

Detailed Table of Contents

	<i>Main Volume</i>	<i>Supple- ment</i>
CONTRIBUTORS	v	v
FOREWORD	vii	vii
PREFACE	ix	ix
AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES	xi	xi
SUMMARY TABLE OF CONTENTS	xix	xvii
CHAPTER 1. THE STATE OF THE LAW OF CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND INFRINGEMENT	 1	 1
I. INTRODUCTION.....	2	—
II. APPLICANTS BEAR THE BURDEN TO DRAFT CAREFULLY	 3	 2
A. Obvious, Harmless Errors Are Correctible.....	3	—
B. Serious Errors Are Not Correctible.....	5	2
C. The Indefiniteness Threshold Is High.....	6	3
III. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION	8	4
A. Standard of Review.....	8	—
B. <i>Phillips v. AWH</i>	9	—
C. General Claim Construction Principles	14	4
1. Applicant as Lexicographer	14	4
2. Preamble Terms and Transitional Phrases.....	14	5
3. Context of Other Claims (Claim Differentiation).....	 17	 6
4. Disclaimer of Claim Scope	17	6
5. Means-Plus-Function Limitations.....	20	7
6. Other Claim Construction Principles.....	21	8
D. PTO Applies Broadest Reasonable Interpretation.....	 22	 12

	<i>Main Volume</i>	<i>Supple- ment</i>
IV. INFRINGEMENT—DIRECT AND INDIRECT.....	24	12
A. Direct Infringement: Literal Infringement.....	24	12
1. All Limitations Must Be Satisfied.....	25	12
2. Extraterritorial Acts Can Infringe.....	26	14
3. The Evidentiary Burden at Trial.....	27	—
B. Direct Infringement: Doctrine of Equivalents.....	28	14
1. Determining Equivalence: Insubstantial Difference and Triple Identity.....	29	14
2. Bars to the Doctrine of Equivalents.....	32	15
a. Prosecution History Estoppel.....	33	15
i. Rebutting the <i>Festo</i> Presumption.....	35	15
b. The All-Elements Rule (“Vitiation” and “Specific Exclusion”).....	37	16
C. Indirect Infringement.....	39	16
1. Active Inducement Under Section 271 (b).....	39	17
2. Contributory Infringement Under Section 271 (c).....	40	18
3. Extraterritorial Indirect Infringement.....	41	18
V. CONCLUSION.....	42	—
Main Volume Footnote Updates.....	—	19
 CHAPTER 2. PITFALLS IN PATENT DRAFTING.....	 45	 21
I. INTRODUCTION.....	47	—
II. PITFALLS IN DRAFTING THE SPECIFICATION.....	49	23
A. Specifications Having Narrow Descriptions.....	49	23
1. Titles Having Unnecessary Verbiage.....	49	—
2. Narrow Field of the Invention/Background of the Invention/Prior Art.....	50	23
3. Narrow Abstracts.....	54	23
4. Narrow Summary of the Invention.....	55	—
5. Specific Problems in the Specification and Drawings.....	56	—
a. “Objects of the Invention” and Similar Characterizations.....	56	—
b. Criticizing Prior Art in the Specification.....	58	—
c. Use of Language Implying Criticality.....	62	—
d. Unintentional Definitions of Claim Terms.....	65	—
e. Disclosing Only a Single Embodiment of the Invention.....	70	—
f. Referring to “The Invention”.....	72	—
g. The “Dedicated to the Public” Doctrine.....	74	—
h. Referring to Prophetic Examples in the Patent.....	76	—

	<i>Main Volume</i>	<i>Supple- ment</i>
B. Failure to Provide Sufficient Written Description/ Enablement Support.....	78	—
1. Claim Overspecificity	80	—
2. Claim Overbreadth	81	—
C. Potential Pitfalls With Provisional Patent Applications	83	—
1. Failure to File Foreign Applications Within One Year of Provisional Filing	83	—
2. Filing Provisionals for the Wrong Reasons	84	—
3. Dangers of “As-Is” Filings	85	—
4. Failure to Establish Ownership for Provisionals	85	—
5. Failure to Claim Subject Matter Supported Entirely by the Provisional Filing	86	—
6. Failure to Carry Over All Subject Matter From Provisional Into Nonprovisional	88	—
III. PITFALLS IN CLAIM DRAFTING	88	24
A. Uncertainty Regarding Whether a Preamble Is “Limiting”	88	—
B. Claims That Are Broader Than the Disclosure or Not Commensurate in Scope With the Disclosure	90	—
C. Use of Claim Terminology That Can Change Over Time	94	—
D. Multiparty Infringers and Divided Infringement Claims	94	24
E. Pitfalls of Means-Plus-Function Claims	101	25
1. Unintended Means-Plus-Function Clauses	102	—
2. Attempted Means-Plus-Function Clauses Not Interpreted as Such	104	—
3. Single-Means Claims	106	—
4. Failure to Clearly Link Structure in the Specification to the Recited Function	107	—
5. Insufficiently Described Corresponding Structure	109	25
F. “Functional” Claiming	111	25
G. Territorial Scope Problems	113	—
H. Indeterminate Scope of “Whereby” Clauses	115	—
I. Definiteness Problems	118	27
1. Use of Relative Terminology	118	27
2. Failure to Provide Antecedent Basis for Claim Elements	122	—
3. Failure to Define “Coined” Terminology [New Topic]	—	28
J. Failure of a Dependent Claim to Further Limit a Parent Claim	123	—

	<i>Main Volume</i>	<i>Supple- ment</i>
K. Use of Jepson-Type Claims	124	—
L. Reciting Operating Conditions or Usage in Apparatus Claims	125	28
M. Reciting Human Activities in Claims	127	—
IV. PITFALLS IN PATENT PROSECUTION	128	29
A. Prosecution Disclaimer	128	29
B. Amendment-Based Estoppel	130	—
C. Argument-Based Estoppel	132	—
D. How to “Festo-Proof” a Patent Application	133	—
E. Clearly Link Arguments to Specific Claims	136	—
V. OTHER PROBLEMS AFFECTING PATENT RIGHTS OR SCOPE	137	29
A. Failure to Investigate Potential Bars to Patentability	137	29
B. Failure to Correctly Determine Inventorship or to Establish Ownership	139	31
C. Failure to Claim the Commercial Embodiment	143	32
D. Failure to Mark Patent Numbers on Covered Devices	143	32
E. Failure to Proofread the Issued Patent	143	—
VI. CONCLUSION	145	—
Main Volume Footnote Updates	—	34
 CHAPTER 3. DRAFTING THE WINNING PATENT	 147	 37
I. INTRODUCTION	148	—
II. PRE-DRAFTING ACTIVITIES	149	39
A. Meeting With the Inventors	149	39
1. Avoid Legal Jargon	150	—
2. Prepare for the Meeting	151	39
3. Take Good Notes	152	—
4. Be Aware of Time-Sensitive Matters, Including Statutory Bars and Later- Developed Best Modes	153	40
5. Draft a Sample Claim During the Meeting	153	—
6. Determine Inventorship	154	40
7. Ask About Reduction to Practice	157	—
B. Searching for Prior Art	157	—
III. DRAFTING THE SPECIFICATION AND DRAWINGS	158	41
A. Clarity and Breadth in the Specification	159	41
1. Keep It Simple	160	—
2. Don’t Leave the Reader Hanging	161	—
3. Follow a Logical Progression With Broadly Worded Language	162	41
4. Clarity in Drawings	165	—
5. Include Multiple Embodiments and Examples	168	43

	<i>Main Volume</i>	<i>Supple- ment</i>
6. Use Self-Serving Statements and Boilerplate	169	—
7. Include Broad Definitions of Claim Terms	171	43
8. Use Terminology Consistently in the Specification and Claims	172	—
9. Favor Over-Inclusion Rather Than Under-Inclusion	173	43
10. Use Incorporation by Reference Carefully	175	44
IV. DRAFTING THE CLAIMS	176	44
A. When to Draft the Claims	177	—
B. Include as Many Claim Types as Possible	178	—
C. Include Primary Independent Claims to Smallest Independent Unit of Invention	180	—
D. Include Claims of Broad, Intermediate, and Narrow Scope	181	44
E. Recite Minimum Number of Elements to Avoid Known Prior Art	183	—
F. Trim Unnecessary Words From Claims	183	—
G. Use a Variety of Claim Terminology Consistent With the Specification	184	—
H. Rely on Claim Differentiation to Maximize Claim Scope	185	—
I. Carefully Select Preamble and Transition Phrases	186	—
J. Targeting Infringers in Advance: Who Will Infringe the Claim?	188	—
K. Selecting Dependent Claim Features	188	—
L. How Many Claims Are Appropriate?	189	45
M. Try to Design Around Your Own Claims	193	—
N. Include a “Picture” Claim	195	—
O. Using Terms of Approximation	195	46
P. Carefully Recite Linkages Among Elements	196	—
Q. Avoiding Indemnity Agreements Among Vendors	197	46
R. Maximizing Damages and Royalties Through Claim Drafting	199	—
V. CHECKLISTS FOR DRAFTING AND PROSECUTION	200	49
A. Quality Control and Second-Attorney Review	200	49
B. Pre-Filing Checklist	200	—
C. Checklist for Specification and Claims	201	—
D. Checklist for Official Filing Receipt and Recorded Assignment	204	—
E. Checklist for First Office Action	204	—
F. Checklist for Patent Prosecution	205	—
G. Checklist for Notice of Allowance	205	—
H. Checklist for Granted Patent	206	—

	<i>Main Volume</i>	<i>Supple- ment</i>
VI. CONCLUSION	206	—
Main Volume Footnote Updates	—	49
CHAPTER 4. CONTINUED PROSECUTION OF THE PATENT	207	53
I. THE FAMILY OF CONTINUATION APPLICATIONS	208	54
A. Continuations	210	54
B. Continuations-in-Part (CIPs)	213	59
C. Divisionals	214	59
D. Prosecution Laches	215	61
E. Certificate of Correction	218	—
F. Continuing Prosecution Strategy	219	63
II. REISSUES	220	63
A. The Patent for the Invention	221	—
B. Through Error Without Deceptive Intent, Deemed Wholly or Partly Inoperative or Invalid	221	63
C. Broadening Claims	222	64
D. Nonbroadening Claims	223	—
E. Recapture Rule	223	—
1. <i>Clement</i> Analysis: Step 1	224	—
2. <i>Clement</i> Analysis: Step 2	224	—
3. <i>Clement</i> Analysis: Step 3	224	—
4. Applying the Recapture Rule	226	—
F. Intervening Rights	229	—
G. Reissue Strategy	231	—
III. REEXAMINATIONS	232	65
A. Ex Parte Reexamination	232	65
B. Inter Partes Reexamination	237	70
1. Similarities and Differences With Respect to Ex Parte Proceedings	237	—
2. Examination and Amendments	240	—
3. Third-Party Estoppel and Litigation	242	72
4. Merging Reexaminations	243	—
5. Appeal	243	73
C. Intervening Rights	245	73
D. Reexamination Strategy	245	73
1. U.S. District Court Patent Litigation	246	73
2. Ex Parte Reexamination	247	78
3. Inter Partes Reexamination	248	79
4. Effective Reexamination Strategy—An Example [New Topic].....	—	80
IV. CONCLUSION	248	—
Appendix 4-1	250	—
Main Volume Footnote Updates	—	82

	<i>Main Volume</i>	<i>Supple- ment</i>
CHAPTER 5. MECHANICAL PATENTS	253	85
I. INTRODUCTION	254	—
II. VALIDITY OF MECHANICAL PATENTS	256	87
A. Written Description Issues	256	87
1. The Traditional Rule: Mechanical Technologies Are Predictable	257	—
2. Predictability in the Mechanical Arts After <i>Gentry Gallery</i>	258	—
3. Don't Rely on Predictability for Mechanical Technologies	260	87
B. Enablement Issues	263	—
C. Definiteness Issues	265	88
D. Obviousness Issues [New Topic]	—	91
III. CLAIM SCOPE AND INTERPRETATION OF MECHANICAL PATENTS	269	95
A. Ordinary Meaning	269	95
B. Avoiding Narrow Claim Scope	270	96
1. The Critical Importance of the Written Description	270	—
2. Maximizing Claim Scope in Mechanical Patents	273	96
a. Disclose and Claim Multiple Embodiments	274	96
b. Use Equivocal Language in the Specification	278	98
c. Pursue Claims of Differing Scope and Type	281	—
d. Avoid Describing Any Particular Feature, Aspect, or Embodiment as “The Invention” in the Specification	284	—
e. Avoid Emphasizing Any Particular Object, Advantage, or Feature of the Invention in the Specification	285	100
f. Avoid Describing the Invention Narrowly in Any “Summary of the Invention”	287	—
g. Avoid Undue Emphasis Distinguishing Over the Prior Art	288	—
h. Drawing Features Should Be Explained	290	100
C. Means-Plus-Function Limitations in Mechanical Patents	293	102
1. Careful Use of Section 112 ¶6 in Mechanical Cases	294	102
2. Avoid Recitation of Structure	295	—

	<i>Main Volume</i>	<i>Supple- ment</i>
3. Disclose Multiple Embodiments of Corresponding Structure	298	102
4. Always Clearly Link Corresponding Structure to the Claimed Functions	301	—
5. Avoid Unintentional Invocation of Section 112 ¶6	303	—
6. The Mysterious and Elusive Step-Plus-Function Claim	305	—
IV. OTHER ENFORCEMENT ISSUES	306	—
A. Some <i>Sage</i> Advice From the Federal Circuit Regarding Claim Drafting	306	—
B. In Mechanical Cases, It May Be Difficult to Rebut the <i>Festo</i> Presumption	311	—
V. CONCLUSION.....	315	—
Main Volume Footnote Updates	—	103
 CHAPTER 6. ELECTRICAL PATENTS.....	 317	 113
I. INTRODUCTION	318	—
II. DRAFTING ELECTRICAL PATENT SPECIFICATIONS	318	114
A. Statutory Considerations	318	114
1. Utility	318	—
2. Enablement and Written Description	320	114
a. “Predictability”	320	—
b. Problems With Claims Broader Than the Specification	321	114
B. Limiting Statements in the Specification	326	116
C. Characterizing “The Invention”	329	118
D. Ensure Sufficient Support for Electrical Structures	330	121
III. CLAIM DRAFTING STRATEGIES	335	124
A. Systems Including Paired Operations	336	—
B. Components of a System	340	—
C. Multiple Party Issues	342	124
D. Method Steps Performed Outside of the United States	344	—
E. Make Sure Claims Accurately Describe the Invention	345	124
F. Transitional Phrases	346	—
G. Problems With Means-Plus-Function Clauses	347	—
H. Time-Dependent Terminology	351	—
I. Use the Term “Or” Carefully	352	—
J. Use Absolute Terms Carefully	353	—
K. Definiteness Problems	354	126
L. Claims to Semiconductor Devices	355	—
M. Draft Claims of Different Scope [New Topic]	—	128
IV. CONCLUSION	356	—

	Main Volume	Supple- ment
CHAPTER 7. SOFTWARE, E-COMMERCE, INTERNET, AND BUSINESS METHOD PATENTS	357	131
I. INTRODUCTION	358	—
II. VALIDITY OF SOFTWARE-RELATED PATENTS	360	133
A. Written Description Issues	360	—
B. Enablement Issues	363	—
C. Best Mode Issues	365	—
D. Definiteness Issues	367	133
E. Statutory Subject Matter Issues	371	136
1. Supreme Court Precedent	371	137
a. <i>Benson</i> : Unpatentable Algorithm	371	—
b. <i>Flook</i> : Another Unpatentable Algorithm ...	373	—
c. <i>Chakrabarty</i> : Patentable Micro-Organism ...	374	—
d. <i>Diehr</i> : Finally, a Patentable Algorithm	375	—
e. <i>Bilski</i> : Unpatentable Abstract Idea [New Topic]	—	137
2. Current Tests to Determine Statutory Subject Matter	377	140
a. The “Useful, Concrete, and Tangible Result” Test [Moved]	378	140
i. <i>In re Alappat</i>	378	—
ii. <i>State Street Bank</i>	379	—
iii. <i>AT&T</i>	382	—
iv. <i>Laboratory Corporation of America</i>	383	—
v. USPTO Guidelines	384	—
vi. Summary	384	—
b. The Transformation Test	385	140
i. Supreme Court Precedent	385	—
ii. <i>Arrhythmia</i>	387	—
iii. USPTO Guidelines	389	—
iv. Summary	389	—
c. The Abstract Idea Test	390	141
i. Supreme Court Precedent	390	141
ii. <i>Alappat</i> , <i>State Street Bank</i> , and <i>AT&T</i>	391	—
iii. <i>Warmerdam</i>	392	—
iv. <i>Comiskey</i> [Moved]	394	141
v. <i>Research Corp.</i> [New Topic]	—	141
vi. USPTO Guidelines [Renumbered]	396	143
vii. Summary [Renumbered]	396	144
d. The Machine-or-Transformation Test [New Topic]	—	145
i. <i>In re Bilski</i> [New Topic]	—	145
ii. <i>Comiskey I</i> and <i>Comiskey II</i> [New Topic]	—	148

	<i>Main Volume</i>	<i>Supple- ment</i>
iii. <i>Ferguson</i> [New Topic]	—	149
iv. <i>SiRF Technology</i> [New Topic]	—	150
v. USPTO Guidelines [New Topic]	—	152
vi. Applying the Machine-or- Transformation Test [New Topic]	—	154
e. The Practical Application Test [New Topic]	—	154
3. Previous Tests to Determine Statutory Subject Matter	397	157
a. The <i>Freeman-Walter-Abele</i> Test	397	157
b. The Business Method Test	398	158
c. The Technological Arts Test	399	158
d. The “Useful, Concrete, and Tangible Result” Test [New Topic]	—	158
e. The Physical Steps Test [New Topic]	—	159
III. CLAIM SCOPE AND INTERPRETATION OF SOFTWARE- RELATED PATENTS	402	160
A. Claims for Software-Related Inventions	402	160
1. Process Claims	403	160
a. Process Claims Interacting With the Physical World	403	160
b. Process Claims With No Interaction With the Physical World	406	161
2. Apparatus Claims	411	163
3. System Claims	414	163
4. Claims With Means- or Step-Plus-Function Recitations	417	164
5. Data Structure Claims	425	165
6. Computer-Readable Medium Claims	427	165
7. Signal Claims	431	166
8. Software Module Claims [New Topic]	—	167
9. Paradigm Claims [New Topic]	—	168
B. Business Method Inventions	436	169
1. Software-Related Business Method Inventions	437	169
2. Non-Software-Related Business Method Inventions	440	171
3. Summary	444	173
C. Claiming Strategies	444	173
1. Claiming a Network or Internet Invention	444	174
2. Claiming a Network Router Invention	450	—
3. Claiming an E-Commerce Website Invention	451	175
4. Claiming a Simulation Software Invention	453	176
IV. CONCLUSION	454	—
Main Volume Footnote Updates	—	178

	<i>Main Volume</i>	<i>Supple- ment</i>
CHAPTER 8. CHEMICAL AND PHARMACEUTICAL PATENTS	455	179
I. INTRODUCTION	456	—
II. VALIDITY OF CHEMICAL AND PHARMACEUTICAL PATENTS	457	181
A. Written Description Issues	457	181
B. Enablement Issues	461	182
C. Best Mode Issues	463	—
D. Utility Issues	465	—
E. Anticipation Issues in Chemical Applications: Inherency	468	—
1. Inherent Anticipation Is Not Avoided by Discovery of a New Benefit or Property of an Old Material or Method	468	—
2. Metabolite Claims Can Be Anticipated If the Metabolite Was Formed <i>In Vivo</i> After Administration of the Prior Art Drug	469	—
3. Creative Claim Drafting Can Often Overcome Inherent Anticipation Problems	471	—
4. A Sufficiently Small Prior Art Genus Can Anticipate a Later-Claimed Species	472	—
F. Obviousness Issues in Chemical and Pharmaceutical Patents	475	—
1. Pre- <i>KSR</i> Standards for Chemical Obviousness	475	—
2. Post- <i>KSR</i> Chemical Obviousness	477	—
G. Double Patenting Issues in Chemical Cases	480	—
III. CLAIM SCOPE AND INTERPRETATION OF CHEMICAL AND PHARMACEUTICAL PATENTS	483	182
A. Claim Scope Issues in Chemical and Pharmaceutical Patents	483	182
1. Product-by-Process Claims	483	182
a. Ambiguity as to Scope	484	—
b. Clarity in Claim Scope	485	—
2. Markush Groups	486	184
a. Markush Group Members Must Share Some Relationship to Be Grouped Together Properly	487	—
b. Careful Wording of a Markush Claim Is Necessary	488	184
c. Provide Supporting Disclosure and Working Examples	490	—
3. Transitional Phrases in Chemical Claims	493	184

	<i>Main Volume</i>	<i>Supple- ment</i>
B. Means-Plus-Function Limitations	496	—
C. Claim Drafting Strategies	497	185
1. A Careful Review of the Chemical Invention Can Ensure That Claims to All Aspects of the Invention Are Included	497	185
a. Consider the Existence of Metabolic Forms When Claiming a Compound	499	—
b. In Pharmaceutical Patents, Consider “Label Claims” That Protect Specific Methods or Uses in the FDA-Approved Prescribing Information	500	—
c. Use Care in Claiming a Polymorphic Form in Terms of Its Analytical Properties	501	—
d. Consider Whether Salt Forms of a Compound Are Intended to Be Encompassed Within the Claim to the Free Acid or Base	502	—
2. Pharmaceutical Claims to Methods of Treatment	503	—
3. Pharmaceutical Claims to Homologs, Racemates, Salt Forms, and Metabolites	505	186
D. Claim Interpretation	505	187
1. Implicit and Explicit Definitions of Claim Terminology	505	187
2. The Effect of Examples and Preferred Embodiments on Claim Construction	508	—
3. Interrelationship of Claims	511	—
4. Prosecution History: Disclaimers and Estoppel	512	190
5. Use of Extrinsic Evidence in Interpreting Chemical Claims	514	191
IV. CONCLUSION	517	—
Main Volume Footnote Updates	—	192
CHAPTER 9. BIOTECHNOLOGY PATENTS	519	193
I. INTRODUCTION	520	—
II. VALIDITY ISSUES RELATED TO BIOTECHNOLOGY PATENTS	521	195
A. Considerations Under 35 U.S.C. Section 101	521	195
1. Patentable Subject Matter	521	195
2. Utility	522	—
B. Considerations Under 35 U.S.C. Section 112	523	198
1. Enablement as of the Date of Filing and After-Arising Technology	523	—

	Main Volume	Supple- ment
2. Written Description and Biological Organisms Deposited With the ATCC	525	—
3. Written Description and DNA-Based Inventions [New Topic]	—	198
III. CLAIM SCOPE AND INTERPRETATION OF BIOTECHNOLOGY PATENTS	526	200
A. Claim Scope Is Fixed as of the Filing Date	526	—
B. Process Limitations and Product Claims	529	—
C. Interpreting Claims in Light of the Specification	531	200
1. Multiple Interpretations of a Claim Versus a Single, Unambiguous Meaning	531	—
2. Expansive Interpretation of a Claim Term May Result From the Use of Varied Terms, or the Use of the Term in Different Contexts, in the Specification	532	—
3. Avoiding Restriction of the Invention to the Disclosed Preferred Embodiment	534	200
4. Relative Terms: “Substantially,” “About,” and “At Least”	535	—
5. Calculations	535	—
D. The Role of the Preamble in Biotechnology Claims	536	—
1. <i>Griffin v. Bertina</i>	537	—
2. <i>Manning v. Paradis</i>	538	—
3. <i>Rapoport v. Dement</i> and <i>Jansen v. Rexall Sundown, Inc.</i>	539	—
4. <i>In Re Cruciferous Sprout Litigation</i>	539	—
5. <i>Boehringer Ingelheim Vetmedica, Inc. v. Schering-Plough Corp.</i>	540	—
E. Nontraditional Claim Language	541	—
F. Infringement of Process Claims [New Topic]	—	202
IV. OTHER ENFORCEMENT AND PROSECUTION ISSUES	542	204
A. The Doctrine of Equivalents Applied to Amino Acid and DNA Inventions	542	—
B. Challenges Based on Obviousness	544	204
C. Miscellaneous Points for Biotechnology Patents	546	204
1. Arguments of a Licensee or Potential Licensee	546	—
2. Statements Made to Governmental Agencies	546	—
3. Inequitable Conduct	547	204
4. Exceptional Cases for the Baseless Filing of an ANDA [New Topic]	—	205

	<i>Main Volume</i>	<i>Supple- ment</i>
V. CONSIDERATIONS AND OVERLAP WITH REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS	548	207
A. The Orange Book and the Timing of Drug Approvals	548	—
1. The Requirements for Listing of Patents in the Orange Book	549	—
a. Drug Substance Patents	549	—
b. Drug Product Patents	551	—
c. Method-of-Use Patents	552	—
2. Patents That Must Not Be Submitted	553	—
a. Process Patents	553	—
b. Patents Claiming Packaging	553	—
c. Patents Claiming Metabolites	554	—
d. Patents Claiming Intermediates	555	—
B. Patents That May Be Granted Patent Term Extension for Delays Due to Regulatory Delays	555	207
1. Mechanics of Filing for and Obtaining an Extension	557	—
2. Length of Extension	557	—
3. Scope of the Extension	557	—
VI. CONCLUSION	559	—
Main Volume Footnote Updates	—	208
CHAPTER 10. DESIGN PATENTS	561	211
I. INTRODUCTION AND DESIGN LAW PRINCIPLES	562	212
A. Licensing and Enforcement	563	—
B. Application of Utility Laws and Evolution	564	—
C. Infringement of Design Patents	565	212
1. Introduction	565	212
2. Claim Construction	565	213
3. Prior Infringement Test— <i>Pre-Egyptian Goddess</i> [New Topic]	—	215
a. Comparison to the Accused Article: <i>Gorham</i> Test	566	—
b. Comparison to the Accused Article: Point of Novelty Test [Redesignated]	568	215
4. Current Infringement Test— <i>Post-Egyptian Goddess</i> [New Topic]	—	216
II. PRACTICE ESSENTIALS	568	219
A. Understanding and Applying the Essential Concepts	568	219
1. Introduction	568	—
2. Portion Practice	568	—
3. Design Claims Are Not Broad or Narrow	570	219

	<i>Main Volume</i>	<i>Supple- ment</i>
4. Consideration of Multiple Applications Should Be the Rule	573	—
5. Design Patents Do Not Protect Concepts	574	—
B. Sculpting the Design Claim	575	219
1. Responsibility and Technique	575	—
2. Aesthetic Significance of Features	576	—
a. <i>KeyStone</i>	577	—
b. <i>Contessa</i>	582	—
3. Functionality of Features	584	219
4. Prior Art Considerations [New Topic]	—	220
C. Creatively Presenting the Design Claim	590	—
D. Accurately Presenting the Design Claim	591	—
E. Avoid Multiple Embodiments in a Single Design Patent	594	222
F. Expanding Options With Strategic Continuation Practice	596	222
1. Introduction	596	222
2. Utility-Design Priority	597	—
3. Design-Utility Priority	597	—
4. Design-Design Priority	598	—
G. Special Considerations—Branding Efforts and Non-traditional Articles	600	—
1. Protect More Than Just the Core Product	600	—
2. Product Packaging	600	—
3. Promotional and Peripheral Products	601	—
4. Computer Icons and Graphical User Interfaces	601	—
5. Type Fonts	603	—
6. Physical Settings	604	—
H. Controlling the Timing	605	—
1. General	605	—
2. Speeding Up	606	—
3. Slowing Down	607	—
I. Think Globally: How International Practice Affects U.S. Practice	608	—
III. CONCLUSION.....	609	—
 CHAPTER 11. COMBINING PROSECUTION WITH OTHER FORMS OF REPRESENTATION	 611	 223
I. INTRODUCTION	612	—
II. IDENTIFYING THE APPLICABLE STANDARDS	612	224
A. Standards Applicable During Prosecution	614	224
1. OED Discipline	615	—
2. PTO Disqualification	616	—
3. Preemption by PTO Code	617	224

	<i>Main Volume</i>	<i>Supple- ment</i>
B. Federal Circuit Choice of Law	619	225
C. Conclusion on Choice of Law	620	—
III. COMBINING PROSECUTION AND LITIGATION	621	225
A. The Possibility of Misuse of Discovery Materials While Prosecuting Applications	621	225
1. Is Prosecution of Patents by Itself Sufficient to Bar Access to Highly Confidential Information?	622	225
a. <i>In re Sibia</i>	624	—
b. The Majority View	627	—
c. A Suggested Analysis	630	—
2. A Proposed Prosecution Bar Raises Potential Conflicts and Liability	632	—
3. Issues to Consider in Crafting Protective Orders	636	233
B. Liability and Disqualification of Prosecuting- Litigators	639	234
1. Inequitable Conduct as a Conflict	639	—
2. Depositions of Prosecuting-Litigators	640	234
C. Advocate-as-Witness Disqualification	642	—
IV. COMBINING OPINION AND TRIAL REPRESENTATIONS	644	234
A. Advocate-as-Witness Disqualification	645	—
1. The Courts Split on Advocate-as-Witness Disqualification	646	—
2. What to Do	648	—
B. Enhanced Risk of Waiver of Work Product	648	234
C. What to Do	655	—
V. CONCLUSION	656	—
Main Volume Footnote Updates	—	235
CHAPTER 12. DRAFTING U.S. PATENTS WITH A VIEW TOWARD EUROPE	657	237
I. INTRODUCTION	658	239
A. Brief History of the Development of the EPO	659	239
B. Applicable Law	661	—
II. REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DESCRIPTION OF AN EPO APPLICATION	661	239
A. Sufficiency of Disclosure—Article 83 EPC	661	—
B. Content of the Application—Rule 42 EPC	662	239
C. Summary	663	—
III. THE CLAIMS	664	240
A. Overview	664	—
B. Content of the Claims—Article 84 EPC	665	—

	<i>Main Volume</i>	<i>Supple- ment</i>
C. Rule 43(1) EPC—Two-Part “Characterized” Form Preferred	665	—
1. Two-Part Form Not Needed for Filing	666	—
2. Two-Part Form Only “Whenever Appropriate”	666	—
D. Only One Independent Claim of Each Category Permitted Except in Special, Limited Circumstances	667	240
1. Plurality of Interrelated Products (Rule 43(2)(a))	668	—
2. Plurality Different Inventive Uses of a Product or Device (Rule 43(2)(b))	668	—
3. Alternative Solutions to a Particular Problem (Rule 43(2)(c))	668	—
E. Dependent Claims Permitted	668	—
F. The Dependent Claims Can Be Multiple Dependent Claims	668	—
G. No Limit on the Number of Claims	669	—
H. The Claims Should Preferably Include Reference Numerals	670	—
IV. UNITY OF INVENTION	670	—
A. Lack of Unity “a Priori” and “a Posteriori”	671	—
B. Claims of Different Categories	671	—
C. Divisional Applications	671	—
V. OTHER ISSUES CONCERNING THE CLAIMS	672	240
A. Alternatives and Markush Groupings	672	—
B. Jepson Claims	672	—
C. “Means for” Language	673	—
D. Computer Implemented Inventions and Business Methods	673	240
E. Beauregard Claims	673	—
F. Product-by-Process Claims	674	—
G. Method of Treatment Claims	674	242
1. First Medical Use Claims	676	—
2. Second Medical Use or Swiss Claims	676	—
3. EPC 2000—The End of Swiss Claims	676	—
4. Practical Advice on Claim Drafting for Methods of Treatment	677	—
H. The EP Approach to Added Matter—Claim Drafting Ramifications	677	—
I. Continuation and Divisional Applications	679	243
1. Continuation Applications	679	—
2. CIP Applications	680	—
VI. PRACTICAL GUIDANCE	681	—
VII. WHEN TO REVISE THE SPECIFICATION	683	—

	<i>Main Volume</i>	<i>Supple- ment</i>
A. Paris Convention Route	683	—
B. Ex-PCT Route	683	—
VIII. POST-GRANT ISSUES [NEW TOPIC]	—	244
A. The Extent of Protection [New Topic]	—	244
1. Harmonization of Different Traditional National Approaches [New Topic]	—	244
2. Equivalents [New Topic]	—	245
B. File Wrapper Estoppel [New Topic]	—	247
C. Forum Shopping [New Topic]	—	247
APPENDIX A	685	—
APPENDIX B	703	—
TABLE OF CASES	725	249
INDEX	753	—