

Chapter 700 Examination of Applications

- 701 Statutory Authority for Examination
- 702 Requisites of the Application
- 702.01 Obviously Informal Cases
- 703 "General Information Concerning Patents" Sent Instead of "Rules of Practice"
- 704 Search
- 705 Patentability Reports
- 705.01 Instructions re Patentability Reports
- 705.01(a) Nature of P. R., Its Use and Disposal
- 705.01(b) Sequence of Examination
- 705.01(c) Counting and Recording P. R.'s
- 705.01(d) Duplicate Prints of Drawings
- 705.01(e) Limitation as to Use
- 705.01(f) Interviews With Applicants
- 706 Rejection of Claims
- 706.01 Contrasted With Objections
- 706.02 On Prior Art
- 706.02(a) Establishing "Well Known" Prior Art
- 706.03 Not Based on Prior Art
- 706.03(a) Nonstatutory Subject Matter
- 706.03(b) Barred by Atomic Energy Act
- 706.03(c) Functional
- 706.03(d) Vague and Indefinite
- 706.03(e) Product by Process
- 706.03(f) Incomplete
- 706.03(g) Prolix
- 706.03(h) Nonstatutory Claim
- 706.03(i) Aggregation
- 706.03(j) Old Combination
- 706.03(k) Duplicate Claims; Double Patenting
- 706.03(l) Multiplicity
- 706.03(m) Nonelected Inventions
- 706.03(n) Correspondence of Claim and Disclosure
- 706.03(o) New Matter
- 706.03(p) No Utility
- 706.03(q) Obvious Method
- 706.03(s) Statutory Bar
- 706.03(t) Other Assigned Application
- 706.03(u) Disclaimer
- 706.03(v) After Interference or Public Use Proceeding
- 706.03(w) Res Judicata
- 706.03(x) Reissue
- 706.03(y) Improper Markush
- 706.03(z) Undue Breadth
- 706.04 Previously Allowed Claim
- 706.05 After Allowance of Application
- 706.06 Claims Copied from Patent
- 706.07 Final Rejection
- 706.07(a) When Proper
- 706.07(b) When Proper on First Action
- 706.07(c) Premature
- 706.07(d) Withdrawal of Premature
- 706.07(e) Withdrawal, General
- 707 Examiner's Letter or Action
- 707.01 Primary Examiner Indicates Action for New Assistant
- 707.02 Actions which Require the Personal Attention of the Primary Examiner
- 707.02(a) Cases Up for Third Action and Five-Year Cases
- 707.03 Sample of Conventional "First Action" Letter
- 707.04 Initial Sentence
- 707.05 Citation of References
- 707.05(a) Grouped at Beginning of Letter
- 707.05(b) "References Applied"
- 707.05(c) References Pertinent
- 707.05(d) Reference Cited in Subsequent Actions
- 707.05(e) Data Used in Citing References
- 707.05(f) Effective Dates of Declassified Printed Matter
- 707.05(g) Incorrect Citation of References
- 707.06 Citation of Decisions, Orders and Notices
- 707.07 Completeness and Clarity
- 707.07(a) Action on Formal Matters
- 707.07(b) Requiring New Oath
- 707.07(c) Draftsman's Requirement
- 707.07(d) Language To Be Used in Rejections
- 707.07(e) Note All Outstanding Requirements
- 707.07(f) Answer All Material Traversed
- 707.07(g) Piecemeal Examination
- 707.07(h) Notify of Inaccuracies in Amendment
- 707.07(i) Each Claim To Be Mentioned in Each Letter
- 707.07(j) State When Claims Are Allowable
- 707.07(k) Numbering Paragraphs
- 707.08 Review by Assistant Examiner
- 707.09 Signing by Primary or Acting Primary
- 707.10 Entry
- 707.11 Date
- 707.12 Mailing
- 707.13 Returned Office Action
- 708 Order of Examination
- 708.01 List of Special Cases
- 708.02 Petition to Make Special
- 708.03 Examiner Tenders His Resignation
- 709 Suspension of Action
- 709.01 Overlapping Applications by Same Applicant or owned by Same Assignee
- 709.02 Actions Following Correspondence under Rule 202
- 710 Period for Response
- 710.01 Statutory

MANUAL OF PATENT EXAMINING PROCEDURE

- 710.01(a) How Computed
- 710.02 Shortened Statutory Period and Time Limit Actions
 - 710.02(a) Approval of Time Set in Case of Shortened Statutory Period
 - 710.02(b) Situations in Which Used: Shortened Statutory Period
 - 710.02(c) Situations in Which Used: Nonstatutory Time Limit
 - 710.02(d) Differences Between Shortened Statutory and Time Limit Periods
 - 710.02(e) Extension of Time
- 710.03 Three Year Period, Government-owned Cases
- 710.04 Two Periods Running
 - 710.04(a) Copying Patent Claims
- 710.05 Period Ending on Saturday, Sunday or Holiday
- 710.06 Miscellaneous Factors Determining Date
- 711 Abandonment
 - 711.01 Express or Formal Abandonment
 - 711.02 Failure to Take Required Action During Time Period
 - 711.02(a) Insufficiency of Response
 - 711.02(b) Special Situations Involving Abandonment
 - 711.02(c) Termination of Proceedings
 - 711.03 Reconsideration of Holding of Abandonment: Revival
 - 711.03(a) Holding Based on Insufficiency of Response
 - 711.03(b) Holding Based on Failure to Respond Within Period
 - 711.03(c) Petitions Relating to Holding of Abandonment
 - 711.03(d) Examiner's Statement on Petition
 - 711.04 Disposition of Abandoned Applications
 - 711.04(a) Pulling and Forwarding
 - 711.04(b) Ordering Abandoned Files
 - 711.05 Letter of Abandonment Received After Application is Allowed
 - 711.06 Publication of Abstracts
 - 711.06(a) Use of Abstract as Reference
- 712 Forfeiture
- 713 Interviews
 - 713.01 General Policy, How Conducted
 - 713.02 Interviews Prior to First Official Action
 - 713.03 Interviews for "Sounding Out" Examiner Not Permitted
 - 713.04 Substance of Interview Must Be Made of Record
 - 713.05 Interviews Prohibited or Granted, Special Situations
 - 713.06 No Inter Partes Questions Discussed Ex Parte
 - 713.07 Exposure of Other Cases
 - 713.08 Demonstration, Exhibits, Models
 - 713.09 Finally Rejected Application
 - 713.10 Interview Preceding Filing Amendment Under Rule 312
- 714 Amendments, Applicant's Actions
 - 714.01 Signatures to Amendments
 - 714.01(a) Unsigned or Improperly Signed Amendment
 - 714.01(b) Disposal of
 - 714.01(c) Signed by Attorney Not of Record
 - 714.01(d) Amendment Signed by Applicant But Not by Attorney of Record
 - 714.01(e) Power of Attorney to a Firm
 - 714.02 Must Be Fully Responsive
 - 714.03 Amendments Not Fully Responsive, Action to Be Taken
 - 714.04 Claims Presented in Amendment with No Attempt to Point Out Patentable Novelty
 - 714.05 Examiner Should Immediately Inspect
 - 714.06 Amendments Sent to Wrong Division
 - 714.07 Amendments Not in Permanent Ink
 - 714.08 Telegraphic Amendment
 - 714.09 Amendments Before First Office Action
 - 714.10 Claims Added in Excess of Filing Fee
 - 714.11 Amendment Filed During Interference Proceedings
 - 714.12 Amendments After Final Rejection or Action
 - 714.13 Amendments After Final Rejection or Action, Letter Written
 - 714.14 Amendments After Allowance of All Claims
 - 714.15 Amendment Mailed Before, but Received in Examining Division After Allowance
 - 714.16 Amendment After Notice of Allowance, Rule 312
 - 714.16(a) Copied Patent Claims
 - 714.16(b) Filed with a Motion Under Rule 234
 - 714.16(c) Excess Number of Claims
 - 714.16(d) Handling
 - 714.16(e) Entry in Part
 - 714.17 Amendment Filed After the Period for Response Has Expired
 - 714.18 Entry of Amendments
 - 714.19 List of Amendments, Entry Denied
 - 714.20 List of Amendments Entered in Part
 - 714.21 Amendments Inadvertently Entered, No Legal Effect
 - 714.22 Entry of Amendments, Directions for
 - 714.23 Entry of Amendments, Directions for, Defective
 - 714.24 Amendment of Amendment
 - 714.25 Discourtesy of Applicant or Attorney
- 715 Swearing Back of Reference—Affidavit Under Rule 131
 - 715.01 Reference Claims Foreign Filing Date
 - 715.01(a) Reference a Joint Patent to Applicant and Another
 - 715.01(b) Reference and Application have Common Assignee
 - 715.01(c) Reference is Publication of Applicant's Own Invention
 - 715.02 General Rule as to Generic Claims
 - 715.03 Exceptions and Practice Relative to Chemical Cases
 - 715.04 Who May Make Affidavit
 - 715.05 Patent Claiming Same Invention
 - 715.06 Affidavit Under Rule 131 Must Be Removed Before Interference
 - 715.07 Facts and Documentary Evidence

- 715.07(a) Diligence
- 715.07(b) Interference Testimony Sometimes Used
- 715.07(c) Acts Relied Upon Must Have Been Carried Out in This Country
- 715.07(d) Disposition of Exhibits
- 715.08 Passed Upon By Primary Examiner
- 715.09 Seasonable Presentation
- 716 Affidavits Traversing Rejections
- 717 File Wrapper
- 717.01 Papers in File Wrapper
- 717.01(a) Arrangement
- 717.01(b) Prints
- 717.02 Date Entered on
- 717.02(a) Statutory Period Ends On Sunday or Holiday
- 717.02(b) Name or Residence of Inventor or Title Changed
- 717.03 Classification During Examination
- 717.04 Index of Claims
- 717.05 Field of Search
- 717.06 Foreign Filing Dates
- 717.07 Related Applications

701 Statutory Authority for Examination

The authority for the examination of applications for patents is set forth in 35 U.S.C. 131.

The Commissioner shall cause an examination to be made of the application and the alleged new invention; and if on such examination it appears that the applicant is entitled to a patent under the law, the Commissioner shall issue a patent therefor.

The main conditions precedent to the grant of a patent to an applicant are set forth in 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103.

702 Requisites of the Application

The Examiner should be careful to see that the application meets all the requisites set forth in Chapter 600 both as to formal matters and as to the completeness and clarity of the disclosure. If all of the requisites are not met, applicant may be called upon for necessary amendments. Such amendments, however, must not include new matter.

702.01 Obviously Informal Cases

When an application is reached for its first action and it is then discovered to be impractical to give a complete action on the merits because of the paucity of disclosure, the following procedure may be followed: (1) A reasonable search should be made of the invention so far as it can be understood from the

disclosure, objects of invention and claims and any apparently pertinent art cited; (2) Deficiencies in the drawing should be pointed out; (3) A requirement should be made that the specification be revised to conform to idiomatic English and United States practice; (4) The claims should be rejected as failing to define the invention in the manner required by 35 U.S.C. 112 if they are informal. A blanket rejection is usually sufficient.

The Examiner should not attempt to point out the specific points of informality in the specification and claims. The burden is on the applicant to revise the application to render it in proper form for a complete examination.

For the procedure to be followed when only the drawing is informal, see 608.02(a) and 608.02(b).

703 "General Information Concerning Patents" Sent Instead of "Rules of Practice"

The pamphlet "General Information Concerning Patents" may be sent to an applicant handling his own case when the Examiner deems it advisable. (Basis: Notice of January 15, 1924, Revised.)

704 Search

After reading the specification and claims, the Examiner searches the prior art.

The subject of searching is more fully treated in Chapter 900. See 904 through 904.02. The invention should be thoroughly understood before a search is undertaken. However, informal cases, or those which can only be imperfectly understood when they come up for action in their regular turn are also given a search, in order to avoid piecemeal prosecution.

PREVIOUS EXAMINER'S SEARCH

When an examiner is assigned to act on an application which has received one or more actions by some other examiner, full faith and credit should be given to the search and action of the previous examiner unless there is a clear error in the previous action or knowledge of other prior art. In general the second Examiner should not take an entirely new approach to the case or attempt to reorient the point of view of the previous Examiner, or make a new search in the mere hope of finding something.

See 717.05.

705 Patentability Reports

Where an application, properly assigned to one examining division, is found to contain one or more claims *per se* classifiable in one or more other divisions, which claims are not divisible *inter se* or from the claims which govern classification of the application in the first division, the application may be referred to the other division or divisions concerned for a report as to the patentability of certain designated claims. This report will be known as a Patentability Report (P.R.) and will be signed by the Primary Examiner of the reporting division. (Basis: Notice of November 10, 1948.)

The report, if legibly written, need not be typed.

Note that the Patentability Report practice is suspended, except in extraordinary circumstances. See 705.01(e).

705.01 Instructions re Patentability Reports

705.01 to 705.01(f) are based on the Notices of November 12, 1948, and April 12, 1951.

In the prosecution of an application under conditions authorized in the Notice of November 10, 1948, relating to Patentability Reports, the following procedure should be observed.

When an application comes up for any action and the Primary Examiners involved agree that a Patentability Report is necessary, the application will be forwarded to the proper division with a memorandum attached, for instance, For Patentability Report from Division _____ as to Claims _____.

705.01(a) Nature of P.R., Its Use and Disposal

The Primary Examiner of the division from which the Patentability Report is requested, if he approves the request, will direct the preparation of the Patentability Report. This Patentability Report will be written or typed on a memorandum form and will include the citation of all pertinent references and a complete action on all claims involved. The field of search covered should be endorsed on the file wrapper by the examiner making the report. When an examiner to whom a case has been forwarded for a Patentability Report is of the opinion that final action is in order as to the referred claims, he should so state. The Patentability Report when signed by the Primary Examiner of the reporting division will be returned to the division to which the application is regularly assigned.

The examiner preparing the Patentability Report will be entitled to receive an explanation of the disclosure from the examiner to whom the case is assigned to avoid duplication of work. If the Primary Examiner of a reporting division is of the opinion that a Patentability Report is not in order, he should so advise the Primary Examiner of the forwarding division.

DISAGREEMENT AS TO CLASSIFICATION

Conflict of opinion as to classification may be referred to an Examiner of Classification for decision.

If the Primary Examiner of the Division having jurisdiction of the case agrees with the Patentability Report, he should incorporate the substance thereof in his action, which action will be complete as to *all* claims. The Patentability Report in such a case will *not* be given a paper number but will be allowed to remain in the file until the case is finally disposed of by allowance or abandonment, at which time it should be removed.

DISAGREEMENT ON PATENTABILITY REPORT

If the Primary Examiner does not agree with the Patentability Report or any portion thereof, he may consult with the Primary Examiner responsible for the report. If agreement as to the resulting action cannot be reached, the Primary Examiner having jurisdiction of the case need not rely on the Patentability Report but may make his own action on the referred claims, in which case the Patentability Report should be removed from the file.

APPEAL TAKEN

When an appeal is taken from the rejection of claims, all of which are examinable in the division preparing a Patentability Report, and the application is otherwise allowable, formal transfer of the case to said division should be made for the purpose of appeal only. The receiving division will take jurisdiction of the application and prepare the examiner's answer. At the time of allowance, the application may be sent to issue by said division with its classification determined by the controlling claims remaining in the case. (Basis: Notice of April 12, 1951.)

705.01(b) Sequence of Examination

In the event that the Primary Examiners concerned in a P.R. case cannot agree as to the order of examination by their divisions, the Primary Examiner having jurisdiction of the case will direct that a complete search be made

of the art relevant to his claims prior to referring the case to another group for report. The group to which the case is referred will be advised of the results of this search.

If the Primary Examiners are of the opinion that a different sequence of search is expedient, the order of search should be correspondingly modified.

705.01(c) Counting and Recording P. R.'s

The forwarding of the application for a Patentability Report is not to be treated as a transfer by the forwarding group. When the P.R. is completed and the application is ready for return to the forwarding group, it is not counted either as a receipt or action by transfer. Credit, however, is given for the time spent. See 1705.

A box is provided on each file wrapper headed "P.R. Div. -----" and the number of the group making the P.R. is entered in pencil.

The date status of the application in the reporting group will be determined on the basis of the dates in the group of original jurisdiction. To insure orderly progress in the reported dates, a timely reminder should be furnished to the group making the P.R.

705.01(d) Duplicate Prints of Drawings

In Patentability Report cases having drawings, the examiner to whom the case is assigned will furnish to the group to which the case is referred, prints of such sheets of the drawings as are applicable, for interference search purposes. That this has been done may be indicated by a pencil notation on the file wrapper.

When a case that has had Patentability Report prosecution is passed for issue or becomes abandoned, NOTIFICATION of this fact will AT ONCE be given by the group having jurisdiction of the case to each group that submitted a P.R. The Examiner of each such reporting group will note the date of allowance or abandonment on his duplicate set of prints. At such time as these prints become of no value to the reporting group, they may be destroyed.

705.01(e) Limitation as to Use

The above outlined Patentability Report practice is not obligatory and should be resorted to only where it will save total examiner time or result in improved quality of action

due to specialized knowledge. A saving of total examiner time that is required to give a complete examination of an application is of primary importance. Patentability Report practice is based on the proposition that when plural, indivisible inventions are claimed, in some instances either less time is required for examination, or the results are of better quality, when specialists on each character of claimed invention treat the claims directed to their specialty. However, in many instances a single examiner can give a complete examination of as good quality on all claims, and in less total examiner time than would be consumed by the use of the Patentability Report practice.

Where claims are directed to the same character of invention but differ in scope only, prosecution by Patentability Report is never proper.

Exemplary situations where Patentability Reports are ordinarily not proper are as follows:

(1) Where the claims are related as a manufacturing process and a product defined by the process of manufacture. The examiner having jurisdiction of the process can usually give a complete, adequate examination in less total examiner time than would be consumed by the use of a Patentability Report.

(2) Where the claims are related as a product and a process which involves merely the fact that a product having certain characteristics is made. The examiner having jurisdiction of the product can usually make a complete and adequate examination.

(3) Where the claims are related as a combination distinguished solely by the characteristics of a subcombination and such subcombination *per se*. The examiner having jurisdiction of the subcombination can usually make a complete and adequate examination.

Because of the high percentage of new examiners, situations frequently arise where the Patentability Report would of necessity be made by an examiner who knows less about the art than the examiner seeking the Patentability Report. Then there are also situations where the examiner seeking the report is sufficiently qualified to search the art himself.

In view of these conditions which are expected to prevail for some time to come, it is felt to be in the best interests of the Office to suspend the present Patentability Report practice. Where it can be shown, however, that a Patentability Report will save total examiner time, exceptions may be permitted with the approval of the Supervisory Examiner of the group to which the application is assigned. The "Approved" stamp should be im-

pressed on the memorandum requesting the P.R. (Basis: Notice of October 8, 1956.)

705.01(f) Interviews With Applicants

In situations where an interview is held on an application in which a Patentability Report has been adopted, the reporting group may be called on for assistance at the interview when it concerns claims treated by them. (Basis: Notice of November 12, 1948.) See 713 to 713.10 regarding interviews in general.

706 Rejection of Claims

Although this part of the Manual explains the procedure in *rejecting* claims, the Examiner should never overlook the importance of his role in *allowing* claims which properly define the invention.

Rule 106. Rejection of claims. (a) If the invention is not considered patentable, or not considered patentable as claimed, the claims, or those considered unpatentable will be rejected.

(b) In rejecting claims for want of novelty or for want of invention, the examiner must cite the best references at his command. When a reference is complex or shows or describes inventions other than that claimed by the applicant, the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable. The pertinence of each reference, if not obvious, must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified.

When an application discloses patentable subject matter and it is apparent from the claims and the Applicant's arguments that the claims are intended to be directed to such patentable subject matter, but the claims in their present form cannot be allowed because of defects in form or omission of a limitation, the Examiner should not stop with a bare objection or rejection of the claims. The Examiner's action should be constructive in nature and when possible he should offer a definite suggestion for correction.

If the Examiner is satisfied after the search has been completed that patentable subject matter has been disclosed and the record indicates that the applicant intends to claim such subject matter, he may note in the Office action that certain aspects or features of the patentable invention have not been claimed and that if properly claimed such claims may be given favorable consideration.

Rule 112. Reexamination and reconsideration. After response by applicant (rule 111) the application will

be reexamined and reconsidered, and the applicant will be notified if claims are rejected, or objections or requirements made, in the same manner as after the first examination. Applicant may respond to such Office action, in the same manner provided in rule 111, with or without amendment, but any amendments after the second Office action must ordinarily be restricted to the rejection or to the objections or requirements made, and the application will be again considered, and so on repeatedly, unless the examiner has indicated that the action is final.

706.01 Contrasted With Objection

The refusal to grant claims because the subject matter as claimed is considered unpatentable is called a "rejection." The term "rejected" must be applied to such claims in the Examiner's letter. If the form of the claim (as distinguished from its substance) is improper, an "objection" is made. The practical difference between a rejection and an objection is that a rejection, involving the merits of the claim, is subject to review by the Board of Appeals, while an objection, if persisted in, may be reviewed only by way of petition to the Commissioner.

An example of a matter of form as to which objection is made is improper dependency of a claim. (See 608.01(n).)

706.02 Rejection on Prior Art

By far the most frequent ground of rejection is on the ground of unpatentability in view of the prior art, that is, that the claimed matter is neither novel under 35 U.S.C. 102 nor non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. 103. The language to be used in rejecting claims should be unequivocal. See 707.07(d).

A U.S. patent is a valid reference against an application even though the patent date is after the filing date of an application provided that the filing date of the patent is prior to the filing date of the application. It is proper to use such a patent as a basic or an auxiliary reference and such patents may be used as both basic and auxiliary references. The doctrine of the *Milburn Co. v. Davis-Bournonville Co.* decision, 1926 C.D. 303; 344 O.G. 817, has been thus construed in *re Youker* (C.C.P.A.), 1935 C.D. 658; 461 O.G. 10, and in *Minn. Mining & Mfg. Co. v. Coe* (C.A.D.C.) 1938 C.D. 100; 497 O.G. 766. See also *Detrola Corp. v. Hazeltine* (U.S.S.C.) 1941 C.D. 811; 528 O.G. 245

and *In re Gregg* (C.C.P.A.), 1957 C.D. 284; 720 O.G. 227.

If there are proper priority papers in the file of the reference patent, a still earlier date; i.e., that of the foreign filing may be the effective date. (Basis: Notice of May 27, 1964.)

For the proper way to cite a patent granted after the filing of an application, see 707.05(e) and the sample letter in 707.03. Rejections on "old combination" are treated in 706.03(j).

706.02(a) Establishing "Well Known" Prior Art

Things believed to be known to those skilled in the art are often asserted by the Examiner to be "well known" or "matters of common knowledge". If justified, the Examiner should not be obliged to spend time to produce documentary proof. If the knowledge is of such notorious character that judicial notice can be taken, it is sufficient so to state. *In re Malcolm*, 1942 C.D. 589; 543 O.G. 440. If the applicant traverses such an assertion the Examiner should cite a reference in support of his position.

Failure of the applicant to seasonably challenge such assertions establishes them as admitted prior art. See *In re Gunther*, 1942 C.D. 332; 538 O.G. 744; *In re Chevenard*, 1944 C.D. 141; 500 O.G. 196. This applies also to assertions of the Board. *In re Selmi*, 1946 C.D. 525; 591 O.G. 160; *In re Fischer*, 1942 C.D. 295; 538 O.G. 503.

706.03 Rejections Not Based on Prior Art

The primary object of the examination of an application is to determine whether or not the claims define a patentable advance over the prior art. In too many instances this consideration is relegated to a secondary position, while undue emphasis is given to technical rejections. Where a major technical rejection is proper (e.g. aggregation, lack of proper disclosure, undue breadth) such rejection should be stated with a full development of the reasons rather than by a mere conclusion coupled with some stereotyped expression.

Certain technical rejections (e.g. negative

limitations, indefiniteness) should not be made where the Examiner recognizing the limitations of the English language, is not aware of an improved mode of definition.

Rejections not based on prior art are explained in 706.03(a) to 706.03(y). **IF THE ITALICIZED LANGUAGE IN THESE SECTIONS IS INCORPORATED IN THE REJECTION, THERE WILL BE LESS CHANCE OF A MISUNDERSTANDING AS TO THE GROUNDS OF REJECTION.**

706.03(a) Nonstatutory Subject Matter

Patents are not granted for all new and useful inventions and discoveries. The subject matter of the invention or discovery must come within the boundaries set forth by 35 U.S.C. 101, which permits patents to be granted only for "any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof."

The term "process" as defined in 35 U.S.C. 100, means process, art or method, and includes a new use of a known process, machine, manufacture, composition of matter, or material.

Judicial decisions, have determined the limits of the statutory classes. Examples of subject matter not patentable under the Statute follow:

PRINTED MATTER

For example, a mere arrangement of printed matter, though seemingly a "manufacture," is rejected as *not being within the statutory classes*.

NATURALLY OCCURRING ARTICLE

Similarly, a thing occurring in nature, which is substantially unaltered, is not a "manufacture." A shrimp with the head and digestive tract removed is an example. *Ex parte Grayson*, 51 USPQ 413.

METHOD OF DOING BUSINESS

Though seemingly within the category of a process or method, the law is settled that a method of doing business can be rejected as not being within the statutory classes. *Hotel Security Checking Co. v. Lorraine Co.*, 160 Fed. 467.

SCIENTIFIC PRINCIPLE

A scientific principle, divorced from any tangible structure, can be rejected as not within the statutory classes. *O'Reilly v. Morse*, 15 Howard 62.

This subject matter is further limited by the Atomic Energy Act explained in 706.03(b).

706.03(b) Barred by Atomic Energy Act

A limitation on what can be patented is imposed by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954. Section 151(a) thereof (42 U.S.C. 2181) reads as follows:

No patent shall hereafter be granted for any invention or discovery which is useful solely in the utilization of special nuclear material or atomic energy in an atomic weapon.

The terms "atomic energy" and "special nuclear material" are defined in Section 11 of the Act (42 U.S.C. 2014).

Sections 151(c) and 151(d) (42 U.S.C. 2181c and d) set up categories of pending applications relating to atomic energy that must be brought to the attention of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission. Under Rule 14(c), applications for patents which disclose or which appear to disclose, or which purport to disclose, inventions or discoveries relating to atomic energy are reported to the Atomic Energy Commission and the Commission will be given access to such applications, but such reporting does not constitute a determination that the subject matter of each application so reported is in fact useful or an invention or discovery or that such application in fact discloses subject matter in categories specified by the Atomic Energy Act.

Applications **MUST** be inspected promptly when received to determine those which appear to relate to atomic energy and those so related **MUST BE PROMPTLY FORWARDED** to the Patent Security Division for processing under Rule 14(c), in order for the Commissioner to fulfill his responsibilities under Section 151(d) of the Act.

All rejections based upon Sections 151(a) and 155 of the Atomic Energy Act **MUST** be made only by Divisions 10, 44 and 46.

706.03(c) Functional

See *Ex parte Ball et al.*, 1953 C.D. 4; 675 O.G. 5 *In re Arbeit et al.*, 1953 C.D. 409; 677 O.G. 843 and *Ex parte Stanley*, 121 USPQ 621.

Section 112 of the Patent Act of 1952 consists of three paragraphs, which read as follows:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and

exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same, and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

An element in a claim for a combination may be expressed as a means or step for performing a specified function without the recital of structure, material, or acts in support thereof, and such claim shall be construed to cover the corresponding structure, material, or acts described in the specification and equivalents thereof.

Paragraph 3 of section 112 has the effect of prohibiting the rejection of a claim for a combination of elements (or steps) on the ground that the claim distinguishes from the prior art solely in an element (or step) defined as a "means" (or "step") coupled with a statement of function. However this provision of paragraph 3 must always be considered as subordinate to the provision of paragraph 2 that the claim particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. If a claim be found to contain language approved by paragraph 3 such claim should always be tested additionally for compliance with paragraph 2 and if it fails to comply with the requirements of paragraph 2, the claim should be so rejected and the reasons fully stated.

Paragraph 3 of section 112 makes no change in the established practice of rejecting claims as *functional* in situations such as the following:

1. A claim which contains functional language not supported by recitation in the claim of sufficient structure to warrant the presence of the functional language in the claim. An example of a claim of this character may be found in *In re Fuller*, 1929 C.D. 172; 388 O.G. 279. The claim reads:

A woolen cloth having a tendency to wear rough rather than smooth.

2. A claim which recites only a single means and thus encompasses all possible means for performing a desired function. For an example, see the following claim in *Ex parte Bullock*, 1907 C.D. 93; 127 O.G. 1580:

In a device of the class described, means for transferring clothes-carrying rods from one position and depositing them on a suitable support.

706.03(d) Vague and Indefinite

When the Examiner is satisfied that patentable novelty is disclosed and it is apparent to

the Examiner that the claims are directed to such patentable subject matter, he should allow claims which define the patentable novelty with a *reasonable* degree of particularity and distinctness. Some latitude in the manner of expression and the aptness of terms should be permitted even though the claim language is not as precise as the Examiner might desire.

The fact that a claim is broad does not necessarily justify a rejection on the ground that the claim is vague and indefinite or incomplete. In non-chemical cases, a claim may, in general, be drawn as broadly as permitted by the prior art.

The rejection of a claim as *indefinite* would appear to present no difficulties. On occasion, however, a great deal of effort is required to explain just what is wrong with the claim, when writing the Examiner's letter. Although cooperation with the attorney is to be commended, undue time should not be spent trying to guess what the attorney was trying to say in the claim. Sometimes, a rejection as indefinite plus the statement that a certain line is meaningless is sufficient. The Examiner's action should be constructive in nature and when possible he should offer a definite suggestion for correction. Inclusion of a negative limitation, such as a "metal, excepting nickel", may make a claim indefinite. Expressions such as: "anhydrous", "colorless" and "non-poisonous" have been permitted because they are definite and by far the least cumbersome way to express the limitation. The mere inclusion of reference numerals in a claim otherwise allowable is not a ground for rejection. But see *Ex parte Osborne*, 1900 C.D. 137; 92 O.G. 1797.

Alternative expressions such as "brake or locking device" may make a claim indefinite if the limitation covers two different elements. If two equivalent parts are referred to such as "rods or bars", the alternative expression may be considered proper.

Still another way in which a claim can be indefinite is where a *non sequitur* occurs. For example, a claim is inferential and therefore indefinite when it recites "said lever" and there was no earlier reference or *no antecedent* in the claim to a lever. An *indirect limitation* also affords a ground of rejection as indefinite. If a "lever" is set forth and, later in the claim, "said aluminum lever" is recited, the claim is rejected as indefinite.

706.03(e) Product by Process

An article which cannot be described in any other manner, may be claimed by a process of making it. In *re Moeller*, 1941 C.D. 316, 527 O.G. 559. Applicant must, however, make a

showing that the product cannot be described except by reference to the process of making it, In *re Dreyfus and Whitehead*, 1935 C.D. 386, 457 O.G. 479. Accordingly both product claims described by characteristics and product-by-process claims concurrently presented are inconsistent. As a rule, the product-by-process claims should be limited to one, unless it appears that there are material differences between the products produced by the processes recited in the different claims. See also "Product by Process Claims" (Wolfe) 28 J.P.O.S. 852.

706.03(f) Incomplete

A claim can be rejected as *incomplete* if it omits essential elements, steps or necessary structural cooperative relationship of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the elements, steps or necessary structural connections. Greater latitude is permissible with respect to the definition in a claim of matters not essential to novelty or operability than with respect to matters essential thereto. See also 706.03(d).

706.03(g) Prolix

Claims are rejected as *prolix* when they contain long recitations of unimportant details which hide or obscure the invention. *Ex parte Iagan*, 1911 C.D. 10; 162 O.G. 538, expresses the thought that very long detailed claims setting forth so many elements that invention cannot possibly reside in the combination should be rejected as prolix. See also *In re Ludwick*, 1925 C.D. 306; 339 O.G. 393.

706.03(h) Nonstatutory Claim

Some applications when filed contain an omnibus claim such as A device substantially as shown and described.

Such a claim can be rejected as follows:

Claim ----- is rejected for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention as required in 35 U.S.C. 112.

For cancellation of such a claim by Examiner's Amendment, see 1302.04(b).

706.03(i) Aggregation

Rejections on the ground of *aggregation* should be based upon a lack of cooperation between the elements of the claim. No prior art should be relied upon in this rejection. However, if art is found showing the various elements, an additional rejection on the prior art

may be advisable. Many decisions and some legal writers extend the term to include old and exhausted combinations (706.03(j)). Rejections on the latter grounds, however, involve the state of the art, and cooperation *is* present. Confusion as to what is meant can be avoided by treating all claims which include more than one element as combinations (patentable or unpatentable) if there is actual cooperation between the elements, and as aggregations if there is no cooperation.

Example of aggregation: A washing machine associated with a dial telephone.

Example of old combination: An improved carburetor claimed in combination with a gasoline engine.

A claim is not necessarily aggregative because the various elements do not function simultaneously. A typewriter, for example, is a good combination. Neither is a claim necessarily aggregative merely because elements which do cooperate are set forth in specific detail.

706.03(j) Old Combination

The rejection on the ground of *old combination* (synonymous with "exhausted combination") requires the citation of a reference, but is treated here because of its relation to aggregation. The reference (not a combination of references, of course) is cited, not to anticipate the claim, but to anticipate the broad combination set forth in the claim. Moreover, the cooperation and result between the elements in the reference must be the same as it is in the claim.

Example: An improved (specifically recited) carburetor claimed in combination with a gasoline engine. A reference is cited which shows a carburetor combined with a gasoline engine. This shows the broad combination to be old. Both in the reference and in the claimed combination, the cooperation between the carburetor and engine is the same and the end result is the same. The claimed combination is an improvement over the prior art only because of the improved carburetor. The carburetor has separate status, since entire subclasses are devoted to carburetors, claimed as such. A reference is preferably cited to show the separate status and development. (See 904.01(d).)

Old combination rejections ordinarily are based on 35 U.S.C. 112 (failure to point out the invention).

706.03(k) Duplicate Claims; Double Patenting

Inasmuch as a patent is supposed to be limited to only one invention or, at most, several closely related indivisible inventions, limiting

an application to a single claim, or a single claim to each of the related inventions might appear to be logical as well as convenient. However, court decisions have confirmed applicant's right to restate (i.e., by plural claiming) his invention in a reasonable number of ways. Indeed, a mere difference in scope between claims has been held to be enough.

Nevertheless, when two claims in an application are duplicates, or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to reject the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. Also, it is possible to reject one claim on an allowed claim if they differ only by subject matter old in the art. The latter ground of rejection is set forth in the following paragraph quoted from *Ex parte Whitelaw*, 1915 C.D. 18; 219 O.G. 1237:

"Claim 54 is not patentable over claim 51 and claims 53, 55 and 56 are not patentable over claim 50 in view of Comstock, No. 590,657, which shows that it is old to employ an engine-casing in tools of this character. The claims held patentable are considered as fully covering applicant's invention, and applicant cannot be permitted to multiply his claims by presenting alleged combinations which distinguish from the real invention only by including elements which are old in the art and perform no new function."

This rejection (the *ex parte Whitelaw* doctrine) is usually not applied if there are only a few claims in the application.

Situations related to that given above are as follows:

Conflicting subject matter in two applications of the same inventor, one of which is assigned, see Section 304.

Where there is a common assignee for two or more applications by different inventors, see Section 305.

Where the same inventor has two or more applications for species or for related inventions, see Chapter 800, particularly Sections 804-804.02, 806.04(h), 822 and 822.01 for double patenting rejections of inventions not patentable over each other.

APPLICATION FILED UNDER 35 U.S.C. 121

The Commissioner has determined that under 35 U.S.C. 121, the Patent Office cannot reject a divisional application on the parent patent if the divisional application is filed as a result of a requirement for restriction made by the Office even though the requirement for restriction relates to species. In *re Joyce*, 1958 C.D. 2; 727 O.G. 4. See also In *re Herrick et al.*, 1958 C.D. 1; 727 O.G. 4 where the Com-

missioner ruled that a requirement for restriction should not be made in an application claiming more than five species if the examiner is of the opinion that the various species are obviously unpatentable over one another.

706.03(1) Multiplicity

Rule 75(b). More than one claim may be presented, provided they differ substantially from each other and are not unduly multiplied.

An unreasonable number of claims; that is unreasonable in view of the nature and scope of applicant's invention and the state of the art, affords a basis for a rejection on the ground of *multiplicity*. A rejection on this ground should include all the claims in the case inasmuch as it relates to confusion of the issue.

To avoid the possibility that an application which has been rejected on the ground of undue multiplicity of claims may be appealed to the Board of Appeals prior to an examination on the merits of at least some of the claims presented, the Examiner should, at the time of making the rejection on the ground of multiplicity of claims, indicate the number of claims which in his judgment is sufficient to properly define Applicant's invention and require the Applicant to select a number of claims, not to exceed the number specified, for examination on merits. The Examiner should be reasonable in setting the number to afford the Applicant some latitude in claiming his invention.

The Applicant's response to this requirement of the Examiner, to be complete, must either:

1. Reduce the number of claims presented to a number not exceeding the number specified by the Examiner in the Office action, thus overcoming the rejection based upon the ground of multiplicity, or

2. Select certain claims for the purpose of examination, the number of which is not greater than the number previously indicated by the Examiner to be sufficient to adequately point out Applicant's invention. This selection must be made even though the Applicant traverses the rejection entered by the Examiner on the ground of multiplicity. If the rejection on multiplicity is adhered to, all claims retained will be included in such rejection and the selected claims only will be additionally examined on their merits. This procedure preserves applicant's right to have the rejection on multiplicity reviewed by the Board of Appeals. (Basis: Notice of Oct. 14, 1960.)

See also 706.03(k).

706.03(m) Nonelected Inventions

See 821 to 821.03. See particularly the last paragraph of 821 for the necessity of rejecting claims, which stand withdrawn because not readable on the elected species, where applicant has traversed the Examiner's holding.

706.03(n) Correspondence of Claim and Disclosure

Rule 117. Amendment and revision required. The specification, claims and drawing must be amended and revised when required, to correct inaccuracies of description and definition or unnecessary prolixity, and to secure correspondence between the claims, the specification and the drawing.

Another category of rejections not based on the prior art is based upon the relation of the rejected claim to the disclosure. In chemical cases, a claim may be so broad as to not be supported by disclosure, in which case it is rejected as unwarranted by the disclosure. If averments in a claim do not correspond to the averments or disclosure in the specification, a rejection on the ground of inaccuracy may be in order. It must be kept in mind that an original claim is part of the disclosure and might adequately set forth subject matter which is completely absent from the specification. Applicant is required in such an instance to add the subject matter to the specification. If subject matter capable of illustration is originally claimed and it is not shown in the drawing, the claim is not rejected but Applicant is required to add it to the drawing. See 608.01(1).

See 706.03(z) for rejections on undue breadth.

706.03(o) New Matter

In the examination of an application following amendment thereof, the Examiner must be on the alert to detect new matter. The prohibition against new matter has been incorporated into the New Patent Code. See 35 U.S.C. 132.

In amended cases, subject matter not disclosed in the original application is sometimes added and a claim directed thereto. Such a claim is rejected on the ground that it is *drawn to new matter*. New matter includes not only the addition of wholly unsupported subject matter, but also, adding specific percentages or compounds after a broader original disclosure, or even the omission of a step from a method. See 608.04 to 608.04(c).

706.03(p) No Utility

A rejection on the ground of *lack of utility* includes the more specific grounds of *inoperativeness, involving perpetual motion, frivolous, fraudulent, against public policy*. The former practice of affording applicant an opportunity for a refund of the filing fee in perpetual motion cases was discontinued by the Notice of November 13, 1945. See 608.01(p).

706.03(q) Obvious Method

An Applicant may invent a new and useful article of manufacture. Once the article is conceived, it often happens that anyone skilled in the art would at once be aware of a method of making it. In such a case, if applicant asserts both article and method claims, the article claims are allowed but the method claims may be rejected as being drawn to an *obvious method of making the article*.

706.03(s) Statutory Bar

Another category of rejections not based on the prior art finds a basis in some prior act of applicant, as a result of which the claim is denied him.

ABANDONMENT OF INVENTION

Under 35 U.S.C. 102(c), abandonment of the "invention" (as distinguished from abandonment of an application) results in loss of right to a patent.

OWN PRIOR FOREIGN PATENT

35 U.S.C. 102. *Conditions for patentability; novelty and loss of right to patent.* A person shall be entitled to a patent unless—

* * * * *

(d) the invention was first patented or caused to be patented by the applicant or his legal representatives or assigns in a foreign country prior to the date of the applications for patent in this country on an application filed more than twelve months before the filing of the application in the United States.

NOTE.—Section 4(b) of the Act of July 19, 1952, provides:

"Section 102(d) of Title 35, as enacted by section 1 hereof, shall not apply to existing patents and pending application, but the law previously in effect, namely the first paragraph of R.S. 4887, shall apply to such patents and applications."

The statutory bar of prior foreign patenting stated in the first paragraph of R.S. 4887 has been changed as expressed in paragraph (d) of Section 102 of the new law. An application for United States patent filed more than one year after the filing of an application for the

same invention in a foreign country is no longer barred unless the foreign patent issued before the United States application is filed.

The statute above quoted establishes four conditions which, if all are present, establish a bar against the granting of a patent in this country:

(1) The foreign application must be filed more than one year before the filing in the United States (Modified by Public Law 690, 201.16).

(2) It must be filed by the applicant, his legal representatives or assigns.

(3) The foreign patent must be actually granted (e.g., by sealing of the papers in Great Britain) before the filing in the United States. Ex parte Gruschwitz et al., 138 U.S.P.Q. 505 discusses "patented" as applied to German procedures.

(4) The same invention must be involved.

If such a foreign patent is discovered by the Examiner, the rejection is made on the ground of *statutory bar*.

The new law only applies to applications filed after January 1, 1953.

SUBMISSION TO LIBRARY UNNECESSARY

Such applications [those filed after January 1, 1953] should not be submitted as a routine matter to the Library to ascertain if the foreign application has become a patent. Since the foreign patent to be a bar under 35 U.S.C. 102(d) must have been granted before the filing date in this country, the probability of the foreign patent having issued after the date of execution of the original oath and before the U.S. filing date is so slight as to make such a search ordinarily unproductive. The practice with reference to cases filed before January 1, 1953 remains unchanged. (Basis: Notice of December 17, 1956.)

FOREIGN FILING WITHOUT LICENSE

35 U.S.C. 184. *Filing of application in foreign country.* Except when authorized by a license obtained from the Commissioner a person shall not file or cause or authorize to be filed in any foreign country prior to six months after filing in the United States an application for patent or for the registration of a utility model, industrial design, or model in respect of an invention made in this country. A license shall not be granted with respect to an invention subject to an order issued by the Commissioner pursuant to section 181 of this title without the concurrence of the head of the departments and the chief officers of the agencies who caused the order to be issued. The license may be granted retroactively where an application has been inadvertently filed abroad and the application does not disclose an invention within the scope of section 181 of this title.

The term "application" when used in this chapter includes applications and any modifications, amendments, or supplements thereto, or divisions thereof.

35 U.S.C. 185. *Patent barred for filing without license.* Notwithstanding any other provisions of law any person, and his successors, assigns, or legal representatives, shall not receive a United States patent for an invention if that person, or his successors, assigns, or legal representatives shall, without procuring the license prescribed in section 184 of this title, have made, or consented to or assisted another's making, application in a foreign country for a patent or for the registration of a utility model, industrial design, or model in respect of the invention. A United States patent issued to such person, his successors, assigns, or legal representatives shall be invalid.

If, upon examining an application, the Examiner learns of the existence of a corresponding foreign application which appears to have been filed before the United States application had been on file for six months, and if the invention apparently was made in this country, he shall refer the application to the Patent Security Division, calling attention to the foreign application. Pending investigation of the possible violation, the application may be returned to the examining division for prosecution on the merits. When it is otherwise in condition for allowance, the application will be again submitted to the Patent Security Division unless the latter has already reported that the foreign filing involves no bar to the United States application.

If it should be necessary to take action under 35 U.S.C. 185, an appropriate security examining division will request transfer of the application to it. (Basis: Notice of July 14, 1961.)

OTHER STATUTORY BARS

Further, claims to an invention in public use or on sale in the United States more than twelve months before the effective U.S. filing date are also rejected. 35 U.S.C. 102(b).

706.03(t) Other Assigned Application

As pointed out in 304, assignment of one of several overlapping applications may be a ground of rejection. See also 305 and 706.03(k).

706.03(u) Disclaimer

Claims may be rejected on the ground that applicant has disclaimed the subject matter involved. Such disclaimer may arise, for example, from the applicant's failure:

(a) to make claims suggested for interference with another application under Rule 203 (1101.01(m)),

(b) to copy a claim from a patent when suggested by the Examiner (1101.02(f)), or

(c) to respond or appeal, within the time limit fixed, to the Examiner's rejection of claims copied from a patent (see Rule 206(b) and 1101.02(f)).

The rejection on disclaimer applies to all claims not patentably distinct from the disclaimed subject matter as well as to the claims directly involved.

706.03(v) After Interference or Public Use Proceeding

For rejections following an interference, see 1109 to 1110.

The outcome of public use proceedings may also be the basis of a rejection. (See Rule 292.)

706.03(w) Res Judicata

A prior adjudication against the inventor on the same or similar claims constitutes a proper ground of rejection as *res judicata*. Where a different question of patentability is presented the rejection of *res judicata* does not apply.

The rejection should only be used when the earlier decision was a final, appellate one, such as a Board of Appeals decision where the time limit for further remedies has expired, or a decision by the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals. But see 201.11, last paragraph, for a special situation.

"When making a rejection on *res judicata*, action should ordinarily be made also on the basis of prior art." (Basis: Notice of April 20, 1938.)

See also 201.07.

706.03(x) Reissue

35 U.S.C. 251 forbids the granting of a reissue "enlarging the scope of the claims of the original patent" unless the reissue is applied for within two years from the grant of the original patent. This is an absolute bar and cannot be excused. This prohibition has been interpreted to apply to any claim which is broader in any respect than the claims of the original patent. Such claims may be rejected as being barred by 35 U.S.C. 251. However, when the reissue is applied for within two years, the Examiner does not go into the question of undue delay.

The same section permits the filing of a reissue application by the assignee of the entire interest only in cases where it does not "enlarge the scope of the claims of the original patent". Such claims which do enlarge the scope may also be rejected as barred by the statute.

A *defective reissue* oath affords a ground for rejecting all the claims in the reissue application. See 1401.08.

Note that a reissue application is "special" and remains so even if applicant does not make a prompt response.

706.03(y) Improper Markush Group

Ex parte Markush, 1925 C.D. 126; 340 O.G. 839, sanctions, in chemical cases, claiming a genus expressed as a group consisting of certain specified materials. This type of claim is employed when there is no commonly accepted generic expression which is commensurate in scope with the field which the applicant desires to cover. Inventions in metallurgy, refractories, ceramics, pharmacy, pharmacology and biology, may be claimed under the Markush formula but it has consistently been held to be improper to extend it to purely mechanical features or process steps. The use of the disjunctive, as in "group consisting of A, B, or C" is improper. In re Archbold, 1946 C.D. 63; 582 O.G. 178. It is also improper to use the term "comprising" instead of "consisting of". Ex parte Dotter, 12 U.S.P.Q. 382. Regarding the normally prohibited inclusion of Markush claims of varying scope (generic and sub-generic for example) in the same case, see Ex parte Burke, 1934 C.D. 5; 441 O.G. 509.

The materials set forth in the Markush group ordinarily must belong to a recognized physical or chemical class or to an art-recognized class. However, when the Markush group occurs in a claim reciting a process or a combination (not a single compound), it is sufficient if the members of the group are disclosed in the specification to possess at least one property in common which is mainly responsible for their function in the claimed relationship, and it is clear from their very nature or from the prior art that all of them possess this property. The test should be applied as liberally as possible. Where a Markush expression is applied only to a portion of a chemical compound, the propriety of the grouping is determined by a consideration of the compound as a whole, and does not depend on there being a community of properties in the members of the Markush expression.

A rejection of a Markush type claim based on any of the grounds pointed out above relates to the merits and is appealable.

SUBGENUS CLAIM

A situation may occur in which a patentee has presented a number of examples which, in the examiner's opinion, are sufficiently representative to support a generic claim and yet a court may subsequently hold the claim invalid

on the ground of undue breadth. Where this happens the patentee is often limited to species claims which may not provide him with suitable protection.

The allowance of a Markush type claim under a true genus claim would appear to be beneficial to the applicant without imposing any undue burden on the Patent Office or in any way detracting from the rights of the public. Such a subgenus claim would enable the applicant to claim all the disclosed operative embodiments and afford him an intermediate level of protection in the event the true genus claims should be subsequently held invalid.

The examiners are therefore instructed not to reject a Markush type claim merely because of the presence of a true genus claim embrace thereof. (Basis: Notice of Sept. 23, 1949.)

See also 608.01(p) and 715.03.

706.03(z) Undue Breadth

In mechanical cases, broad claims may properly be supported by a single form of an apparatus or structure. In re Vickers et al., 1944 C.D. 324; 564 O.G. 174.

In chemical cases, however, the disclosure of a single species usually does not provide an adequate basis to support generic claims. In re Sol, 1938 C.D. 723; 497 O.G. 546. This is because in chemistry it is not obvious from the disclosure of one species, what other species will work. In re Dreshfield, 1940 C.D. 351; 518 O.G. 255 gives this general rule: "It is well settled that in cases involving chemicals and chemical compounds, which differ radically in their properties it must appear in an applicant's specification either by the enumeration of a sufficient number of the members of a group or by other appropriate language, that the chemicals or chemical combinations included in the claims are capable of accomplishing the desired result." The article "Broader than the Disclosure in Chemical Cases", 31 J.P.O.S. 5, by Samuel S. Levin covers this subject in detail.

706.04 Rejection of Previously Allowed Claims

A claim noted as allowable shall thereafter be rejected only after the proposed rejection has been submitted to the Primary Examiner for consideration of all the facts and approval of the proposed action.

Great care should be exercised in authorizing such a rejection. See Ex parte Grier, 1923 C.D. 27; 309 O.G. 223; Ex parte Hay, 1909 C.D. 18; 139 O.G. 197 (Basis: Order 3157).

PREVIOUS ACTION BY DIFFERENT EXAMINER

Full faith and credit should be given to the search and action of a previous examiner unless there is a clear error in the previous action or knowledge of other prior art. In general, an examiner should not take an entirely new approach or attempt to reorient the point of view of a previous examiner, or make a new search in the mere hope of finding something.

Because it is unusual to reject a previously allowed claim, the Examiner should point out in his letter that the claim now being rejected was previously allowed.

706.05 Rejection After Allowance of Application

See 1308.01 for a rejection based on a reference.

For rejection of claims in an allowed case which has failed to make the date of a senior application in correspondence under Rule 202, see 1101.01(i).

706.06 Rejection of Claims Copied From Patent

See 1101.02(f).

706.07 Final Rejection

Rule 113. Final rejection or action. (a) On the second or any subsequent examination or consideration, the rejection or other action may be made final, whereupon applicant's response is limited to appeal in the case of rejection of any claim (rule 191) or to amendment as specified in rule 116. Petition may be taken to the Commissioner in the case of objections or requirements not involved in the rejection of any claim (rule 181). Response to a final rejection or action must include cancellation of, or appeal from the rejection of, each claim so rejected and, if any claim stands allowed, compliance with any requirement or objection as to form.

(b) In making such final rejection, the examiner shall repeat or state all grounds of rejection then considered applicable to the claims in the case, clearly stating the reasons therefor.

Before final rejection is in order a clear issue should be developed between the Examiner and applicant. To bring the prosecution to as speedy conclusion as possible and at the same time to deal justly by both the applicant and the public, the invention as disclosed and claimed should be thoroughly searched in the first action and the references fully applied; and in response to this action the applicant should amend with a view to avoiding all the grounds of rejection and objection. Switching from one subject matter to another in the

claims presented by applicant in successive amendments, or from one set of references to another by the Examiner in rejecting in successive actions claims of substantially the same subject matter, will alike tend to defeat attaining the goal of reaching a clearly defined issue for an early termination; i.e., either an allowance of the case or a final rejection.

While the Rules no longer give to an applicant the right to "amend as often as the Examiner presents new references or reasons for rejection", present practice does not sanction hasty and ill-considered final rejections. The applicant who is seeking to define his invention in claims that will give him the patent protection to which he is justly entitled should receive the cooperation of the Examiner to that end, and not be prematurely cut off in the prosecution of his case. But the applicant who dallies in the prosecution of his case, resorting to technical or other obvious subterfuges in order to keep the application pending before the Primary Examiner, can no longer find a refuge in the Rules to ward off a final rejection.

The Examiner should never lose sight of the fact that in every case the applicant is entitled to a full and fair hearing, and that a clear issue between applicant and Examiner should be developed, if possible, before appeal is prosecuted. However, it is to the interest of the applicants as a class as well as to that of the public that prosecution of a case be confined to as few actions as is consistent with a thorough consideration of its merits.

Ex parte Hoogendam 1939 C.D. 3; 499 O.G. 3, states the attitude of the Office on the matter of final rejections. The position therein taken holds that neither the Statutes nor the Rules of Practice confer any right on an applicant to a more extended prosecution of his application than is comprised in an "examination" and a re-examination thereof. It is recognized, however, that the equities in a given case may justify a large number of Office actions.

STATEMENT OF GROUNDS

In making the final rejection, all outstanding grounds of rejection of record should be carefully reviewed, and any such grounds relied on in the final rejection should be reiterated. They must also be clearly developed to such an extent that applicant may readily judge the advisability of an appeal unless a previous (single) Office action contains a complete statement supporting the rejection. (Note of February 18, 1949.)

However, where a single previous Office action contains a complete statement of a ground

of rejection, the final rejection may refer to such a statement and also should include a rebuttal of any arguments raised in the applicant's response. If appeal is taken in such a case, the examiner's answer should contain a complete statement of the examiner's position.

A summary indicating the final disposition of each claim is desirable and also a statement that:

"The above rejection is made FINAL", or
"This is a FINAL rejection".

For amendments filed after final rejection, see 714.12 and 714.13.

706.07(a) Final Rejection, When Proper

Due to the change in practice as affecting final rejections, older decisions on questions of prematureness of final rejection or admission of subsequent amendments do not necessarily reflect present practice. Under procedure which became effective July 1, 1964, second actions on the merits shall be final, except in rare circumstances. Citation of a new reference in the second action does not preclude making it final although, depending on circumstances, it *may* prevent setting of a shortened statutory period for reply. See 710.02(b).

In the consideration of claims in an amended case where no attempt is made to point out the patentable novelty, the Examiner should be on guard not to allow such claims. See 714.04. The claims, however, may be finally rejected if, in the opinion of the Examiner, they are clearly open to rejection on grounds of record.

706.07(b) Final Rejection, When Proper on First Action

In certain instances, the claims of a new application may be finally rejected in the first action. This may be done when the claims of the new application, for example, a continuing application, are similar to those of an earlier application filed by the same applicant, and if the claims of the earlier application were rejected on the grounds which are also applicable against the claims of the new application. If the rejection is based on *res judicata*, however, and the earlier application had not been rejected on such a ground, it may not be made

final in the first action, since this would constitute a new ground of rejection.

706.07(c) Final Rejection, Premature

Any question as to prematureness of a final rejection should be raised, if at all, while the case is still pending before the Primary Examiner. This is purely a question of practice, wholly distinct from the tenability of the rejection. It may therefore not be advanced as a ground for appeal, or made the basis of complaint before the Board of Appeals. It is reviewable by petition.

706.07(d) Final Rejection, Withdrawal of, Premature

If, on request by applicant for reconsideration, the Examiner finds the final rejection to have been premature, he should withdraw the finality of the rejection.

706.07(e) Withdrawal of Final Rejection, General

See 714.12 and 714.13, Amendments after final rejection.

Once a final rejection that is not premature has been entered in a case, however, it should not be withdrawn at the applicant's request except on the showing of Rule 116. This does not mean that no further amendment or argument will be considered. An amendment that will place the case either in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal may be admitted. While the Office will continue rigorous enforcement of Rule 116, citation of new art by the Examiner in a final rejection will obviate further showing under Rule 116(b) for any amendment necessitated by the new art.

The Examiner may withdraw the rejection of finally rejected claims whenever he deems the conditions appropriate for such action. If, for example, new facts or reasons are presented such as to convince the Examiner that the previously rejected claims are in fact allowable, then the final rejection should be withdrawn. Occasionally, the finality of a rejection may be withdrawn in order to apply a new ground of rejection.

When a final rejection is withdrawn, all amendments filed after the final rejection are ordinarily entered.

707 Examiner's Letter or Action

Extract from Rule 104. (b) The applicant will be notified of the examiner's action. The reasons for any adverse action or any objection or requirement will be stated and such information or references will be given as may be useful in aiding the applicant to judge of the propriety of continuing the prosecution of his application.

707.01 Primary Indicates Action for New Assistant

After the search has been completed, action is taken in the light of the references found. Where the assistant Examiner has been in the Office but a short time, it is the duty of the Primary Examiner to go into the case thoroughly. The usual procedure is for the assistant Examiner to explain the invention and discuss the references which he regards as most pertinent. The Primary Examiner may indicate the action to be taken, whether restriction or election of species is to be required, or whether the claims are to be considered on their merits. If action on the merits is to be given, he may indicate how the references are to be applied in cases where the claim is to be rejected, or authorize allowance if it is not met in the references and no further field of search is known.

707.02 Actions Which Require the Attention of the Primary Examiner

There are some questions which existing practice requires the Primary Examiner to be personally responsible for. The following actions fall in this category:

- Third action on any case (707.02(a)).
- Action on a case pending 5 or more years (707.02(a)).
- Final rejection.
- Setting up an interference. (1101.01(c).)
- Disposition of an amendment in a case in

interference looking to the formation of another interference involving that application (1111.05).

Decisions on interference motions under Rules 232 to 235; also, actions taken under Rule 237 (1105.02 to 1105.05).

Rejection of a previously allowed claim (706.04).

Proposed rejection of a copied patent claim. (If applicable to a patentee, see 1101.02(f).)

Classification of allowed cases (903.07).

Holding of abandonment for insufficient response.

Suspension of Examiner's action (Rule 103).

Treatment of newly filed application which obviously fails to comply with 35 U.S.C. 112 (702.01).

Consideration of the advisability of a patentability report (705.01).

Requirements for restriction (803.01).

Withdrawal of final rejection (706.07(d) and 706.07(e)).

Decision on reissue oath.

Decision on affidavits under Rule 131 (715.08) and under Rule 132(716).

Sealing of Rule 131 and other affidavits prior to interference.

For a list of actions that are to be submitted to the Supervisory Examiners see 1003, 1004, and 1005.

707.02(a) Cases Up for Third Action and Five-Year Cases

The Principal Examiners should impress their assistants with the fact that the shortest path to the final disposition of an application is by finding the best references on the first search and carefully applying them.

The Principal Examiners are expected to personally consider every application which is up for the third official action with a view to finally concluding its prosecution.

Any case that has been pending five years should be carefully studied by the Principal Examiner and every effort made to terminate its prosecution. In order to accomplish this result, the case is to be considered "special" by the Examiner. (Basis: Notice of October 11, 1930.)

POI-90
3-29-63
ADDRESS ONLY
THE COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20535

PAPER No. 2

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
PATENT OFFICE
WASHINGTON

IN REPLY PLEASE REFER TO: Group 370

John A. Smith
1441 G Street, N. W.
Washington, D. C. 20005

Please find below a communication from the
EXAMINER in charge of this application.

Commissioner of Patents.

Applicant: Endicott C. Hart		MAILED OCT 8 1964 GROUP 370
Ser. No. 287,171		
Filed June 5, 1963		
For METHOD		

16-63457-7 GPO

SHORTENED TIME FOR REPLY

This application has been examined.

References applied:

Re 20,727	10/57	Hansberg	64-58
1,613,549	1/27	Carter (1)	91-15
3,067,583	12/62	Carter (2)	91-15

Reference further showing the state of the art:

Winslow, C. E., Packaging. N. Y., E. P. Dutton, 1926
TH763.W5 (pp. 97-99 relied on)

A more specific title is required; for example,
--- PACKAGING METHOD ---.

Claims 1-7 appear in the case.

Claims 1-5 are rejected as unpatentable over
Hansberg in view of either of the Carter references. The
steps recited find a full response in Hansberg except that
the receivers are not "vendable". Both Carter references,
however, show receivers similar to those disclosed by applicant
and it would be obvious, in the sense of 35 U.S.C. 103, to
carry out Hansberg's method with the receivers of the second-
ary references. No change in overall operation would result.
This operation has been disclosed in Hansberg.

Serial No. 287,171

- 2 -

Claims 1-5 would be made allowable, in the Examiner's opinion, if they were amended to specify that the "impact" filling of the container is effected by producing a substantial negative pressure in the container. Preferably, this limitation should follow the step of "effecting a seal".

In this connection, attention is directed to the Winslow publication. Pages 97-99 clearly disclose that pressure differentials broadly are common in the art of packaging fluent material.

Claims 1-7 are rejected.

No claim is deemed allowable.

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE FOUR MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS LETTER. (803 O.G. 893).

Examiner

LTRipley:aw

WO 7-3521

707.04 Initial Sentence

The initial sentence of each letter should indicate the status of that action, as, "This application has been examined" if it is the first action in the case, or, "This is in response to amendment filed * * *" if such is the case. Other papers received, such as supplemental amendments, affidavits, new drawings, etc., should be separately mentioned.

Preliminary amendment in a new case should be acknowledged by adding some sentence such as "Amendment filed (date) has been received" following the initial sentence. It should be noted, however, that in cases in which claims in excess of the number supported by the filing fee are presented before the first official action in the case, action is given only on the claims originally presented and any additional claims covered by the original fee and applicant advised accordingly. See 714.10.

707.05 Citation of References

Rule 107. Citation of references. If domestic patents be cited, their numbers and dates, the names of the patentees, and the classes of inventions must be stated. If foreign patents be cited, their nationality or country, numbers and dates, and the names of the patentees must be stated, and such other data must be furnished as may be necessary to enable the applicant to identify the patents cited. In citing foreign patents, the number of pages of specification and sheets of drawing must be specified, and in case part only of the patent be involved, the particular pages and sheets containing the parts relied upon must be identified. If printed publications be cited, the author (if any), title, date, pages or plates, and place of publication, or place where a copy can be found, shall be given. When a rejection is based on facts within the personal knowledge of an employee of the Office, the data shall be as specific as possible, and the reference must be supported, when called for by the applicant, by the affidavit of such employee, and such affidavit shall be subject to contradiction or explanation by the affidavits of the applicant and other persons.

References cited by applicant should be inspected but need not be cited in the Office action, even though this is requested by applicant, unless the Examiner considers them either a basis for rejection or reasonably pertinent. The practice of placing references in the file for use by the typist is not to be encouraged since this may make the references unavailable for search purposes for unduly long periods. (Basis: Notice of September 24, 1956.)

See 901.04—901.05(b). See 1302.12.

707.05(a) Grouped at Beginning of Letter

In citing references for the first time, the identifying data of the citation should be placed in the typed letter immediately following the initial introductory sentence (707.04), or acknowledgment of preliminary amendment (if any). It is helpful in preparing the list of references (PO-98), if the U.S. patents are arranged in numerical order. (Basis: Order No. 2938.)

707.05(b) References Applied

The references selected as needed for treating the claims should be preceded by a heading such as: "References Applied." (Basis: Order No. 2938.)

707.05(c) References Pertinent

Any references selected to cover subject matter disclosed but not claimed should be separately listed under a heading such as "Other pertinent art", "References further showing the state of the art," or some similar expression. The pertinent features of such references must be pointed out but a lengthy explanation is unnecessary. See 706.07(a).

707.05(d) References Cited in Subsequent Actions

When references are cited in a subsequent action, the heading should be "Additional references made of record," or "Additional references relied upon." (Basis: Order 2938.)

Where an applicant in an amendatory paper refers to a reference which is subsequently relied upon by the Examiner, such reference shall be cited by the Examiner in the usual manner. (Basis: Notice of December 20, 1946.)

If an English language patent is found corresponding to an earlier cited foreign language patent, see 707.05(e).

707.05(e) Data Used in Citing References

Rule 107 (707.05 and 901.05(a)) requires the Examiner to give certain data when citing references. See 901.04 for details concerning the various series of U.S. patents and how to cite them. Note that patents of the X-Series (dated prior to July 4, 1836) are *not* to be cited by number. Some U.S. patents issued in 1861 have two numbers thereon. The larger number should be cited.

If the patent date of a U.S. patent is after the effective U.S. filing date of the application, the filing date of the patent must be set forth in parentheses below the citation of the patent. This calls attention to the fact that the particular patent relied on is a reference because of its filing date and not its patent date. Similarly, when the reference is a continuation-in-part of an earlier-filed application which discloses the anticipatory matter and it is necessary to go back to the earlier filing date, the fact that the subject matter relied upon was originally disclosed on that date in the first application should be stated.

CROSS-REFERENCES

Official cross-references should be marked "X" and unofficial cross-references "uxi." (Basis: Order 3217.)

Cite abstracts as in 711.06(a) giving class and subclass.

See 901.06(c) for citation of Alien Property Custodian publications.

FOREIGN PATENTS

Data to be used in citing foreign patents is given in Rule 107, in 901.05(a).

In some instances the entire copy of a foreign patent will not be needed for the purpose of a rejection. In these instances the number of sheets of drawing and pages of specification must be specified and also the particular part of the drawing and the particular pages of specification relied upon must be given. (Basis: Order No. 3251.) See citation of foreign patent in sample letter of 707.03.

In order to direct attention of interested parties to English translations of foreign language patents, the following practice should be observed:

Cite the foreign language patent as usual. If at that time the Examiner knows of a corresponding English language patent, but because of date or disclosure, the Examiner must rely upon the foreign language patent, he should cite both, thus:

Herrmann French, 860,963, 3 pp., Oct. 15, 1940, 167-75.

(Corresponding U.S.—Herrmann, 2,537,757, Jan. 9, 1951, 167-75.)

If the corresponding English language patent is found later, the Examiner should cite it in the next regular Office action or, if the application is being sent to issue, in an Examiner's Amendment calling attention to its correspondence to the previously cited foreign language patent in the following manner:

Herrmann, 2,537,757, Jan. 9, 1951, 167-75.

(U.S. Corresponding to Herrmann—French Cited in paper No. -----.)

To insure inclusion of both patents and to indicate the correspondence between them in the list of references (Form PO-98), the Examiner should make a marginal notation on the Office action adjacent the citation of the foreign language patent, such as:

"See Paper No. ----- for corresponding U.S. patent." This should be in pencil and initialed by the Examiner. (Basis: Notice of September 27, 1951.)

PUBLICATIONS

In citing a publication, sufficient information should be given to determine the identity and facilitate the location of the publication. The data required by Rule 107 (Sec. 705.05) together with the Scientific Library call number will suffice. The call number appears on the "spine" of the book if the book is thick enough and, in any event, on the back of the title page.

If the copy relied upon is located in the Group making the action and there is no call number, the additional information, "Copy in Group -----" should be given. Examples of nonpatent bibliographical citations follow:

Winslow, C. E. A. Fresh air and ventilation. N.Y., E. P. Dutton, 1926. p. 97-112. TH7653.W5.

Singer, T. E. R. Information and communication practice in industry. N.Y., Reinhold, 1958. Chapter 8, p. 157-165, by J. F. Smith, Patent searching. T175.S5.

Machinery's Handbook, 16th ed. N.Y., Industrial Press, 1959. p. 1526-1527. TJ151.M3 1959

Calvert, R. Patents (Patent law). In Encyclopedia of chemical technology, ed. by R. E. Kirk and D. F. Othmer. N.Y., Interscience Encyclopedia. Vol. 9, 1952, p. 868-890. TP9. E68

Hine, J. S. Physical organic chemistry. N.Y., McGraw-Hill, 1956. QD476.H5

Noyes, W. A., Jr. A climate for basic chemical research. In Chem. & Eng. News. 38(42): p. 91-95. Oct. 17, 1960. TP1-1418.

NOTE: In this citation, 38 is the volume number, 42 the issue number, and 91-95 the page numbers.

If the original publication is located outside the Office, the Examiner should immediately order a photocopy of at least the portion relied upon and indicate the class and subclass in which it will be filed. The Office action MUST designate this class and subclass. The Examiner must, in addition, state the place where the original publication may be found. For example, Whitrow, G. J. Berkeley's philosophy

of motion. *In* British Journal for the Philosophy of Science. 4(13): p37-45. May 1953. Q175.B787 Library of Congress.

Whenever in citing references in applications and in Form PO-98 (1302.12) the titles of periodicals are abbreviated, the abbreviations of titles used in Chemical Abstracts and printed in the list of periodicals abstracted by Chemical Abstracts should be adopted with the following exceptions: (1) the abbreviation for the *Berichte der deutschen chemischen Gesellschaft* should be *Ber. Deut. Chem.* rather than *Ber.*, and (2) where a country or city of origin is a necessary part of a complete identification, the country or city of origin should be added in parentheses, e.g., *J. Soc. Chem. Ind. (London)*. (Basis: Memorandum of Feb. 3, 1947.)

707.05(f) Effective Dates of Declassified Printed Matter

In using declassified material as references there are usually two pertinent dates to be considered, namely, the printing date and the publication date. The printing date in some instances will appear on the material and may be considered as that date when the material was prepared for limited distribution. The publication date is the date of release when the material was made available to the public.* If the date of release does not appear on the material, this date may be determined by reference to the Office of Technical Services, Commerce Department.

In the use of any of the above noted material as an anticipatory publication, the date of release following declassification is the effective date of publication within the meaning of the statute.

For the purpose of anticipation predicated upon prior knowledge under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) the above noted declassified material may be taken as *prima facie* evidence of such prior knowledge as of its printing date even though such material was classified at that time. When so used the material does not constitute an absolute statutory bar and its printing date may be antedated by an affidavit under Rule 131. (Basis: Notice of Feb. 24, 1947.)

*See *Ex parte Harris et al.*, 79 U.S.P.Q. 438.

707.05(g) Incorrect Citation of References

Whenever a reference has been incorrectly cited in any official paper forming part of an application file, and such citation has been correctly given in an ensuing Office action, the Examiner is directed to correct the error, in ink, in the paper in which the error appears,

and place his initials on the margin of such paper, together with a notation of the paper number of the action in which the citation has been correctly given.

Where a wrong citation of a patent has been made by the Examiner and this is evidenced by the submission of the purchased copy, it is customary as a matter of courtesy to mail the applicant a correct copy. The erroneous copy should be removed from the file and discarded. It should not be returned to Patent Copy Sales Branch. See also 710.06.

In any case otherwise ready for issue, in which the erroneous citation has not been formally corrected in an official paper, the Examiner is directed to correct the citation by way of an Examiner's Amendment. (Basis: Notice of May 13, 1948.)

If a FOREIGN patent is incorrectly cited; for example, the wrong country is indicated or the country omitted from the citation, the General Reference Branch of the Scientific Library may be helpful. The date and number of the patent are often sufficient to determine the correct country which granted the patent.

707.06 Citation of Decisions, Orders and Notices

In citing published decisions, both the C.D. and the O.G. citation should be given if the case is reported in these publications. The U.S., C.C.P.A., Federal Reporter or U.S.P.Q. citation should also be given when it is convenient to do so. (Basis: Order 3357.)

In citing a manuscript decision which is available to the public but which has not been published, the tribunal rendering the decision and complete data identifying the paper should be given. Thus, a decision of the Board of Appeals which has not been published but which is available to the public in the patented file should be cited, as "Ex parte ----, decision of the Board of Appeals, Patent No. -----, paper No, ----, ----- pages."

Decisions found only in patented files should be cited only when there is no published decision on the same point. Any such decision which is frequently cited should be called to the attention of the appropriate Director to determine if it would be advisable to have it published.

The citation of manuscript decisions which are not available to the public should be avoided. If an examiner believes that a particular manuscript decision not open to public inspection would be useful, he may, call it to the attention of the appropriate Director who

will determine whether steps should be taken to release it for publication. (Basis: Order 1370.)

When a Commissioner's Order, Notice or Memorandum is cited in any official action, the date of the order, notice or memorandum or the *Official Gazette* in which the same may be found should also be given. (Basis: Notice of Feb. 12, 1924.)

707.07 Completeness and Clarity

Rule 105. Completeness of examiner's action. The examiner's action will be complete as to all matters, except that in appropriate circumstances, such as misjoinder of invention, fundamental defects in the application, and the like, the action of the examiner may be limited to such matters before further action is made. However, matters of form need not be raised by the examiner until a claim is found allowable.

Whenever, upon examination, it is found that the terms or phrases of modes of characterization used to describe the invention are not sufficiently consonant with the art to which the invention pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to enable the examiner to make the examination specified in Rule 104, the examiner should make a reasonable search of the invention so far as it can be understood from the disclosure. The action of the examiner may be limited to a citation of what appears to be the most pertinent prior art found and a request that applicant correlate the terminology of his specification with art-accepted terminology before further action is made.

A suitable form for this action is as follows:

"A preliminary examination of this application indicates that the following terminology (or properties or units of test data, etc) . . . which appear(s) at page(s) . . . of the specification is (are) so different from those generally accepted in the art to which this invention pertains that it is difficult or impossible to make a reliable search.

Applicant is therefore requested to provide a sufficient elucidation of these terms (or properties or test data) or correlation thereof with art-accepted terminology so that a proper comparison with the prior art can be made.

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE (date)." (Basis: Notice of March 28, 1962.)

707.07(a) Action on Formal Matters

In every instance requirements to correct informalities noted on Form PO-152 (pink slip) by the Head of the Application Branch and

Draftsman's criticisms of the drawings should be made in the first letter.

Every action on the merits should be complete and thorough as to the merits. (Basis: Order 5267.) See 714.02.

707.07(b) Requiring New Oath

See 602.02.

707.07(c) Draftsman's Requirement

The Examiner should embody the Draftsman's criticism of the drawing in his first letter to the applicant, clearly indicating whether a new drawing is required. He should also state that correction as indicated or submission of the new drawing may be deferred pending the allowance of a claim. See also 608.02(a), 608.02(e), 608.02(s).

707.07(d) Language To Be Used In Rejecting Claims

Where a claim is refused for any reason relating to the merits thereof it should be "rejected" and the ground of rejection fully and clearly stated, and the word "reject" must be used. If the claim is rejected as too broad, the reason for so holding should be given; if rejected as indefinite the Examiner should point out wherein the indefiniteness resides; or if rejected as incomplete, the element or elements lacking should be specified, or the applicant be otherwise advised as to what the claim requires to render it complete.

In general, the most usual ground of rejection is based on prior art under either 35 U.S.C. 102 or 35 U.S.C. 103 and, ordinarily a statement of the statutory basis by express reference to a section of 35 U.S.C. would be appropriate.

35 U.S.C. 102 (ANTICIPATION OR LACK OF NOVELTY)

The distinction between rejections based on 35 U.S.C. 102 and those based on 35 U.S.C. 103 should be kept in mind. Under the former, the claim is "fully met by", "fully anticipated by" or is "readable on" the reference. No question of obviousness is present. It may be advisable to identify a particular part of the reference to support the rejection. If not it may be said that the claim is "obviously fully met by", the reference; or some similar expression may be employed.

35 U.S.C. 103 (OBVIOUSNESS)

In contrast, 35 U.S.C. 103 authorizes a rejection where to meet the claim, it is necessary to

modify a single reference or to combine it with one or more others. Pointing out what modification or combination of features of the reference(s) would be required and that it would be "obvious in the sense of 35 U.S.C. 103" to do so helps to make the Examiner's position clear. The quoted language is no more than a statement of a conclusion. Reasons should be given for arriving at the conclusion.

Everything of a personal nature must be avoided. Whatever may be the Examiner's view as to the utter lack of patentable merit in the disclosure of the application examined, he should not express in the record the opinion that the application is, or appears to be, devoid of patentable subject matter. Nor should he express doubts as to the allowability of allowed claims or state that every doubt has been resolved in favor of the applicant in granting him the claims allowed.

Under current policy which imposes an obligation on the Examiner to direct attention to allowable subject matter in the application and suggest amendments which would make rejected claims allowable, the absence of such suggestions from a letter rejecting all claims may imply that the Examiner, at the time, recognized no patentable subject matter in the entire disclosure.

IMPROPER REJECTIONS

An omnibus rejection of the claim "on the references and for the reasons of record" is stereotyped and usually not informative and should therefore be avoided. This is especially true where certain claims have been rejected on one ground and other claims on another ground.

A plurality of claims should never be grouped together in a common rejection, unless that rejection is equally applicable to all claims in the group.

Cumulative (multiple) or "pyramid" rejections should ordinarily be avoided, the best references only being used.

707.07(e) Note All Outstanding Requirements

In taking up an amended case for action the Examiner should note in every letter all the requirements outstanding against the case. Every point in the prior action of an Examiner which is still applicable must be repeated or referred to, to prevent the implied waiver of the requirement.

As soon as allowable subject matter is found, correction of all informalities then present should be *required*.

707.07(f) Answer All Material Traversed

Where the requirements are traversed, or suspension thereof requested, the Examiner should make proper reference thereto in his action on the amendment.

Where the applicant traverses any rejection, the Examiner should, if he repeats the rejection, take note of the applicant's argument and answer the substance of it.

If a rejection of record is to be applied to a new or amended claim, specific identification of that ground of rejection, as by citation of the paragraph in the former Office letter in which the rejection was originally stated, should be given.

ANSWERING ASSERTED ADVANTAGES

After an Office action, the response (in addition to making amendments, etc.) may frequently include arguments and affidavits to the effect that the prior art cited by the Examiner does not teach how to obtain or does not inherently yield one or more advantages (new or improved results, functions or effects), which advantages are urged to warrant issue of a patent on the allegedly novel subject matter claimed.

If it is the Examiner's considered opinion that the asserted advantages are without significance in determining patentability of the rejected claims, he should state the reasons for his position in the record, preferably in the action following the assertion or argument relative to such advantages. By so doing the Applicant will know that the asserted advantages have actually been considered by the Examiner and, if appeal is taken, the Board of Appeals will also be advised.

The importance of answering such arguments is illustrated by *In re Herrmann et al.*, 1959 C.D. 159; 739 O.G. 549 where the applicant urged that the subject matter claimed produced new and useful results. The court noted that since Applicants' statement of advantages was not questioned by the Examiner or the Board of Appeals, it was constrained to accept the statement at face value and therefore found certain claims to be allowable. (Basis: Notice of October 27, 1959.)

707.07(g) Piecemeal Execution

Piecemeal examination of prosecution should be avoided as much as possible. The Examiner ordinarily should reject each claim on all valid grounds available, avoiding, however, undue multiplication of references. (See 904.02.)

Moreover, when there exists a sound rejection on the basis of prior art which discloses the "heart" of the alleged invention (as distinguished from prior art which merely meets the terms of the claim), secondary rejections on technical grounds ordinarily should not be made. Where a major technical rejection is proper (e.g., aggregation, lack of proper disclosure, undue breadth), such rejection should be stated with a full development of the reasons rather than by a mere conclusion coupled with some stereotyped expression. Certain technical rejections (e.g. negative limitations, indefiniteness) should not be made where the examiner, recognizing the limitations of the English language, is not aware of an improved mode of definition.

707.07(h) Notify of Inaccuracies in Amendment

See 714.23.

707.07(i) Each Claim To Be Mentioned in Each Letter

In every letter each claim should be mentioned by number, and its treatment or status given. Since a claim retains its original numeral throughout the prosecution of the case, its history through successive actions is thus easily traceable. Each action should conclude with a summary of rejected, allowed and cancelled claims.

Claims retained under Rule 142 and claims retained under Rule 146 should be treated as set out in 821 to 821.03 and 809.02(a).

See 1109.02 for treatment of claims in the application of losing party in interference.

The Index of Claims should be kept up to date as set forth in 717.04.

707.07(j) State When Claims Are Allowable

ALLOWABLE EXCEPT AS TO FORM

When an application discloses patentable subject matter and it is apparent from the claims and the Applicant's arguments that the claims are intended to be directed to such patentable subject matter, but the claims in their present form cannot be allowed because

of defects in form or omission of a limitation, the Examiner should not stop with a bare objection or rejection of the claims. The Examiner's action should be constructive in nature and when possible he should offer a definite suggestion for correction. Further, an Examiner's suggestion of allowable subject matter may justify his indicating the possible desirability of an interview to accelerate early agreement on allowable claims.

If the Examiner is satisfied after the search has been completed that patentable subject matter has been disclosed and the record indicates that the Applicant intends to claim such subject matter, he may note in the Office action that certain aspects or features of the patentable invention have not been claimed and that if properly claimed such claims may be given favorable consideration.

If a claim is otherwise allowable but is dependent on a cancelled claim or on a rejected claim, the Office action should state that the claim would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

EARLY ALLOWANCE OF CLAIMS

Where the Examiner is satisfied that the prior art has been fully developed and some of the claims are clearly allowable, he should not delay the allowance of such claims. The practice of some Examiners of never allowing a claim in the early actions, when the aforementioned conditions exist, is a handicap to attorneys or agents. An early allowance of some claims is more conducive to a compromise or cancellation of rejected claims. Such practice is also a hardship on the inventor in his attempts to negotiate for the exploitation of his invention.

707.07(k) Numbering Paragraphs

It is good practice to number the paragraphs of the letter consecutively. This facilitates their identification in the future prosecution of the case.

707.08 Reviewing and Initialing by Assistant Examiner

The typed Office action is compared with the rough draft by the Assistant Examiner and the original copy initialed when satisfactory.

707.09 Signing by Primary or Other Authorized Examiner

In each Examiner's letter, the word "Examiner" without the number of the Division, should appear at the end on both the original and carbon copies, the original only being signed. (Basis: Order 2938.)

707.10 Entry

After the original copy has been signed by the Primary Examiner, the typist places it in the file wrapper and enters in black on the outside of the wrapper, under "Contents", the character of the action.

707.11 Date

Since the period for response begins to run from the date of mailing of the Examiner's action, the date should not be typed when the letter is written, but should be stamped on all copies of the letter after it has been signed by the Examiner and the carbon copies are about to be mailed.

707.12 Mailing

The carbon copies are mailed after the original, initialed by the Assistant and signed by the Primary Examiner, has been placed in the file.

707.13 Returned Office Action

Letters are sometimes returned to the Office because the Post Office has not been able to deliver them. The Examiner should use every reasonable means to ascertain the correct address and forward the letter again, after stamping it "remailed" with the date thereof and redirecting it if there be any reason to believe that the letter would reach applicant at such new address. If the Office letter was addressed to an attorney, a letter may be written to the inventor or assignee informing him of the returned letter. The six months running against the application begins with the date of remailing. (Ex parte Gourtoff, 1924 C.D. 153; 329 O.G. 536.)

If the Office is not finally successful in delivering the letter, it is placed, with the envelope, in the file wrapper. If six months elapse from the remailing with no communication from applicant, the case is forwarded to the Abandoned Files Unit.

708 Order of Examination

Rule 101. Order of examination. (a) Applications filed in the Patent Office and accepted as complete applications (rules 53 and 55) are assigned for examination to the respective examining divisions having the classes of inventions to which the applications relate. Applications shall be taken up for examination by the examiner to whom they have been assigned in the order in which they have been filed.

(b) Applications which have been acted upon by the Examiner, and which have been placed by the applicant in condition for further action by the Examiner (amended applications) shall be taken up for action in such order as shall be determined by the Commissioner.

Effective July 1, 1964, each Examiner will give priority to that application in his docket, whether amended or new, which has the oldest effective U.S. filing date. Except as rare circumstances may justify Group Supervisors in granting individual exceptions, this basic policy applies to all applications.

Whether a given application has an effective U.S. filing date earlier than its actual filing date is determined by whether the disclosure of a parent case adequately supports any claim or claims of the later case. Examiners are responsible for making this determination. If at any time an Examiner determines that the "effective filing date" status of any application differs from what the records show, he should so inform the Clerk of Group, who should promptly amend the records to show the correct status, with the date of correction.

The new order of examination for each Examiner will continue top priority for those special cases having a fixed 60-day due date, such as Examiner's Answers and Decisions on Motions. Most other cases still remaining in the "special" category (for example, reissues, interference cases, cases made special by petition, cases ready for final conclusion, etc.) will continue in this category, with the first effective U.S. filing date among them normally controlling priority.

708.01 List of Special Cases

Rule 102. (a) Advancement of examination. Applications will not be advanced out of turn for examination or for further action except as provided by these rules, or upon order of the Commissioner to expedite the business of the Office, or upon a verified showing which, in the opinion of the Commissioner, will justify so advancing it.

(b) Applications wherein the inventions are deemed of peculiar importance to some branch of the public service and the head of some department of the Government requests immediate action for that reason, may be advanced for examination.

Certain procedures by the Examiners take precedence over actions even on special cases.

For example, all papers typed and ready for signature should be completed and mailed.

All issue cases returned with a "Printer Waiting" slip must be processed and returned within the period indicated.

Cases in which practice requires that the Examiner act within 60 days, such as decisions on motion (1105.06) and Examiner's answers (1208), necessarily take priority over special cases without specific time limits. Such cases should be taken up for action at least 30 days before the 60-day period expires, to guarantee completion within the 60-day limit. (Basis: Notice of March 29, 1963.)

If an Examiner has a case which he is satisfied is in condition for allowance, or which he is satisfied will have to be finally rejected, he should give such action forthwith instead of making the case await its turn. (Basis: Order 3084.)

The following is a list of special cases (those which are advanced out of turn for examination):

(a) Applications wherein the inventions are deemed of peculiar importance to some branch of the public service and when for that reason the head of some department of the Government requests immediate action and the Commissioner so orders (Rule 102).

(b) Cases made special as a result of a petition. (See 708.02.)

Subject alone to diligent prosecution by the applicant, an application for patent that has once been made special and advanced out of turn for examination by reason of a ruling made in that particular case (by the Commissioner or an Assistant Commissioner) will continue to be special throughout its entire course of prosecution in the Patent Office, including appeal, if any, to the Board of Appeals; and any interference in which such an application becomes involved shall, in like measure, be considered special by all Patent Office officials concerned. (Basis: Notice of Dec. 3, 1954.)

(c) Applications for reissues (Rule 176).

(d) Cases remanded by an appellate tribunal for further action.

(f) Applications which appear to interfere with other applications previously considered and found to be allowable, or which it is demanded shall be placed in interference with an unexpired patent or patents (Rule 201).

(g) Cases ready for allowance, or ready for allowance except as to formal matters. (See Order 3084 above, and Order 5267 in 710.02 (b).)

(h) Cases which are in condition for final rejection. (See Order 3084 above.)

(i) Cases pending more than five years, including those which, by relation to a prior United States application, have an effective pendency of more than five years. See 707.02 (a) and 710.02(b), item (d).

See also 714.13 and 1207.

708.02 Petition to Make Special

MANUFACTURE OR INFRINGEMENT

Petitions to make special may be based on the grounds of prospective manufacture or actual infringement (as explained in Form PO-94) or the inability of the applicant to interest capital due to the lack of a patent or of an Office action indicating patentable subject matter.

AGE OR ILL HEALTH

Petitions to make special may be based on a verified showing that the age (65 or older) or state of health of the applicant is such that he might not be available to assist in the prosecution of the application, if it were to run its normal course, or be alive at the time of the grant to derive any benefit from his patent.

CONTINUING APPLICATION

Petitions to make special a continuing application may be based on an allegation that the application contains only claims which have been held allowable in the parent case or claims differing therefrom only in matters of form or by immaterial terminology. The Examiner is requested to make a report stating whether the allegation in the petition is correct and including a list of the references over which the claims were allowed, unless such references have been listed in the petition. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, the claims in the application do not qualify it for special status as above noted, but he is able to determine from inspection that the application is allowable in matters of substance or that the claims are otherwise such as would, by reason of the previous prosecution, be clearly subject to immediate final action, he should report the fact. (Basis: Notice of July 25, 1938, and Notice of November 7, 1955, 700 O.G. 567.)

Beginning August 1, 1961, each petition to make special, regardless of the ground upon

which the petition is based and the nature of the decision is placed of record in the application file, together with the decision thereon. The petition and the decision will be entered in the application by the Office where the petition is ruled on. The petition, together with any attached papers and supporting affidavits, will be given a single paper number and entered by that number in the "Contents" of the file. The decision will be accorded a separate paper number and so entered in the "Contents" of the file.

In order to insure entries in the "Contents" of the application file in proper order, the clerk in the examining group will be expected to make certain that all papers prior to a petition have been entered in the application file before forwarding it for consideration. (Basis: Notice of July 25, 1961.)

708.03 Examiner Tenders His Resignation

Whenever an Examiner tenders his resignation, the Primary Examiner should see that he spends his remaining time as far as possible in winding up the old complicated cases or those with involved records and getting as many of his amended cases as possible ready for final disposition. (Basis: Order 3084.)

If the Examiner has considerable experience in his particular art, it is also advantageous to the Office if he indicates (in pencil) in the file wrappers of new cases on his desk, the field of search that he considers appropriate.

709 Suspension of Action

Rule 103. Suspension of action. (a) Suspension of action by the Office will be granted at the request of the applicant for good and sufficient cause and for a reasonable time specified. Only one [such] suspension may be granted by the primary examiner; any further suspension must be approved by the Commissioner.

(b) If action on an application is suspended when not requested by the applicant, the applicant shall be notified of the reasons therefor.

Action by the examiner may be suspended by order of the Commissioner in the case of applications owned by the United States whenever publication of the invention by the granting of a patent thereon might be detrimental to the public safety or defense, at the request of the appropriate department or agency.

Suspension of action (Rule 103) should not be confused with extension of time for reply

(Rule 136). It is to be noted that a suspension of action applies to an impending Office action by the examiner whereas an extension of time for reply applies to action by the applicant.

The second paragraph of the Rule provides for a suspension of Office action by the examiner on his own initiative, as in Secs. 709.01 and 1101.01(i).

709.01 Overlapping Applications by Same Applicant or Owned by Same Assignee

Examiners should not consider *ex parte*, when raised by an applicant, questions which are pending before the Office in *inter partes* proceedings involving the same applicant or party of interest. (See *ex parte* Jones, 1924 C.D. 59; 327 O.G. 681.)

Because of this where one of several applications of the same inventor or assignee which contain overlapping claims gets into an interference it was formerly the practice to suspend action by the Office on the other applications in accordance with *Ex Parte* McCormick, 1904 C.D. 575; 113 O.G. 2508.

Now, partly in view of *In re* Seebach, 1937 C.D. 495; 484 O.G. 503 the prosecution of all the cases not in the interference is required to be carried as far as possible, by treating as prior art the counts of the interference and by rejections forcing the drawing of proper lines of division. See 1111.03.

709.02 Actions Following Correspondence Under Rule 202

See 1101.01(i).

710 Period for Response

See Chapter 1200 for period for response when appeal is taken or court review sought.

710.01 Statutory Period

Extract from Rule 135. (a) If an applicant fails to prosecute his application within six months after the date when the last official notice of any action by the Office was mailed to him, or within such shorter time as may be fixed (rule 136), the application will become abandoned.

The normal statutory period for response to an Office action is six months. 35 U.S.C. 133.

710.01(a) Statutory Period, How Computed

The period is computed from the day of the mailing of the Office action to the date of receipt by the Office of applicant's response. No cognizance is taken of fractions of a day and applicant's response is due on the corresponding day of the month six months after the Office action.

Response to an Office action dated August 30, is due on the following February 28 (or 29 if it is a leap year), while a response to an Office action dated February 28 is due on August 28 and not on the last day of August. *Ex parte Messick*, 1930 C.D. 6; 400 O.G. 3.

The date of receipt of a response to an Office action is given by the "Office date" stamp which appears on the responding paper. See 505.

In some cases the Examiner's letter does not determine the beginning of a statutory response period. For example, the Examiner may write a letter adhering to a final rejection, in which case the statutory response period running from the date of the final rejection is not disturbed. In all cases where the statutory response period runs from the date of a previous action, a statement to that effect should be included at the end of the letter.

710.02 Shortened Statutory Period and Time Limit Actions

Under Rule 136 (35 U.S.C. 133) an applicant does not always have six months within which to respond to an Office action. He may be required to respond in a shorter period, not less than 30 days, whenever it is deemed "necessary or expedient". Some conditions deemed "necessary or expedient" are listed in Section 710.02(b).

In other situations, for example, the rejection of a copied patent claim, the Examiner may require applicant to respond on or before a specified date. These are known as time limit actions. The time limit requirement should be typed in capital letters.

Care should be exercised to set a date which is not a Saturday, Sunday or holiday.

Furthermore, the legend "SHORTENED TIME FOR REPLY" is stamped on the *first page* of every action, *including all carbon copies* in which a shortened time for reply has been set. This legend is applied preferably just under the date stamp so prominently that a person looking merely for the mailing date

of the action and not reading the action as a whole cannot reasonably avoid seeing the legend. (Basis: Notice of November 22, 1941.)

710.02(b) Shortened Statutory Period: Situations in Which Used

From time to time the Commissioner adds to or removes from the list of types of actions calling for a shortened statutory period. In general where the prosecution has obviously been dilatory, or where the circumstances are such that the public interest requires the prosecution to be promptly closed, a shortened statutory period may be set.

Some specific cases are:

(a) When an application is in condition for allowance, except as to matters of form, such as correction of drawings or specification, a new oath, etc., the case will be considered special and prompt action taken to require correction of formal matters. Such action should include a statement that prosecution on the merits is closed in accordance with the decision in *ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213, and should conclude with the setting of a shortened statutory period for (two months) response. (Basis: Order 5267.) Shortened period for signing and returning drawing prepared by Patent Office. See 608.02(x).

(b) When a prompt issue as a patent is desired to avoid futile interference proceedings, as where the junior party fails to overcome the senior party's filing date under Rule 202, a shortened period for response by the senior party may be set. See 1101.01(i).

(c) Where, after the termination of an interference proceeding, the application of the winning party contains an unanswered office action, final rejection or any other action, the Primary Examiner notifies the applicant of this fact. In this case response to the Office action is required within a shortened statutory period (two months) running from the date of such notice. See *Ex parte Peterson*, 1941 C.D. 8; 525 O.G. 3. (Basis: Notice of April 14, 1941.)

(d) When a case has been pending for five years, in order to expedite termination of the prosecution. This also applies to any case which by relation to a prior application has an effective pendency of more than five years. (Basis: Memorandum of September 14, 1951.)

(e) In any action requiring restriction which action does not include a rejection of any claim.

(f) When multiplicity is the only ground of rejection relied upon.

A shortened statutory period may not be less than 30 days. (Basis: Notice of July 23, 1964.)

710.02(c) Nonstatutory Time-Limit: Situations in Which Used

(a) Rule 203 provides that in suggesting claims for interference:

The parties to whom the claims are suggested will be required to make those claims (i. e., present the suggested claims in their applications by amendment) within a specified time, not less than 30 days, in order that an interference may be declared.

See 1101.01 (j), and 1101.01(m).

(b) Rule 206 provides:

Where claims are copied from a patent and the examiner is of the opinion . . . that none of the claims can be made, he shall state in his action why the applicant cannot make the claims and set a time limit, not less than 30 days, for reply. If, after response by the applicant, the rejection is made final, a similar time limit shall be set for appeal.

See 1101.02(f).

(c) When applicant's action is not fully responsive to the Office action, the Examiner may give applicant one month to complete his response. See third paragraph of Rule 135 which reads as follows:

When action by the applicant is a bona fide attempt to advance the case to final action, and is substantially a complete response to the examiner's action, but consideration of some matter or compliance with some requirement has been inadvertently omitted, opportunity to explain and supply the omission may be given before the question of abandonment is considered.

See 714.03.

710.02(d) Difference Between Shortened Statutory and Time-Limit Periods

The distinction between a limited time for reply and a shortened statutory period under Rule 136 should not be lost sight of. The penalty attaching to failure to reply within the time limit (from the suggestion of claims or the rejection of copied patent claims) is loss of the subject matter involved on the doctrine of disclaimer. A rejection on the ground of disclaimer is appealable. On the other hand, a

complete failure to respond within the set statutory period results in abandonment of the entire application. This is not appealable, but a petition to revive may be granted if the delay was unavoidable. Further, where applicant responds a day or two after the time limit, this may be excused by the Examiner if satisfactorily explained; but a response one day late in a case carrying a shortened statutory period under Rule 136, no matter what the excuse, results in abandonment; however, if asked for in advance extension of the period may be granted by the Examiner, provided the extension does not go beyond the six months' period from the date of the Office action. See also 1101.02(f).

710.02(e) Extension of Time

Extract from Rule 136. (b) The time for reply, when a time less than six months has been set, will be extended only for good and sufficient cause, and for a reasonable time specified. Any request for such extension must be filed on or before the day on which action by the applicant is due, but in no case will the mere filing of the request effect any extension. Only one extension may be granted by the primary examiner in his discretion; any further extension must be approved by the Commissioner. In no case can any extension carry the date on which response to an action is due beyond six months from the date of the action.

It should be very carefully noted that neither the Primary Examiner nor the Commissioner has authority to extend the shortened statutory period unless request for the extension is filed on or before the day on which applicant's action is due. While the shortened period may be extended within the limits of the statutory six months' period, no extension can operate to extend the time beyond the six months.

Compare, however, Rule 135(c) and 714.03.

710.03 Three Year Period, Certain Government Owned Cases

35 U.S.C. 267. Time for taking action in Government applications. Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 133 and 151 of this title, the Commissioner may extend the time for taking any action to three years, when an application has become the property of the United States and the head of the appropriate department or agency of the Government has certified to the Commissioner that the invention disclosed therein is important to the armament or defense of the United States.

710.04 Two Periods Running

There sometimes arises a situation where two different periods for response are running against an application, the one limited by the regular statutory period, the other by the limited period set in a subsequent Office action. The running of the first period is not suspended nor affected by an *ex parte* limited time action or even by an appeal therefrom. For an exception, involving suggested claims, see 1101.01(n).

710.04(a) Copying Patent Claims

Where in an application in which there is an unanswered rejection of record, claims are copied from a patent and all of these claims are rejected there results a situation where two different periods for response are running against the application. One period, the first, is the regular statutory period of the unanswered rejection of record, the other period is the limited period set for response to the rejection (either first or final), established under Rule 206. The date of the last unanswered Office action on the claims other than the copied patent claims is the controlling date of the statutory period. (Ex parte Milton, 164 Ms. D. 1, 63 USPQ 132 and Ex parte Nelson, 164 Ms. D. 361, 26 J.P.O.S. 564.) See also 1101.02(f).

710.05 Period Ending on Saturday, Sunday or Holiday

Rule 7. Times for taking action; expiration on Saturday, Sunday, or holiday. Whenever periods of time are specified in these rules in days, calendar days are intended. When the day, or the last day, fixed by statute or by or under these rules for taking any action or paying any fee in the Patent Office falls on Saturday, Sunday, or on a holiday within the District of Columbia, the action may be taken, or the fee paid, on the next succeeding day which is not a Saturday, Sunday, or a holiday. See rule 304 for time for appeal or for commencing civil action.

The holidays in the District of Columbia are: New Year's Day, January 1; Washington's Birthday, February 22; Memorial Day, May 30; Independence Day, July 4; Labor Day (first Monday in September); Veterans' Day, November 11; Thanksgiving Day (fourth Thursday in November); Christmas Day, December 25; Inauguration Day (January 20, every four years). Whenever a holiday falls on a Sunday, the following day (Monday) is also a holiday. Ex. Order 10,358; 17 F.R. 5269.

When a holiday falls on a Saturday, any ac-

tion or fee due on the preceding day (Friday) must be filed on that day even though, by reason of Public Law 86-362, the Patent Office is closed. (Basis: Notice of February 7, 1964.)

When an amendment is filed a day or two later than the expiration of the period fixed by statute, care should be taken to ascertain whether the last day of that period was Saturday, Sunday or a holiday in the District of Columbia, and if so, whether the amendment was filed or the fee paid on the next succeeding day which is not a Saturday, Sunday or a holiday.

An amendment received on such succeeding day which was due on Saturday, Sunday or a holiday is endorsed on the file wrapper with the date of receipt. The Saturday, Sunday and/or holiday is also indicated.

710.06 Miscellaneous Factors Determining Date

Where the citation of a reference relied upon for a rejection is incorrect and this error is called to the attention of the Office before the expiration of the period for response, a new period for response starts from the date of the Office letter giving the correct citation. The previous period is restarted regardless of the time remaining. See 707.05(g) for the manner of correcting the record where there has been an erroneous citation. (Basis: Notice of April 29, 1959, Revised.)

Where for any reason it becomes necessary to re-mail any action (707.13), the action should be correspondingly redated, as it is the re-mailing date that establishes the beginning of the six months period. *Ex parte Gourtoff*, 1924 C.D. 153; 329 O.G. 536.

A supplementary action after a rejection explaining the references more explicitly or giving the reasons more fully, even though no further references are cited, establishes a new date from which the statutory period runs.

If for any other reason an Office action is defective in some matter necessary for a proper response applicant's time to respond begins with the date of correction of such defect. An example is an action rejecting a claim on a reference which is not cited at all nor already of record.

711 Abandonment

Rule 135. Abandonment for failure to respond within time limit. (a) If an applicant fails to prosecute his application within six months after the date when the last official notice of any action by the Office was mailed to him, or within such shorter time as may be fixed (rule 136), the application will become abandoned.

(b) Prosecution of an application to save it from abandonment must include such complete and proper action as the condition of the case may require. The admission of an amendment not responsive to the last official action, or refusal to admit the same, and any proceedings relative thereto, shall not operate to save the application from abandonment.

(c) When action by the applicant is a bona fide attempt to advance the case to final action, and is substantially a complete response to the examiner's action, but consideration of some matter or compliance with some requirement has been inadvertently omitted, opportunity to explain and supply the omission may be given before the question of abandonment is considered.

(d) Prompt ratification or filing of a correctly signed copy may be accepted in case of an unsigned or improperly signed paper.

(See rule 7.)

Rule 138. Express abandonment. An application may be expressly abandoned by filing in the Patent Office a written declaration of abandonment, signed by the applicant himself and the assignee of record, if any, and identifying the application.

Abandonment may be either of the invention or of an application. This discussion is concerned with abandonment of the application for patent.

An abandoned application is one which is removed from the Office docket of pending cases through:

1. formal abandonment by the applicant himself (acquiesced in by the assignee if there be one), or through

2. failure of applicant to take appropriate action within a specified time at some stage in the prosecution of the case.

But see 608.02(1).

711.01 Express or Formal Abandonment

Applications may be expressly abandoned as provided for in Rule 138. When a letter expressly abandoning an application (not in issue) is received, the Examiner should acknowledge receipt thereof, indicate whether it does or does not comply with the requirements of Rule 138, and if it does comply, state that the application is abandoned and that it is being sent to the Abandoned Files Unit. However, in the case of an application in issue, express abandonments which are received before the final fee is paid are acknowledged by the Head of the Issue and Gazette Branch; in those cases where the final fee has been paid and the patent to be issued has received its date and number, express abandonments must be approved by the Commissioner, and under these circumstances, approval depends upon a

showing of sufficient cause for waiting so long before deciding to abandon the application.

In view of the doctrine set forth in *Ex parte Lasscell*, 1884 C.D. 66; 29 O.G. 861, an amendment canceling all of the claims, even though said amendment is signed by the applicant himself and the assignee, is not an express abandonment. Such an amendment is regarded as non-responsive and should not be entered, and applicant should be notified as explained in 714.03, 714.05. But see 608.02(1) for situation where application is abandoned along with transfer of drawings to a new application.

711.02 Failure To Take Required Action During Time Period

Rule 135 specifies that an application becomes abandoned if applicant "fails to prosecute" his application within the fixed statutory period. This failure may result either from

1. failure to respond within the statutory period, or

2. insufficiency of response, i.e., failure to take "complete and proper action, as the condition of the case may require" within the statutory period (Rule 135).

Abandonment by entire failure to respond presents no problems.

Nor is there ordinarily any particular difficulty when an amendment reaches the Office (not the division) after the expiration of the statutory period. The case is abandoned and the remedy is to petition to revive it. The Examiner should notify the applicant or attorney at once that the application has been abandoned. The late amendment is endorsed on the file wrapper but not formally entered. (See 714.17.)

To pass on questions of abandonment, it is essential that the Examiner know the dates that mark the beginning and end of the statutory period under varying situations. The *ex parte* prosecution before the Examiner presents few departures from the ordinary type in which the applicant's response must reach the Office within six months from the mailing date of the Office letter, or not later than the date set as ending the shortened period for reply. (See 710 to 710.06.)

711.02(a) Insufficiency of Response

Abandonment may result in a situation where applicant's reply is within the statutory period but is not fully responsive to the Office action. But see 710.02(c), par. (c). See also 714.02 to 714.04.

711.02(b) Special Situations Involving Abandonment

The following situations involving questions of abandonment often arise, and should be specially noted:

1. Copying claims from a patent when not suggested by the Patent Office does not constitute a response to the last Office action and will not save the case from abandonment, unless the last Office action relied solely on the patent for the rejection of all the claims rejected in that action.

2. A case may become abandoned through withdrawal of, or failure to prosecute, an appeal to the Board of Appeals. See 1215.01 to 1215.04.

3. Likewise it may become abandoned through dismissal of appeal to C.C.P.A. or civil action, where there was not filed prior to such dismissal an amendment putting the case in condition for issue or fully responsive to the Board's decision. Failure to perfect an appeal as required by CCPA Rule 25. See 1215.05 and 1216.01.

4. Where claims are suggested for interference near the end of the statutory period running against the case, see 1101.01(n).

5. When drawings are transferred under Rule 88. See 608.02(1).

6. When a portion of an application (an "abbreviature") is published in the Official Gazette.

711.02(c) Termination of Proceedings

"Termination of proceedings" is an expression found in 35 U.S.C. 120. As there stated, a second application is considered to be co-pending with an earlier case if it is filed before (a) the patenting, (b) the abandonment of, or (c) other termination of proceedings in the earlier case. "Before" has consistently been interpreted, in this context, to mean "not later than".

In each of the following situations, proceedings are terminated:

1. When the final fee is not paid and the application is forfeited, proceedings are terminated as of the date the final fee was due and the application is the same as if it were abandoned on that date (but if the final fee is later accepted, on petition, the application is in a sense revived).

2. If an application is in interference involving all the claims present in the application as counts and the application loses the interference as to all the claims, then proceedings on that application are terminated as of the date

appeal or review by civil action was due if no appeal or civic action was filed.

3. Proceedings are terminated in an application after decision by the Board of Appeals as explained in Section 1214.06.

4. Proceedings are terminated after a decision by the court as explained in Sections 1215.05 and 1216.01.

711.03 Reconsideration of Holding of Abandonment; Revival

When advised of the abandonment of his application, applicant may either ask for reconsideration of such holding, if he disagrees with it; or petition for revival if he acquiesces with the holding.

711.03(a) Holding Based on Insufficiency of Response

Applicant may deny that his response was incomplete.

While the Examiner has no authority to act upon an application in which no action by applicant was taken during the statutory period, he may reverse his holding as to whether or not an amendment received during such period was responsive and act on a case of such character which he has previously held abandoned. This is not a revival of an abandoned application but merely a holding that the case was never abandoned. See also 714.03.

711.03(b) Holding Based on Failure To Respond Within Period

When an amendment reaches the Patent Office (not the Examining Group) after the expiration of the statutory period and there is no dispute as to the dates involved, no question of reconsideration of a holding of abandonment can be presented.

However, the Examiner and the applicant may disagree as to the date on which the statutory period commenced to run or ends. In this situation, as in the situation involving sufficiency of response, the applicant may take issue with the examiner and point out to him that his holding was erroneous.

711.03(c) Petitions Relating to Abandonment

Rule 137. Revival of abandoned application. An application abandoned for failure to prosecute may be revived as a pending application if it is shown to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the delay was

unavoidable. A petition to revive an abandoned application must be accompanied by a verified showing of the causes of the delay, by the proposed response unless it has been previously filed, and by the petition fee.

A petition to revive an abandoned application should not be confused with a petition from an Examiner's holding of abandonment. Abandonment may result not only from insufficiency of response but also from entire failure to respond, within the statutory period following an office action.

Where the holding of abandonment is predicated on the insufficiency of the response, or disagreement as to controlling dates the petition from such holding comes under Rule 181 and does not require a fee.

Where the applicant acquiesces in the holding of abandonment, or where the petition from such holding is denied, applicant's only recourse, so far as concerns the particular case involved, is by petition to revive.

711.03(d) Examiner's Statement on Petition Relating to Abandonment

ON PETITION TO REVIVE

Effective immediately, no answer will be prepared by the Examiner to a petition to revive, except by filling out the form which will accompany the application when it is forwarded to him for a report. No communication will be sent to the applicant by the Examiner and no credit will be given for an action. (Basis: Notice of December 14, 1961.)

ON PETITION TO SET ASIDE EXAMINER'S HOLDING

Rule 181 states that the Examiner "may be directed by the Commissioner to furnish a written statement within a specified time setting forth the reasons for his decision upon the matters averred in the petition, supplying a copy thereof to the petitioner". Often, however, the question is passed upon without a statement being requested, if the issue raised is clear from the record. Unless requested, such a statement should not be prepared. See 1002.01.

711.04 Disposition of Abandoned Applications

Extract from Rule 14. Abandoned applications may be destroyed after twenty years from their filing date,

except those to which particular attention has been called and which have been marked for preservation. Abandoned applications will not be returned.

As explained in 1302.07, a retention label is used to indicate applications not to be destroyed.

711.04(a) Pulling and Forwarding

Once each month, the files and drawings of such applications as have become abandoned during the *preceding* month are pulled and forwarded to the Abandoned Files Unit.

They should be carefully scrutinized by the appropriate assistant examiner to verify that they are actually abandoned. A check should be made of files containing a decision of the Board of Appeals for the presence of allowed claims to avoid their being erroneously sent to the Abandoned Files Unit.

711.04(b) Ordering Abandoned Files

Abandoned files may be ordered by sending (through the Messenger Service) a completed Form PO-125 to the Abandoned Files Unit which is no longer located in the Department of Commerce building. The name and group of the individual Examiner ordering the file should appear on the form and the file will be sent to him through the Messenger Service.

Abandoned files more than ten years old which have not been marked for permanent retention are stored in a nearby Federal Records Center. Orders for files in this group require at least two days for processing. The file should be returned promptly when it is no longer needed.

EXPEDITED SERVICE

By dialing Extension 2597, service may be expedited.

711.05 Letter of Abandonment Received After Application Is Allowed

Receipt of a letter of abandonment while an application is allowed, is acknowledged by the Issue and Gazette Branch. When the final fee has been paid and the patent to issue has received its date and number, the abandonment may not be accepted without a showing of the reasons for such a late abandonment. Approval of the Commissioner is necessary. (See Rule 313.) If a letter of abandonment is received while an application is forfeited, the Docket Branch prepares and sends the acknowledgment.

711.06 Publication of Abstracts

The practice of publishing abstracts of abandoned applications, instituted by Commissioner's Notice of January 25, 1949, 610 O.G. 258, has been discontinued. (Basis: Commissioner's Order of May 26, 1953, 671 O.G. 316.)

711.06(a) Use of Abstract as Reference

The published abstracts will be used as references against any application in which they may be applicable. Care must be taken by the examiner not to refer to these abstracts as patents or as applications. They may be designated and cited as follows:

Brown, abstract of application serial number -----, published -----, ---- O.G. ----. (Give class and subclass.)

These abstracts will be used by the examiner as a basis for rejection only as printed publications effective from the date of publication in the Official Gazette (This is similar to the practice with respect to applications published for the Alien Property Custodian, see notice of May 14, 1943). If properly prepared, it should not be necessary to refer to the complete application file, but in any case in which material in the application file is used as a reference it should only be used as evidence of matters of public knowledge on the date of the publication of the abstract. (Basis: Circular of Apr. 13, 1949.)

See 901.06(d).

712 Forfeiture

Rule 316. Forfeited application. (a) A forfeited application is one upon which a patent has been withheld for failure to pay the final fee within the prescribed time. (See rule 314.)

(b) A forfeited application is not considered as pending while forfeited, and, if the final fee is not subsequently paid and accepted as provided in rule 317, the application is abandoned, as of the date it became forfeited.

It is seen that a forfeited application is one which had the status of an allowed case for six months and on which the final fee was not paid. (Rule 316.) Its legal status during the year dating from its forfeiture makes possible its being issued as a patent on petition to the Commissioner when the petition is supported by a verified showing (as, for example, that

the delay was unavoidable) and accompanied by the final fee and the petition fee (\$10). (Rule 317.)

When the six months' period within which the final fee might have been paid has expired, the file is returned by the Issue and Gazette Branch to the Examining Group. Certain clerical operations are performed and the file and drawing are forwarded to the Abandoned Files Unit. When the final fee is not paid and the application is forfeited, proceedings are terminated as of the date the final fee was due and the application is the same as if it were abandoned on that date (but if the final fee is later accepted, on petition, the application is in a sense revived). If the final fee is not tendered within eighteen months after the date of allowance and accepted, the forfeited case becomes abandoned; and such abandoned application cannot be revived. In this respect an abandoned application that has passed through the twelve months' period of forfeiture differs in status from an application that has become abandoned under the provisions of Rules 135 and 136 in that the latter may be revived under the provisions of Rule 137.

713 Interviews

The personal appearance of an applicant, attorney, or agent before the Examiner presenting matters for the latter's consideration is considered an interview.

713.01 General Policy, How Conducted

Rule 133. Interviews. (a) Interviews with examiners concerning applications and other matters pending before the Office must be had in the examiners' rooms at such times, within office hours, as the respective examiners may designate. Interviews will not be permitted at any other time or place without the authority of the Commissioner. Interviews for the discussion of the patentability of pending applications will not be had before the first official action thereon. Interviews should be arranged for in advance.

Interviews are permissible on any working day except on overtime Saturdays.

An interview should normally be arranged for in advance, as by letter, telegram or phone call, in order to insure that the Primary Examiner and/or the Examiner in charge of the application will be present in the Office. When a second division is involved (Patentability Report), the availability of the second Examiner should also be checked. (See 705.01(f).) The

unexpected appearance of an attorney or applicant requesting an interview without any previous notice to the Examiner may well justify his refusal of the interview at that time, particularly in an involved case. An Examiner's suggestion of allowable subject matter may justify his indicating the possibility of an interview to accelerate early agreement on allowable claims.

An interview should be had only when the nature of the case is such that the interview could serve to develop and clarify specific issues and lead to a mutual understanding between the Examiner and the applicant, and thereby advance the prosecution of the application. Thus the attorney when presenting himself for an interview should be fully prepared to discuss the issues raised in the Office action. When it is obvious that the attorney is not so prepared, an interview should not be permitted.

The Examiner should not hesitate to state, if such be the case, that claims presented for consideration at the interview require further search and study. Nor should the Examiner hesitate to conclude an interview when it appears that no common ground can be reached nor when it becomes apparent that the application requires further amendment or an additional action by the Examiner.

It is the duty of the Primary Examiner to see that an interview is not extended beyond a reasonable period even when he does not personally participate in the interview.

During an interview with an applicant who is prosecuting his own case and is not familiar with Office procedure the Examiner may make suggestions that will advance the prosecution of this case; this lies wholly within his discretion. Too much time, however, should not be allowed for such interviews.

To offset any increase rigor of prosecution (under the procedure effective July 1, 1964), Examiners are authorized to grant one interview after final rejection.

EXAMINATION BY EXAMINER OTHER THAN THE ONE WHO CONDUCTED THE INTERVIEW

Sometimes the Examiner who conducted the interview is transferred to another division or resigns, and the examination is continued by another Examiner. If there is an indication that an interview had been held, the second Examiner should ascertain if any agreements were reached at the interview. Where conditions permit, as in the absence of a clear error or knowledge of other prior art, the second Examiner should take a position consistent with the agreements previously reached.

713.02 Interviews Prior to First Official Action

Prior to the first action and, obviously, prior to filing, no interview is permitted. However, in the Examiner's discretion, a limited amount of time may be spent in indicating the field of search to an attorney, searcher or inventor.

SEARCHING IN DIVISION

Searching in the division should be permitted only with the consent of the Primary Examiner.

EXPOUNDING PATENT LAW

The Patent Office cannot act as an expounder of the patent law, nor as a counsellor for individuals.

713.03 Interview for "Sounding Out" Examiner Not Permitted

Interviews that are solely for the purpose of "sounding out" the Examiner, as by a local attorney acting for an out-of-town attorney, should not be permitted when it is apparent that any agreement that would be reached is conditional upon being satisfactory to the principal attorney.

713.04 Substance of Interview Must Be Made of Record

The substance of an interview must always be made of record in the application, particularly where agreement between attorney and the Examiner is reached. Rule 133 (second paragraph) specifically requires that:

(b) In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for response to Office actions as specified in rules 111, 135.

This is further brought out by the following Rule:

Rule 2. Business to be transacted in writing. All business with the Patent Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

EXAMINER TO CHECK FOR ACCURACY

Applicant's summary of what took place at the interview should be carefully checked to determine the accuracy of any statement attributed to the examiner during the interview.

(a) If there is such an inaccuracy and it bears directly on the question of patentability, it should be pointed out in the next Office letter. If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the Examiner should withhold allowance by means of an Ex parte Quayle action until the record is clarified. (b) If the inaccuracy does not bear directly on the question of patentability, the case may be sent to issue, if allowable for reasons of record, but the Examiner should send a letter setting forth his version of the statement attributed to him.

An inaccuracy with respect to an argument presented at the interview; e.g., including in the summary of the interview an argument not then presented, should be treated as in (a) or (b) above.

Some Examiners prepare, for their own information, informal notes setting forth what occurred at the interview. These informal notes do not become an official part of the record. A convenient arrangement is to make the notes on 4 by 6 cards which may be retained with the file wrapper by means of the slits in the flap. All notes should be removed from the file at the time of allowance.

713.05 Interviews Prohibited or Granted, Special Situations

Saturday interviews, see 713.01.

Except in unusual situations, no interview is permitted after the brief on appeal is filed or after a case has been passed to issue.

Patent Office employees are forbidden to hold either oral or written communication with a disbarred attorney regarding an application unless it be one in which said attorney is the applicant. See 105.

Interviews are frequently requested by persons whose credentials are of such informal character that there is serious question as to whether such persons are entitled to any information under the provisions of Rule 14. In general, interviews are not granted to anyone who lacks proper authority from the applicant or attorney of record in the form of a paper on file in the case. **A MERE POWER TO INSPECT IS NOT SUFFICIENT AUTHORITY FOR GRANTING AN INTERVIEW INVOLVING THE MERITS OF THE APPLICATION.**

However, interviews may be granted to persons who are known to be the local representa-

tives of the attorney in the case, even though their power of attorney be not of record in the particular application. When prompt action is important an interview with the local representative may be the only way to save the application from abandonment. (See 408.)

If the person seeking the interview is unknown to the Examiner but has in his possession a copy of the application file, the Examiner may accept his statement that he is the person named as the attorney of record or an employee of such attorney.

713.06 No Inter Parte Questions Discussed Ex Parte

The Examiner may not discuss *inter partes* questions *ex parte* with any of the interested parties. See 1111.01.

713.07 Exposure of Other Cases

Prior to an interview the Examiner should arrange his desk so that files, drawings and other papers, except those necessary in the interview, are placed out of view. See 101.

713.08 Demonstration, Exhibits, Models

The invention in question may be exhibited or demonstrated during the interview by a model thereof which may be sent to the Office prior to the interview where it is received in the model room and forwarded to the division. A model is not to be received by the Examiner directly from the applicant or his attorney. See 608.03 and 608.03(a).

Oftentimes a model or exhibit is not given into the custody of the Office but is brought directly into the division by the attorney solely for inspection or demonstration during the course of the interview. This is permissible. Demonstrations of apparatus or exhibits too large to be brought into the Office may be viewed by the Examiner outside of the Office, (in Washington) with the approval of the Primary Examiner. It is presumed that the witnessing of the demonstration or the reviewing of the exhibit is actually essential in the developing and clarifying of the issues involved in the application.

713.09 Finally Rejected Application

The grace extended an applicant after final rejection will be determined in part by the length of prosecution prior to final rejection, and the possible patentable subject matter in the case. Interviews on finally rejected cases

can be justified only on the ground that the applicant has not fully understood the position of the Examiner or that the Examiner has not fully appreciated the limitations in the claims over the prior art, or that the Examiner may be able to offer some constructive aid in amending finally rejected claims or in formulating a new claim that would distinguish over the prior art where the case contains patentable subject matter not fully protected by any allowed claims.

713.10 Interview Preceding Filing Amendment Under Rule 312

After a case is sent to issue, it is technically no longer under the jurisdiction of the Primary Examiner, Rule 312. An interview with an Examiner that would involve a detailed consideration of claims sought to be entered and perhaps entailing a discussion of the prior art for determining whether or not the claims are allowable should not be given. Obviously an applicant is not entitled to a greater degree of consideration in an amendment presented informally than is given an applicant in the consideration of an amendment when formally presented, particularly since consideration of an amendment filed under Rule 312 cannot be demanded as a matter of right.

714 Amendments, Applicant's Action

Rule 115. Amendment by applicant. The applicant may amend before or after the first examination and action, and also after the second or subsequent examination or reconsideration as specified in rule 112 or when and as specifically required by the examiner.

See also 714.12.

714.01 Signatures to Amendments

Note 605.04 to 605.05(a) for a discussion of signatures to the application.

714.01(a) Unsigned or Improperly Signed Amendment

An unsigned amendment or one not properly signed by a person having authority to prosecute the case is not entered. This applies, for instance, where the amendment is signed by one only of two applicants and the one signing has not been given a power of attorney by the other applicant. An amendment signed by a person whose name is known to have been removed from the Registers of Attorneys and

Agents under the provisions of Rule 347 or Rule 348 is not entered. The file and unentered amendment are submitted to the Office of the Solicitor for appropriate action.

714.01(b) Unsigned or Improperly Signed Amendment, Disposal of

When an unsigned amendment or an improperly signed amendment is received it is returned, but when there is not sufficient time for the return of the paper for signature before the expiration of the time allowed by law within which to take proper action, the Examiner will endorse such amendment on the file wrapper and notify the applicant of the status of the case.

The Examiner in carrying out the provisions of the above paragraph gives applicant one month to furnish a duplicate amendment properly signed, or to ratify the amendment already filed. [See Rule 135, 711.]

Informal amendments which are to be returned will be forwarded to the Correspondence and Mail Branch with a memorandum giving the name and address of the attorney, or other person to whom correspondence is to be sent (from file wrapper), the date of the last Office action in the case and a statement as to why the paper is to be returned. The Correspondence and Mail Branch will cancel the impression of the receiving stamp and conduct the correspondence incident to the return of the papers. (Basis: Order No. 1961, and Notice of July 23, 1964.)

Note 717.01 on return of papers entered on File Wrapper.

Before returning unsigned or improperly signed amendments, the Examiner should call in the local representative of the attorney if there be one, as he may have authority to sign said attorney's name to the amendment.

714.01(c) Signed by Attorney Not of Record

Where an amendment is filed, signed by an attorney whose power is not of record, he should be notified that the amendment cannot be entered and similar notification sent to the applicant in person and to the attorney of record, if there be one. (Basis: Notice of September 30, 1918, Revised.)

If this is after the death of an attorney of record, see 406.

714.01(d) Amendment Signed by Applicant But Not by Attorney of Record

If an amendment signed by the applicant is received in an application in which there is a duly appointed attorney, the amendment should be entered and acted upon. Attention should be called to Rule 35. The customary two carbon copies of the action should be prepared, one only being sent to the attorney and the other direct to Applicant. The notation: "Copy to applicant" should appear on the original and on both copies.

714.01(e) Power of Attorney to a Firm

See 402.03, 402.04, 402.04(a).

714.02 Must Be Fully Responsive

Rule 111. Reply by applicant. (a) After the Office action, if adverse in any respect, the applicant, if he persist in his application for a patent, must reply thereto and may request re-examination or reconsideration, with or without amendment.

(b) In order to be entitled to re-examination or reconsideration, the applicant must make request therefor in writing, and he must distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the examiner's action; the applicant must respond to every ground of objection and rejection in the prior Office action (except that request may be made that objections or requirements as to form not necessary to further consideration of the claims be held in abeyance until a claim is allowed), and the applicant's action must appear throughout to be a bona fide attempt to advance the case to final action. A general allegation that the claims define invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references does not comply with the requirements of this rule.

(c) In amending an application in response to a rejection, the applicant must clearly point out the patentable novelty which he thinks the claims present in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. He must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections. See rules 135 and 136 for time for reply.

Compliance with or discussion of a requirement for the correction of formal matters may be deferred by applicant until a claim is indicated to be allowable or allowable in substance. See 707.07(a).

Formal matters generally include drawing corrections, correction of the specification and the presentation of a new oath. However, the

line between formal matters and substance is not sharp, and the determination of the merits of a case may sometimes require that drawing corrections, corrections of the specifications and the presentation of a new oath be insisted upon prior to allowance of a claim.

Extract from Rule 119. Amendment of Claims . . . The requirements of Rule 111 must be complied with by pointing out the specific distinctions believed to render the claims patentable over the references in presenting arguments in support of new claims and amendments.

An amendment submitted after a second or subsequent non-final action which is otherwise responsive but which increases the number of claims drawn to the invention previously acted upon is not to be held nonresponsive for that reason alone.

The prompt development of a clear issue requires that the responses of the applicant meet the objections to and rejections of the claims.

Responses to requirements to restrict are treated under 818.

714.03 Amendments Not Fully Responsive, Action To Be Taken

If there is sufficient time remaining in the six months' statutory period or set shortened period when applicant's amendment is found to be not fully responsive to the last Office action, a letter should at once be sent applicant pointing out wherein his amendment fails to fully respond coupled with a warning that the response must be completed within the time period in order to avoid the question of abandonment. See 714.05.

Where a bona fide response to an Examiner's action is filed before the expiration of a permissible period, but through an apparent oversight or inadvertence some point necessary to a complete response has been omitted,—such as an amendment or argument as to one or two of several claims involved or signature to the amendment,—the Examiner, as soon as he notes the omission, should require the applicant to complete his response within a specified time limit (one month) if the period has already expired or not sufficient time is left to take action before the expiration of the period. If this is done the application should not be held abandoned even though the prescribed period has expired. (Basis: Circular of July 26, 1934.)

See Rule 135.

The Examiner must exercise discretion in applying this practice to safeguard against abuses thereof.

The practice outlined above does not apply where there has been a deliberate omission of some necessary part of a complete response. For example, if an election of species has been required and applicant does not make election because he holds the requirement to be wrong, the amendment on its face is not a "bona fide attempt to advance the case to final action" (Rule 111), and the Examiner is without authority to postpone decision as to abandonment.

If there be ample time for applicant's reply to be filed within the time period, no reference is made to the time limit other than to note in the letter that the response must be completed within the statutory period dating from the last Office action.

714.04 Claims Presented in Amendment With No Attempt To Point Out Patentable Novelty

In the consideration of claims in an amended case where no attempt is made to point out the patentable novelty, the claims should *not* be allowed. (Basis: Order 2801.) (See Rule 111, 714.02.)

An amendment failing to point out the patentable novelty which the applicant believes to exist in his case should generally be held to be nonresponsive and a time limit set to furnish a proper response if the statutory period has expired or almost expired (714.03). However, if the claims as amended are clearly open to rejection on grounds of record, a final rejection may be made.

714.05 Examiner Should Immediately Inspect

Actions by Applicant, especially those filed near the end of the statutory period, should be inspected immediately upon filing to determine whether they are completely responsive to the preceding Office action so as to prevent abandonment of the application. If found inadequate, and sufficient time remains, applicant should be notified of the deficiencies and warned to complete the response within the statutory period. (Basis: Order 2215½.) See 714.03.

All amended cases when put on the Examiner's desk should be inspected by him at once to determine:

If the amendment is properly signed (714.01).

If the amendment has been filed within the statutory period, set shortened period or time limit (710).

If the amendment is fully responsive. See 714.03 and 714.04.

If the changes made by the amendment warrant transfer.

If the case is special. See 708.01.

If claims suggested to Applicant for interference purposes have been inserted.

If there is a traverse of a requirement for restriction. See 818.03(a).

If "easily erasable" paper has been used or other non-permanent method of preparation or reproduction. See 714.07.

If applicant has cited references. See 717.01(a) and 1302.12.

If a terminal disclaimer has been filed.

ACTION CROSSES AMENDMENT

A supplemental action is usually necessary when an amendment is filed on or before the mailing date of the regular action but reaches the examining group later. The supplemental action should be promptly prepared. It need not reiterate all portions of the previous action that are still applicable but it should specify which portions are to be disregarded, pointing out that the period for response runs from the mailing of the supplemental action. The action should be headed "Responsive to amendment of (date) and supplemental to the action mailed (date)".

714.06 Amendments Sent to Wrong Group

See 508.01.

714.07 Amendments Not in Permanent Ink

Rule 52(a) requires "permanent ink" to be used on papers which will become part of the record and *In re Benson*, 1959 C.D. 5; 744 O.G. 353 holds that documents on so-called "easily erasable" paper violate the requirement. The fact that Rule 52(a) has not been complied with may be discovered as soon as the amendment reaches the examining group or, later, when the case is reached for action. In the first instance, applicant is promptly notified that the amendment is not entered and is required to file a permanent copy within one month or to order a copy to be made by the Patent Office at his expense. Physical entry of the amendment will be made from the permanent copy.

If there is no appropriate response within the one month period, a copy is made by the

Patent Office, applicant being notified and required to remit the charges or authorize charging them to his deposit account.

In the second instance, when the non-permanence of the amendment is discovered only when the case is reached for action, similar steps are taken, but action on the case is not held up, the requirement for a permanent copy of the amendment being included in the Office action.

Xeroprinting or good carbon copies on satisfactory paper are acceptable. But see *In re Application Papers Filed Jan. 20, 1956*, 706 O.G. 4.

714.08 Telegraphic Amendment

When a telegram amendment is received it is placed in the file but not entered. If confirmation of this amendment by a properly signed formal amendment does not follow in due time, the applicant is notified that proper confirmation is required; otherwise, the telegram will not be accepted as a response to the former Office action. If he does confirm promptly, the amendment is entered. (See *Ex parte Wheary*, 1913 C.D. 253; 197 O.G. 534.)

The same test as to completeness of response applies to an amendment sent by telegraph as to one sent by mail. See 714.02.

714.09 Amendments Before First Office Action

As an applicant has the right to amend before action on his case provided the number of claims is kept within the limit imposed by his filing fee, an amendment is sometimes filed along with the filing of the application. Such amendment does not enjoy status as part of the original disclosure. It is entered in the case and acted on in the first Office action. In regard to the introduction of new matter by such an amendment, see 608.04 (b).

714.10 Claims Added in Excess of Filing Fee

In cases in which claims in excess of the number supported by the filing fee are presented before the first Official action on the case, the clerk will place the amendment in the file and enter it on the file wrapper. Only such claims are entered as are covered by the original fee. In his first action the Examiner should act only on such claims and the original claims and should defer action on the other claims. In this first action the Examiner also

should inform the applicant that if he believes that any of the claims presented by the amendment are patentable, he can have them entered and considered in the next action but only by specifically pointing out wherein the claims presented in the amendment are patentable over the references relied upon in rejecting any claim. (Basis: Notice of August 18, 1928, Revised.)

714.11 Amendment Filed During Interference Proceedings

See 1111.05.

714.12 Amendments After Final Rejection or Action

Rule 116. Amendments after final action. (a) After final rejection or action (rule 113) amendments may be made cancelling claims or complying with any requirement of form which has been made, and amendments presenting rejected claims in better form for consideration on appeal may be admitted; but the admission of any such amendment or its refusal, and any proceedings relative thereto, shall not operate to relieve the application from its condition as subject to appeal or to save it from abandonment under rule 135.

(b) If amendments touching the merits of the application be presented after final rejection, or after appeal has been taken, or when such amendment might not otherwise be proper, they may be admitted upon a showing of good and sufficient reasons why they are necessary and were not earlier presented.

(c) No amendment can be made as a matter of right in appealed cases. After decision on appeal, amendments can only be made as provided in rule 198, or to carry into effect a recommendation under rule 196.

Once a final rejection that is not premature has been entered in a case, applicant no longer has any right to unrestricted further prosecution. This does not mean that no further amendment or argument will be considered. Any amendment that will place the case either in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal will be entered.

Ordinarily, amendments filed after the second action on the merits are not entered until approved by the Examiner. When extensive amendments to the claims are proposed, it is suggested that a copy of the claims as proposed to be amended be included either in the "Remarks" or in a separate paper. Bracketing deleted matter and underlining inserted matter would also be helpful. This copy of the claim is, of course, in addition to the usual instructions to amend the claims as required by

Rule 121. See 706.07(e) and 714.13, 1207. (Basis: Notice of February 12, 1964.)

714.13 Amendments After Final Rejection or Action, Letter Written

Any amendment filed after a final rejection should be immediately considered to determine whether it places the application in condition for allowance or in better form for appeal. In the first instance, the Notice of Allowance is sufficient notification, however, if less than four weeks remain in the period for response, the Examiner should immediately send a letter as follows:

"Responsive to amendment filed (date)."

"Said amendment has been entered as complying with Rule 113."

Such a letter is important because it may act as a safeguard against a holding of abandonment. It may avoid an unnecessary appeal. Every effort should be made to mail the letter before the statutory period expires.

ENTRY NOT A MATTER OF RIGHT

It should be kept in mind that applicant cannot, as a matter of right, amend any finally rejected claims, add new claims after a final rejection (see Rule 116) or reinstate previously canceled claims. Except for the provisions of item 3 of 714.20, applicant's failure to properly respond within the statutory period results in abandonment.

See also 1207 and 1211.

NO APPEAL FILED

In the event that the amendment does not place the case in better form for appeal, nor in condition for allowance, applicant should be promptly informed of this fact, whenever possible, within the statutory period. The refusal should not be arbitrary. The proposed amendment should, at least, be given sufficient consideration to determine whether it obviously places any of the claims in condition for allowance or would simplify the issues on appeal. Ordinarily, the letter should not discuss the specific deficiencies of the amendment. The reasons should be concisely expressed. For example,

(1) the claims as amended do not avoid any of the rejections set forth in the last Office action, and thus the amendment does not place the case in condition for allowance or in better condition for appeal,

(2) the claims as amended avoid the rejection on indefiniteness but do not avoid the re-

jection on the references. The amendment will be entered upon the filing of an appeal,

(3) the claims as amended present new issues requiring further consideration or search,

(4) since the amendment presents additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims it is not considered as placing the application in better condition for appeal; *Ex parte Wirt*, 1905 C.D. 247; 117 O.G. 599.

Applicant should be notified, if it is a fact, that certain portions of the amendment would be acceptable as placing some of the claims in better form for appeal, if a separate paper were filed containing only such amendments. Similarly, if the proposed amendment to some of the claims would render them allowable, applicant should be so informed. This is helpful in assuring the filing of a brief consistent with the claims as amended. A statement that the final rejection stands and that the statutory period runs from the date of the final rejection is also in order.

SECOND AMENDMENT AFTER FINAL

If applicant submits a second or further amendment, it should be considered to the extent of determining if the claims are placed in allowable condition or obviously in better form for appeal by such amendment or if it substantially complies with the previous Office action. If not, the Examiner need not respond thereto but should merely write in pencil on the margin of the amendment that he has noted it and the application should be returned to the "rejected" files. If an appeal is later filed, the second amendment should be treated in the same way as the first amendment after a final rejection as outlined above.

APPEAL FILED

If an appeal has been filed, the Examiner should consider and reply to any unanswered amendment including those mentioned in the paragraph immediately above. If the denial of entry is due to the fact that the amendment cannot be entered in part, a statement that certain parts of the amendment will be entered if submitted in a separate paper should be included. Change in status of a claim, such as its being rendered allowable upon entry of the amendment, should be specifically noted. In this case also, it should be stated that the brief should be directed to the claims in their present form, if the amendment is not entered, or to the claims as amended, if the amendment has been entered.

NEW REFERENCE

In the consideration of any proposed amendment, a new reference may be discovered which is pertinent to the claims as amended. The practice set forth in 1207, last two paragraphs, should be followed.

714.14 Amendments After Allowance of All Claims

Under the decision in *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213, after all claims in a case have been allowed the prosecution of the case on the merits is closed even though there may be outstanding formal objections which preclude making the action final.

Amendments touching the merits are treated in a manner similar to amendments after final rejection, though the prosecution may be continued as to the formal matters. See 714.12 and 714.13.

714.15 Amendment Mailed Before, But Received in Examining Division After Allowance

Where an amendment, even though prepared by applicant prior to allowance, does not reach the Office until after the notice of allowance has been mailed, such amendment has the status of one filed under Rule 312. Its entry is a matter of grace. For discussion of amendments filed under Rule 312, see 714.16 to 714.16(e).

If, however, the amendment is filed in the Office, but is not received by the Examiner prior to the mailing out of the notice of allowance, it has the same standing in the case as though the notice had not been mailed. Where the case has not been closed to further prosecution, as by final rejection of one or more claims, or by an action allowing all of the claims, applicant may be entitled to have such amendment entered even though it may be necessary to withdraw the application from issue. Such withdrawal, however, is unnecessary if the amendatory matter is such as the Examiner would recommend for entry under Rule 312.

As above implied, the case will not be withdrawn from issue for the entry of an amendment that would reopen the prosecution if the Office action next preceding the notice of allowance closed the case to further amendment, i.e., by indicating the patentability of all of

the claims, or by allowing some and finally rejecting the remainder.

After an applicant has been notified that the claims are all allowable, further prosecution of the merits of the case is a matter of grace and not of right (*Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213). To this extent the practice affecting the status of an amendment received in the Office on the date of mailing the notice of allowance, as set forth in *Ex parte Miller*, 1922 C.D. 36; 305 O.G. 419, is modified.

714.16 Amendment After Notice of Allowance, Rules 312

Rule 312. Amendments after allowance. Amendments after the notice of allowance of an application will not be permitted as a matter of right, but may be made, if the printing of the specification has not begun, on the recommendation of the Primary Examiner, approved by the Commissioner, without withdrawing the case from issue.

The Commissioner has delegated the approval of such recommendation to the Supervisory Examiners.

A supplemental oath is not treated as an amendment under Rule 312, see 603.01.

After the Notice of Allowance has been mailed, the application is technically no longer under the jurisdiction of the Primary Examiner. He can however, make Examiner's Amendments (See 1302.04) and has authority to enter amendments submitted after Notice of Allowance of an application which embody merely the correction of formal matters in the specification or drawing, or formal matters in a claim without changing the scope thereof, or the cancellation of claims from the application, without forwarding to the Supervisory Examiner for approval. (Basis: Order 3311.)

Amendments other than these require approval by the Group Supervisor. He also establishes Group policy with respect to the treatment of Order 3311 amendments directed to trivial informalities which seldom affect significantly the vital formal requirements of any patent; namely, (1) that its disclosure be adequately clear, and (2) that any invention present be defined with sufficient clarity to form an adequate basis for an enforceable contract.

Consideration of an amendment under Rule 312 cannot be demanded as a matter of right. Prosecution of a case should be conducted before, and thus be complete *including editorial revision of the specification and claims* at the time of the Notice of Allowance. However, where amendments of the type noted are shown (1) to be needed for proper disclosure or pro-

tection of the invention, and (2) to require no substantial amount of additional work on the part of the Office, they may be considered and, if proper, entry may be recommended by the Primary Examiner.

The requirements of Rule 111(c) (714.02) with respect to pointing out the patentable novelty of any claim sought to be added or amended, apply in the case of an amendment under Rule 312, as in ordinary amendments. See 713.04 and 713.10 regarding interviews. As to amendments affecting the disclosure, the scope of any claim or that add a claim, the remarks accompanying the amendment must fully and clearly state the reasons on which reliance is placed to show: (1) why the amendment is needed; (2) why the proposed amended or new claims require no additional search or examination; (3) why the claims are patentable and, (4) why they were not earlier presented.

NOT TO BE USED FOR CONTINUED PROSECUTION

Rule 312 was never intended to provide a way for the continued prosecution of application after it has been passed for issue. When the recommendation is against entry, a detailed statement of reasons is not necessary in support of such recommendation. The simple statement that the proposed claim is not obviously allowable and briefly the reason why is usually adequate. Where appropriate, any one of the following reasons is considered sufficient: (1) an additional search is required, or (2) more than a cursory review of the record is necessary, or (3) the amendment would involve materially added work on the part of the Office, e.g. checking excessive editorial changes in the specification or claims.

Where claims added by amendment under Rule 312 are all of the form of dependent claims, some of the usual reasons for non-entry are less likely to apply although questions of new matter, sufficiency of disclosure, or undue multiplicity of claims could arise. (Basis: Notice of April 6, 1961.)

714.16(a) Amendments Under Rule 312, Copied Patent Claims

See 1101.02(g) for the procedure to be followed when an amendment is received after notice of allowance which includes one or more claims copied or substantially copied from a patent.

The entry of the copied patent claims is not a matter of right. See 714.19 item (4).

714.16(b) Amendment Under Rule 312 Filed With a Motion Under Rule 234

Where an amendment filed with a motion under Rule 234 applies to a case in issue, the case is not immediately withdrawn from issue if the date set for transmitting the motion comes well within the six months' period of allowance. Otherwise, the case is withdrawn, but the amendment is not entered unless and until the motion has been granted. See 1105.03.

714.16(c) Amendment Under Rule 312, Excess Number of Claims

When an amendment under Rule 312 which has been approved adds claims which increase the total number in the case above twenty, the Examiner's clerk in preparing the form will see that the amount of the final fee is filled in to correspond to the number of claims that stand allowed in the case after the entry of the amendment if the number of claims has been increased. (Basis: Notice of Jan. 26, 1928, Revised.)

A proposed amendment under Rule 312 which, if entered, would increase the final fee beyond that remitted, and received both without the additional necessary fee and too late in the period to notify applicant so that the additional fee will be received within the period, should be refused entry. Applicant should be promptly informed of this act and also whether or not the proposed amendment is otherwise enterable.

714.16(d) Amendments Under Rule 312, Handling

AMENDMENTS NOT UNDER ORDER 3311

Amendments under Rule 312 are sent by the Mail and Correspondence Branch to the Issue and Gazette Branch which, in turn, forwards the proposed amendment, file, and drawing (if any) to the group which allowed the application. In the event that the class and subclass in which the application is classified has been transferred to another group after the application was allowed, the proposed amendment, file and drawing (if any) are transmitted directly to said other group and the Issue and Gazette Branch notified (Ext. 2495). If the Assistant Examiner who allowed the application is still employed in the Patent Office but not in said other Group, he may be consulted about the propriety of the pro-

posed amendment and given credit for any time spent in giving it consideration.

The amendment is **PROMPTLY** considered by the Examiner who indicates thereon whether or not its entry is recommended. It should be kept in mind that the words "recommended" or "not recommended" are used instead of "entered" or "not entered".

If the recommendation is favorable, the amendment is entered and the stamp "Entry Recommended under Rule 312" is affixed thereto. A notice of entry (POL-97) is prepared. This notice is not signed by the Primary Examiner, his concurrence being indicated by his signature in the space provided on the stamp.

If the Examiner's recommendation is completely adverse, the Examiner's report giving the reasons for non-entry is typed on the notice of disapproval (POL-105). This notice is signed by the Primary Examiner.

The file, drawing, and unmailed notices (POL-97 or POL-105) are forwarded to the Supervisory Examiner for consideration, approval, and mailing. The file and drawing are returned to the Issue and Gazette Branch by the Supervisory Examiner's office. Note that the file is forwarded **DIRECTLY** from the examining division to the Supervisory Examiner. (Basis: Order No. 2698.)

For entry-in-part, see 714.16(e).

The filling out of the appropriate form by the clerk does not signify that the amendment has been admitted; for, though actually entered it is not officially admitted unless and until approved.

AMENDMENTS UNDER ORDER 3311

Amendments concerning merely formal matters do not require submission to the Supervisory Examiner prior to entry. See 714.16. The notice of entry (POL-66) is date stamped and mailed by the examining division. If such amendments are disapproved either in whole or in part, they are handled like those not under Order 3311.

714.16(e) Amendments Under Rule 312, Entry in Part

The general rule that an amendment cannot be entered in part and refused in part should not be relaxed, but when, under Rule 312, an amendment, for example, is proposed containing a plurality of claims or amendments to claims, some of which may be entered and some not, the acceptable claims or amendments should be entered in the case. If necessary, the claims should be renumbered to run con-

secutively with the claims already in the case. The refused claims or amendments should be canceled in lead pencil on the amendment.

The Examiner should then submit a report on Form POL-103 recommending the entry of the acceptable portion of the amendment and the non-entry of the remaining portion together with his reasons therefor. The claims entered should be indicated by number in this report. (Basis: Notice of August 11, 1922.)

Handling is similar to complete entry of a Rule 312 amendment.

714.17 Amendment Filed After the Period for Response Has Expired

When an application is not prosecuted within six months from the date of the last Office action therein, or within a set shortened statutory period and thereafter an amendment is filed, such amendment shall be endorsed on the file wrapper of the application, but not formally entered and the Examiner shall immediately notify the applicant that the amendment was not filed within the time period and therefore cannot be entered. The applicant should also be notified that the application is abandoned. (Basis: Order 1854.)

714.18 Entry of Amendments

Amendments are stamped with the date of their receipt in the division. It is important to observe the distinction which exists between the stamp which shows the date of receipt of the amendment in the division ("Division Date" stamp) and the stamp bearing the date of receipt of the amendment by the Office ("Office Date" stamp). The latter date, placed in the left-hand corner, should always be referred to in writing to the applicant with regard to his amendment.

The amendment or letter is placed in the file, given its number as a paper in the application, and its character endorsed on the file wrapper in red ink.

When several amendments are made in an application on the same day no particular order as to the hour of the receipt or the mailing of the amendments can be assumed, but consideration of the case must be given as far as possible as though all the papers filed were a composite single paper.

After entry of the amendment the application is "up for action", and it is generally kept separated from those applications which await action by the applicant. It is placed on the Examiner's desk, and he is responsible for its proper disposal. The Examiner should immediately inspect the amendment as set forth in

714.05. After inspection if no immediate or special action is required, the application awaits re-examination in regular order.

Amendments or other papers filed in cases before the Law Examiner should be promptly forwarded to him. (Basis: Notice of April 18, 1919.)

714.19 List of Amendments, Entry Denied

The following types of amendments are ordinarily denied entry:

1. An amendment presenting an unpatentable claim, or a claim requiring a new search or otherwise raising a new issue in a case whose prosecution before the Primary Examiner has been closed, as where

- (a) All claims have been allowed,
- (b) All claims have been finally rejected,
- (c) Some claims allowed and remainder finally rejected.

See 714.12 to 714.14.

2. Substitute specification that has not been required and is not needed. See Rule 125, 608.01(q) and 714.20. If the Examiner approves, it may be entered.

3. A patent claim suggested by the Examiner and not presented within the time limit set or a reasonable extension thereof, unless entry is authorized by the Commissioner. See Notice of September 27, 1933, revised. 1101.02(f).

4. While copied patent claims are generally admitted even though the case is under final rejection or on appeal, under certain conditions, the claims may be refused entry. See 1101.02(g).

5. An unsigned or improperly signed amendment or one signed by a disbarred attorney or any person having no authority.

6. An amendment filed in the Patent Office after the expiration of the statutory period or set time limit for response. See 714.17.

7. An amendment so worded that it cannot be entered with certain accuracy. See 714.23.

8. An amendment cancelling all of the claims and presenting no substitute claim or claims. (711.01.)

9. An amendment in a case no longer within the Examiner's jurisdiction with certain exceptions in applications in issue (714.16), except on approval of the Commissioner.

10. An amendment filed before the first action increasing the number of claims when all the added claims are in excess of those supported by the filing fee. But see 714.10.

11. Amendments to the drawing held by the Examiner to contain new matter are not entered until the question of new matter is set-

tled. This practice of non-entry because of alleged new matter, however, does not apply in the case of amendments to the specification and claims.

12. An amendatory paper containing objectionable remarks that, in the opinion of the Examiner, brings it within the condemnation of Rule 3, will be submitted to the Commissioner with a view toward its being returned to applicant. See 714.25.

13. Amendments not in permanent ink. Amendments on so-called "easily erasable paper." See *In re Benson*, 1959 C.D. 5; 744 O.G. 353.

While amendments falling within any of the foregoing categories should not be entered by the Examiner at the time of filing, a subsequent showing by applicant may lead to entry of the amendment.

714.20 List of Amendments Entered in Part

To avoid confusion of the record the general rule prevails that an amendment should not be entered in part. As in the case of most other rules, the strict observance of its letter may sometimes work more harm than would result from its infraction, especially if the amendment in question is received at or near the end of the statutory period. Thus,

(1) An "amendment" presenting an un-called-for and unnecessary substitute specification along with amendatory matter, as amendments to claims or new claims, should be entered in part, rather than refused entry *in toto*. The substitute specification should be denied entry and so marked, while the rest of the paper should be entered. The case as thus amended is acted on when reached in its turn, the applicant being advised that the substitute specification has not been required and is not necessary and therefore has not been entered, and that any desired changes in the original specification must be made by specific amendments. (Basis: Notice of August 17, 1934.) See also Rule 125, 608.01(q).

It may be noted in this connection, however, that the fact that a substitute specification, in the opinion of the Examiner, contains new matter is not in itself a proper reason for refusing entry thereof.

(2) An amendment under Rule 312, which in part is approved and in other part disapproved, is entered only as to the approved part. See 714.16(e).

(3) In a case having some claims allowed and others finally rejected, where an amendment is received at or near the close of the statutory period cancelling the finally rejected

claims and presenting one or more new ones which the Examiner cannot allow, the amendment, after the statutory period has ended, is entered to the extent only of cancelling the finally rejected claims. Of course, if any of the new claims were, in the Examiner's opinion, patentable, they too would be entered. The applicant is notified that the new claims which are held unpatentable have not been admitted, and at the same time the case is passed for issue.

(4) Where all of the claims are under final rejection and the amendment cancels these claims and presents new ones, only some of which are deemed allowable by the Examiner, the same practice is followed as indicated in (3).

(5) In a case having all claims allowed and some formal defect noted, where an amendment is presented at or near the close of the statutory period curing the defect and adding one or more claims some or all of which are in the opinion of the Examiner not patentable, or will require a further search, the procedure indicated in (3) is followed. After the statutory period has ended, the amendment in such a case will be entered only as to the formal matter and to any of the newly presented claims that may be deemed patentable.

(6) In an amendment accompanying a motion granted only in part, the amendment is entered only to the extent that the motion was granted. See 1108.

(7) An amendment, before the first action, adding claims in excess of the number supported by the filing fee. See 714.10.

NOTE: The Examiner writes "Enter" in ink and his initials in the left margin opposite the enterable portions.

714.21 Amendments Inadvertently Entered, No Legal Effect

If the clerk inadvertently enters an amendment when it should not have been entered, such entry is of no legal effect, and the same action is taken as if the changes had not been actually made, inasmuch as they have not been legally made. Unless such unauthorized entry is deleted, suitable notation should be made on the margin of the amendatory paper, as "Not Officially Entered".

An amendatory paper, even though not entered, should be given a paper number, and appropriately endorsed on the file jacket, as by "Not Entered".

714.22 Entry of Amendments, Directions for

Rule 121. Manner of making amendments. Erasures, additions, insertions, or alterations of the papers and records must not be made by the applicant. Amendments are made by filing a paper (which should conform to rule 52), directing or requesting that specified amendments be made. The exact word or words to be stricken out or inserted in the application must be specified and the precise point indicated where the deletion or insertion is to be made.

714.23 Entry of Amendments, Directions for, Defective

The directions for the entry of an amendment may be defective, as, inaccuracy in the line designated, or lack of precision where the word to which the amendment is directed occurs more than once in the specified line. If it is clear from the context what is the correct place of entry, the amendatory paper will be properly amended in the examining group, and notation thereof, initialed in ink by the Examiner, who will assume full responsibility for the change, will be made on the margin of the amendatory paper. In the next Office action the applicant should be informed of this alteration in his amendatory paper and the entry of the amendment as thus amended. He will also be informed of the nonentry of an amendment where defective directions and context leave doubt as to the intent of applicant. (Basis: Notice of June 30, 1939, as amended May 7, 1951.)

714.24 Amendment of Amendment

Rule 124. Amendment of amendments. When an amendatory clause is to be amended, it should be wholly rewritten and the original insertion cancelled, so that no interlineations or deletions shall appear in the clause as finally presented. Matter cancelled by amendment can be reinstated only by a subsequent amendment presenting the cancelled matter as a new insertion.

However, where a relatively small amendment to a previous amendment can be made easily without causing the amendatory matter to be obscure or difficult to follow, such small amendment should be entered.

714.25 Discourtesy of Applicant or Attorney

Rule 3. Business to be conducted with decorum and courtesy. Applicants and their attorneys or agents are required to conduct their business with the Patent

Office with decorum and courtesy. Papers presented in violation of this requirement will be submitted to the Commissioner and will be returned by his direct order. Complaints against examiners and other employees must be made in communications separate from other papers.

If the attorney is discourteous in the remarks or arguments in his amendment, either the discourtesy should be entirely ignored or the paper submitted to the Supervisory Examiner with a view toward its being returned.

715 Swearing Back of Reference-Affidavit Under Rule 131

Rule 131. Affidavit of prior invention to overcome cited patent or publication. (a) When any claim of an application is rejected on reference to a domestic patent which substantially shows or describes but does not claim the rejected invention, or on reference to a foreign patent or to a printed publication, and the applicant shall make oath to facts showing a completion of the invention in this country before the filing date of the application on which the domestic patent issued, or before the date of the foreign patent, or before the date of the printed publication, then the patent or publication cited shall not bar the grant of a patent to the applicant, unless the date of such patent or printed publication be more than one year prior to the date on which the application was filed in this country.

(b) The showing of facts shall be such, in character and weight, as to establish reduction to practice prior to the effective date of the reference, or conception of the invention prior to the effective date of the reference coupled with due diligence from said date to a subsequent reduction to practice or to the filing of the application. Original exhibits of drawings or records, or photocopies thereof, must accompany and form part of the affidavit or their absence satisfactorily explained.

Any printed publication dated prior to an applicant's effective filing date, or any patent of prior filing date, which is in its disclosure pertinent to the claimed invention, is available for use by the examiner as a reference, either basic or auxiliary, in the rejection of the claims of the application.

Such a rejection may be overcome, in certain instances noted below, by applicant's filing of an affidavit under Rule 131, known as "swearing back" of the reference.

Affidavits under Rule 131 may be used:

(1) Where the date of the foreign patent or that of the publication is less than one year prior to applicant's effective filing date.

(2) Where the reference, a U.S. Patent, with a patent date less than one year prior to appli-

cant's effective filing date, shows but does not claim the invention.

Affidavit under Rule 131 is not appropriate in the following situations:

(1) Where reference publication date is more than one year back of applicant's effective filing date. Such a reference is a "statutory bar".

(2) Where the reference U.S. patent claims the invention. See 1101.02(a).

(3) Where reference is a foreign patent for the same invention to applicant or his legal representatives or assigns issued prior to the filing date of the domestic application on an application filed more than twelve months prior to the filing date of the domestic application.

(4) Where the effective filing date of applicant's parent application or an International Convention proved filing date is prior to the effective date of the reference, affidavit under Rule 131 is unnecessary and the reference is not used. See 201.11 to 201.15.

(5) Where the reference is a prior U.S. patent to the same party, claiming the same invention, the question involved is one of "double patenting."

(6) Where the reference is the disclosure of a prior U.S. patent to the same party, not co-pending, the question is one of dedication to the public.

Should it be established that the portion of the patent disclosure relied on as the reference was introduced into the patent application by amendment and as such was new matter, the date to be overcome by the affidavit is the date of the amendment. In *re Williams et al.*, 1935 C.D. 229; 454 O.G. 535.

It should be kept in mind that it is the *rejection* that is withdrawn and not the reference.

715.01 Reference Claims Foreign Filing Date

The foreign filing date is considered the effective date in those situations where claimed subject matter of the domestic patent (or disclosed matter related thereto) is being used as the basis for rejection, and where no question of interference exists. Where the foreign date is used as the effective date the Examiner must determine from an independent examination of the priority documents in the patent file that the domestic patent is actually entitled to the priority date with respect to the subject matter relied upon for the rejection. Section 102(e) of Title 35 U.S.C. considered with Section 119 determines the effective date of such domestic patents. (Basis: Notice of May 27, 1964.)

715.01(a) Reference a Joint Patent to Applicant and Another

When subject matter disclosed but not claimed in a patent issued jointly to S and another is claimed in a later application filed by

S, the joint patent is a valid reference unless overcome by affidavit under Rule 131. In re Strain, 1951 C.D. 252; 648 O.G. 5. Disclaimer by the other patentee should not be required. But see 201.06.

715.01(b) Reference and Application Have Common Assignee

The mere fact that the reference patent which shows but does not claim certain subject matter and the application which claims it are owned by the same assignee does not avoid the necessity of filing an affidavit under Rule 131. The common assignee does not obtain any rights in this regard by virtue of common ownership which he would not have in the absence of common ownership. In re Beck et al., 1946 C.D. 398; 590 O.G. 357; Pierce v. Watson, 124 U.S.P.Q. 356.

715.01(c) Reference Is Publication of Applicant's Own Invention

Unless it is a statutory bar, a rejection on a publication may be overcome by a showing that it was published either by applicant himself or in his behalf. Ex parte Lemieux, 1957 C.D. 47; 725 O.G. 4; Ex parte Powell et al., 1938 C.D. 15; 489 O.G. 231.

CO-AUTHORSHIP

Where the applicant is one of the co-authors of a publication, cited against his application, he is not required to file an affidavit under Rule 131. The publication may be removed as a reference by filing a disclaiming affidavit of the other authors. Ex parte Hirschler, 110 U.S.P.Q. 384.

715.02 General Rule as to Generic Claims

A reference applied against generic claims may (in most cases) be antedated as to such claims by an affidavit under Rule 131 showing completion of the invention of only a single species, within the genus, prior to the effective date of the reference (assuming, of course, that the reference is not a statutory bar or a patent claiming the same invention). See, however, 715.03.

715.03 Practice Relative to Chemical Cases

In chemical cases, where generic claims have been rejected on a reference which discloses a species not antedated by the affidavit, the rejection will not ordinarily be withdrawn unless the applicant is able to establish that he was in possession of the generic invention prior to the effective date of the reference. In other words, the affidavit under Rule 131 must show as much as the minimum disclosure

required by a patent specification to furnish support for a generic claim.

"The principle is well established in chemical cases, and in cases involving compositions of matter, that the disclosure of a species in a cited reference is sufficient to prevent a later applicant from obtaining generic claim." In re Steenbock, 1936 C.D. 594; 473 O.G. 495.

Where the only pertinent disclosure in the reference is a single species, which species is antedated by the affidavit, the reference is overcome. In re Stempel 1957 C.D. 200; 717 O.G. 886.

MARKUSH TYPE GENUS CLAIM

Where a claim reciting a Markush group is rejected on a reference disclosing but not claiming a specific member of the group, the reference cannot be avoided by an affidavit under Rule 131 showing different members of the group.

715.04 Who May Make Affidavit

A. The Inventor.

B. One of two joint inventors is accepted where suitable excuse is given for failure of the other applicant to sign. In re Carlson et al., 1936 C.D. 95; 462 O.G. 479.

C. The Assignee or other party in interest when it is not possible to produce the affidavit of the inventor. Ex parte Foster, 1903 C.D. 213; 105 O.G. 261.

715.05 Patent Claiming Same Invention

When the reference in question is a patent claiming the same invention as applicant and its issue date is less than one year prior to the filing date of the application being examined, applicant's remedy, if any, must be by way of Rule 204 instead of Rule 131. The Examiner should therefore take note whether the status of the patent as a reference is that of a PATENT or a PUBLICATION. If the patent is claiming the same invention as the application, this fact should be noted in the Office letter. The reference patent can then be overcome only by way of interference. Note, however, 35 U.S.C. 135, 1101.02(f).

715.06 Affidavit Under Rule 131 Must Be Removed Before Interference

Where an application in which an affidavit under Rule 131 has been filed is to be involved in an interference, the affidavit must be sealed

in an envelope properly labeled before forwarding the application to the interference division.

The same practice obtains with respect to a Rule 131 affidavit in the file of an application made the subject of a motion under Rule 234 or 235.

Under the practice established in *Ferris v. Tuttle*, 1940 C.D. 5; 521 O.G. 523, the Rule 131 affidavit is thrown open to the opposing party or parties to the interference at the time the preliminary statements are opened. See 1101.03 and 1102.01.

715.07 Facts and Documentary Evidence

The essential thing to be shown under Rule 131 is priority of invention and this may be done by any satisfactory evidence of the fact. *FACTS*, not conclusions, must be shown by the evidence accompanying an affidavit under Rule 131. For example:

1. As shown in attached sketches.
2. As shown in attached blueprints.
3. As indicated by accompanying model.
4. As shown in attached photographs.
5. As shown in reproductions of notebook entries.
6. If verbal disclosures were made instead of the above, supporting statements by the witness will be acceptable.
7. If the dates of the exhibits have been removed or blocked off, the matter of dates can be taken care of in the body of the oath.

The dates in the oath may be the actual dates or, if the applicant does not desire to disclose his actual dates, he may merely allege that the acts referred to occurred prior to a specified date.

A general allegation that the invention was completed prior to the date of the reference is not sufficient. *Ex parte Saunders*, 1883 C.D. 23; 23 O.G. 1224.

"If the applicant made sketches he should so state, and produce and describe them; if the sketches were made and lost, and their contents remembered, they should be reproduced and furnished in place of the originals. The same course should be pursued if the disclosure was by means of models. If neither sketches nor models are relied upon, but it is claimed that verbal disclosures, sufficiently clear to indicate definite conception of the invention, were made the witness should state as nearly as possible the language used in imparting knowledge of the invention to others." *Ex parte Donovan*, 1890 C.D. 109; 52 O.G. 309.

The affidavit must state *FACTS* and produce such documentary evidence and exhibits

in support thereof as are available to show conception and completion of invention **IN THIS COUNTRY**, the conception at least being at a date prior to the effective date of the reference. Where there has not been reduction to practice prior to the date of the reference, the applicant must show diligence in the completion of his invention from a time just prior to the date of the reference continuously up to the date of an actual reduction to practice or up to the date of filing of his application, which constitutes a *constructive* reduction to practice. Rule 131. In this connection, note the following:

A conception of an invention, evidenced by disclosure, drawings, and even a model, is not a complete invention under the patent laws, and confers no rights on an inventor, and has no effect on a subsequently granted patent to another, **UNLESS HE FOLLOWS IT WITH REASONABLE DILIGENCE BY SOME OTHER ACT**, such as an actual reduction to practice or filing an application for a patent. *Automatic Weighing Mach. Co. v. Pneumatic Scale Corp., Limited*, 1909 C.D. 498; 139 O.G. 991.

Conception is the mental part of the inventive act, but it must be capable of proof, as by drawings, complete disclosure to another person, etc. In *Mergenthaler v. Scudder*, 1897 C.D. 724; 81 O.G. 1417, it was established that conception is more than a mere vague idea of how to solve a problem; the means themselves and their interaction must be comprehended also.

The facts to be established under Rule 131 are similar to those to be proved in interference. The difference lies in the way in which the evidence is presented. If applicant disagrees with a holding that the facts are insufficient to overcome the rejection, his remedy is by appeal from the continued rejection.

715.07(a) Diligence

Where conception occurs prior to the date of the reference, but reduction to practice is afterward it is not enough merely to allege that applicant had been diligent. *Ex parte Hunter*, 1889 C.D. 218; 49 O.G. 733.

What is meant by diligence is brought out in *Christie v. Seybold*, 1893 C.D. 515; 64 O.G. 1650. In patent law, an inventor is either diligent at a given time or he is not diligent; there are no degrees of diligence. A man may be diligent within the meaning of the patent law when he is doing nothing, if his lack of activity is excused.

Note, however, that only diligence *before* reduction to practice is a material consideration. The "lapse of time between the completion or reduction to practice of an invention and the filing of an application thereon" (Ex parte Merz, 75 U.S.P.Q. 296) is not relevant to a Rule 131 affidavit.

715.07(b) Interference Testimony Sometimes Used

In place of an affidavit the testimony of the applicant in an interference may be sometimes used to antedate a reference in lieu of a Rule 131 affidavit.

The part of the testimony to form the basis of priority over the reference should be pointed out. Ex parte Bowyer, 1939 C.D. 5; 505 O.G. 759.

715.07(c) Acts Relied Upon Must Have Been Carried Out in This Country

The affidavit must contain an allegation that the acts relied upon to establish the date prior to the reference were carried out *in this country*. See 35 U.S.C. 104.

715.07(d) Disposition of Exhibits Submitted as Evidence to Support Facts

Exhibits, such as those filed as part of an affidavit under Rule 131, that are too bulky to be placed in the application file are retained in the Examining Group until the case is finally disposed of. When the case goes to issue (or abandonment) the exhibits are sent to the Model and Receiving Room, notation to this effect being made on the margin of the affidavit. See 608.03 (a).

715.08 Passed Upon by Primary Examiner

The question of sufficiency of affidavits under Rule 131 should be reviewed and decided by a Primary Examiner. (Basis: Order 2712.)

715.09 Seasonable Presentation

Affidavits under Rule 131 must be seasonably presented. Ex parte Berg, 1906 C.D. 36; 120 O.G. 903; Ex parte Romunder, 1910 C.D. 121; 157 O.G. 209; Ex parte Hale, 49 U.S.P.Q. 209; Ex parte Bowyer, 1939 C.D. 5; 505 O.G. 759.

For affidavits under Rule 131 filed after appeal see Rules 195 and 1212.

716 Affidavits Traversing Rejections, Rule 132

Rule 132. Affidavits traversing grounds of rejection. When any claim of an application is rejected on reference to a domestic patent which substantially shows or describes but does not claim the invention, or on reference to a foreign patent, or to a printed publication, or to facts within the personal knowledge of an employee of the Office, or when rejected upon a mode or capability of operation attributed to a reference, or because the alleged invention is held to be inoperative or lacking in utility, or frivolous or injurious to public health or morals, affidavits traversing these references or objections may be received.

NOTE THAT RULE 132 IS NOT APPLICABLE TO A REJECTION BASED ON A U.S. PATENT WHICH CLAIMS THE REJECTED INVENTION.

Hereafter, it shall be the responsibility of the Primary Examiner to personally review and decide whether affidavits submitted under Rule 132 for the purpose of traversing grounds of rejection, are responsive to the rejection and present sufficient facts to overcome the rejection. (Basis: Notice of December 15, 1959.)

This rule sets forth the general policy of the Office consistently followed for a long period of time of receiving affidavits evidence traversing rejections or objections. Ex parte Gresselin, 1896 C.D. 39; 76 O.G. 1573. The enumeration of rejections in the rule is merely exemplary. All affidavits presented which do not fall within or under other specific rules are to be treated or considered as falling under this rule.

Certain legal principles and standards have been established respecting affidavit evidence. Some are applicable to all affidavits, while others are applicable only to particular types of affidavits, as indicated below. The critical factors and standards are summarized as an aid or guide to the examiners in evaluating such affidavits. Affidavits timely filed (i.e. before final action or appeal) should be acknowledged and commented upon in the action following filing. See Sec. 707.02. If an affidavit is filed later and entered (See Rule 195) similar action should be taken.

The following criteria are applicable to all affidavits submitted under this rule:

(1) Affidavits must be timely or seasonably filed (i.e. before final rejection or appeal) to be entitled to consideration. In re Rothermel et al., 1960 C.D. 204; 755 O.G. 621. Affidavits not timely filed must meet the requirements of Rule 195.

(2) Affidavits must set forth facts, not merely conclusions. In re Pike et al., 1950 C.D. 105;

633 O.G. 680. The facts presented in the affidavits must be pertinent to the rejection. In re Renstrom 1949 C.D. 306; 624 O.G. 5. Otherwise, the affidavits have no probative value.

(3) Affidavits should be scrutinized closely and the facts presented weighed with care. The affiant's interest is a factor which may be considered, but the affidavit cannot be disregarded solely for that reason. In re McKenna et al., 1953 C.D. 251; 674 O.G. 9; Bullard & Co. v. Coe 1945 C.D. 13; 573 O.G. 547.

Rule 132 affidavits may be classified in five groups, and such affidavits must conform, in addition, to the established criteria and standards for the group into which they fall. These groups and the applicable standards are:

COMPARATIVE TESTS OR RESULTS

Affidavits comparing applicant's results with those of the prior art must relate to the reference relied upon and not other prior art—Blanchard v. Ooms 1946 C.D. 22; 585 O.G. 175—, and the comparison must be with disclosure identical (not similar) with that of the reference. In re Tatincloux 1956 C.D. 102; 702 O.G. 964. Otherwise, the affidavits have no probative value.

Where the comparison is not identical with the reference disclosure, deviations therefrom should be explained—In re Finley, 1949 C.D. 284; 624 O.G. 262—and if not explained should be noted and evaluated, and if significant explanation should be required. In re Armstrong 1960 C.D. 422; 759 O.G. 4. Otherwise, the affidavits may be entitled to little weight.

Where the comparison shows unexpected results or advantages, it should be compared with the application disclosure, since recitals of the specification are controlling. Abbott v. Coe, 1940 C.D. 13; 512 O.G. 3. In re Rossi 1957 C.D. 130; 717 O.G. 214. Advantages not disclosed carry little or no weight in establishing patentability.

Affidavits setting forth advantages and asserting that despite familiarity with the art, the claimed subject matter was not obvious to affiants, do not afford evidence of non-obviousness, where the advantages relied upon are merely those which would result from following the teaching of the prior art. In re Henrich 1959 C.D. 353; 747 O.G. 793.

OPERABILITY OF APPLICANT'S DISCLOSURE

Since it is the Examiner's duty to pass upon the operativeness of any invention which he is called upon to examine he is free to express his opinion on that question so long as he gives reasons for his holding with clarity and

completeness. Therefore, he need not support every rejection on inoperativeness with references or affidavits. In re Quattlebaum 84 U.S.P.Q. 383.

Affidavits attempting to show that the structure deemed inoperative was seen in operation by persons who vouch for its operability, are insufficient. In re Perrigo, 1931 C.D. 512, 411 O.G. 544.

Where the invention involved is of such a nature that it cannot be tested by known scientific principles, theoretical arguments in affidavit form are unacceptable, and the only satisfactory manner of overcoming the rejection is to demonstrate the operability by construction and operation of the invention. Buck v. Ooms 1947 C.D. 33; 602 O.G. 177. In re Chilowsky 1956 C.D. 155; 704 O.G. 213.

INOPERABILITY OF REFERENCES

Since every patent is presumed valid (35 U.S.C. 282), and since that presumption includes the presumption of operability—Metropolitan Eng. Co. v. Coe 1935 C.D. 54; 455 O.G. 3—Examiners should not express any opinion on the operability of a patent. Therefore affidavits attacking the operability of a patent cited as a reference, though entitled to consideration, should be treated, not as conclusive of the factual matter presented, but rather as an expression of opinion by an expert in the art. In re Berry, 137 U.S.P.Q. 353. See also In re Lurelle Guild 1953 C.D. 310; 677 O.G. 5. Opinion affidavits need not be given any weight. In re Pierce 1930 C.D. 34; 390 O.G. 265; In re Reid 1950 C.D. 194; 635 O.G. 694.

Further, since in a patent it is presumed that a process if used by one skilled in the art will produce the product or result described therein, such presumption is not overcome by a mere showing that it is possible to operate within the disclosure without obtaining the alleged product. It is to be presumed also that skilled workers would as a matter of course, if they do not immediately obtain desired results, make certain experiments and adaptations, within the skill of the competent worker. The failures of experimenters who have no interest in succeeding should not be accorded great weight. Bullard v. Coe 1945 C.D. 13; 573 O.G. 547; In re Michalek 1947 C.D. 458; 604 O.G. 223; In re Reid 1950 C.D. 194; 635 O.G. 694.

Where the affidavit presented asserts inoperability in some features of the patent as to which it was not relied upon, the matter is of no concern. In re Wagner, 1939 C.D. 581; 407 O.G. 1041.

Where the affidavit asserts inoperability of the process disclosed in the reference for pro-

ducing the claimed product, which product is fully disclosed in the reference, the matter is of no concern. In re Attwood 1958 C.D. 204; 730 O.G. 790.

Where the affidavit presented asserts that the reference relied upon is inoperative, it is elementary that the claims presented by applicant must distinguish from the alleged inoperative reference disclosure; therefore the matter is of no concern. In re Crecelius 1937 C.D. 112; 474 O.G. 465. In re Perrine 1940 C.D. 465; 519 O.G. 520. In re Crosby 1947 C.D. 35; 595 O.G. 5.

Affidavit by patentee that he did not intend his device to be used as claimed by applicant is immaterial. In re Pio 1955 C.D. 59; 691 O.G. 454.

COMMERCIAL SUCCESS

Affidavits submitting evidence of commercial success can have no bearing in a case where the patentability over the prior art is not in doubt. In re Jewett et al 1957 C.D. 420; 724 O.G. 225. In re Troutman, 1960 C.D. 308; 757 O.G. 556.

Affidavits showing commercial success of a structure not related to the claimed subject matter has neither significance nor pertinence. In re Kulieke 1960 C.D. 281; 756 O.G. 288.

Affidavits which attribute commercial success to the invention "described and claimed" or other equivalent indefinite language have little or no evidentiary value. In re Troutman 1960 C.D. 308; 757 O.G. 556.

Where affidavits show commercial success it must appear that such success resulted from the invention as claimed. In re Hollingsworth 1958 C.D. 210; 730 O.G. 282. Otherwise the affidavit showing is non-pertinent.

SUFFICIENCY OF DISCLOSURE

Affidavits presented to show that the disclosure of an application is sufficient to one skilled in the art are not acceptable to establish facts which the specification itself should recite. In re Smyth 1951 C.D. 449; 651 O.G. 5.

Affidavits purporting to explain the disclosure or to interpret the disclosure of a pending application are usually not considered. In re Oppenauer 1955 C.D. 587; 568 O.G. 393. (Basis: Notice of Oct. 21, 1960.)

717 File Wrapper

717.01 Papers in File Wrapper

Full details are given in the Manual of Clerical Procedures. Papers that do not become a permanent part of the record should not be entered on the "Contents" of the file wrapper

(jacket). No paper entered on the "Contents" should ever be withdrawn or returned to applicant without special authority of the Commissioner. (Basis: Order 767 and Order 2799.) An exception to this is the withdrawal of a list of prior art submitted by applicant in a separate paper. Certain oaths executed abroad are returned but a copy is retained in the file. See 604.04(a).

717.01(a) Arrangement of Papers in File Wrapper

Until revision for allowance, the specification, amendments and all other communications from applicant are fastened to the left side (center fold) of the file jacket. They are in inverse chronological order; that is, the communication with the latest "Mail Room" date is on top. A similar arrangement is followed on the right side, where Office actions and other communications from the Office are fastened, except that the print is always kept on top for the convenience of the Examiner.

Where amendments are submitted in duplicate, the carbon copy is destroyed except where the duplicate is received within the time period for response and the original is late. In this latter situation both copies are placed in the file. The "original" (ribbon copy) is entered with reference made to the carbon copy.

If the attorney wishes a receipt for any paper filed, this may be had by enclosing with the paper a self-addressed postal card identifying the paper. The mail-room receiving-stamp will be placed on the card, and the card dropped in the outgoing mail. (Basis: Order 1733.)

717.01(b) Prints

The prints of the drawing are fastened inside the file wrapper by the Application Branch, and shall always be kept on top. A paper number is assigned by the Clerk of the group.

The prints shall always be kept on top of the papers on the right of the file wrapper.

All prints and inked sketches subsequently filed to be part of the record should be endorsed with the date of their receipt in the office and given their appropriate paper number. (Basis: Order 3240.)

717.02 Data Entered on File Wrapper

See also 707.10, 717.01 and 1302.08.

If the Examiner notices an error in any of the data originally entered on the file wrapper, he should have it corrected by the Application Branch.

If an error is noticed in the name or address of the assignee, it should be corrected by the Assignment Branch.

All of the above entries are either typed or made in black ink. Such changes by amendment as change of address or of attorney are entered in red ink by the clerk of the group, the original entry being canceled but not erased.

717.02(a) Statutory Period Ends on Saturday, Sunday or Holiday

See 710.05.

717.02(b) Name or Residence of Inventor or Title Changed

The distinction between "residence" and Post Office address should not be lost sight of.

Sec. 605.04(c) explains the procedure to be followed concerning sending the application to the Assignment Branch and the Application Branch when Applicant changes name.

Unless specifically requested by applicant, the residence will not be changed on the file. For example, if a new oath gives a different residence from the original, the file will not be changed.

717.03 Classification During Examination

When a new case is received in an Examining Group, the classification of the case and the initials or name of the assistant examiner who will examine it are noted in pencil in the upper left-hand corner of the jacket.

717.04 Index of Claims

Constant reference is made to the "Index of Claims" found in the inside of the file wrapper of all applications. It should be kept up to date so as to be a reliable index of all claims standing in a case, and of the amendment in which the claims are to be found.

A column has been designated on the new file wrapper (Form PO-436) for the entry of the final numbering of allowed claims. The preprinted series of claim numbers appearing on the old jacket (Form PO-136) has been retained and continues to refer to claim numbers as originally filed.

A line in ink should be drawn below the number corresponding to the number of claims originally presented. Thereafter, a line in ink should be drawn below the number corresponding to the highest numbered claim added by each amendment. Just outside the Index of Claims form opposite the number corresponding to the first claim of each amendment there should be placed the letter designating the amendment.

As any claim is canceled a line should be drawn through its number. (Basis: Circular of February 17, 1936.)

717.05 Field of Search

In each action involving a search, the Examiner shall encorse, on the flap of the file wrapper, the classes and subclasses and publications searched, the date when the search was made or was brought up to date and the Examiner's initials, all entries being in BLACK INK. Great care should be taken, inasmuch as this record is important to the history of the application. (Basis: Order 2146.)

717.06 Foreign Filing Dates

See 1302.06.

717.07 Related Applications

The file wrapper should identify earlier filed related applications. See 202.02.