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Limitations and restrictions
derivation vs. originality, Section 102(f), 8:8
technical sufficiency of invalidating event, 8:11,
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Mental acts and matters
derivation vs. originality, Section 102(f), 8:5, 8:6
technical sufficiency of invalidating event, 8:23
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Mitchell v. Tighlman, 8:27
1984 amendments to Section 116, 8:8
Non-informing public use, 8:20
Non-limiting recitations, effect of, 8:14
Non-Obviousness (this index)
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:53, 5:71, 5:74, 5:84
Notice and knowledge. Technical sufficiency of invalidating event, below
Novelty, Section 102(b), generally, 8:1
On-sale activity, paragraph 102(b), 8:20
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8:22
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8:31
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Patentability, generally, 8:1
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Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:3, 8:14, 8:21
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Prior events. Technical sufficiency of invalidating event, below
Prior filing, 8:21
Priority, generally, 8:1
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Prior public use, paragraph 102(b), 8:21
Prior use, 8:18
Processes, 5:24, 8:28
Publication, 8:19, 8:31
Public possession, 8:19, 8:30
Public use, 8:21
Qualification
derivation vs. originality, Section 102(f), 8:7
ANTICIPATION, LACK OF
—Cont’d
Technical sufficiency of invalidating event—Cont’d
knowledge. Enabling knowledge, required presence of, above in this group
non-limiting recitations, effect of, 8:14
Section 103 vs. Section 112, par. 1, 8:31
subcombination, 8:12
Technological completeness, 8:32
Tests, 8:5
Tighlman v. Proctor, 8:27
Time and date, 8:1
Time-wise priority, 8:5
Timing of event. Priority (this index)
Underlying rationale, relation to, 8:16
Use, 8:21
Validation. Technical sufficiency of invalidating event, above
Value judgment, 8:1

ANTI-SLAVERY PROVISIONS
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ANTI-TRUST
Claims, 4:80
History, 1:7
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Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:80
Processes (this index)
Static physical configurations, 5:8

APPEAL AND REVIEW
See also Judicial Review (this index)
Adequate Commerciality (this index)
Adequate disclosure, 7:52, 7:54, 7:57
Appellate Division of United States Court of Claims, 2:37
Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (BPAI) (this index)
Claims (this index)
Computer-related inventions, 5:42
Correction of inventorship, 10:64
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District Court (this index)
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History, 1:19, 1:21, 1:24
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Utility Requirement (this index)

APPLICANT
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Generally, 2:12, 2:32
Adequate Commerciality (this index)
Adequate disclosure, 7:56
Claims (this index)
Correction of inventorship, 10:56
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Filing Application (this index)
Filing Date of Application (this index)
Foreign Countries (this index)
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History, 1:18
Inventorship, 10:8
Joint Applications (this index)
Joint Inventorship (this index)

APPLICATION—Cont’d
Noninfringement pleading, 17:9-17:13
Non-Obviousness (this index)
Policy justification, 1:38
Priority (this index)
Processes, 5:24, 5:26
Static physical configurations, 5:8, 5:9
Technological scope, 13:106
Temporal Scope of Infringement (this index)
Utility Requirement (this index)

APPLIED TECHNOLOGY
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:61
Statutory Subject Matter (this index)

APPOINTMENT TO OFFICE
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:22

APPRÉCIATION
Priority, 8:46, 8:58

ARBITRARY, CAPRICIOUS OR ABUSE OF DISCRETION
Judicial review, 2:41

ARIAD PHARMACEUTICALS, INC. v. ELI LILLY AND CO.
Adequate disclosure, 7:38

ARISTOTLE
History, 1:2

ARO MFG. CO. v. CONVERTIBLE TOP REPLACEMENT CO.
Adequate commerciality, 14:32
Indirect infringement, 15:11, 15:12, 15:20, 15:24

ARRHYTHMIA RESEARCH TECHNOLOGY, INC. v. CORAZONIX CORP.
Computer-related inventions, 5:44
ARTICLE I
History, 1:10
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:1
ARTICLES OF CONFEDERATION
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:4
AS A WHOLE
Claims, hybrid claim presentations and nonlimiting recitations, 4:82
Non-obviousness, 9:1, 9:5, 9:6, 9:12
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:48, 5:56
ASEXUALLY REPRODUCED PLANTS
Static physical configurations, 5:12
ASSIGNING MEANINGS
Claims (this index)
ASSIGNMENT
Adequate disclosure, 7:54
Adequate utility, 7:51
Correction, 10:66-10:68
Defenses, estoppel, 17:42, 17:43
History, 1:16
Inventorship (this index)
Non-obviousness, 9:46, 9:47
ASSISTANT COMMISSIONERS
Generally, 2:22
ASSISTANT JUDGE OF CIRCUIT COURT
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ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE
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ASSOCIATIONS
History, 1:4
ASSUMPTION
Adequate disclosure, 7:29
AS-YET-UNDISCOVERED
Adequate utility, 7:14
AT TIME INVENTION WAS MADE
Non-obviousness, 9:21
ATHENAEUS
History, 1:2
ATLANTIC THERMOPLASTICS CO. v. FAYTEX CORP.
Claims, 4:74
AT&T CORP. v. EXCEL COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
Computer-related inventions, 5:44
AT THE TIME INVENTION WAS MADE
Non-obviousness, 9:32
AT THE TIME THE INVENTION WAS MADE
Non-obviousness, 9:21, 9:24
ATTORNEY GENERAL
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:15, 2:20
ATTORNEYS
Laches, lack of counsel, unreasonable delay, 2:22
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:22
ATTORNEYS’ FEES
Adequate commerciality, 14:78
AT&T v. EXCEL COMMUNICATIONS, INC.
Processes, 5:23, 5:37
AUKERMAN v. CHAIDES
Laches, 23:16
AUTHORS AND AUTHORSHIP
History, 1:11
AUTHORS AND AUTHORSHIP
—Cont’d
Inventorship, 10:6, 10:16
Static physical configurations, 5:11

AVOIDANCE
Defenses, 17:6

BACK FIRING
Claims, 4:85

BACKGROUND
Adequate utility, 7:10, 7:13, 7:16, 7:19
Anticipation, lack of, 8:29, 8:30, 8:32
Non-obviousness, 9:17, 9:19, 9:74

BACTERIA
Static physical configurations, 5:14, 5:17

BAIN v. MORSE
Central vs. peripheral claiming, 4:9
Priority, 8:101, 8:197

BASS
Non-obviousness, 9:37

BATTIN v. TAGGERT
Reissue of patent, 16:21

BAUER & CIE v. O’DONNELL
Adequate commerciality, 14:33, 14:39
Express and implied licenses, 19:19
Indirect infringement, 15:6, 15:7
Misuse of patent, 18:13

BAYER AG v. SCHEIN PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.
Adequate disclosure, 7:52, 7:53

BEDFORD v. HUNT
Adequate utility, 6:4, 6:6, 6:7, 6:9

BEMIS v. CHEVRON RESEARCH CO.
Correction of inventorship, 10:64

BEST MODE
Adequate Disclosure (this index)
Adequate utility, 7:1, 7:5, 7:9
America Invents Act, diminution of defense, 1:26

BEYOND REASONABLE DOUBT
Priority, 8:68, 8:69

BIFURCATED TREATMENT
History, 1:5

BIGHAM v. GODTFREDSEN
Priority, 8:66

BILATERAL CONTRACT
Justification, 1:38

BILSKI v. KAPPOS
Processes, 5:32

BINARY CLASSIFICATION
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:58

BINARY-CODED DECIMALS (BCD)
Computer-related inventions, 5:44

BIOENGINEERING
Static physical configurations, 5:13

BIOLOGICAL COMPONENTS
Static physical configurations, 5:17

BIOLOGICAL DEPOSITS
Adequate disclosure, 7:22
Adequate utility, 7:9

BIOLOGICAL MATERIALS
Adequate disclosure, 7:11
Statutory subject matter, 5:6
Index

BIOLGICAL PROCESSES
Claims, 4:6

BIOMATERIAL DEPOSITORY
Adequate utility, 7:37

BIOTECHNOLOGICAL PROCESS PATENT AMENDMENT ACT OF 1995
Non-obviousness, 9:1, 9:82, 9:83

BIOTECHNOLOGY
Adequate utility, 6:6, 7:14
Anticipation, lack of, 8:22
Claims, 4:75, 4:77, 4:80
Non-Obviousness (this index)
Priority, 8:50
Processes, 5:39
Static physical configurations, 5:14
Statutory subject matter, 5:1, 5:2, 5:16-5:18

BLACKLEDGE v. WEIR & CRAIG MFG. CO.
Joint inventorship, 10:51

BLACKSTONE'S COMMENTARIES
Inventorship, 10:4

BLAKE v. SMITH
Indirect infringement, 15:4

BLOCKING PATENT
Claims, 4:63

BLONDER-TONGUE LABORATORIES, INC. v. UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS FOUNDATION
Invalidity, 17:28-17:31

BLUE-PENCIL RULE
Non-Statutory Hybrid Inventions (this index)

BOARD OF EXAMINERS
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:32, 2:33

BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES (BPAI)
Generally, 2:22, 2:37
Computer-related inventions, 5:42
Joint inventorship, 10:46
Judicial review of decisions, 2:38
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:83
Priority, 8:46, 8:66

BOARD OF USEFUL ARTS
Non-obviousness, 9:2

BPAI
Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (BPAI) (this index)

BRAND NAMES
Adequate disclosure, 7:12

BREACH
Invalidity, 17:40

BREADTH AND NARROWNESS
Claims, 4:63

BREADTH OF CLAIM
Adequate disclosure, 7:4, 7:23-7:26, 7:33

BREATHE LIFE AND MEANING INTO STATEMENTS IN BODY
Claims, 4:99

BREEDING
Static physical configurations, 5:15, 5:17

BRENNER v. MANSON
Adequate disclosure, 7:14
Adequate utility, 6:6, 6:7, 6:17-6:19
Anticipation, lack of, 8:22
BRENNER v. MANSON—Cont’d
Priority, 8:50, 8:53, 8:57

BROWN v. DUCHESNE
Geographic scope, 12:4

BUBBLE HIERARCHY
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:78
Processes, 5:23

BUDDING
Static physical configurations, 5:14

BURDEN OF PLEADING
Six-year limitation, 21:20

BURDEN OF PROOF
Adequate utility, 6:16, 7:46
Claims, 4:2, 4:74, 4:93
Invalidity, 17:17
Laches, 23:39
Non-obviousness, 9:75
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:13
Six-year limitation, 21:19
Technological scope, 13:84

BURR v. DURYEE
Reissue of patent, 16:28

BUSINESS ENTITIES AND METHODS
Anticipation, lack of, 8:27
Inventorship (this index)
Joint inventorship, 10:52
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:80
Processes, 5:23
Static physical configurations, 5:10
Statutory Subject Matter (this index)

CALCULATIONS
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:81, 5:83
Reissue of patent, 16:117

CAMPBELL v. CITY OF HAVERHILL
Laches, 23:8
Six-year limitation, 21:6

CANCELLATION
Claims, 4:1
Technological scope, 13:104

CAP
Claims, 4:97, 4:98

CAPITAL EXPENDITURES
Inventorship, 10:17

CAPITAL RESOURCES
Inventorship, 10:17

CARBICE CORPORATION OF AMERICA v. AMERICAN PATENTS DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION
Indirect infringement, 15:8-15:10
Misuse of patent, 18:15

CARDINAL CHEMICAL CO. v. MORTON INTERNATIONAL, INC.
Invalidity, 17:24, 17:25

CARLTON v. VOKEE
Reissue of patent, 16:29

CARTER RULE
Joint inventorship, 10:53

CARTER v. BRAINTREE
Reissue of patent, 16:19

CASE LAW
See also Supreme Court (this index)
Adequate disclosure, 7:9, 7:25
Adequate utility, 6:14, 7:2, 7:14, 7:23, 7:46
Examination of Original Application (this index)
Geographic Scope of Infringement (this index)
History, 1:5, 1:17, 1:21
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CASE LAW—Cont’d
Inventorship, 10:6, 10:7, 10:11
Joint Inventorship (this index)
Misuse of Patent (this index)
Non-Obviousness (this index)
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:53
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:20, 2:26, 2:28
Prior inventor, prior-user rights, section 273 defense, 22:2-22:16
Priority, 8:56, 8:63
Processes, 5:24-5:26
Six-year limitation, section 286 defense, 21:2-21:15
Technological Scope of Infringe-ment (this index)

CATEGORIES OF ESTOPPEL
Early categories, 24:5

CAUSES OF ACTION
History, 1:14
Reissue of patent, 16:48, 16:49

CCPA
Court of Customs and Patent Appeals (CCPA) (this index)

CENTRAL CLAIMING
Claims (this index)

CERTIFICATES AND CERTIFICATION
Adequate commerciality, 14:78
Static physical configurations, 5:14, 5:15

CERTIORARI
Adequate utility, 6:6
Non-obviousness, 9:33
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:34, 2:43
Static physical configurations, 5:17

CHALLENGES
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:15
Processes, 5:39

CHANGE AND MODIFICATION
Adequate commerciality, 14:30, 14:64
Adequate utility, 6:18, 7:13, 7:22, 7:38
Anticipation, lack of, 8:22
Claims, 4:5, 4:6, 4:94, 4:101
Correction (this index)
Examination of Original Application (this index)
History, 1:16, 1:23, 1:25
Inventorship, 10:7, 10:14, 10:18, 10:45
Joint inventorship, 10:45, 10:50
Non-Obviousness (this index)
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:68, 5:81
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), generally, 2:1
Processes, 5:19, 5:24, 5:28, 5:30
Static physical configurations, 5:14
Temporal scope, 11:12-11:15

CHARGE TO JURY
Adequate utility, 6:9
Priority, 8:44

CHECKPOINT SYSTEMS, INC. v. U.S. INTERN. TRADE COM’N
Correction of inventorship, 10:67

CHEMICAL ARTS
Adequate commerciality, 14:61

CHEMICALS AND CHEMISTRY
Generally, 5:5, 5:9
Adequate disclosure, 7:25, 7:26
Adequate utility
generally, 6:7, 6:19
markers, construction of, 6:18
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CHEMICALS AND CHEMISTRY
—Cont’d
Adequate utility—Cont’d
process, 6:17
products, 6:1, 6:6, 6:16
Anticipation, lack of, 8:22
Bonding, 5:9
Claims (this index)
Compositions, 5:17
Field, 5:8
Hybrid claim presentations and nonlimiting recitations, 4:75-
4:78
Non-Obviousness (this index)
Priority, 8:46, 8:50
Processes, generally, 5:39
Static physical configurations, 5:8, 5:9, 5:17
Statutory Subject Matter (this index)
CHEVRON U.S.A., INC. v. NATURAL RESOURCES DEFENSE COUNCIL
Generally, 2:48
CHIEF JUSTICE OF DISTRICT COURT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:33
CIRCUIT COURT FOR DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CIRCuit
Non-obviousness, 9:33
CIRCUIT COURTS
Generally, 2:33
Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, 5:27
Regional federal circuit courts of appeal, 1:24
CIRCUITS (HARDWARE)
Computer-related inventions, 5:41

CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE
Adequate commerciality, 14:16
Adequate utility, 6:20
Anticipation, lack of, 8:27
Claims, 4:31
Indirect infringement, 15:15, 15:16, 15:22, 15:24
Non-Obviousness (this index)
Priority (this index)
CIRCUMSTANTIAL INFERENCE
Indirect infringement, 15:15
CITY OF ELIZABETH v. NICHOLSON PAVEMENT CO.
Priority, 8:250
CIVIL ACTIONS
Invalidity, full and fair opportunity to litigate, 17:31
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:7, 2:38
Priority, 8:68
Processes, 5:39
CLAIMED
Defined, 13:98
CLAIMS
Generally, 4:1 et seq.
Abstract identifier, 4:97
Accuracy, definitional, 4:9
Adequate disclosure, 4:2, 7:7-7:9
Administrative proceedings, 4:6
Administrative publications, 4:2
All-elements rule
hybrid claim presentations and nonlimiting recitations, 4:71-4:74, 4:80-4:82
policy justification and historical development, 4:6
tripartite form of individual claims, 4:97
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### CLAIMS—Cont’d

**Alternative organization. Central vs. peripheral claiming, below**
- Amendment of claim, 4:69
- Amendment of language, 4:94
- Amendment of statutes
  - multiple claims in single patent, 4:102
  - policy justification and historical development, 4:5, 4:6
  - section 103(b), 1995, 4:75-4:78
- Anticipation, lack of, 4:2, 4:71, 8:11-8:14
- Antitrust, 4:80
- Appeal and review
  - central vs. peripheral claiming, 4:9
  - construction and interpretation, 4:19
  - hybrid claim presentations and nonlimiting recitations, 4:76, 4:80
  - means expressions, 4:93
  - policy justification and historical development, 4:6
- As a whole, consideration, 4:82
- Assigning meanings
  - peripheral claiming, below
  - policy justification and historical development, 4:2
- Atlantic Thermoplastics Co. v. Faytex Corp., 4:74
- Back firing, 4:85
- Bain v. Morse, 4:9
- Biological processes, 4:6
- Biotechnology, 4:77, 4:80
- Blocking patent, 4:63
- Body, 4:96, 4:97

### CLAIMS—Cont’d

**Breadth and narrowness, 4:63**
- Breathe life and meaning into statements in body, 4:99
- Burden of countering alternative position, 4:2
- Burden of proof, 4:74, 4:93
- Cancellation of claims, 4:1
- Cap, 4:97, 4:98
- Central claiming
  - generally, 4:2-4:6
  - adequate utility, 7:5, 7:46
  - history, 1:21, 1:23
  - means expressions, below peripheral claiming compared.
  - Central vs. peripheral claiming, below processes, 5:21
- Central vs. peripheral claiming
  - generally, 4:8-4:62
  - alternative organization.
  - Construction and interpretation, below in this group construction and interpretation
  - generally, 4:10-4:60
  - alternative organization
    - generally, 4:54-4:60
    - application to claims, 4:58-4:60
    - general example of semantic and pragmatic meanings, 4:56
    - illustrative diagram, 4:59
    - illustrative diagram of semantic and pragmatic meanings, 4:57
    - recommendation, 4:60
  - semantic and pragmatic meanings, 4:55-4:57
  - contract interpretation, 4:52, 4:53
- decision maker. Identity of decision maker, below this group
Central vs. peripheral claiming
—Cont’d
construction and interpretation
—Cont’d
extrinsic sources. Intrinsic vs. extrinsic sources, below in this subgroup
fact, law versus. Law versus fact, below in this subgroup
hierarchy of sources, generally, 4:32-4:60
historical development
generally, 4:33-4:40
Johnson Worldwide v. Zebco, 4:36
Phillips v. AWH, 4:39
subsequent developments, 4:40
Texas Digital Instruments v. Telegenix, 4:38
Toro v. White Consol. Industries, 4:37
Vitronics Corp. v. Conceptronic, Inc., 4:34
identity of decision maker
generally, 4:11-4:24
judge versus jury, below in this subgroup
law versus fact, below this subgroup
instructions to jury. Judge versus jury, below in this subgroup
intrinsic vs. extrinsic sources
generally, 4:41, 4:50-4:53
contract interpretation
analogy, 4:52, 4:53
statutory interpretation, contrast with, 4:51
judge versus jury
generally, 4:21-4:24
application to interpretation, 4:23, 4:24

Law versus fact
generally, 4:12-4:20
appeal review, 4:19
corollary issues, 4:18-4:20
finality, 4:19
Markman v. Westview Instruments, 4:16
mixed questions of law and fact, 4:14
preclusion of issue, 4:20
stare decisis, 4:20
underlying questions of fact, 4:17
patentability versus validity, 4:62
questions of law and fact.
Law versus fact, above in this subgroup
required process, 4:61
special sub-rules
generally, 4:42-4:49
claims, 4:43
contra proferentum, 4:48
dictionaries, 4:46
expert testimony, 4:47
prosecution history, 4:45
specification, 4:44
validity, preservation of, 4:49
statutory interpretation
contrasted with intrinsic and extrinsic sources,
Central vs. peripheral claiming
—Cont’d
construction and interpretation
—Cont’d
target meaning
generally, 4:25-4:31
application to patent interpretations, 4:29-4:31
author and recipient meanings, generally, 4:26-4:28
contract interpretation, example, 4:28
patentee’s intended meaning as circumstantial evidence, 4:31
patentee’s meaning versus recipient’s meaning, 4:30, 4:31
statutory interpretation, example, 4:27
verdicts. Judge versus jury, above in this subgroup
definitional accuracy, 4:9
evidence, intrinsic vs. extrinsic sources. Construction and interpretation, above in this group
extrinsic sources. Construction and interpretation, above in this group
fact. Construction and interpretation, above in this group
Federal Circuit courts
historical development, decisions after Vitronics, 4:35-4:38
Johnson Worldwide v. Zebco, 4:36
notice and definitional accuracy, 4:9
Texas Digital Instruments v. Telegenix, 4:38

Central vs. peripheral claiming
—Cont’d
Federal Circuit courts—Cont’d
Toro v. White Consol. Industries, 4:37
historical development.
Construction and interpretation, above in this group
instructions to jury. Construction and interpretation, above in this group
intrinsic vs. extrinsic sources. Construction and interpretation, above in this group
law vs. fact. Construction and interpretation, above in this group
notice, 4:9
questions of law and fact.
Construction and interpretation, above in this group
special sub-rules. Construction and interpretation, above in this group
verdicts. Construction and interpretation, above in this group
Change and modification
generally, 4:5, 4:6, 4:94, 4:101
see also entries beginning:
"Amendment," above

Chemicals
dominance and subservience, 4:65, 4:66
hybrid claim presentations and nonlimiting recitations, 4:73-4:76, 4:80-4:82
policy justification and historical development, 4:4, 4:6
starting and ending materials, 4:75-4:78
Circumstantial evidence, 4:31
CLAIMS—Cont’d
Clinton Administration, 4:77
Closed formats, 4:98
Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), 4:73
Combinations
dominance and subservience, below
means expressions, below subcombination, 4:64
Commentary, means expressions, 4:90
Common law, 4:5, 4:77, 4:78
Competitors, 4:2
Comprising, 4:98
Compulsory license, 4:63
Computer industry, 4:81
Configurations, 4:87, 4:94
Conflict between tribunals, 4:80
Congress
definiteness and notice, 4:94
hybrid claim presentations and nonlimiting recitations, 4:75, 4:80
means expressions, 4:87, 4:88, 4:93
multiple claims in single patent, 4:103
policy justification and historical development, 4:5, 4:6
Consisting essentially of, 4:98
Consisting of, 4:98
Construction and interpretation, generally, 4:1 et seq.
Contract interpretation, 4:28, 4:52, 4:53
Contra proferentum, 4:48
Contributions, 4:9, 4:64, 4:83
Corresponding structure, 4:5, 4:91, 4:93
Costs and expenses, 4:63, 4:73, 4:83, 4:94
Court of Appeals, 4:76
Court of Appeals for Federal Circuit, 4:6, 4:80, 4:88, 4:93
CLAIMS—Cont’d
Court of Customs and Patent Appeals (CCPA), 4:76, 4:93
Cross licenses, 4:63
Damages, 4:80
Decision maker. Central vs. peripheral claiming, above
Defective specification, 4:2
Definiteness, 4:6, 4:94
Definitional accuracy, 4:9
Definition of patent rights, generally, 4:4
Dependent, multiply, 4:5
Dependent claims, 4:102, 4:103
Dependent form, 4:5
Determinations, 4:72, 4:73, 4:91
Diagrams, 4:63, 4:97
Dictionaries, 4:46
Disclaimers, 4:2
Disclosure, see lines throughout this index topic
Discretion of applicants, 4:2
District courts
definiteness and notice, 4:94
hybrid claim presentations and nonlimiting recitations, 4:73, 4:80, 4:81
means expressions, 4:93
policy justification and historical development, 4:6
DNA sequences, 4:66
Doctrine of Equivalents
central vs. peripheral claiming, 4:9
means expressions, 4:87, 4:88, 4:92
policy justification and historical development, 4:4, 4:6
Doctrine of Overclaiming, 4:64
Dominance and subservience generally, 4:7, 4:63-4:66
genus and specie, 4:65
infringement, 4:66
limitations and restrictions, 4:63, 4:65
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CLAIMS—Cont’d
Dominance and subservience
—Cont’d
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public possession prior to patentee’s date of invention, paragraph 102(a), below
Prior acts and matters
conceptual inconsistencies, above
law, 8:105
novelty, Paragraph 102(b), above
public possession prior to patentee’s date of invention, paragraph 102(a), below
work, 8:162
Private acts and activity, 8:69, 8:82
Private laboratory notebooks and drawings, 8:74
Private offers for sale, 8:228
Probabilities, 8:170
Property-based compensation, 8:36
Property law, 8:36, 8:38
Provisional application, 8:149, 8:155, 8:216
Public. Novelty, Paragraph 102(b), above
PRIORITY—Cont’d

Publication
description in previously filed patent, paragraph 102(e), 8:141
novelty in relation to filing date of application, Paragraph 102(b), 8:220-8:223
public possession prior to patentee’s date of invention, paragraph 102(a), below

Public disclosure, 8:64, 8:159
Public domain, 8:36, 8:40
Public invention, interference priority vs., 8:43
Public knowledge. Public possession prior to patentee’s date of invention, paragraph 102(a), below
Public possession prior to patentee’s date of invention, paragraph 102(a), generally, 8:156-8:198
circumstantial proof of public knowledge
generally, 8:169-8:190
conflicting authorities, 8:183
described in patent, 8:178-8:181
existing authorities, synthesis of
generally, 8:186-8:190
abandoned and failed experiments, 8:189
individual uses, 8:187
reduction to practice, relation to, 8:188
secret, noninforming uses, 8:190
improper analogies to paragraph 102(b), 8:184
low probabilities, acceptance of, 8:170
potential relation to paragraph 102(d), 8:179

Public possession prior to patentee’s date of invention, paragraph 102(a) — Cont’d
circumstantial proof of public knowledge — Cont’d
printed publication
generally, 8:173-8:177
effective date of publication, 8:176
historical development, 8:174
printed defined, 8:177
prior public knowledge, evidence of, 8:175-8:177
publication defined, 8:177
printed publications, relation to, 8:180
prior use and prior invention, 8:185
rule-based definiteness, 8:171
secret patents, 8:181
social disutility, 8:172
used, generally, 8:182-8:190
evidence. Circumstantial proof of public knowledge, above in this group
existing authorities, synthesis of. Circumstantial proof of public knowledge, above in this group
gеographic limitations
generally, 8:191-8:198
administrative justification, 8:192
Bain v. Morse, 8:197
diffusion, speed of, 8:194
historical development, 8:195-8:197
in this country defined, 8:194
local priority, symmetry with, 8:193
Shaw v. Cooper, 8:196
Public possession prior to patentee’s date of invention, paragraph 102(a)—Cont’d
historical development and policy justification generally, 8:157-8:163
evidence of superior priority, 8:160-8:162
general absence of policy discussions, 8:158
inconsistencies with paragraph 102(g), 8:163
knowledge and circumstantial evidence of prior knowledge, 8:161
public disclosure, 8:159
status of applicant’s own prior work, 8:162
justification. Historical development and policy justification, above in this group
limitations and restrictions.
Geographic limitations, above in this group
notice and knowledge. Public knowledge, below in this group
policy justification. Historical development and policy justification, above in this group
printed publication.
Circumstantial proof of public knowledge, above in this group
publication. Circumstantial proof of public knowledge, above in this group
public knowledge generally, 8:164-8:168
abandoned applications, 8:168
circumstantial proof of public knowledge, above in this group

Qualification, 8:57
Quantified abandonment, 8:210
Quantified probativeness, 8:72
Race of diligence, 8:79
Ready for patenting, 8:235
Reason, rule of, 8:70, 8:71, 8:74
Reasonable diligence, 8:65
Reduction to practice generally, 8:44
collection, 8:53
diligence, 8:63-8:65, 8:67
evidence, 8:70
experimental use, 8:258
novelty, 8:258
used, 8:188
Reed v. Cuter, 8:44
Reference, 8:36, 8:48, 8:62
Reference, importance of subject matter claimed in, 8:148
Reissue of patent, 16:82
Rejection of application, 8:73, 8:74
Reliance on exact claim language, 8:259
Renewed activity, 8:130
Research and development, 8:46
Resolution, 8:62
Reversal, 8:46
Rule 131. Date of invention in paragraphs 102(a) and (e), above
Rule-based control, 8:72
Rule-based definiteness, 8:171
Index

PRIORITY—Cont’d
Sales. Novelty, Paragraph 102(b), above
Same invention, 8:113-8:115
Secrecy, 8:87
Secret, 8:64, 8:190
Secret patents, 8:181
Section 103, 8:136
Section 104. Conceptual inconsistencies, above
Settled issues, 8:228-8:231
Shaw v. Cooper, 8:196, 8:203
Showing, 8:135
Simultaneous events, 8:128
Skilled in the art, 8:46, 8:58
Skilled person, 8:54
Social costs, 8:33
Social disutility, 8:172
Sophistication, 8:44
Species and genus, 8:47
Spero v. Ringold, 8:46
Standard of evidence, 8:69
State of mind, 8:58
Status of applicant’s own prior work, 8:162
Subcombination of elements, 8:47
Subjective knowledge, 8:52
Subjective possession, 8:46
Subsequent applications, 8:126
Substantive law, 8:223
Sufficiency of single offer, 8:229
Sufficient commercialization, 8:237
Sufficient technological completion, 8:233
Superior priority, 8:34, 8:142, 8:160-8:162
Superior title, 8:40
Suppression
description in previously filed patent, paragraph 102(e), 8:143

PRIORITY—Cont’d
Suppression—Cont’d
first-to-invent priority, Section 102(g), above
Supreme Court
generally, 8:50
Alexander Milburn Co. v. Davis-Bournonville Co., 8:140
Andrews v. Hovey, 8:206, 8:251
Bain v. Morse, 8:101, 8:197
City of Elizabeth v. Nicholson Pavement Co., 8:250
Electric Storage Battery Co. v. Shimadzu, 8:102
In re Borst, 8:165
In re Hilmer, 8:121, 8:153
Metallizing Engineering v. Kenyon Bearing, 8:243
Paulik v. Rizkalla, 8:130
Pennock v. Dialogue, 8:203
Pfaff v. Wells Electronics, 8:234
Shaw v. Cooper, 8:196, 8:203
Sydeman v. Thoma, 8:60-8:62
Symmetry arguments, 8:100
Technical content of showing, required, 8:135
Technology, 8:233
Temporal scope, 11:23
Testing required, degree of, 8:59-8:62
Tests, 8:55, 8:57, 8:59, 8:60, 8:62, 8:67
Theoretical justification, 8:92
Third parties, experiments by, 8:256
Third-party offers, 8:232
Time and dateconceptual inconsistencies, 8:123
date of invention in paragraphs 102(a) and (e), above

© 2012 Thomson Reuters/West, 9/2012
Index-161
PRIORITY—Cont’d
Time and date—Cont’d
novelty, Paragraph 102(b), above
public possession prior to patentee’s date of invention, paragraph 102(a), above
Time-wise priority, 8:34
Traditional justification, 8:71
Treaties, 8:154
Tripartite analysis, 8:60
12-month period, computation of, 8:123
Underlying rationales, 8:84-8:87
Unexpected properties, 8:52
Unified standard, 8:61
Unresolved issues, 8:244
Unsettled issues, 8:232, 8:257-8:260
Use, right to, 8:38
Useful arts, 8:56
US Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) vs. court proceedings, 8:75
Utility, 8:51
Vacations, 8:67
Validity, 8:69
Value, 8:56
Voluntariness, 8:67
Weight and sufficiency of evidence, 8:72
Withdrawal of material from public domain, 8:241
Witnesses
generally, 8:34, 8:68, 8:69
competency of, 8:72
corroborated, generally, 8:70-8:75
oral testimony, 8:74
standard of proof, 8:69
Workability, 8:60
Written acts and matters, 8:74

PRIOR MINIMAL INFRINGEMENT
Laches, unreasonable delay, 23:35

PRIOR STATUTES
Defenses, general pleading theory, 17:3, 17:10

PRIOR USER RIGHT
Inventorship, 10:14
Section 273 defense. Prior Inventor, Prior-User Rights (this index)

PRIVACY
Processes, 5:39

PRIVATE ACTION
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:18

PRIVATE ACTS AND ACTIVITIES
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:2, 2:4
Priority, 8:69, 8:82

PRIVATE COMMUNICATIONS
History, 1:1

PRIVATE CORPORATIONS
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:22

PRIVATE ENTITIES
Policy justification, 1:39

PRIVATE INFORMATION
Non-obviousness, 9:46

PRIVATE KNOWLEDGE
Adequate disclosure, 7:17

PRIVATE LABORATORY NOTEBOOKS AND DRAWINGS
Priority, 8:74

PRIVATELY KNOWN INFORMATION
Non-obviousness, 9:43
PRIVATE OFFERS FOR SALE
Priority, 8:228

PRIVATE PARTIES
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:17

PRIVATE REMEDIES
History, 1:18

PRIVATE SINGLE-SOURCE CONTROL
Statutory subject matter, 5:5

PRIVILEGES
History, 1:4, 1:12

PRIVY SEAL
History, 1:1

PROBABILITIES
Priority, 8:170

PROCESS CONTROL CORP. v. HYDRECLAIM CORP.
Adequate utility, 6:19

PROCESSES—Cont’d
Apparatus—Cont’d
variations of disclosed apparatus, 5:21
Appeal and review, 5:21, 5:26, 5:27, 5:30
Application, 5:24, 5:26
Arts, 5:21
Bilski v. Kappos, 5:32
Biotech industry, 5:39
Biotechnology industry, 5:39
Board of Appeals, 5:27
Bubble hierarchy, 5:23
Business methods
generally, 5:28-5:33
apparatus-independent business methods, 5:23
early history, 5:29
hybrid claiming, 5:38
modern developments, 5:30
observations, 5:36-5:38
physical transformation, adapting requirement of, 5:37
Case law, 5:24-5:26
Central claiming, 5:21
Challenges, 5:39
Change and modification, 5:19, 5:24, 5:28, 5:30
Chemical compositions, 5:39
Circuit court, 5:27
Civil action, 5:39
Clarity, 5:28
Cochran v. Deener, 5:22
Commercial manufacture, 5:39
Commercial processes, 5:37
Common law, 5:24
Competition, 5:39
Compositions, 5:39
Compromise, 5:39
Computers, 5:24, 5:26, 5:27, 5:30
Congress, 5:30
Consent orders, 5:39
PROCESSES—Cont’d
Construction and interpretation, 5:21, 5:23, 5:27
Consumer, 5:39
Contracts and agreements, 5:29
Contribution to the art, 5:21
Conversion, 5:30
Copyright, 5:38
Corning v. Burden, 5:21
Costs and expenses, 5:39
Coupons, 5:29
Court of Customs and Patent Appeals (CCPA), 5:26, 5:27, 5:30
CPR, 5:39
Creative thought, 5:26
Current developments, 5:31
Customer records, handling, 5:28
Damages, 5:39
Data constructs, manipulation of, 5:19
Data systems, 5:30
Defenses, 5:23
Definiteness, 5:26
Definition, 5:19
Demand, 5:39
Descriptions, 5:29
Developments, 5:31
Diagnostic procedures, 5:39
Dicta, asserted in, 5:21
Directed summary judgment, 5:30
Disclosure, 5:19, 5:21
Discovery, 5:24
Discretion of human participant, 5:27
District court, 5:30
Dolbear v. American Bell Telephone Co., 5:24
Drugs, 5:39
Economic control, 5:38
Electricity, 5:21
Embodyments, 5:21, 5:22
Emotional thought, 5:26
End results, 5:24

PROCESSES—Cont’d
Enforcement, 5:39
English law, 5:21
European Patent Convention (EPC), 5:39
Examination process, 5:30
Examining corps, 5:38
Exception for Ministerial Acts, 5:27
Exceptions, exclusions, and exemptions
business methods, 5:29, 5:30, 5:39
exclusions, generally, 5:22, 5:24, 5:26, 5:29
mathematical formulae, scientific principles, natural phenomena, and end results, 5:24
mental steps, 5:26
peripheral claiming, 5:22
Exclusive power, 5:21
Expanded post-grant review, 5:35
Ex parte McNabb, 5:27
Ex parte Read, 5:27
Facsimile machines, 5:24
Federal Circuit, 5:30
Fees, 5:39
Filing civil action, 5:39
Financial revenue, 5:39
Food and Drug Administration, 5:39
Foreign countries, 5:39
Ganske/Frisk compromise, 5:39
General agreement, 5:29
General Patent Act of 1870, 5:21
Gene therapy treatments, 5:39
Geographic scope, 12:25
Gottschalk v. Benson, 5:24
Halliburton Oil Well Cementing Co. v. Walker, 5:27
Health care entities, 5:39
Heimlich maneuver, 5:39
Historical developments, industrial processes, 5:21
INDEX

PROCESSES—Cont’d
History, 5:30
Human interpretive, 5:25
Human intervention, 5:24
Human participant, 5:25, 5:27
Hybrid claims, 4:74, 5:29, 5:36
Imaginative thought, 5:26
Immunity, 5:30
Improvements, 5:21
Incentives, 5:39
Industrial processes, generally, 5:19-5:23
Infringement, 5:23, 5:26, 5:30, 5:39
In re Heritage, 5:27
In re Musgrave, 5:26
In re Prater, 5:26
In re Schrader, 5:30
In re Warmerdam, 5:23
Injunctions, 5:39
Intent, 5:30, 5:37
Internal decisions of Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 5:29
Internal operations of Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 5:30
Interpretive judgment, 5:26
Interpretive mental acts, 5:27
Intervention, 5:24
Issuance of patent, 5:21, 5:39
Judgments, 5:26, 5:30
Judicial decisions, 5:19, 5:37
Ledger sheets, 5:29
Legislation, 5:28, 5:39
Le roy v. Tatham, 5:21
Licensed health professionals, 5:39
Licensing fees, 5:39
Limitations and restrictions—Cont’d
medical and surgical procedures, 5:39
mental steps, 5:26
Logarithmic scales, 5:27
Manipulation of physical apparatus, 5:27
Manipulation of raw, physical materials, 5:36
Manual implementation of computer technology, 5:30
Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), 5:30
Mathematical algorithm, 5:30
Mathematical formulae, 5:22, 5:24
Medical and surgical procedures, 5:39
Medical device or machine, 5:39
Medical equipment, 5:39
Medical information, 5:39
Medical professionals, 5:39
Mental activity, 5:25, 5:27
Mental acts, 5:27
Mental steps, 5:22, 5:25-5:27
Merger doctrine, 5:38
Ministerial acts, 5:25
Modern developments, 5:31
Modern developments, industrial processes, 5:23
Monopolies, 5:21
Motive, 5:21
Natural phenomena, 5:24
Natural state, 5:24
Nature, power of, 5:21
Network printers, 5:24
New medical procedure, 5:39
Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, 5:27
Non-statutory, 5:23, 5:26, 5:29-5:32
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:81
PROCESSES—Cont’d
Non-statutory subject matter, 5:29
Notice and knowledge, 5:21, 5:24
Novelty, 5:21
Nullity, 5:24
Numerical calculation, 5:30
Numerical construct, 5:23
Objections, 5:26, 5:29
Orders, 5:39
O’Reilly v. Morse, 5:24
Paper accounting forms, 5:38
Participation, 5:30
Patentability, generally, 5:22
Patent Act of 1790, 5:21
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO)
  business methods, 5:28-5:30
  industrial processes, 5:21
  internal decisions of Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 5:29
  mathematical formulae, scientific principles, natural phenomena, and end results, 5:24
  medical and surgical procedures, 5:39
  mental steps, 5:26, 5:27
Patient privacy, 5:39
Performance, 5:25, 5:26, 5:30
Peripheral claiming, 5:21, 5:22, 5:24
Per se invention, 5:29
Per se method, 5:21
Per se patentable subject matter, 5:21
Per se processes, 5:21
Pharmaceuticals, 5:39
Physical objects, 5:19, 5:30
Physical transformation, 5:23, 5:26
Physicians, 5:39
Policy justification, 5:26, 5:29

PROCESSES—Cont’d
Policy rationales, mental steps, 5:26
Post-grant review, 5:35
Practical application, 5:21
Price, 5:39
Printers, 5:24
Printing on ledger sheets, 5:29
Prior art, 5:30
Privacy, 5:39
Publication, 5:39
Purely manual implementations, 5:26
Purely mental acts, 5:27
Pure method, 5:22
Purity, increase in, 5:24
Qualifications, 5:21
Qualitative judgment, 5:26
Quality of life, 5:39
References, 5:22, 5:38
Rejection of application
  business methods, 5:29, 5:30, 5:38
  mathematical formulae, scientific principles, natural phenomena, and end results, 5:24
  mental steps, 5:26, 5:27
Research and development, 5:39
Researchers, 5:39
Reversal, 5:30
Review, 5:35
Robotic environment, 5:23
Royalties, 5:39
Scientific laws and principles, 5:22, 5:24
Secrecy, 5:39
Section 102, 5:38
Section 103, 5:38
Section 273, 5:30
Section 281, 5:39
Section 283, 5:39
Section 285, 5:39
Section 287(c), 5:39
INDEX

PROCESSES—Cont’d
Section 616, 5:39
Social cost, 5:39
Social underutilization, 5:39
Software, 5:43-5:45
Specification, 5:19, 5:21, 5:26
State Street Bank & Trust Co. v.
Signature Financial Group,
Inc., 5:30, 5:38
Statute of Monopolies, 5:21
Statutes, 5:33-5:35
Step-by-step, 5:38
Subjective thought to perform, 5:25
Summary judgment, 5:30
Supreme Court, 5:21, 5:22, 5:24
Tax strategies, 5:34
Telecommunications industry, 5:23
Tilghman v. Mitchell, 5:21
Trade secrets, 5:30
Transformation, 5:19, 5:22, 5:30
Treatises, 5:30
Trial court, 5:21
True method, 5:27
Unassisted human thought, 5:26
Validity
business methods, 5:28, 5:30
industrial processes, 5:21
medical and surgical
procedures, 5:39
mental steps, 5:27
Variations of disclosed apparatus, 5:21
Void, 5:24
Wyeth v. Stone, 5:24

PROCESS PATENTS
AMENDMENT ACT OF
1988
Geographic scope, 12:36-12:38

PRODUCT
Defined, 12:37

PRODUCT-AND-METHOD
Claims, 4:63

PRODUCT-BY-PROCESS
Claims, 4:73, 4:74, 4:82, 4:102

PRODUCTION AND
PRODUCTION PROCESS
Adequate disclosure, 7:52, 7:53
Geographic scope, 12:32
Static physical configurations, 5:9

PRODUCTION DETAILS
Adequate disclosure
best mode, 7:52

PRODUCTIVE KNOWLEDGE
Adequate utility, 7:5

PRODUCTIVE USE
Adequate utility, 7:1, 7:6

PRODUCT METHOD
Claims, 4:66

PRODUCTS MADE BY
PATENTED PROCESS
Geographic Scope of Infringe-
ment (this index)

PROFITS
Adequate commerciality, 14:12
Adequate utility, 6:19, 7:5
Claims, 4:63
Joint inventorship, 10:53
Non-statutory hybrid inventions,
5:61
Policy justification, 1:34, 1:39,
1:41
Statutory subject matter, 5:4

PRO FORMA
Non-obviousness, 9:84

PROGRAMS
Computer-Related Inventions
(this index)

PROMOTING PROGRESS
Non-obviousness, 9:9

© 2012 Thomson Reuters/West, 9/2012 Index-167
PROPER INVENTORSHIP
   Inventorship (this index)
   Joint inventorship, 10:20-10:22
PROPER OWNERSHIP
   Inventorship, 10:7
PROPER PLACEMENT
   Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:63
PROPERTY-BASED COMPENSATION
   Priority, 8:36
PROPERTY LAW
   Inventorship, 10:4, 10:14
   Misuse of patent, patent rights as property, 18:8
   Priority, 8:36, 8:38
PROSECUTION
   Adequate utility, 6:13
   Claims, 4:93
   Correction of inventorship, 10:56
   Examination of Original Application (this index)
   Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:22
   Reissue of Patent (this index)
PROSECUTION HISTORY
   Claims, 4:45
   Estoppel, Technological Scope of Infringement (this index)
PROSPECTIVE-USE-BASED VIEW
   Adequate utility, 6:19
PROSPECTS
   Justification, 1:40, 1:42
PROTECTIONISM
   Prior inventor, prior-user rights, 22:5
PROVISIONAL APPLICATION
   Priority, 8:149, 8:155, 8:216

PROVISIONAL RIGHTS
   Temporal Scope of Infringement (this index)

PTO
   Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) (this index)
PUBLIC ACCESSIBILITY
   Joint inventorship, 10:51
PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEES
   Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:22

PUBLICATION
   Adequate disclosure, 7:5, 7:18
   Anticipation, lack of, 8:31
   Claims, 4:2
   Examination of Original Application (this index)
   Non-Obviousness (this index)
   Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:20, 2:24
   Priority (this index)
   Processes, 5:39
   Temporal Scope of Infringement (this index)

PUBLIC DISCLOSURE
   Non-obviousness, 9:22, 9:42, 9:51
   Policy justification, 1:37, 1:38
   Priority, 8:64, 8:159

PUBLIC DOMAIN
   Anticipation, lack of, 8:27-8:29
   Correction of inventorship, 10:68
   Examination of Original Application (this index)
   History, 1:15
   Non-Obviousness (this index)
   Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:4
   Priority, 8:36, 8:40
   Static physical configurations, 5:18

Index-168
QUALIFICATIONS—Cont’d
Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)
History, 1:21
Inventorship (this index)
Joint Inventorship (this index)
Non-Obviousness (this index)
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:74
Priority, 8:57
Processes, 5:21
Static physical configurations, 5:15

QUESTIONS OF CAPACITY FOR USE
Adequate commerciality, 14:29-14:31

QUESTIONS OF LAW
Claims (this index)

QUID PRO QUO
Claims, 4:91

RACE OF DILIGENCE
Priority, 8:79

RACE-TO-INVENT
Adequate utility, 7:5

RADIO CORP. OF AMERICA v. ANDREA
Adequate commerciality, 14:21, 14:22, 14:26

RAISING QUESTIONS
Indirect infringement, 15:24

RAW MATERIALS
Policy justification, 1:39

REACTIVE MEASURES
Reissue of patent, 16:17-16:46

READY FOR PATENTING
Priority, 8:235

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST
Adequate disclosure, 7:54

REAL PROPERTY OR CHATTEL
Joint inventorship, 10:49

REASON, RULE OF
Priority, 8:70, 8:71, 8:74

REASONABLE APPREHENSION
Adequate commerciality, 14:80

REASONABLE DILIGENCE
Priority, 8:65

REASONABLE EXPERIMENTATION
Adequate disclosure, 7:20

REASONABLE MIND
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:43

REASONABLENESS
Adequate commerciality, 14:72
Judicial review, 2:41

REASONABLE NOTICE
Claims, 4:2

REASONABLE PEOPLE
Claims, 4:3

REASONABLE RELATIONSHIP
Adequate commerciality, 14:68, 14:73

REASONABLY CAPABLE OF USE
Adequate commerciality, 14:19

REASONABLY CLEAR
Claims, 4:94

REASONABLY CORRELATED
Adequate utility, 7:23

REASONABLY PERTINENT
Non-obviousness, 9:18
REFERENCE—Cont’d
Adequate utility, 6:7
Anticipation, lack of, 8:13, 8:22, 8:25
Correction of inventorship, 10:65, 10:66, 10:68
Disclosure (this index)
Examination of Original Application (this index)
Joint inventorship, 10:46
Non-Obviousness (this index)
Priority, 8:36, 8:48, 8:62, 8:148
Processes, 5:22, 5:38

REFORM MOVEMENT
Reissue of patent, 16:41

REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA v. ELI LILLY & CO.
Adequate disclosure, 7:37, 7:39

REGIONAL CIRCUIT COURTS
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:37

REGIONAL FEDERAL CIRCUIT COURTS OF APPEAL
History, 1:24

REGISTRATION
Congress, 2:16
Designs, 5:46
Geographic scope, registered vessels, 12:13
History, 1:18, 1:19
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), generally, 2:2

REGULAR RESULT
Anticipation, lack of, 8:25

REHEARINGS
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:22

REHEARING SUA SPONTE
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:22

REISSUE OF PATENT
Generally, 16:1, 16:72
Accident, mistake or inadvertence, pre-1882 broadening reissues, 16:25
Analysis and recommendation, same invention, 16:97
Broadening changes, defect claims, 16:77-16:79
Broadening defined, requirements for eligibility, 16:78
Burr v. Duryee, pre-1882 broadening reissues, reactive measures, 16:28
Calculation on date of reissue grant, 16:117
Carlton v. Bokee, pre-1882 broadening reissues, reactive measures, 16:29
Causes of action, effect of reissue on existing, 1882-1952 developments, 16:48, 16:49
Claims, 4:4, 4:9
Continuation status under Section 120, eligibility, 16:83
Dann amendments, ‘no-defect’ reissue practice, 16:64
Deceptive intent lacking, 16:98
Defect generally, 16:74
broadening changes claims, 16:77-16:79
claims, generally, 16:75-16:80
continuation status under Section 120, 16:83

Index-172
REISSUE OF PATENT—Cont’d
Defect—Cont’d
definiteness, changes to improve, 16:80
definition of broadening, broadening changes claims, 16:78
disclosure, 16:81
inventorship changes, 16:84
narrowing changes claims, 16:76
new matter prohibition, 16:81
priority, assertions under Section 119, 16:82
reexamination, “no-defect” reissue practice under Dann amendments, 16:64
Section 119 priority, 16:82
Section 120 continuation status, 16:83
two-year time limit, broadening changes claims, 16:79
Definiteness, changes to improve, eligibility, 16:80
Definitions
broadening, 16:78
error, general definition, 16:105-16:107
Disclosure, eligibility, 16:81
1846-1884, Stimpson v. West Chester R Co. decision as to error, 16:102
1884-1952, Mahn v. Harwood decision as to error, 16:103
Eligibility. Requirements for eligibility, below
Error, mechanisms to prevent expanded prosecution, 16:99-16:107
Examination of Original Application (this index)
Existing embodiments, implied license as to, 16:119
Expiration date of new rights, limitations on remedies, 16:114

REISSUE OF PATENT—Cont’d
Federal Circuit decisions, same invention, 16:93-16:96
General claiming requirements, pre-1882 broadening reissues, 16:26-16:29
Giant Powder Co. v. California Powder Workst, pre-1882 broadening reissues, same invention, 16:24
Goodyear v. Day, pre-1882 broadening reissues, same invention, 16:23
GranGrant v. Raymond, prestatutory history, 16:5
Grant of reissue, calculation on date, 16:117
Historical development generally, 16:2, 16:3
accident, mistake or inadvertence, pre-1882 broadening reissues, 16:25
amendments, Patent Act of 1852, 16:61
Burr v. Duryee, pre-1882 broadening reissues, reactive measures, 16:28
Carlton v. Bokee, pre-1882 broadening reissues, reactive measures, 16:29
gauses of action, effect of reissue on existing, 1882-1952 developments, 16:48, 16:49
court decisions post-1870, pre-1882 broadening reissues, new matter prohibition, 16:37
developments up to 1882, broadening reissues, 16:5-16:46
ey early statutory history, 16:7-16:9
effect on reissuance practice, Miller v. Bridgeport Brass Co., pre-1882 broadening

© 2012 Thomson Reuters/West, 9/2012
REISSUE OF PATENT—Cont’d

Historical development—Cont’d
reissues, 16:46
1882-1952 developments, 16:47-16:56
factual setting, Miller v. Bridgeport Brass Co., pre-1882 broadening reissues, 16:43
general claiming requirements, pre-1882 broadening reissues, 16:26-16:29
Giant Powder Co. v. California Powder Workst, pre-1882 broadening reissues, same invention, 16:24
Goodyear v. Day, pre-1882 broadening reissues, same invention, 16:23
GranGrant v. Raymond, prestatutory history, 16:5
Hoffheins v. Brand, broadening problem, 16:16
inadvertence, accident, or mistake, pre-1882 broadening reissues, 16:25
inclusion of later inventions, 16:13
intervening rights, 1882-1952 developments, 16:51-16:56
invalidity, intervening rights, 1882-1915, 16:53
judicial reactions, pre-1882 broadening reissues, new matter prohibition, 16:35
limitations on remedies, intervening rights, 16:116
mechanisms to prevent expanded prosecution, error, 16:100-16:104
Miller v. Bridgeport Brass Co., pre-1882 broadening reissues, time limit, 16:41-16:46
mistake, accident, or inadvertence, pre-1882

Moy’s Walker on Patents

REISSUE OF PATENT—Cont’d
Historical development—Cont’d
broadening reissues, 16:25
mistaken reliance, 16:12
models as lingering problem, pre-1882 broadening reissues, new matter prohibition, 16:39
new matter prohibition, pre-1882 broadening reissues, reactive measures, 16:30-16:39
1915-1952, intervening rights, rise of personal defense, 16:54-16:56
1952, developments subsequent to, 1:22
O’Reilly v. Morse, pre-1882 broadening reissues, reactive measures, 16:27
parol evidence, pre-1882 broadening reissues, new matter prohibition, 16:33, 16:34
Patent Act of 1832, 16:7
Patent Act of 1836, below
Patent Act of 1852, below
Patent Act of 1870, below
Patent Act of 1928, effect of reissue on existing causes of action, 16:49
Patent Office, pre-1882 broadening reissues earliest practices, 16:31
new matter prohibition, 16:32
post-2002 developments, reexamination, 16:68
pre-1882, intervening rights, no defense, 16:52
pre-1882 developments, broadening reissues, 16:5-16:46

Index-174
REISSUE OF PATENT—Cont’d
Historical development—Cont’d
inadvertence, accident, or mistake, pre-1882 broadening reissues, 16:25
In re Amos decision in Federal Circuit, same invention, 16:96
In re Hounsfield decision in Federal Circuit, same invention, 16:94
In re Weiler decision in Federal Circuit, same invention, 16:95
Inter partes reexamination under 1999 amendments, 16:66
Intervening rights
1882-1952 developments, 16:50
limitations on remedies, 16:115-16:120
Invalidity, intervening rights, 1882-1915, 16:53
Inventorship changes, eligibility, 16:84
Judicial reactions, pre-1882 broadening reissues, new matter prohibition, 16:35
Limitations on remedies generally, 16:109
calculation on date of reissue grant, 16:117
expiration date of new rights, 16:114
historical development, intervening rights, 16:116
implied license as to existing embodiments, 16:119
intervening rights, 16:115-16:120
narrowing claims, application of intervening rights, 16:118
newly added rights, 16:112-
16:114
original rights, 16:111
potential license to continue other utilization, 16:120

REISSUE OF PATENT—Cont’d
In re Weiler decision in Federal Circuit, same invention, 16:95
Inter partes reexamination under 1999 amendments, 16:66
Intervening rights
1882-1952 developments, 16:50
limitations on remedies, 16:115-16:120
Invalidity, intervening rights, 1882-1915, 16:53
Inventorship changes, eligibility, 16:84
Judicial reactions, pre-1882 broadening reissues, new matter prohibition, 16:35
Limitations on remedies generally, 16:109
calculation on date of reissue grant, 16:117
expiration date of new rights, 16:114
historical development, intervening rights, 16:116
implied license as to existing embodiments, 16:119
intervening rights, 16:115-16:120
narrowing claims, application of intervening rights, 16:118
newly added rights, 16:112-
16:114
original rights, 16:111
potential license to continue other utilization, 16:120

REISSUE OF PATENT—Cont’d
Historical development—Cont’d
prestatutory history, 16:4, 16:5
private remedies, 1:18
reactive measures, pre-1882 broadening reissues, 16:17-16:46
reduction in reissues, pre-1882 broadening reissues, new matter prohibition, 16:38
reexamination, below reform movement, Miller v. Bridgeport Brass Co., pre-1882 broadening reissues, 16:41
rule against recapture, 1882-1952 developments, 16:50
same invention, pre-1882 broadening reissues, 16:22-16:24
speculation, 16:14
subsequent acceptance, Miller v. Bridgeport Brass Co., pre-1882 broadening reissues, 16:45
Supreme Court decision, Miller v. Bridgeport Brass Co., pre-1882 broadening reissues, 16:44
time limit imposition, pre-1882 broadening reissues, 16:40-16:46
2002 amendments, reexamination, 16:67
Woodworth patents, broadening problem, 16:15
Hoffheins v. Brand, broadening problem, 16:16
implied license as to existing embodiments, 16:119

© 2012 Thomson Reuters/West, 9/2012 Index-175
REISSUE OF PATENT—Cont’d
Limitations on remedies—Cont’d
starting date of new rights,
16:113
time span, 16:110-16:114
Mahn v. Harwood decision as to
error, 16:103
Mechanisms to prevent expanded
prosecution
generally, 16:85
analysis and recommendation,
same invention, 16:97
court decisions prior to 1952,
same invention, 16:88-16:90
deceptive intent lacking, 16:98
early history, same invention,
16:87
early statutory provisions as to
error, 16:101
1846-1884, Stimpson v. West
Chester R Co. decision as to
error, 16:102
1884-1952, Mahn v. Harwood
decision as to error, 16:103
error, generally, 16:99-16:107
Federal Circuit decisions, same
invention, 16:93-16:96
general definition of error,
16:105-16:107
historical development, error,
16:100-16:104
In re Amos decision in Federal
Circuit, same invention,
16:96
In re Hounsfield decision in
Federal Circuit, same invention,
16:94
In re Weiler decision in Federal
Circuit, same invention,
16:95
1952-1982 court decisions,
same invention, 16:92
nonelected subject matter, error,
16:106

REISSUE OF PATENT—Cont’d
Mechanisms to prevent expanded
prosecution—Cont’d
ParkParker & Whipple Co. v.
Yale Clock Co. decision,
same invention, 16:89
Patent Act of 1952, 16:91,
16:104
rule against recapture, error,
16:107
same invention, 16:86-16:97
U.S. Industrial Chemicals v.
Carbide & Carbon
Chemicals Corporation
decision, same invention,
16:90
Miller v. Bridgeport Brass Co.,
pre-1882 broadening reis-
sues, time limit, 16:41-16:46
Mistake, accident, or inadvertence,
pre-1882 broadening reis-
sues, 16:25
Mistaken reliance, 16:12
Models as lingering problem, pre-
1882 broadening reissues,
new matter prohibition, 16:39
Narrowing claims
application of intervening
rights, 16:118
intervening rights application,
16:118
requirements for eligibility,
16:76
Newly added rights, limitations on
remedies, 16:112-16:114
New matter prohibition
pre-1882 broadening reissues,
reactive measures, 16:30-
16:39
requirements for eligibility,
16:81
1915-1952, intervening rights, rise
of personal defense, 16:54-
16:56
1952, developments subsequent
to, 1:22

Index-176
REISSUE OF PATENT—Cont’d

“No-defect” reissue practice under Dann amendments, 16:64

Nonelected subject matter, error, 16:106

Oath, 16:108

O’Reilly v. Morseilly v. Morse, pre-1882 broadening reissues, reactive measures, 16:27

Original rights, limitations on remedies, 16:111

Other utilization, potential license to continue, 16:120

Park & Whipple Co. v. Yale Clock Co. decision, same invention, 16:89

Parol evidence, pre-1882 broadening reissues, new matter prohibition, 16:33, 16:34

Patent Act of 1832, 16:7

Patent Act of 1836 ban on broadening, 16:18-16:21

Battin v. Taggert, allowance of broadening reissues, 16:21

Carter v. Braintree, impact of central claiming, 16:19

developments up to 1870, 1:20
disagreement over statutory interpretation, 16:20

ey early statutory history, 16:8


Section 251, 16:58

Section 252, 16:59

Section 253, 16:60

subsequent amendments, 16:61

Patent Act of 1870 early statutory history, 16:9

pre-1882 broadening reissues, new matter prohibition, 16:36

Patent Act of 1928, effect of reissue on existing causes of action, 16:49

REISSUE OF PATENT—Cont’d

Patent Act of 1952

history, 1:23

mechanisms to prevent expanded prosecution, 16:91, 16:104


Patent Office, pre-1882 broadening reissues

earliest practices, 16:31

new matter prohibition, 16:32

Policy justification generally, 16:69

reexamination, 16:71

reissue, 16:70

Potential license to continue other utilization, limitations on remedies, 16:120

Priority under Section 119, eligibility, 16:82

Private remedies, historical developments, 1:18

Reactive measures, pre-1882 broadening reissues, 16:17-16:46

Reduction in reissues, pre-1882 broadening reissues, new matter prohibition, 16:38

Reexamination

Dann amendments, “no-defect” reissue practice, 16:64

early developments, 16:63

history, generally, 16:62-16:68

inter partes reexamination under 1999 amendments, 16:66

“no-defect” reissue practice under Dann amendments, 16:64


policy justification, 16:71

post-2002 developments, 16:68

2002 amendments, 16:67
REISSUE OF PATENT—Cont’d
Reform movement, Miller v.
Bridgeport Brass Co., pre-
1882 broadening reissues,
16:41
Reissue oath, 16:108
Remedies, limitations. Limitations
on remedies, above
Requirements for eligibility
generally, 16:73
defect, above
mechanisms to prevent
expanded prosecution,
above
reissue oath, 16:108
Rule against recapture
1882-1952 developments, 16:50
error, 16:107
Same invention
mechanisms to prevent
expanded prosecution,
16:86-16:97
pre-1882 broadening reissues,
16:22-16:24
Section 119 priority, eligibility,
16:82
Section 120 continuation status,
eligibility, 16:83
Sontag Chain Stores Co. Limited
v. National Nut Co. of Cali-
ifornia, intervening rights,
1915-1952, rise of personal
defense, 16:56
Speculation, historical develop-
ment, 16:14
Starting date of new rights, limita-
tions on remedies, 16:113
Stimpson v. West Chester R Co.
decision as to error, 16:102
Subsequent acceptance, Miller v.
Bridgeport Brass Co., pre-
1882 broadening reissues,
16:45
Supreme Court decision, Miller v.
Bridgeport Brass Co., pre-

REJECTION IN PART
Non-obviousness, 9:33

REJECTION OF APPLICATION
Adequate disclosure, 7:1, 7:9,
7:14, 7:25
Adequate utility, 6:6, 6:13
Claims (this index)
Computer-related inventions,
5:42, 5:44, 5:45
Joint inventorship, 10:36, 10:38,
10:39, 10:51
Non-obviousness
determination of obviousness,
9:68
Rule 131 affidavits, 9:36
secret prior art, 9:36, 9:37, 9:42
starting and ending materials,
9:79, 9:80
structures accompanied by
properties or uses, 9:73,
9:77
timeliness, Section 102, 9:23,
9:25
REJECTION OF APPLICATION
—Cont’d
Non-statutory hybrid inventions,
5:53, 5:63, 5:75, 5:80
Patent and Trademark Office
(PTO), 2:32
Priority, 8:73, 8:74
Processes, 5:24-5:27, 5:29, 5:30,
5:38
Static physical configurations, 5:9,
5:17
Technological configuration, 9:71
Technological scope, 13:107,
13:108
RELATED APPLICANTS
Foreign countries, 8:277
RELATED CLAIMS AND
APPLICATIONS
Technological scope, 13:106
RELATED HEALTH-CARE
ENTITY
Medical and diagnostic
procedures, section 287(c)
defense, 20:20
RELATED INFORMATION
Adequate disclosure, 7:52, 7:53
RELATIVE SKILL
Adequate utility, 7:20
RELEVANCE OF PROOF
Adequate commerciality, 14:16
RELEVANT ART
Non-obviousness, 9:51
RELEVANT DISCLOSURE
Joint inventorship, 10:46
RELEVANT FIELD
Adequate utility, 7:15
RELEVANT KNOWLEDGE
Joint inventorship, 10:33
RELEVANT PARTICIPANTS
Correction of inventorship, 10:60
RELEVANT PARTIES
Correction of inventorship, 10:61
RELEVANT TECHNICAL
DISCLOSURE
Joint inventorship, 10:44
RELIANCE
Estoppel, 24:28
Priority, 8:259
Reissue of patent, 16:12
REMAND
Claims, 4:74
Non-obviousness, 9:50
Technological scope, 13:26,
RENEWED ACTIVITY
Priority, 8:130
REPAIR
Defenses, implied-in-law licenses,
19:42
REPRINTS
Patent and Trademark Office
(PTO), 2:27
REPRODUCTION
Static physical configurations,
5:14, 5:15
RESALE RESTRICTIONS
Misuse of patent, 18:35
RESEARCH AND
DEVELOPMENT
Adequate commerciality, 14:74
Adequate disclosure, 7:5
Adequate utility, 6:6, 6:15, 6:17
Anticipation, lack of, 8:27
Claims, 4:63, 4:77
Computer-related inventions, 5:44
Correction of inventorship, 10:64
## Index

**ROUTINE DETAILS**  
Adequate disclosure, 7:52

**ROYAL LETTERS PATENT**  
History, 1:4, 1:5

**ROYAL SIGNET**  
History, 1:1

**ROYALTIES**  
Invalidity, 17:39  
Inventorship, 10:14  
Joint inventorship, 10:52  
**Misuse of Patent** (this index)  
Processes, 5:39

**RULE 71(B)**  
Adequate utility, 7:8

**RULE AGAINST RECAPTURE**  
Reissue of patent, 16:50, 16:107

**RULE 131**  
Non-obviousness, 9:25, 9:36, 9:37  
**Priority** (this index)

**RULE-BASED CONTROL**  
Priority, 8:72

**RULE-BASED DEFINITENESS**  
Priority, 8:171

**RULE-BASED IMPLEMENTATION**  
Adequate commerciality, 14:13

**RULE-OF-REASON APPROACH**  
Adequate utility, 7:12

**SAB INDUSTRI AB v. BENDIX CORP.**  
Joint inventorship, 10:40

**SAFE AND EFFECTIVE**  
Adequate utility, 6:12

**SAFE HARBOR**  
Adequate Commerciality (this index)

**SALEABLE PRODUCT**  
Policy justification, 1:41

**SALES**  
Adequate Commerciality (this index)  
Adequate utility, 6:8  
Anticipation, lack of, 8:20  
**Examination of Original Application** (this index)  
Geographic scope, 12:18-12:21  
**Indirect Infringement** (this index)  
Misuse of patent, 18:35  
**Priority** (this index)  
Static physical configurations, 5:14, 5:15

**SALTS**  
Temporal scope, 11:47

**SAME INVENTION**  
Foreign countries, 8:279  
**Priority**, 8:113-8:115  
**Reissue of Patent** (this index)

**SAMPLES AND SAMPLING**  
Adequate utility, 7:11  
Non-obviousness, 9:9

**SANCTIONS**  
Joint inventorship, 10:25

**SANITARY REFRIGERATOR CO. v. WINTERS**  
Technological scope, 13:70

**SANITY**  
Inventorship, 10:7

**SCARCITY**  
Justification, 1:34

**SCHOLARSHIP NOTES**  
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:49

**SCIENCE**  
Adequate utility, 6:5
SECRETS AND SECRECY
Adequate disclosure, 7:5, 7:18, 7:44, 7:55
Policy justification, 1:38
Priority, 8:64, 8:87, 8:181, 8:190
Processes, 5:39

SECTION 102
America Invents Act, amendment of Section 102 timewise priority, 1:26

SECTION 282
Defenses, 17:11

SECTION 287(C)
Defenses. Medical and Diagnostic Procedures (this index)
Processes, 5:39

SEEDS
Static physical configurations, 5:14, 5:15

SEMANTIC MEANING
Claims, 4:55-4:57

SENATE
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:22

SENIOR EXECUTIVE SERVICE
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:22

SEPARATE DELEGATIONS
Congress, 2:7

SERIAL PERFORMANCE
Adequate commerciality, 14:36

SERIAL SET OF CONGRESSIONAL DOCUMENTS
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:4
SERIES OF ACTS
  Statutory Subject Matter (this index)

SERVICEABLE IN VIVO
  Adequate utility, 6:18

SERVICES
  History, 1:4
  Inventorship, 10:11, 10:13

SETTING ASIDE
  Inventorship, 10:7

SETTLEMENT
  Invalidity, 17:41

7 USCA §§ 2321 ET SEQ.
  Static physical configurations, 5:13

17 USC, SECTION 201(A)
  Inventorship, 10:6

SEVENTH CIRCUIT
  Joint inventorship, 10:51

SEXUALLY REPRODUCING PLANTS
  Static physical configurations, 5:8, 5:13, 5:15

SEYMOUR v. OSBOURNE
  Anticipation, lack of, 8:18, 8:31

SHAW v. COOPER
  Priority, 8:196, 8:203

SHELTER FOR TRADE SECRET USER
  Prior inventor, prior-user rights, 22:6

SHOWINGS
  Non-obviousness, 9:75
  Priority, 8:135

SILENCE
  Estoppel, communication from patent owner, 24:26

SIMULTANEOUS ACTS AND MATTERS
  Adequate disclosure, 7:51
  Non-obviousness, 9:58
  Priority, 8:128

SINGLE-CELLED MICROORGANISMS
  Static physical configurations, 5:17

SINGLE-EMBODIMENT
  Adequate Disclosure (this index)

SINGLE INVENTIVE ACT
  Correction of inventorship, 10:66

SINGLE MEANS CLAIMS
  Generally, 4:87

SINGLE-SOURCE CONTROL
  Adequate commerciality, 14:12
  Anticipation, lack of, 8:20
  Justification, 1:32
  Statutory subject matter, 5:4, 5:5

SINGLE-SOURCE PROFITS
  Inventorship, 10:3

SINKO TOOL & MFG. CO. v. AUTOMATIC DEVICES CORP.
  Priority, 8:61

SITUS OF ACCUSED ACTIVITY
  Geographic Scope of Infringement (this index)

SIX-YEAR LIMITATION
  Generally, 21:1-21:24
  Accrual, 21:21, 21:22
  Basic rule of law, 21:17
  Burden of pleading, 21:20
  Burden of proof, 21:19
  Campbell v. City of Haverhill, 21:6
  Contractual agreements, 21:24
SIX-YEAR LIMITATION
—Cont’d
Court decisions between 1897 and 1952
historical development of section 286 defense, 21:8-21:10
Peters v. Hanger, 21:9
Pollen v. Ford Instrument Co., 21:10
Court decisions since 1982
historical development of section 286 defense, 21:12-21:15
Hughes Aircraft Co. v. National Semiconductor Corp., 21:15
Stucki Co. v. Buckeye Steel Castings Co., 21:14
Date of filing of complaint or counterclaim, 21:1
Defenses, section 286
generally, 21:1
accrual, 21:21, 21:22
basic rule, 21:17
burden of pleading, 21:20
burden of proof, 21:19
complaints, 21:20
contractual agreements, 21:24
historical development of section 286 defense, below indirect infringers, 21:22
pleading, 21:20
policy justification, 21:16
subsidiary issues, 21:18-21:24
tolling, 21:23, 21:24
Early cases, 21:3
Historical development of section 286 defense
generally, 21:2
Campbell v. City of Haverhill, 21:6

SIX-YEAR LIMITATION
—Cont’d
Historical development of section 286 defense—Cont’d
court decisions between 1897 and 1952, 21:8-21:10
court decisions since 1982, 21:12-21:15
early cases, 21:3
Hughes Aircraft Co. v. National Semiconductor Corp., 21:15
Patent Act of 1870, 21:4
Pollen v. Ford Instruments Co., 21:10
Revised Statutes of 1874, 21:5
Stucki Co. v. Buckeye Steel Castings Co., 21:14
subsequent cases, 1897 to 1952, 21:8-21:10
Hughes Aircraft Co. v. National Semiconductor Corp., 21:15
Indirect infringers, 21:22
Patent Act of 1870, 21:4
Peters v. Hanger, 21:9
Policy justification, section 286 defense, 21:16
Pollen v. Ford Instruments Co., 21:10
Revised Statutes of 1874, 21:5
Stucki Co. v. Buckeye Steel Castings Co., 21:14
INDEX

SIX-YEAR LIMITATION
—Cont’d
Subsequent cases, 1897 to 1952, 21:8-21:10
Subsidiary issues, 21:18-21:24
Tolling, 21:23, 21:24

SIX-YEAR PRESUMPTION
Laches, unreasonable delay, 23:40

SKILL
Adequate utility, minimal skill, 7:16
Adequate utility, relative skill, 7:20
Ordinary artisan generally, 9:50
non-obviousness, 9:78
Priority, skilled person, 8:54

“SKILL IN THE ART”
Adequate disclosure, 7:34
Adequate utility, 6:13
Anticipation, lack of, 8:31
Claims, 4:2, 4:91, 4:92
Disclosure (this index)
Inventorship, 10:12
Priority, 8:46, 8:58

SOCIAL BENEFITS
Policy Justification (this index)

SOCIAL COST
Adequate utility, 6:2, 6:4, 6:10
Policy Justification (this index)
Priority, 8:33
Processes, 5:39
Statutory subject matter, 5:5

SOCIAL DISUTILITY
Priority, 8:172

SOCIAL UNDERUTILIZATION
Processes, 5:39

SOFTWARE
Computer-Related Inventions
(this index)

SOLE INVENTORS
Generally, 10:9
Joint inventorship, 10:43

SOLE LICENSE
History, 1:4

SOLE-TO-SOLE CONVERSIONS
Correction (this index)

SOLIDS
Static physical configurations, 5:9

SONTAG CHAIN STORES CO. LIMITED v. NATIONAL NUT CO. OF CALIFORNIA
Reissue of patent, 16:56

SOPHISTICATION
Adequate utility, 7:5, 7:10
Non-obviousness, 9:50
Priority, 8:44

SOUND MORALS
Adequate utility, 6:15

SOUTH CAROLINA
History, 1:9

SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY
History, 1:14

SOYBEANS
Static physical configurations, 5:14

SPECIAL ACTS
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:2

SPECIAL DAMAGES
Adequate commerciality, 14:78

SPECIAL PRIVILEGES
History, 1:4

© 2012 Thomson Reuters/West, 9/2012
SPECIAL SERVICES
History, 1:4

SPECIAL SUB-RULES
Claims (this index)

SPECIES
Genus and Species (this index)

SPECIFICATION
Anticipation, lack of, 8:22
Claims, 4:44
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:80
Policy justification, 1:38
Processes, 5:19, 5:21, 5:26
Utility Requirement (this index)

SPECIFIC USES
Adequate utility, 6:18

SPECIMENS
Adequate utility, 7:11

SPECTRA-PHYSICS, INC. v. COHERENT, INC.
Adequate utility, 7:48

SPECULATION
Reissue of patent, 16:14

SPERO v. RINGOLD
Priority, 8:46

SPONTANEOUS STATEMENTS
Non-obviousness, 9:59

SPORADIC RESULT
Anticipation, lack of, 8:25

STANDARD HAVENS PRODUCTS, INC. v. GENCOR INDUSTRIES, INC.
Adequate commerciality, 14:27

STANDARD OF PROOF
Invalidity, 17:18

STANDARD OIL CO. v. NIPPON SHOKUBAI KAGAKU KOGYO CO.
Six-year limitation, 21:13

STAPLE ARTICLES
Indirect infringement, 15:23

STARE DECESIS
Claims, 4:20
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:75, 5:76

STARTING AND ENDING MATERIALS
Adequate disclosure, 7:10, 7:12
Non-Obviousness (this index)

STARTING DATE
Reissue of patent, 16:113

STATE ACTS
History, 1:9

STATE COURTS
Generally, 1:14

STATE DEPARTMENT
Claims, 4:2

STATEMENTS
Non-obviousness, 9:59

STATE OF MIND
Adequate commerciality, 14:17
Adequate disclosure, 7:49
Correction of inventorship, 10:60
Non-obviousness, 9:43, 9:59
Priority, 8:58

STATE OF PRIOR ART
Adequate utility, 7:20

STATE OF THE ART
Joint inventorship, 10:33
Non-obviousness, 9:28, 9:38, 9:58
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:62, 5:69, 5:85
ERRATA

STATE-OWNED ENTITIES
History, 1:14

STATES
Sovereign immunity, 1:14

STATE STATUTES
History, 1:13
Inventorship, 10:6

STATE STREET BANK &
TRUST CO. v. SIGNATURE
FINANCIAL GROUP, INC.
Non-statutory hybrid inventions,
5:79
Processes, 5:30, 5:38

STATIC PHYSICAL
CONFIGURATION—Cont’d
Generally, 5:1, 5:7-5:18
Abstractions, 5:10
Agency decisions, 5:16
Alloys, 5:9
Amendment to statute, 5:14
Animal husbandry, 5:18
Animals and related biotechnol-
yogy, 5:8, 5:16-5:18
Anticipation, lack of, 5:9, 5:16
Anti-slavery provisions, 5:17
Apparatus, 5:8
Appeal and review, 5:9, 5:12,
5:15, 5:17
Application, 5:8, 5:9
Art, 5:11
Article of manufacture, 5:8, 5:11,
5:17
Asexually reproduced plants, 5:12
Author’s control, 5:11
Bacteria, 5:14, 5:17
Bioengineering, 5:13
Biological components, 5:17
Biotechnological advances, 5:14
Breeding, 5:15, 5:17
Budding, 5:14
Business forms, 5:10
Certificates, 5:14

STATIC PHYSICAL

Chemicals and Chemistry (this
index)
Claims, 5:8
Combinations of mechanical pow-
ers and devices, 5:8
Combinations of two or more sub-
stances, 5:9
Commercial importance, 5:13
Communication, 5:11
Compilations, 5:11
Complete living organisms, 5:17
Compositions, 5:7-5:9, 5:17
Compounds, 5:9
Computer-related inventions, 5:8,
5:10
Congress, 5:8, 5:14, 5:15, 5:17
Constitutional law, 5:17
Construction and interpretation,
5:8, 5:14, 5:15, 5:18
Control, level of, 5:11
Copying, 5:14
Copyright, 5:11
Corning v. Burden, 5:8
Costs and expenses, 5:14
Cotton, 5:14
Court of Customs and Patent
Appeals (CCPA), 5:9, 5:12,
5:17
Courts, generally, 5:10
Crops, 5:14
Cultivated spores, 5:14
Database, 5:11
Definition, 5:8
Delivery of health care and
medicine, 5:18
Denial, 5:8
Department of Agriculture, 5:14
Devices, 5:8
Diamond v. Chakrabarty, 5:17
Disclosure, 5:12, 5:14
Every article devised by man except machinery upon the one side and compositions of matter on the other,
Evidence, 5:17
Examination of application, 5:17
Exceptions, exclusions, and exemptions generally, 5:7
functional relationships, 5:12
judicial exceptions, 5:10, 5:17
machines and articles of manufacture, 5:8
plants, 5:14, 5:17
printed matter, 5:11
Exclusive rights, 5:15
Ex parte Allen, 5:17
Ex parte examination, 5:17
Factual compilations, 5:11
Factual information stored on computer-readable media, 5:11
Farmers and farming, 5:14, 5:18
Federal Circuit, 5:11, 5:15
Filing, 5:17
First-generation hybrids, 5:14
Foodstuffs, production of, 5:18
Foreign countries, 5:18
Fourteenth Amendment, 5:17
Fungi, 5:14
Gases, 5:9
Gels, 5:9
Generating subsequent seed stock, 5:15
Genetically engineered animals, 5:17
Grafting, 5:14
Handmade mechanical clock, 5:8
Health care, 5:18
History, 5:14, 5:15, 5:17
Human audience, communication to, 5:11
Human-directed expression, 5:11
Human manipulation, 5:12
Human operator, 5:12
Hybrid combinations, 5:8
Hybrid for, 5:11
Hybrids, 5:14
Imports and exports, 5:14
Incentives, 5:14
Individual specimens, 5:17
Industrial apparatus, 5:8
Infringement, 5:7
In re Breslow, 5:9
In re Lowry, 5:11
In re Miller, 5:12
In situ production, 5:9
Intent, 5:14, 5:15, 5:17
Interlocutory appeal, 5:15
International community, 5:18
International Convention for Protection of New Varieties of Plants, 5:14
Interrelated component parts, 5:8
Judicial decisions, 5:16
Judicial exceptions, 5:10, 5:17
Kits, 5:8
Legislation, 5:15
Legislative history, 5:14, 5:15
Licenses and permits, 5:15
Limitations and restrictions, 5:8, 5:11, 5:14-5:17
Liquids, 5:9
Literary works, 5:11
Living organisms, 5:7, 5:16
Machine-readable data, 5:11
Machines, 5:7, 5:8
Manufactures, 5:7
Index

STATIC PHYSICAL
CONFIGURATION—Cont’d
Mathematical demands, 5:12
Mechanical devices, 5:8
Medicine, 5:18
Mental steps, 5:12
Mental theories, 5:10
Mistake and error, 5:15
Mixture of naturally occurring bacteria, 5:17
Mixtures, 5:9
Multicellular animals, 5:8, 5:16
Music, 5:11
Mutants, 5:14
Naturally occurring substances, 5:9, 5:17
Natural state, 5:9
Nature, products of, 5:17
New applications, 5:8
New living organism, 5:17
Newly found seedlings, 5:14
New song encoded on player piano roll, 5:11
Non-obviousness, 5:9, 5:12, 5:16
Non-statutory subject matter, 5:10, 5:11, 5:17
Novelty, 5:14
Painting, 5:8
Patentability, generally, 5:7
Patent Act of 1793, 5:8, 5:9
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 5:9, 5:11, 5:14-5:17
Performance, 5:8
Petition for certiorari, filing of, 5:17
Physical proximity, 5:9
Pioneer Hi-Bred v J.E.G. Ag Supply, 5:15
Plant breeding, 5:15
Plants, 5:8, 5:13-5:15
Plant Variety Protection Act (PVPA), 5:13, 5:15, 5:17
Policy, animals and related biotechnology, 5:17
Policy justification, 5:11
Political interest, 5:15
Possession, 5:7
Powders, 5:9
Primitive living organisms, 5:16
Printed matter, 5:7, 5:10-5:12
Prior generations, 5:17
Production process, 5:9
Public domain, 5:18
Public welfare, 5:14
Purity, elevated levels of, 5:9
Qualifications, 5:15
Reasonably stable, 5:9
Rejection of application, 5:9, 5:17
Reproduction, 5:14, 5:15
Research and development, 5:14
Reversal, 5:9, 5:11, 5:12
Sales, 5:14, 5:15
Section 12, 5:14
Section 102, 5:9
Section 103, 5:9
Section 161 et seq., 5:13
Seeds, 5:15
Seed varieties, 5:14
7 USCA §§ 2321 et seq., 5:13
Sexually reproducing plants, 5:8, 5:13, 5:15
Single-celled microorganisms, 5:17
Solids, 5:9
Soybeans, 5:14
Supreme Court, 5:8, 5:15, 5:17
Technological methods distinguished, 5:7
Title and ownership, 5:18
Traditional animal husbandry, 5:17
Trial court, 5:15
Tuber-propagated plants, 5:14
Utility patents, 5:14
STATIC PHYSICAL CONFIGURATION—Cont’d
Validity, 5:8, 5:17
Value, 5:15

STATUTE OF MONOPOLIES
Adequate Commerciality (this index)
History, 1:6
Processes, 5:21

STATUTE OF REPOSE
Section 286 defense. Six Year Limitation (this index)

STATUTES
See also specific statutes throughout this index
Abandonment, 8:269
Adequate disclosure, 7:8
Claims, 4:5, 4:27, 4:51
Construction and interpretation, 8:151
Geographic Scope of Infringe-
ment (this index)
History, 1:8, 1:14
Initial statutes and development up to 1836, 1:18
Misuse of Patent (this index)
Non-obviousness, 9:5, 9:6, 9:16,
9:34-9:37
Non-statutory hybrid inventions,
5:59
Processes, 5:33-5:35
Reforms of 1870, 2:34
Six-year limitation, revised statutes of 1874, 21:5
Technological scope, 13:19

STATUTORY STEPS
Non-statutory hybrid inventions,
5:81

STATUTORY SUBJECT MATTER
Generally, 5:1 et seq.
Advances, 5:5

STATUTORY SUBJECT MATTER—Cont’d
Amendment of statute, 5:6
Animals and related biotechnol-
ogy, 5:16-5:18
Anticipation, 5:1
Any new and useful art, machine,
manufacture, or composition of matter, generally, 5:2
Any new and useful process,
machine, manufacture, or
composition of matter, gener-
ally, 5:1 et seq.
Any useful art, manufacture,
engine, machine, or device,
or any improvement therein,
generally, 5:2
Application of technology, gener-
ally, 5:4
Applied technology, generally, 5:2
Articles of manufacture, generally,
5:4
Arts, generally, 5:4
Biological materials, 5:6
Biotechnology, 5:1, 5:2, 5:16-
5:18
Bona fide questions, 5:1
Business methods. Processes, below
Change and modification, 5:2
Chemicals and Chemistry (this index)
Claims (this index)
Cochran v. Deener, industrial processes, 5:22
Commercialization, 5:4, 5:5
Competition, 5:4, 5:5
Composition of matter, generally,
5:1 et seq.
Computer-Related Inventions
(this index)
Configuration, 5:1
Congressional intent, 5:1 et seq.
Constitutional law, 5:2

Index-190
STATUTORY SUBJECT
MATTER—Cont’d

Construction and interpretation, 5:1 et seq.
Contests, 5:1
Copyrights, 5:4
Costs on society, 5:5
Courts, generally, 5:1
Defenses, 5:5
Designs, 5:46
Devices, generally, 5:2
Disclosure, proper, 5:1
Doing business, methods of, 5:2, 5:6
End results, 5:24
Engines, generally, 5:2
European Patent Convention, 5:4
Exceptions and exclusions
        generally, 5:1-5:6
        functional relationships, 5:12
        ministerial acts, 5:27
Expectations, 5:4
Exploitation, 5:4, 5:5
Factual compilations, 5:42
Fine arts, 5:1
Foodstuffs, generally, 5:5
Foreign countries, 5:4, 5:5
Formulae, 5:24
Functional relationships, 5:12
Future research, 5:5
Historical development and policy
        justification, generally, 5:2-5:5
Hybrid claiming, 5:38
Hybrid inventions. Non-Statutory
        Hybrid Inventions (this index)
Improvements, generally, 5:2
Incentives, 5:4, 5:5
Industrial processes, 5:20-5:23
Infringement, 5:5
Intellectual property, generally, 5:2
Intellectual property law, 5:5

STATUTORY SUBJECT
MATTER—Cont’d

Intent, 5:1, 5:4, 5:6
Intervention, 5:4
Japanese, 5:4
Judicial decisions, 5:6
Judicial exceptions, 5:4
Limitations and restrictions, generally, 5:1
Machines, generally, 5:1 et seq.
Manufacturing, generally, 5:1 et seq.
Mathematics
        generally, 5:1
        algorithms, 5:44
        formulae, 5:6, 5:24
        pure mathematics, matters of, 5:4
Medical and surgical procedures, 5:39
Mental steps, 5:6, 5:25-5:27, 5:45
Methods per se, 5:2
Ministerial acts, 5:27
Natural phenomena, 5:24
Negotiations, 5:5
New and useful, generally, 5:2
New technological fields, 5:2
Non-obviousness, 5:1
Non-Statutory Hybrid Inventions (this index)
Non-Statutory Subject Matter
        (this index)
Observations, 5:36-5:38
Patentability, 5:4
Patent Act of 1790, 5:2
Patent Act of 1793, 5:2
Patent Act of 1836, 5:2
Patent Act of 1870, 5:2
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:3, 5:2
Performance of sequential acts
        over period of time, 5:1
Peripheral claiming, industrial
        processes, 5:22
STATUTORY SUBJECT
MATTER—Cont’d
Pharmaceuticals, generally, 5:5
Physical structures, generally, 5:1 et seq.
Physical transformation, 5:37, 5:53
Pioneer hi-bred case, 5:15
Plants, 5:13-5:15
Policy justification, generally, 5:2-5:5
Printed matter, 5:4, 5:6, 5:10-5:12, 5:42
Private single-source control, 5:5
Process, generally, 5:6
Processes (this index)
Profits, 5:4
Pure mathematics, matters of, 5:4
Pure scientific, matters of, 5:4
Quality of life, 5:5
Research and development, 5:5
Science, 5:1, 5:4
Scientific principles, 5:24
Section 101, generally, 5:1 et seq.
Series of acts or steps of method, 5:1 et seq.
Single-source control, 5:4, 5:5
Social cost, 5:5
Static Physical Configuration (this index)
Steps of method, 5:1 et seq.
Structures, generally, 5:6
Surgical methods, generally, 5:5
Surgical procedures, 5:39
Technical ideas, 5:4
Time and date, 5:1, 5:4
Undue social cost, 5:5
Useful art, generally, 5:2
Usefulness, generally, 5:1 et seq.
Utility patents, 5:14
Validity, 5:4
Value, 5:5

STAY OF PROCEEDINGS
Reexamination, parallel proceedings, 16:131

STEARNS-ROGER MFG. CO. v. RUTH
Adequate commerciality, 14:29

STEP-BY-STEP
Processes, 5:38

STEPS OF METHOD
Statutory Subject Matter (this index)

STIMPSON v. WEST CHESTER R CO.
Reissue of patent, 16:102

STOCKHOLDERS
Indirect infringement, 15:19

STORAGE MEDIA
Computer-Related Inventions (this index)

STRATEGIES
Processes, 5:34

STRICT LIABILITY
Adequate commerciality, 14:14

STRUCTURAL EQUIVALENTS
Claims, 4:92

STRUCTURAL SIMILARITIES
Non-obviousness, 9:73, 9:74

STRUCTURES ACCOMPANIED BY PROPERTIES OR USES
Non-Obviousness (this index)

STUCKI CO. v. BUCKEYE STEEL CASTINGS CO.
Six-year limitation, 21:14

STUDIENGESELLSCHAFT KOHLÉ MBH v. EASTMAN KODAK CO.
Adequate utility, 7:48
INDEX

SUA SPONTE ACTS AND MATTERS
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:10

SUBCOMBINATION
Adequate disclosure, 7:24
Adequate utility, 6:6
Anticipation, lack of, 8:12
Claims, 4:63, 4:64
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:50
Priority, 8:47

SUBCOMBINATIONS
Temporal scope, 11:49

SUB-ISSUE
Adequate utility, 6:7

SUBJECTIVE ABANDONMENT
History, 1:21

SUBJECTIVE APPRECIATION
Adequate disclosure, 7:34, 7:39
Adequate utility, 7:27

SUBJECTIVE CREATIVITY
Non-obviousness, 9:20

SUBJECTIVE INSIGHT
Non-obviousness, 9:41-9:43

SUBJECTIVE JUDGMENTS
Non-obviousness, 9:54

SUBJECTIVE KNOWLEDGE
Priority, 8:52

SUBJECTIVELY POSSESSED
Adequate utility, 7:31

SUBJECTIVENESS
Non-obviousness, 9:7

SUBJECTIVE OUTLOOK
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:49

SUBJECTIVE POSSESSION
Priority, 8:46

SUBJECTIVE STATE OF MIND
Non-obviousness, 9:43

SUBJECTIVE THOUGHT TO PERFORM
Processes, 5:25

SUBJECT MATTER
Claims (this index)
Medical activity, section 287(c) defense, 20:17

SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION
Claims, 4:6
History, 1:14
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:37

SUBSEQUENT ACTS AND MATTERS
Adequate commerciality, 14:24, 14:27, 14:74
Claims, 4:40
Non-obviousness, 9:4
Priority, 8:126
Reissue of patent, 16:45
Technological scope, 13:39, 13:112

SUBSERVIENCE
Claims (this index)

“SUBSTANTIAL”
Reexamination, substantial new question of patentability, 16:129

SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE
Judicial review, 2:41, 2:42
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:39, 2:43

SUBSTANTIAL LOGIC
Non-obviousness, 9:43

SUBSTANTIALLY AS DESCRIBED
Claims, 4:2

© 2012 Thomson Reuters/West, 9/2012

Index-193
SUBSTANTIAL PRIOR CONCEPTION
Anticipation, lack of, 8:7

SUBSTANTIAL USES
Adequate utility, 6:18

SUBSTANTIVE RULE-MAKING
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:21

SUBSTITUTIONS
Technological scope, 13:104

SUCCESS
Non-obviousness, 9:61-9:64, 9:62
Reexamination, 16:135

SUGGESTION
Joint Inventorship (this index)
Non-obviousness, 9:66, 9:77

SUMMARY JUDGMENT
Adequate commerciality, 14:36, 14:79
Adequate disclosure, 7:52
Processes, 5:30

SUPERINTENDENT OF PATENTS
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:20, 2:31

SUPERVISORY PROCEDURE
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:83

SUPPLEMENTAL PATENTS
Adequate utility, 7:18

SUPPLEMENTAL SOURCES
Adequate utility, 7:18

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS
Adequate utility, 7:10, 7:18

SUPPLEMENTS
Anticipation, lack of, 8:31

SUPPLY
Social costs of patenting, 1:33

SUPPRESSION
Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)
Misuse of patent, 18:28
Priority, 8:143

SUPREME COURT
Adequate Commerciality (this index)
Adequate disclosure, 7:14, 7:31, 7:48
Adequate utility, 6:6, 6:17
Alexander Milburn Co. v. Davis-Bournonville Co., 8:140
Andrews v. Hovey, 8:206, 8:251
Anticipation, lack of, 8:18, 8:22, 8:27
Bain v. Morse, 8:101, 8:197
City of Elizabeth v. Nicholson Pavement Co., 8:250

Claims (this index)
Computer-related inventions, 5:44
Electric Storage Battery Co. v. Shimadzu, 8:102

Examination of Original Application (this index)
History, generally, 1:14-1:24
In re Borst, 8:165
In re Hilmer, 8:121, 8:153
Invalidity, early development, 17:22

Inventorship, 10:7
Joint inventorship, 10:33

Licenses and Permits (this index)
Metallizing Engineering v. Kenyon Bearing, 8:243
Misuse of patent, 18:19-18:21
Non-Obviousness (this index)

Index-194
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUPREME COURT—Cont’d</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:34, 2:43, 2:48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paulik v. Rizkalla, 8:130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennock v. Dialogue, 8:203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pfaff v. Wells Electronics, 8:234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy justification, 1:29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority, 8:50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes, 5:21, 5:22, 5:24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reissue of patent, 16:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaw v. Cooper, 8:196, 8:203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Static physical configurations, 5:15, 5:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological Scope of Infringement (this index)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUPREME COURT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (SCDC)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:34, 2:36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SURGICAL METHODS AND PROCEDURES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory Subject Matter (this index)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SYDEMAN v. THOMA</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority, 8:60-8:62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SYMBOLS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History, 1:15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SYMmetry</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conceptual inconsistencies, 8:100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority, 8:100, 8:193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SYNTHESIS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technological Scope of Infringement (this index)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TANGIBLE BENEFIT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate utility, 6:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TARGET AUDIENCE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate disclosure, 7:16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TARIFFS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate commerciality, 14:39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TARIFFS—Cont’d</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) (this index)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAXATION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History, 1:3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes, 5:34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEACHING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipation, lack of, 8:19, 8:31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>background knowledge, 7:15, 7:16, 7:19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>claimed configuration, 7:6, 7:9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>how to use, 7:13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>method of making single-embodiment, 7:10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TECHNICAL COMMUNITY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-obviousness, 9:54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TECHNICAL COMPLETENESS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TECHNICAL CONTENT OF SHOWING</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority, 8:135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TECHNICAL DETAILS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-obviousness, 9:77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TECHNICAL DISCLOSURE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claims, 4:8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint inventorship, 10:44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-obviousness, 9:54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TECHNICAL IDEAS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statutory subject matter, 5:4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TECHNICAL SUFFICIENCY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TECHNOLOGICAL COMPLETENESS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anticipation, lack of, 8:32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© 2012 Thomson Reuters/West, 9/2012
TECHNOLOGICAL CONFIGURATION
Claims, 4:65, 4:71, 4:94
Inspection, 9:71
Non-obviousness, 9:19, 9:65, 9:70, 9:77

TECHNOLOGICAL FIELD
Non-obviousness, 9:17-9:19

TECHNOLOGICAL KNOWLEDGE
Joint inventorship, 10:33

TECHNOLOGICAL METHODS
Static physical configurations, 5:7

TECHNOLOGICAL SCOPE OF INFRINGEMENT—Cont’d
Case law—Cont’d
Wilson Sporting Goods case, 13:82
Winans v. Denmead, 13:6
YBM Magnex, Inc. v. USITC, 13:96
Claimed defined, 13:98
Claiming
central claiming and means expressions, 13:114
Equivalents, Doctrine of, below
peripheral claiming, below
Claim theory, impact of
generally, 13:4-13:8
central claiming, 13:5-13:7
peripheral claiming, 13:8
Winans v. Denmead, 13:6
Claim theory, role of, 13:42
Classical estoppel, 13:89
Claude Neon Lights v. E. Machlett & Son, 13:71
Commentary and synthesis.
Equivalents, Doctrine of, below
Context and inadvertent mistakes, 13:57, 13:58
Decisions. Equivalents, Doctrine of, below
Defenses. Equivalents, Doctrine of, below
Definitional accuracy, 13:54
Definitions
claimed, 13:98
disclosed, 13:99
Descriptions by learned hand, 13:11
Disclosed defined, 13:99
Disclosure dedication.
Equivalents, Doctrine of, below
TECHNOLOGICAL SCOPE OF INFRINGEMENT—Cont’d

Discovery, 13:56

Doctrine of Equivalents.

Equivalents, Doctrine of, below
Early history, 13:3
Early procedural history, 13:28
Element-by-element inquiry, 13:73

En banc decision, 13:31-13:33
Equity, 13:20, 13:61

Equivalents, Doctrine of generally, 13:52-13:113

commentary and synthesis.

Element-by-element inquiry, 13:73
Factual equivalency, below this group
decisions
en banc decision, 13:31-13:33
patentee’s conduct, subsequent decisions, 13:112
peripheral claiming, below this group
defenses. Legal defenses, below this group
disclosure dedication.

Patentee’s conduct, below this group

Estoppel
generally, 13:23

Patentee’s conduct, below this group

Factual equivalency
generally, 13:63-13:76
Claude Neon Lights v. E. Machlett & Son, 13:71

TECHNOLOGICAL SCOPE OF INFRINGEMENT—Cont’d

Equivalents, Doctrine of—Cont’d
factual equivalency—Cont’d
commentary and synthesis, generally, 13:68-13:72
element-by-element inquiry, 13:73
formulation of test, generally, 13:65-13:71
function, way, result, 13:66
history, 13:64
illustrative diagram, 13:72
insubstantial differences, 13:67

inventive concept, 13:69
known interchangeability, 13:75, 13:76

peripheral claiming, 13:21
pioneer inventions versus improvements, 13:74

policy justification, 13:64
Sanitary Refrigerator Co. v. Winters, 13:70

synthesis, generally, 13:68-13:72
time frame, 13:76

Federal Circuit
generally, 13:94-13:96

peripheral claiming, below this group

Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., Ltd.
generally, 13:111

peripheral claiming, below this group

formulation of test. Factual equivalency, above this group

TECHNOLOGICAL SCOPE OF INFRINGEMENT—Cont’d
Equivalents, Doctrine of—Cont’d
Hilton Davis Chemical Co. v. Warner-Jenkinson Co., Inc. Peripheral claiming, below this group
history. Patentee’s conduct, below this group
language issues. Policy justification, below this group
legal defenses
  generally, 13:77-13:113
  all-elements rule, 13:113
graphical illustration, 13:78
patentee’s conduct, below this group
prior art, below this group
1950, developments to, 13:10, 13:11
1994, developments to, 13:13
patentee’s conduct
  generally, 13:87-13:112
abandonment, 13:89
arguments, 13:105
cancellations, 13:104
claimed defined, 13:98
classical estoppel, 13:89
dedication via other activities, 13:100
disclosed defined, 13:99
disclosure dedication, generally, 13:92-13:100
estopping events, generally, 13:103-13:108
Festo case, 13:111
formal rejections and restrictions, 13:107

TECHNOLOGICAL SCOPE OF INFRINGEMENT—Cont’d
Equivalents, Doctrine of—Cont’d
patentee’s conduct—Cont’d
historical development, 13:93
history, prosecution history estoppel, generally, 13:101-13:112
insufficient disclosure rejections, 13:108
judicial estoppel, 13:91
narrowing of related claims and applications, 13:106
novelty requirement, analogy to, 13:90
prosecution history estoppel, generally, 13:101-13:112
subsequent decisions, 13:112
substitutions, 13:104
underlying purpose, 13:110
YBM Magnex, Inc. v. USITC, 13:96
peripheral claiming
decisions
  Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., Ltd., below this subgroup
  Hilton Davis Chemical Co. v. Warner-Jenkinson Co., Inc., below this subgroup
descriptions by learned hand, 13:11
Federal Circuit
  generally, 13:13

Index-198
TECHNOLOGICAL SCOPE OF INFRINGEMENT—Cont’d
Equivalents, Doctrine of—Cont’d
peripheral claiming—Cont’d
Federal Circuit—Cont’d
developments to 1994,
13:13
Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu
Kinzoku Kogyo
Kabushiki Co., Ltd.,
13:30-13:33, 13:35-
13:37
Hilton Davis Chemical Co.
v. Warner-Jenkinson
Co., Inc., 13:15-
13:17, 13:26
Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu
Kinzoku Kogyo
Kabushiki Co., Ltd. —Cont’d
concurring, Federal
Circuit decision on
second remand, 13:37
dissenting, Federal
Circuit decision,
13:33
defendants, Federal
Circuit decision on
remand, 13:26
majority opinion, initial
Federal Circuit decision,
13:16
of, 13:19
Prosecution history estop-
pel, 13:23
Supreme Court decision,
generally, 13:18-
13:25
time frame, 13:24
Johnson & Johnston v. R.E.
Service Co., 13:38
1950, developments to,
13:10, 13:11
1994, developments to, 13:13
subsequent developments,
13:39

TECHNOLOGICAL SCOPE OF INFRINGEMENT—Cont’d
Equivalents, Doctrine of—Cont’d
peripheral claiming—Cont’d
Federal Circuit—Cont’d
Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu
Kinzoku Kogyo
Kabushiki Co., Ltd.
—Cont’d
Supreme Court opinion,
13:34
Graver Tank & Mfg. Co. v.
Linde Air Products Co.,
13:12
Hilton Davis Chemical Co. v.
Warner-Jenkinson Co.,
Inc.
generally, 13:14-13:26
all-element rule, 13:22
concurring opinion, 13:25
dissenting opinions, 13:17
equity vs. law, 13:20
factual equivalency, 13:21
Federal Circuit decision,
initial, 13:15-13:17
Federal Circuit decision on
remand, 13:26
majority opinion, initial
Federal Circuit decision,
13:16
of, 13:19
Prosecution history estop-
pel, 13:23
Supreme Court decision,
generally, 13:18-
13:25
time frame, 13:24
Johnson & Johnston v. R.E.
Service Co., 13:38
1950, developments to,
13:10, 13:11
1994, developments to, 13:13
subsequent developments,
13:39
TECHNOLOGICAL SCOPE OF INFRINGEMENT—Cont’d
Equivalents, Doctrine of—Cont’d
policy justification
certainty and inadvertent
mistakes, 13:57, 13:58
factual equivalency, 13:64
infringement by equivalents
as reaction, 13:60
International Rectifier Corp.
v. Ixys Corp., 13:59
language issues, generally,
13:55-13:60
later-discovered technology,
13:56
law versus equity, 13:61
non-patent example, context
and inadvertent
mistakes, 13:58
notice versus definitional
accuracy, 13:54
patentee’s conduct, 13:88-
13:91, 13:102
patent example, 13:59
prior art, 13:80
reissue, relation to, 13:62
prior art
generally, 13:79-13:86
burden of proof, 13:84
history, 13:80
hypothetical claim, 13:83
obvious variations, 13:81,
13:82
other issues of patentability,
13:86
patent claim, required rela-
tion to, 13:85
policy justification, 13:80
Wilson Sporting Goods case,
13:82
prosecution history estoppel.
Patentee’s conduct, above
this group

TECHNOLOGICAL SCOPE OF INFRINGEMENT—Cont’d
Equivalents, Doctrine of—Cont’d
subsequent developments,
13:39
synthesis. Factual equivalency,
above this group
test. Factual equivalency, above
this group
Estoppel. Equivalents, Doctrine
of, above
Facts, 13:29
Factual equivalency. Equivalents,
Doctrine of, above
Federal Circuit. Equivalents, Doc-
trine of, above
Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku
Kogyo Kabushiki Co., Ltd.
Equivalents, Doctrine of,
above
Formal rejections and restrictions,
13:107
Formulation of test. Equivalents,
Doctrine of, above
Function, way, result, 13:66
Graphical illustration, 13:78
Graver Tank & Mfg. Co. v. Linde
Air Products Co., 13:12
Hilton Davis Chemical Co. v.
Warner-Jenkinson Co., Inc.
Equivalents, Doctrine of,
above
Historical development, 13:93
History
generally, 13:2-13:39
claim theory, impact of, above
early history, 13:3
Equivalents, Doctrine of, above
Hypothetical claim, 13:83
Illustrative diagram, 13:72
Improvements, 13:74
Inadvertent mistakes, 13:57, 13:58
Infringement by equivalents as
reaction, 13:60
Insubstantial differences, 13:67
TECHNOLOGICAL SCOPE OF INFRINGEMENT—Cont'd
Insufficient disclosure rejections, 13:108
International Rectifier Corp. v. Ixys Corp., 13:59
Inventive concept, 13:69
Judicial estoppel, 13:91
Justification. Policy justification, below
Known interchangeability, 13:75, 13:76
Language issues. Equivalents, Doctrine of, above
Later-discovered technology, 13:56
Law versus equity, 13:20, 13:61
Learned hand, 13:11
Legal defenses. Equivalents, Doctrine of, above
Limitations and restrictions, 13:107
Literal infringement generally, 13:44-13:51
additional elements or functions, 13:49
all-elements rule, 13:47-13:50
alternative species, 13:50
claim interpretation, relation to, 13:46
history, 13:45
methods, all-elements rule, 13:48
peripheral claiming, generally, 13:44-13:51
policy justification, 13:45
reverse doctrine of equivalents, 13:51

TECHNOLOGICAL SCOPE OF INFRINGEMENT—Cont’d
Means expressions, 13:114
Mistakes, 13:57, 13:58
1994, developments to, 13:13
Notice and knowledge, 13:54, 13:75, 13:76
Novelty requirement, analogy to, 13:90
Obvious variations, 13:81, 13:82
Opinions. Case law, above
Patentee’s conduct. Equivalents, Doctrine of, above
Peripheral claiming generally, 13:43-13:113
claim theory, impact of, 13:8
Equivalents, Doctrine of, above
literal infringement, above
Pioneer inventions versus improvements, 13:74
Policy justification generally, 13:40-13:42
claims, role of, 13:42
claim theory, role of, 13:42
Equivalents, Doctrine of, above
Prior art. Equivalents, Doctrine of, above
Procedural history, 13:28
Prosecution history estoppel. Equivalents, Doctrine of, above
Reissue, 13:62
Rejections, 13:107, 13:108
Related claims and applications, 13:106
Sanitary Refrigerator Co. v. Winters, 13:70
Second remand, 13:35-13:37
TECHNOLOGICAL SCOPE OF INFRINGEMENT—Cont’d
Subsequent decisions, 13:112
Subsequent developments, 13:39
Substitutions, 13:104
Sufficiency, 13:108
Supreme Court. Case law, above
Synthesis. Equivalents, Doctrine of, above
Temporal scope, 11:5
Time frame, 13:24, 13:76
Variations, 13:81, 13:82
Wilson Sporting Goods case, 13:82
Winans v. Denmead, 13:6
YBM Magnex, Inc. v. USITC, 13:96

TECHNOLOGICAL SOPHISTICATION
Adequate disclosure, 7:5

TELECOMMUNICATIONS INDUSTRY
Processes, 5:23

TELEFLEX, INC. v. FICOSA NORTH AMERICA CORP.
Adequate disclosure, 7:52, 7:53

TEMPORAL SCOPE OF INFRINGEMENT
Generally, 11:1 et seq.
Adequate commerciality, 11:6
Appeals, 11:29
Applications
extension of term under Section 156, application for, 11:43
onset at issuance versus filing, below
PCT applications, 11:24
Basic 20-year patent term, 11:21-11:24
Basic extension, 11:42
Beginning of term, 11:38
Changes, 11:12-11:15
Claims, 11:22-11:24

Combinations and subcombinations, identity of drug products, 11:49
Commerciality, adequacy, 11:6
Domestic priority, 11:23
Drug products, 11:46-11:49
Economic justifications, 11:18
Effective date, 11:30, 11:35
18-month publication. Onset at issuance versus filing, below
Ending of term, 11:39
Esters, identity of drug products, 11:47
Extension of term under Section 156
generally, 11:40-11:49
application for extension, 11:43
basic extension, 11:42
history, 11:41
interim extensions, 11:44
policy justification, 11:41
special issues
generally, 11:45-11:49
combinations and subcombinations, 11:49
identity of drug products, 11:46-11:49
pro-drugs and metabolites, 11:48
salts and esters, 11:47
Filing
history and policy justification,
20 years from filing, 11:14
onset at issuance versus filing, below
Foreign and domestic priority, claims of, 11:23
Geographic scope, 11:4
History
generally, 11:9-11:15
convoyed changes, 11:15
eyear U.S. law, 11:10

Index-202
TEMPORAL SCOPE OF INFRINGEMENT—Cont’d

History—Cont’d
extension of term under Section 156, 11:41
intermediate period, 17 years from issuance, 11:11
modern changes, 11:12-11:15
onset at issuance versus filing, 11:20
restoration of term, 11:13
20 years from filing, 11:14
Identity of drug products, 11:46-11:49
Infringement generally, 11:1-11:7
adequate commerciality, 11:6
geographic scope, 11:4
qualities of patent right, generally, 11:2-11:6
technological scope, 11:5
Interim extensions under Section 156, 11:44
Issuance. Onset at issuance versus filing, below
Justification. History and policy justification, above
Limitations, 11:28, 11:34
Metabolites, identity of drug products, 11:48
Natural right, 11:17
1994 provisions, applications filed on or after June 8, 1995, 11:26
1999 provisions, applications filed on or after May 29, 2000, 11:27-11:30
Onset at issuance versus filing generally, 11:19-11:37
applications filed on or after June 8, 1995, 11:21-11:24
basic 20-year patent term, 11:21-11:24
18-month publication. Provisional rights and 18-month

TEMPORAL SCOPE OF INFRINGEMENT—Cont’d
Onset at issuance versus filing —Cont’d
publication, below this group
foreign and domestic priority, claims of, 11:23
history, 11:20
policy, 11:20
prior PCT applications, claims to, 11:24
provisional rights and 18-month publication
generally, 11:31-11:36
effective date, 11:35
limitations, 11:34
policy justification, 11:32
requirement of published application, 11:33
value, general impact of value of patent, 11:36
restoration of term generally, 11:25-11:30
appeals, 1999 provisions, 11:29
effective date, 1999 provisions, 11:30
limitations, 1999 provisions, 11:28
1994 provisions, applications filed on or after June 8, 1995, 11:26
1999 provisions, applications filed on or after May 29, 2000, 11:27-11:30
procedures, 1999 provisions, 11:29
Sections 120 and 121, claims of benefit under, 11:22
term basic 20-year patent term, 11:21-11:24
restoration of term, above this group
TEMPORAL SCOPE OF INFRINGEMENT—Cont’d
Onset at issuance versus filing — Cont’d
transitional provisions, applications filed before June 8, 1995, 11:37
Policy, onset at issuance versus filing, 11:20
Policy justification
generally, 11:16-11:18
economic justifications, 11:18
extension of term under Section 156, 11:41
natural right, 11:17
onset at issuance versus filing, 11:20, 11:32
Priority, 11:23
Prior PCT applications, claims to, 11:24
Procedures, 1999 provisions, 11:29
Provisional rights and 18-month publication. Onset at issuance versus filing, above
Publication. Onset at issuance versus filing, above
Restoration of term
history and policy justification, 11:13
onset at issuance versus filing, above
Salts, identity of drug products, 11:47
Section 120, claims of benefit under, 11:22
Section 121, claims of benefit under, 11:22
Section 156. Extension of term under Section 156, above
Special issues. Extension of term under Section 156, above
Subcombinations, identity of drug products, 11:49
Technological scope, 11:5

TEMPORAL SCOPE OF INFRINGEMENT—Cont’d
Term
beginning of term, 11:38
ending of term, 11:39
extension of term under Section 156, above
onset at issuance versus filing, above
restoration of term, above
Transitional provisions, applications filed before June 8, 1995, 11:37
Value, general impact of value of patent, 11:36

TEMPORARY NATIONAL EMERGENCY COMMITTEE (TNEC)
Policy justification, 1:29

TENANCY IN COMMON
Joint inventorship, 10:49, 10:50

TERMINAL DISCLAIMERS
History, 1:24

TERMINATION
Examination of Original Application (this index)

TERRITORIAL LIMITATIONS
Adequate commerciality, 14:22
Misuse of patent, 18:33

TESTS AND EXPERIMENTS
Adequate utility, 6:1, 6:8, 6:18
Anticipation, lack of, 8:5
Claims, 4:74, 4:92
Disclosure (this index)
Joint Inventorship (this index)
Non-Obviousness (this index)
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:59, 5:74, 5:78, 5:81
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:2
Priority (this index)
INDEX

TESTS AND EXPERIMENTS
— Cont’d
Technological Scope of Infringement (this index)

TEVA PHARMACEUTICALS USA, INC. v. PFIZER, INC.
Adequate commerciality, 14:80

TEXAS DIGITAL INSTRUMENTS v. TELEGENIX
Claims, 4:38

TEXT
Adequate disclosure, 7:5
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:83

THE CLOTHWORKERS OF IPSWICH
History, 1:5

THEORETICAL JUSTIFICATION
Priority, 8:92

THIRD PARTIES
Adequate commerciality, 14:32
Adequate disclosure, 7:24
Adequate utility, 6:7
Inventorship, 10:11, 10:13, 10:18
Joint inventorship, 10:28, 10:29, 10:42, 10:47, 10:49, 10:51
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:12, 2:13, 2:18
Policy justification, 1:29
Priority, 8:232, 8:256
Reexamination, 16:135

THIRD-PARTY PARTICIPATION
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:13

THIRD PERSONS
Indirect infringement, 15:14

THIRD PERSONS—Cont’d
Third Parties (this index)

35 USC
Generally, 1:23
Claims, 4:5

35 USC, SECTION 01
Inventorship, 10:7

35 USC, SECTION 102(F)
Inventorship, 10:7

35 USC, SECTION 115
Inventorship, 10:7

35 USC, SECTION 261
Inventorship, 10:7

35 USCA § 271(E)(2)(A)
Adequate commerciality, 14:79

37 CFR
History, 1:20
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:83

THREAT
Estoppel, communication from patent owner, 24:26

3D SYSTEMS, INC. v. AAROTECH LABORATORIES, INC.

TILGHMAN v. MITCHELL
Processes, 5:21

TIME OR DATE AND RELATED MATTERS
Adequate Commerciality (this index)
Adequate disclosure, 7:21, 7:22, 7:29, 7:56
TIME OR DATE AND RELATED MATTERS—Cont’d

Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)
Correction of inventorship, 10:62, 10:68
Disclosure, 7:29, 7:52, 7:56
Effective Filing Date (this index)
Examination of Original Application (this index)
Geographic scope, 12:41
History, 1:5, 1:18
Inventorship, 10:14
Non-obviousness, 9:17, 9:57
Non-Obviousness (this index)
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:1
Priority (this index)
Reissue of patent, 16:40-16:46, 16:110-16:114
Statutory subject matter, 5:1, 5:4
Technological scope, 13:24, 13:76
Temporal Scope of Infringement (this index)
Utility Requirement (this index)

TIME-WISE PRIORITY

Adequate disclosure, 7:5
Anticipation, lack of, 8:5
Non-obviousness, 9:38
Priority, 8:33

TITLE AND OWNERSHIP

Adequate commerciality, 14:18
Claims, 4:2
History, 1:16
Inventorship (this index)
Laches, insecure title, 23:31
Non-Obviousness (this index)
Policy justification, 1:28
Static physical configurations, 5:18

TITLE TO LAND

History, 1:1

TOLLING

Six-year limitation, 21:23, 21:24

TOPPAN v. TIFFANY REFRIGERATOR CAR CO.
Adequate commerciality, 14:42

TORO v. WHITE CONSOL. INDUSTRIES
Claims, 4:37

TORPHARM, INC. v. RANBAXY PHARMACEUTICALS, INC.
Non-obviousness, 9:85

TOTAL INCAPACITY

Adequate utility, 6:11

TOTAL USES

Adequate utility, 6:16

TOWNS

History, 1:4

TRADEMARKS

See also Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) (this index)
Adequate disclosure, 7:12
Designs, 5:46
History, 1:14, 1:15

TRADE-RELATED ASPECTS OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS, AGREEMENT ON (TRIPs)
Adequate commerciality, 14:10, 14:27, 14:46
Prior inventor, prior-user rights, 22:11

TRADE SECRETS

Adequate disclosure generally, 7:1
best mode, 7:46, 7:50
history and policy justification, 7:5
single-embodiment, 7:17, 7:21
Adequate utility, 6:5
Correction of inventorship, 10:68
INDEX

TRADE SECRETS—Cont’d
History, 1:15
Inventorship, 10:3
Policy justification, 1:38
Prior inventor, prior-user rights, 22:6
Processes, 5:30

TRADE SHOWS
Adequate commerciality, 14:33

TRAINING AND TRAINING MATERIALS
Adequate disclosure, 7:16
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:83

TRANSFERRING FUNDS
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:83

TRANSFERS OF RIGHTS AND TITLE
Adequate commerciality, 14:42
Correction of inventorship, 10:61, 10:64, 10:68
Invalidity (this index)
Inventorship, generally, 10:7-10:17
Joint inventorship, 10:25

TRANSFORMATION
Processes, 5:19, 5:22, 5:30

TRANSITIONAL PHRASE
Claims, 4:96, 4:98, 4:99

TRANSITIONAL PROVISIONS
Temporal scope, 11:37

TRANSITORY EMBODIMENTS
Geographic scope, 12:44

TREATISES
Inventorship, 10:2

TREATISES—Cont’d
Joint inventorship, 10:24
Priority, 8:154
Processes, 5:30

TRIAL-AND-ERROR
Adequate disclosure, 7:20

TRIAL COURTS
Claims, 4:2, 4:80
Non-obviousness, 9:3, 9:50
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:79
Processes, 5:21
Static physical configurations, 5:15

TRIPARTITE ANALYSIS
Priority, 8:60

TRIPARTITE FORM OF INDIVIDUAL CLAIMS
Generally, 4:96-4:99

TRIPS
Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights, Agreement on (TRIPs) (this index)

TROPIX INC. v. LUMIGEN INC.
Claims, 4:74

TRUE INVENTOR
Adequate disclosure, 7:28
Correction of inventorship, 10:60, 10:66

TRUE METHOD
Processes, 5:27

TUBER-PROPAGATED PLANTS
Static physical configurations, 5:14

TUBULAR BODY
Claims, 4:97, 4:98

21 USCA §§ 151 TO 158
Adequate commerciality, 14:76

© 2012 Thomson Reuters/West, 9/2012
28 USCA § 1498

Adequate commerciality, 14:55

TWO-PRONG TEST

Adequate disclosure, 7:49

2002 AMENDMENTS

Reissue of patent, 16:67, 16:68

TWO-YEAR TIME LIMIT

Reissue of patent, 16:79

TYING ARRANGEMENTS

Misuse of patent, 18:41

TYPICAL SOPHISTICATION

Adequate disclosure, 7:10

UNASSISTED HUMAN THOUGHT

Processes, 5:26

UNCLEAN HANDS

Estoppel, 24:31
Laches, 23:41

UNDERLYING POLICY

Non-obviousness, 9:46

UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE FOR INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY

Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:22

UNDERSTANDING OF CONFIGURATIONS

Technological configuration, 9:71

UNDUE DELAY

Non-obviousness, 9:39

UNDUE EXPERIMENTATION

Adequate disclosure, 7:20, 7:25

UNDUE SOCIAL COST

Statutory subject matter, 5:5

UNEXPECTED PROPERTIES

Non-obviousness, 9:77

UNEXPECTED PROPERTIES — Cont’d

Priority, 8:52

UNEXPECTED RESULTS

Non-obviousness, 9:76

UNFAIR COMPETITION

History, 1:14

UNIFIED STANDARD

Priority, 8:61

UNIFORMITY

Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:59

UNILATERAL ACTION

Joint inventorship, 10:52

UNILATERAL CONTRACT

Justification, 1:39

UNION OIL CO. OF CALIFORNIA v. ATLANTIC RICHFIELD CO.

Adequate commerciality, 14:37

UNIVERSITIES

Non-obviousness, 9:47

UNPREDICTABLE ARTS

Non-obviousness, 9:67

UNRESTRICTED SALES

Defenses, implied-in-law licenses, 19:39

UNSCRUPULOUS ENTITY

Adequate utility, 6:15

UNWANTED ACTIVITY

Adequate utility, 6:5
Utility requirement, 6:5

UNWANTED BEHAVIOR

Adequate utility, 6:5

UNWANTED FIELDS

Adequate utility, 6:5

Index-208
INDEX

URUGUAY ROUND
    Adequate commerciality, 14:10

U.S. INDUSTRIAL CHEMICALS
    v. CARBIDE & CARBON
    CHEMICALS
    CORPORATION
    Reissue of patent, 16:90

USEFUL ARTS
    Copyright clause, 1:11
    History, 1:12
    Inventorship, 10:2, 10:7
    Non-obviousness, 9:9
    Patent and Trademark Office
        (PTO), 2:15, 2:20
    Priority, 8:56
    Statutory subject matter, 5:2
    Statutory Subject Matter (this index)
    Utility Requirement (this index)

USEFULNESS
    Claims, 4:66
    Non-obviousness, 9:2
    Statutory Subject Matter (this index)
    Utility Requirement (this index)

USEFUL PROPERTY
    Non-obviousness, 9:77

USES
    Non-Obviousness (this index)

UTILITY PATENT
    Designs, 5:46
    Statutory subject matter, 5:14

UTILITY REQUIREMENT
    Generally, 6:1 et seq.
    Abstract acts and matters, 6:18
    Adequate disclosure, 6:6, 6:19
    Administrative law and procedure,
        6:4
    Advance in art, 6:3
    Amusement, 6:15
    Animals, 6:5, 6:18
    —Cont’d
    Anticipation, lack of, 6:7, 8:22
    Apparatus, 6:15
    Appeal and review, 6:6, 6:17
    Art, advance in, 6:3
    Bedford v. Hunt, 6:4, 6:6, 6:7, 6:9
    Biotechnological arts, 6:6
    Brenner v. Manson, 6:6, 6:7,
        6:17-6:19
    Burden of proof, 6:16
    Case law, 6:14
    Certiorari, 6:6
    Change and modification, 6:18
    Charge to the jury, 6:9
    Chemical arts, 6:7, 6:19
    Chemical markers, construction
        of, 6:18
    Chemical process, 6:17
    Chemical products, 6:1, 6:6, 6:16
    Circumstantial evidence, 6:20
    Clear and convincing evidence,
        6:14
    Cloning of multicellular animals
        or humans, 6:5
    Combinations, 6:6
    Commercialized, 6:4
    Commercially salable, 6:8, 6:11
    Commissioner of Patents, 6:6
    Compounds, 6:18
    Congress, 6:9
    Constitutional law, 6:2, 6:5, 6:9
    Construction and interpretation,
        generally, 6:1
    Consumer fraud, 6:5, 6:15
    Consumer Products Safety Com-
        mission, 6:5
    Correctness, 6:13
    Costs and expenses, 6:4, 6:10
    Court of Customs and Patent
        Appeals (CCPA), 6:6, 6:17
    Current, tangible benefit, 6:16
    Currently available, 6:18
    Dangerous, 6:12
UTILITY REQUIREMENT
—Cont’d
Date of invention, 6:7
Deceptive scheme, 6:15
Defensive, 6:7
Demand, 6:4, 6:10
Disclosure, 6:6, 6:16-6:19
Discovery, 6:18
Disdainful amusement devices, 6:15
Dominant-subservient relationships, 6:6
Duplication, 6:3
Economic considerations, 6:2
Economic costs, 6:4, 6:10
Economic justification, 6:10
Electrical arts, 6:19
Embodiment, 6:14
Enforcement, 6:19
European Patent Convention (EPC), 6:3
Evidence
adequate utility
generally, 6:4
burden of proof, 6:16
circumstantial evidence, 6:20
clear and convincing evidence, 6:14
burden of proof, 6:16
circumstantial evidence, 6:20
clear and convincing evidence, 6:14
history, 6:4
practical utility, 6:18
prosecution, 6:13
Examination, 6:13
Exceptions and exclusions, 6:5
Expectations, 6:19
Factual statements, 6:13
False assertions, 6:13
False scheme, 6:15
Federal Circuit, 6:18, 6:19
Federal Trade Commission, 6:5
Fixed standard, 6:18

UTILITY REQUIREMENT
—Cont’d
Food and Drug Administration, 6:5, 6:12
Foreign countries, 6:3, 6:5, 6:6
Forensics, 6:18, 6:19
Foreseeability, 6:1, 6:6, 6:16
Fourteenth amendment, 6:5
Fraud, 6:5, 6:15
Frivolous or injurious to well-being, good policy, or sound morals of society, 6:15
Future acts and matters
practical utility, 6:16-6:19
research, 6:6
technology, 6:19
use-based view, 6:20
Gambling, 6:5, 6:15
Genetics, 6:5, 6:6
Genomic inventions, 6:19
Genus dominate a species, 6:6
Germany, 6:3, 6:6
Good policy, 6:15
Harmful, 6:15
Historical development and policy justification
generally, 6:2-6:7, 6:15
advance in art, 6:3
date of invention, 6:7
limiting scope of control over future uses, 6:6
market forces, use of, 6:4
operability, 6:9
unwanted activity, deterring, 6:5
Humans, 6:5, 6:18
Incentives, 6:19
Industrial application, 6:8
Inferior, 6:3
Infringement, 6:4, 6:20
In re Joly, 6:17
In re Kirk, 6:17
In re Ziegler, 6:18
In vitro tests, 6:18

Index-210
UTILITY REQUIREMENT — Cont’d
References, 6:7
Rejection of application, 6:6, 6:13
Research and development, 6:6, 6:15, 6:17
Reversal, 6:6
Safe and effective, 6:12
Sale, 6:8
Scientific development, 6:19
Scientific field, 6:5
Section 101, generally, 6:1
Section 103, 6:7
Section 112, 6:6, 6:19
Section 282, 6:14
Serviceable in vivo, 6:18
Skill in the art, 6:13
Social costs, 6:2, 6:4, 6:10
Sound morals, 6:15
Specification, 6:1, 6:7, 6:19
Specific uses, 6:18
Sub-combination dominate more comprehensive combinations, 6:6
Sub-issue, 6:7
Substantial uses, 6:18
Supreme Court, 6:6, 6:17
Tangible benefit, 6:16
Tests, 6:1, 6:8, 6:18
Third persons, 6:7
Total incapacity, 6:11
Total uses, 6:16
Trade secrets, 6:5
Unscrupulous entity, 6:15
Unwanted activity, deterring, 6:5
Unwanted behavior, 6:5
Unwanted fields, 6:5
Useful, generally, 6:1
Useful arts, generally, 6:2
Validity, 6:4, 6:7, 6:11-6:14
Value, 6:20
Well-being, 6:15

VACATIONS
Priority, 8:67

VALIDITY
Anticipation, Lack Of (this index)
Claims, 4:49, 4:62
Correction (this index)
Defense of invalidity. Invalidity (this index)
Examination of Original Application (this index)
History, 1:5, 1:18, 1:24
Inventorship, 10:1, 10:7, 10:10
Joint Inventorship (this index)
Non-Obviousness (this index)
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:76
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) (this index)
Priority, 8:69
Processes (this index)
Static physical configurations, 5:8, 5:17
Statutory subject matter, 5:4
Utility Requirement (this index)

VALUE
Adequate utility, 6:20
Anticipation, lack of, 8:1
Joint inventorship, 10:47, 10:50, 10:52
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:49
Policy justification, 1:39
Priority, 8:56
Static physical configurations, 5:15
Statutory subject matter, 5:5
Temporal scope, 11:36

VAN KANNELL REVOLVING DOOR CO. v. REVOLVING DOOR & FIXTURE CO.
Adequate commerciality, 14:39, 14:40, 14:46

VARIATIONS
Processes, 5:21
VARIATIONS—Cont’d
Technological scope, 13:81, 13:82
VENN DIAGRAM
Claims, 4:63
VERDICT
Claims (this index)
Non-obviousness, 9:3
VESSELS
Geographic scope, 12:13
VESTING OF TITLE
Inventorship (this index)
VETERINARY BIOLOGICAL PRODUCTS
Adequate Commerciality (this index)
VICE PRESIDENT
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:22
VIEWED PER SE
Non-statutory hybrid inventions, 5:83
VITRONICS CORP. v. CONCEPTRONIC, INC.
Claims, 4:34
VOID AND VOIDABLE ACTS AND MATTERS
Correction of inventorship, 10:56
History, 1:4, 1:5
Joint inventorship, 10:19
Processes, 5:24
VOLUNTARINESS
Defenses, implied-in-law licenses, involuntary sales, 19:41
History, 1:14
Priority, 8:67
VOSE v. SINGER
Joint inventorship, 10:50
WAIVER
History, 1:14
WALLACE v. HOLMES
Indirect infringement, 15:4, 15:16
Misuse of patent, 18:5
WANLASS v. FEDDERS
Laches, unreasonable delay, 23:27
WANLASS v. GENERAL ELEC. CO.
Laches, unreasonable delay, 23:26
WARNER JENKINSON v. HILTON DAVIS
Claims, 4:6
WARNER-LAMBERT CO. v. APOTEX CORP.
Adequate commerciality, 14:79
WAYMARK CORP. v. PORTA SYSTEMS CORP.
Adequate commerciality, 14:27
WEBSTER LOOM CO. v. HIGGINS
Adequate disclosure, 7:48
WEED CHAIN TIRE GRIP CO v. CLEVELAND CHAIN & MFG CO.
Adequate commerciality, 14:31
WEIGHT AND SUFFICIENCY OF EVIDENCE
Patent and Trademark Office (PTO), 2:39
Priority, 8:72
WELL-BEING
Adequate utility, 6:15
WHITE v. WALBRIDGE
Adequate commerciality, 14:20
WHITTEMORE v. CUTTER
Adequate commerciality, 14:3, 14:52
WHOLE TRUTH
Adequate disclosure, 7:45
WILSON SPORTING GOODS
CASE
Technological scope, 13:82

WINANS v. DENMEAD
Technological scope, 13:6

WITHDRAWAL
History, 1:4, 1:15
Priority, 8:241

WITNESSES
Priority (this index)

WOMEN
Inventorship, 10:7

WOODWORTH PATENTS
Reissue of patent, 16:15

WORKABILITY
Priority, 8:60

WORK-FOR-HIRE
Inventorship, 10:16, 10:17

WORLD TRADE
ORGANIZATION (WTO)
AGREEMENT
Adequate commerciality, 14:46

WORST CASE SCENARIO
Non-obviousness, 9:65

WRITTEN ACTS AND
MATTERS
Adequate disclosure, 7:8, 7:11, 7:27, 7:37
Claims (this index)
Correction of inventorship, 10:56
Examination of Original
Application (this index)
History (this index)
Non-obviousness, 9:2
Priority, 8:74
Utility Requirement (this index)

WTO
World Trade Organization
(WTO) Agreement (this index)

WYETH v. STONE
Estoppel as defense to patent
infringement, 24:9
Processes, 5:24

YBM MAGNEX, INC. v. USITC
Technological scope, 13:96

YET-TO-BE-INVENTED
TECHNOLOGY
Adequate disclosure, 7:14, 7:24

ZENITH RADIO CORP v.
HAZELTINE RESEARCH,
INC.
Misuse of patent, 18:20