B] The Reality	711
§8.03	Joint Inventors	712
	[A] Statutory Basis	712
	[B] Who Qualifies as a Joint Inventor?	712
	[1] Conception as the Touchstone	712
	[2] Quality of the Contribution	713
	[a] “Not Insignificant in Quality”	713
	[b] Contribution of an “Essential Element”	715
	[C] Burden of Proof and Standard of Review	718
	[D] Decisions Denying Joint Inventorship	718
	[E] Decisions Finding Joint Inventorship	721
	[F] The Impact of Joint Inventorship on Ownership	723
§8.04	Correction of Inventorship	726
	[A] Correction of Inventorship in Pending Patent Applications	727
	[B] Correction of Inventorship in Issued Patents	727
	[1] Section 256 Actions Generally	727
	[2] Standing Requirement for Section 256 Actions	729
§8.05	Derivation	732
	[A] Derivation Defined	732
	[B] Derivation Defense in Patent Litigation	733
	[1] Generally	733
	[2] <i>Agawam</i> (U.S. 1868)	734
	[3] Derivation Requires Proving Earlier Conception of Entire Invention as Claimed	735
	[C] Derivation-Related Proceedings in the USPTO	738
	[1] Derivation as an Issue in Interference Proceedings [Pre-AIA]	738
	[2] Derivation Proceedings Under the America Invents Act of 2011	740
Chapter 9	THE NONOBVIOUSNESS REQUIREMENT	745
§9.01	Statutory Basis: 35 U.S.C. §103	747
§9.02	Historical Background	751
	[A] <i>Hotchkiss v. Greenwood</i> and the Elusive Requirement for “Invention”	751
	[B] The <i>Hotchkiss</i> “Ordinary Mechanic”	753
	[C] Replacing “Invention” with Nonobviousness	753

	[1] Patent Act of 1952	754
	[a] Enactment of §103	754
	[b] “Shall Not Be Negated”	755
	[c] The “Person Having Ordinary Skill in the Art”	755
	[d] “Would Have Been” Obvious	756
	[2] <i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> (U.S. 1966)	757
	[a] Constitutionality of §103	758
	[b] Analytical Framework for Nonobviousness Determinations: Overview	758
§9.03	<i>Graham</i> Factor (1): Scope and Content of the Prior Art	759
	[A] Terminology	759
	[B] What Is Prior Art for §103 Purposes	759
	[C] Section 102/Section 103 Overlap	761
	[1] <i>In re Bass</i> (CCPA 1973)	762
	[2] Section 103(c) Exclusion of Commonly Owned Subject Matter [Pre-America Invents Act of 2011]	764
	[3] Section 103(c) (2006) Exclusion of Joint Research Work [Pre-America Invents Act of 2011]	765
	[4] Use of Temporarily Secret Prior Art to Establish Obviousness [Pre-America Invents Act of 2011]	767
	[D] Analogous Art	768
	[1] Required for Obviousness Under §103	768
	[2] Test of <i>In re Wood</i>	769
	[3] Same Field of Endeavor	770
	[4] Same Problem Addressed	774
	[5] Not Required for Anticipation Under §102	778
§9.04	<i>Graham</i> Factor (2): Differences Between Claimed Invention and Prior Art	778
§9.05	<i>Graham</i> Factor (3): Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	780
§9.06	<i>Graham</i> Factor (4): Secondary Considerations	783
	[A] Evidentiary Weight	784
	[1] Diverging Views	784
	[2] Versus Strength of <i>Prima Facie</i> Case	790
	[3] Need for Explicit Analysis	793
	[B] Nexus Requirement	794
	[1] Generally	794
	[2] Rebuttable Presumption of Nexus	795
	[3] Nexus with Entire Claimed Invention Versus Novel Features	799

	[C] Evidence of Commercial Success	803
	[1] Generally	803
	[2] Nexus Requirement for Commercial Success	806
	[D] Evidence of Long-Felt but Unsolved Need	807
	[E] Evidence of Failure of Others	809
	[F] “Etc.”	811
	[1] Evidence of Copying	812
	[2] Evidence of Licensing	814
	[3] Evidence of Industry Praise	817
	[4] Evidence of Skepticism	819
	[G] Potential Impact of Blocking Patents on Secondary Considerations Evidence	820
§9.07	Combining Prior Art Disclosures	825
	[A] Teaching, Suggestion, or Motivation to Combine	825
	[B] Reasonable Expectation of Success	828
	[1] Degree of “Reasonableness”	829
	[2] Timing of Expectation	832
	[3] Relation to <i>KSR</i> (U.S. 2007)	837
	[C] “Obvious to Try” (Pre- <i>KSR</i> Meaning)	838
	[D] Unexpected Results	839
	[1] Generally	839
	[2] Timing of Evidence	841
	[3] Placement in <i>Graham</i> Framework	848
	[E] Teaching Away	848
	[1] Generally	848
	[2] <i>United States v. Adams</i> (U.S. 1966)	849
	[3] Inoperability	850
	[4] Merely “Not Preferred” Is Insufficient	851
	[5] Not Relevant to Anticipation	855
§9.08	Nonobviousness in the Twenty-First Century: <i>KSR v. Teleflex</i> (U.S. 2007)	855
	[A] Expanding the Reasons for Combining Prior Art Teachings	855
	[B] Common Sense	860
	[C] Requirement for Explicit Analysis	862
	[D] Redefining “Obvious to Try”	865
	[E] Predictability	871
	[F] Representative Federal Circuit Applications of <i>KSR</i>	873
	[1] Mechanical Inventions	873
	[2] Computer/Internet-Implemented Inventions	875
	[3] Pharmaceutical and Biotechnology Inventions	877

§9.09	The <i>Prima Facie</i> Case of Obviousness	880
	[A] Generally	880
	[B] <i>In re Dillon</i> (1990) (<i>en banc</i>)	883
	[C] Burden-Shifting in Validity Litigation?	885
	[1] Cases Rejecting Burden-Shifting in Court Litigation	885
	[2] Cases Approving Burden-Shifting in Court Litigation	888
	[D] Overlapping (or At Least Abutting) Ranges or Variables	899
§9.10	Federal Circuit’s Standards of Review in §103 Determinations	909
	[A] USPTO	909
	[1] Factual Findings	909
	[2] “Harmful Error” Requirement	911
	[B] Federal District Court	911
	[1] Factual Findings by Court	912
	[2] Factual Findings by Jury	912
§9.11	Biotechnological Processes: §103(b) (2006) [Pre-America Invents Act of 2011]	912
Chapter 10 THE UTILITY REQUIREMENT		915
§10.01	Statutory Basis: 35 U.S.C. §101	915
§10.02	Practical/Real-World Utility	916
§10.03	Historical Development	919
	[A] Justice Story’s Standard	919
	[B] <i>Brenner v. Manson</i> (U.S. 1966)	920
§10.04	Federal Circuit Examples	921
	[A] Chemical Compounds	921
	[B] Methods of Treating Disease	924
	[C] Genetic Inventions	927
§10.05	USPTO Examination Guidelines on Utility	929
§10.06	Inoperability	931
	[A] Examples of Inoperable Inventions	931
	[B] Inoperable Species Within a Genus	932
§10.07	Immoral or Deceptive Inventions	933
§10.08	Utility Versus How-to-Use Requirement of §112, ¶1	935
Chapter 11 PATENT PROSECUTION PROCEDURES IN THE U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE		937
§11.01	Introduction	938
§11.02	Filing the Patent Application	939
	[A] Non-Provisional/Regular Application	940

	[B] Provisional Application	943
	[C] Incorporation by Reference	947
§11.03	Examination by the USPTO	954
	[A] Overview	954
	[B] Search of Prior Art	955
	[C] First Office Action	956
	[D] Applicant's Response	958
	[E] Second or Final Office Action	959
	[F] Requests for Continued Examination	960
	[G] Continuing Applications	961
§11.04	Patent Issuance	962
§11.05	Patent Term Adjustment	962
	[A] Generally	962
	[B] Overlap Limitation	964
	[C] Treatment of Continued Examination	967
	[D] What Constitutes USPTO Fault for A-Type Delay	968
§11.06	Publication of Pending Nonprovisional Applications	971
§11.07	Continuing Application Practice	973
	[A] Introduction	973
	[B] Three Types of Continuing Applications	975
	[C] Filing Requirements	976
	[D] Effective Filing Date of Claims in Continuing Applications	983
	[E] Patent Term of Continuing Applications	985
	[F] Divisional Applications	986
	[1] Restriction Requirements	986
	[2] Consonance Requirement	989
§11.08	Claiming Foreign Priority	991
	[A] Treaty Basis and Statutory Implementation	991
	[B] "Shall Have the Same Effect"	993
	[C] "Same Invention"	993
	[D] Formal Requirements	994
	[E] First-Filed Foreign Applications	995
§11.09	Appeals to the USPTO Patent Trial and Appeal Board	996
	[A] Generally	996
	[B] Challenging the Board's Decision	998
	[C] New Ground of Rejection by Board	999
§11.10	Civil Actions for a Patent	1003
§11.11	Sample Office Action and Applicant's Response	1006
§11.12	Sample Patent and Its Components	1011

Chapter 12	DOUBLE PATENTING	1017
§12.01	Introduction	1017
§12.02	Two Types of Double Patenting	1019
	[A] Same Invention-Type Double Patenting	1020
	[B] Obviousness-Type Double Patenting	1020
§12.03	Policy Bases	1021
	[A] Prevent Improper Extension of Patentee's Right to Exclude Others	1021
	[B] Prevent Potential Harassment by Multiple Assignees	1022
§12.04	Foundational Case Study	1026
§12.05	Twenty-Year Patent Term Did Not Eliminate Double Patenting Concerns	1028
§12.06	How Double Patenting Differs from Anticipation and Obviousness	1031
	[A] Claim-to-Claim Comparison	1031
	[B] Prior Art Is Not Involved	1033
	[C] Similarities	1035
§12.07	Proper Use of the Disclosure to Interpret the Claims	1036
§12.08	Improper Use of the Disclosure as Prior Art	1037
§12.09	Use of Terminal Disclaimer to Overcome Obviousness-Type Double Patenting	1043
	[A] Terminal Disclaimers in the USPTO	1043
	[B] Terminal Disclaimers in Litigation	1046
	[C] Terminal Disclaimer Does Not Admit Claims Patentably Indistinct	1048
§12.10	One-Way Versus Two-Way Test for Obviousness-Type Double Patenting	1052
	Glossary	1059
	Table of Cases	1071
	Table of Authorities	1187
	Table of Statutes	1213
	Index	1233

About the Author

Janice M. Mueller is a registered U.S. patent attorney and chemical engineer. She was the first woman to serve as a judicial law clerk for Judge Giles S. Rich, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, from 1990 to 1992. Janice litigated patent and copyright infringement cases as an Honors Program Trial Attorney in the U.S. Department of Justice before entering legal academia. From 2004 to 2011 Janice was a tenured full Professor at the University of Pittsburgh School of Law, where she taught and wrote in the field of intellectual property law with an emphasis in U.S. and comparative patent law. Janice has also taught at John Marshall Law School (Chicago), Suffolk University (Boston), the University of Kentucky, the University of Washington, Seattle University, Santa Clara University, and William Mitchell College of Law (St. Paul). Wolters Kluwer issued the sixth edition of her student text, *Patent Law*, in 2020. Janice's scholarly articles have been published in *Baylor Law Review*, *Berkeley Technology Law Journal*, *Houston Law Review*, *Journal of the Patent and Trademark Office Society*, *Kentucky Law Journal*, *University of Pittsburgh Law Review*, and *Washington Law Review*. In 2009 Janice co-founded with Donald S. Chisum the Chisum Patent Academy, which provides patent law educational services in a unique small-group seminar format. Janice has served on the American Intellectual Property Law Association's Amicus Committee, lectured for BarBri Patent Bar Review, chaired the Expert Advisory Committee on Intellectual Property for the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research, and was a trustee of the Federal Circuit Historical Society.