

DETAILED TABLE OF CONTENTS
For
Mueller's *PATENT LAW, Fifth Edition* (July 2016)

Preface

Chapter 1 Foundations of the U.S. Patent System

- A. Introduction and Chapter Overview
- B. Why Study Patent Law?
 - 1. Rise of the Information-Based Economy
 - 2. Educational Prerequisites
- C. What Is a Patent?
 - 1. Patents as a Form of Intellectual Property
 - 2. The Appropriability Problem of Intellectual Property
 - 3. Public Goods
 - 4. Exception to the General Rule of Competition by Imitation
 - 5. The Patent Document and Its Components
 - 6. The Negative Right to Exclude
 - 7. The Patent Term
- D. Economic Considerations
 - 1. Is a Patent a Monopoly?
 - 2. Cost/Benefit Analysis for Patents
 - a. Costs
 - b. Benefits
- E. Philosophical Rationales for Patent Protection
 - 1. Natural Rights
 - 2. Reward for Services Rendered
 - 3. Monopoly Profits Incentive
 - 4. Exchange for Secrets
- F. Primary Sources of U.S. Patent Law
 - 1. The Constitution

2. Federal Statutes and Regulations
3. Case Law
- G. Adjudicatory Forums for Patent Matters
 1. U.S. District Courts
 - a. Subject Matter Jurisdiction and Venue
 - b. Civil Actions Against the USPTO Director in the Eastern District of Virginia
 2. U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit
 3. USPTO Patent Trial and Appeal Board
 4. U.S. International Trade Commission
- H. Patent Prosecution Overview
 1. Introduction
 2. Filing the Application
 3. Examination by the USPTO
 - a. Sample Office Action and Applicant's Response
 4. Publication of Pending Patent Applications
 5. Continuing Application Practice
 6. Double Patenting
 - a. Introduction
 - b. Two Forms
 - c. Policy Concerns
 - d. Comparing Claims with Claims
 - e. Case Study
 - f. Terminal Disclaimers

Chapter 2 Patent Claims

- A. Introduction
 1. Historical Development of Patent Claiming
 2. Definition of a Patent Claim
 3. A Key Reference Work
- B. Claim Definiteness Requirement (35 U.S.C. §112(b))
 1. Own Lexicographer Rule
 2. Definiteness Standards

- a. Introduction
- b. Supreme Court Adjusts the Standard (*Nautilus* (U.S. 2014))
- c. Judicial Correction of Errors in Patent Claims
- 3. Antecedent Basis
- C. Anatomy of a Patent Claim
 - 1. Preamble
 - 2. Transition
 - a. “Comprising” Transition
 - b. “Consisting of” Transition
 - c. “Consisting Essentially of” Transition
 - 3. Body
- D. Independent and Dependent Claims
- E. Specialized Claiming Formats
 - 1. Means-Plus-Function Claim Elements (35 U.S.C. §112(f))
 - a. Introduction
 - b. Interpreting the Scope of Means-Plus-Function Elements
 - (i) Scope-Narrowing Operation
 - (ii) Timing of Statutory Equivalents
 - (iii) Presumptions
 - c. Distinguishing §112(f) Statutory Equivalents and the Doctrine of Equivalents
 - 2. Product-by-Process Claims
 - 3. *Jepson* Claims
 - 4. *Markush* Claims
 - 5. *Beauregard* Claims

Chapter 3 Disclosure Requirements (35 U.S.C. §112(a))

- A. Introduction
 - 1. The Statutory Framework
 - 2. Disclosure as *Quid Pro Quo*
 - 3. Timing of Disclosure Compliance
- B. The Enablement Requirement
 - 1. Undue Experimentation

2. *Wands* Factor: Predictable Versus Unpredictable Inventions
 3. *Wands* Factor: Scope of the Claims
 4. *Wands* Factor: Working Examples
 5. Nascent and After-Arising Technology
- C. The Best Mode Requirement
1. Best Mode Scale-Back by America Invents Act of 2011
 2. Distinguishing Best Mode from Enablement
 3. Policy Rationale
 4. The *Chemcast* Analysis
 - a. Step 1: Subjective Inquiry
 - b. Step 2: Objective Inquiry
 5. Scope of the Best Mode Obligation
 6. Is Intentional Concealment Required?
- D. The Written Description of the Invention Requirement
1. Timing Mechanism
 2. How an Application Conveys Possession of an Invention
 3. Distinguishing Written Description from Enablement
 4. Typical Fact Scenarios Invoking Written Description Scrutiny
 5. Federal Circuit's Expansion of the Written Description Requirement
 - [a] *Regents of Univ. of Cal. v. Eli Lilly* (1997)
 - [b] *Univ. of Rochester v. G.D. Searle* (2004)
 - [c] *Carnegie Mellon Univ. v. Hoffman-La Roche* (2008)
 - [d] *Ariad Pharms. v. Eli Lilly* (2010) (en banc)
 - [e] *AbbVie Deutschland v. Janssen Biotech* (2014)
 - [f] Concluding Thoughts

Chapter 4 Novelty, Loss of Right, and Priority Pre- and Post-America Invents Act of 2011 (35 U.S.C. §102)

Guide to This Chapter

Part I: General Principles of Anticipation

- A. The Meaning of Anticipation
- B. Burden of Proof

- C. The Strict Identity Rule of Anticipation
 - 1. In General
 - 2. The Special Case of Species/Genus Anticipation
- D. Anticipation by Inherency
- E. Enablement Standard for Anticipatory Prior Art
- F. What Is a Printed Publication?

Part II: Novelty, Loss of Right, and Priority Pre-America Invents Act of 2011

- G. Introduction
 - 1. Statutory Basis
 - 2. Geographic Distinctions
 - 3. Who Is the Actor?
 - 4. Distinguishing Novelty from Loss of Right
- H. “Known or Used” Under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) (Pre-AIA)
- I. The Statutory Bars of 35 U.S.C. §102(b) (Pre-AIA)
 - 1. Introduction
 - 2. Grace Period
 - 3. Section 102(b) Public Use
 - a. Inventor’s Control
 - b. Acts by Third Parties
 - c. “Secret” Public Use?
 - 4. Section 102(b) on Sale Bar
 - a. Introduction
 - b. Is Claimed Invention “Ready for Patenting”?
 - c. Is Claimed Invention the Subject of a Commercial Offer for Sale?
 - 5. Experimental Use Negation of the §102(b) Bars
- J. Abandonment Under 35 U.S.C. §102(c) (Pre-AIA)
- K. Foreign Patenting Bar of 35 U.S.C. §102(d) (Pre-AIA)
- L. Description in Another’s Earlier-Filed Patent or Published Patent Application Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) (Pre-AIA)
 - 1. In General
 - 2. Attempted Reliance on Provisional Application Filing Date as Effective Date for

§102(e) Reference (Rule of *In re Wertheim*)

M. Derivation and Inventorship Under 35 U.S.C. §102(f) (Pre-AIA)

1. Derivation
2. Who Is an Inventor?
3. Correction of Inventorship
4. Joint Inventors

N. Prior Invention Under 35 U.S.C. §102(g) (Pre-AIA)

1. Introduction
2. Interference Proceedings Under §102(g)(1)
3. Anticipation Under §102(g)(2)
 - a. Introduction
 - b. Prior Invention Must Not Be “Abandoned, Suppressed, or Concealed”
 - c. Geographic Requirements
 - d. Section 102(g)(2) as Invalidity Defense
 - e. Expansion of the Role of §102(g)
4. Applying the Priority Rule of §102(g)

O. Antedating (or “Swearing Behind”) Prior Art (Pre-AIA)

Part III: Novelty and Priority Post-America Invents Act of 2011

P. Introduction

1. Statutory Basis
2. Sense of Congress and Legislative History
3. Comparing Pre- and Post-AIA Frameworks
 - a. What Section 3 of the AIA Retained
 - b. What Section 3 of the AIA Changed

Q. Presumptively Novelty-Destroying Events Under Post-AIA 35 U.S.C. §102(a)(1)

1. Invention “Patented, Described in a Printed Publication, or in Public Use, [or] on Sale” Before Effective Filing Date
2. Invention “Otherwise Available to the Public” Before Effective Filing Date
3. Does the AIA Permit Secret Prior Art?

R. Presumptively Novelty-Destroying Events Under Post-AIA 35 U.S.C. §102(a)(2)

S. Novelty-Preserving Exceptions Under Post-AIA 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

1. Introduction
2. Post-AIA §102(b)(1): Shields Against Post-AIA §102(a)(1) Presumptively Novelty-Destroying Events
 - a. (A)-Type Exceptions
 - b. (B)-Type Exceptions
3. Post-AIA §102(b)(2): Shields Against Post-AIA §102(a)(2) Presumptively Novelty-Destroying Events
 - a. (A)-Type Exceptions
 - b. (B)-Type Exceptions
- T. Effective Date for AIA §3 First-Inventor-to-File Amendments
- U. Common Ownership Under Joint Research Agreements

Chapter 5 The Nonobviousness Requirement (35 U.S.C. §103)

- A. Introduction
- B. Historical Context: The *Hotchkiss* “Ordinary Mechanic” and the Requirement for “Invention”
- C. Enactment of §103 of the Patent Act of 1952, Incorporating the Requirement of Nonobviousness
- D. The *Graham v. John Deere* Framework for Analyzing Nonobviousness
 1. Constitutionality of 35 U.S.C. §103
 2. *Graham*’s Analytical Framework for a §103 Analysis
- E. *Graham* Factor: Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art
- F. *Graham* Factor: Scope and Content of the Prior Art
 1. Terminology
 2. Sources of Prior Art
 3. Section 102/103 Overlap
 - a. Overview
 - b. *In re Bass* (CCPA 1973)
 - c. 1984 Amendments
 - d. AIPA (1999) Amendments
 - e. CREATE Act (2004) Amendments
 - f. AIA (2011) Amendments
 - g. European Comparison

- 4. Analogous Art
- G. *Graham* Factor: Differences Between Claimed Invention and Prior Art
- H. *Graham* Factor: Secondary Considerations
 - 1. The Weight to Be Accorded Secondary Considerations Evidence
 - 2. The Nexus Requirement for Evidence of Commercial Success
- I. Combining the Disclosures of Prior Art References to Establish Obviousness
 - 1. Teaching, Suggestion, or Motivation to Combine
 - 2. *KSR v. Teleflex*: Combinations, Predictability, and “Common Sense”
 - 3. Teaching Away
 - 4. “Obvious to Try”
 - 5. Unexpected Results
 - a. Generally
 - b. Timing of Evidence
 - c. Placement in *Graham* Framework
- J. The *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness
- K. Federal Circuit Standards of Review in §103 Determinations
 - 1. USPTO
 - 2. Federal District Court

Chapter 6 The Utility Requirement (35 U.S.C. §101)

- A. Introduction
- B. Practical/Real-World Utility
- C. The Supreme Court View
 - 1. *Brenner v. Manson* (1966)
 - 2. USPTO Implementing Guidelines
- D. The Federal Circuit View
 - 1. Chemical Compounds
 - 2. Methods of Medical Treatment
 - 3. Genetic Inventions
- E. Inoperability
 - 1. Examples of Inoperable Inventions
 - 2. Inoperable Species Within a Genus

- F. Immoral or Deceptive Inventions
- G. Relationship Between Utility Requirement of §101 and How-to-Use Requirement of §112(a)
- H. Utility Requirement in Foreign Patent Systems
 - 1. Industrial Applicability
 - 2. Morality Criterion

Chapter 7 Potentially Patentable Subject Matter (35 U.S.C. §101)

- A. Introduction
 - 1. The General Nature of §101
 - 2. The Statutory Categories of §101
 - 3. Claiming the Inventive Concept Within Different Statutory Categories
 - 4. Exceptions to §101
- B. Section 101 Processes
 - 1. Basic Principles
 - 2. Process Versus Product
 - 3. Computer-Implemented Processes
 - 4. Business Methods
 - a. *State Street Bank* (Fed. Cir. 1998)
 - b. *Bilski* (U.S. 2010)
 - c. *Mayo* (U.S. 2012)
 - d. *Alice Corp.* (U.S. 2014)
 - e. Federal Circuit “Abstract Idea” Cases after *Alice Corp.*
 - 5. Methods of Medical Treatment
 - a. ***Mayo v. Prometheus* (U.S. 2012)**
 - b. **Federal Circuit Applications of *Mayo***
- C. Section 101 Machines
- D. Section 101 Compositions of Matter
 - 1. Structure Versus Properties
 - 2. Products of Nature
 - a. Purified Forms of Natural Products
 - b. Genetic Materials

- i. *Ass'n for Molecular Pathology v. Myriad Genetics* (U.S. 2013)
 - ii. Post-*Myriad* (U.S. 2013) Federal Circuit Decisions
 - c. Spontaneously-Generated Compositions
- 3. Life Forms
 - a. Foundation: *Diamond v. Chakrabarty* (U.S. 1980)
 - b. Multi-Cellular Organisms
 - c. Clones
- E. Section 101 Manufactures
 - 1. Computer Media Claims
 - 2. Electrical Signals
 - 3. Device Profiles
- F. Nonpatentable Subject Matter
- G. Medical/Surgical Procedures
- H. Patentable Subject Matter Beyond §101: Plant Patents and Design Patents
 - 1. Plant Patents
 - 2. Design Patents
 - a. Criteria for Obtaining Design Patents
 - b. Establishing Infringement of Design Patents
 - c. Unique Remedy for Design Patent Infringement
 - (i) Statutory Basis: 35 U.S.C. §289
 - (ii) No Apportionment

Chapter 8 Correcting and Challenging Issued Patents in the USPTO

- A. Introduction
- B. Certificates of Correction
- C. Reissue
 - 1. Overview
 - 2. Historical Development
 - 3. Statutory Basis
 - 4. Broadening Reissues
 - 5. Reissue Error
 - 6. The Recapture Rule

7. Effect of Reissue: Intervening Rights
8. Strategic Considerations for Reissue
- D. Reexamination
 1. Introduction
 2. *Ex Parte* Reexamination
 - a. Who Can Request
 - b. Statutory Grounds for Reexamination
 - c. Substantial New Question of Patentability
 - d. Legislative Changes in Response to *Portola*
 - e. Reexamination Compared to Reissue
 3. *Inter Partes* Reexamination (Pre-AIA)
- E. AIA-Implemented Procedures for Challenging Issued Patents
 1. *Inter Partes* Review
 2. Post-Grant Review
 3. Broadest Reasonable Construction Rule for Challenged Claims

Chapter 9 Patent Infringement

- A. Introduction
 1. Statutory Framework
 - a. Direct Versus Indirect Infringement Under §271
 - b. “Divided” Infringement by Multiple Parties Under §271(a)
 2. Two-Step Analysis for Patent Infringement
- B. Step One: Patent Claim Interpretation
 1. The Central Role of Claims
 2. Judge or Jury as Interpreter? The *Markman* Revolution
 3. Evidentiary Sources for Claim Interpretation
 4. The *Phillips* Debate: “Contextualist” Versus “Literalist” Approaches
 5. *Markman* Hearings
 6. Appellate Review of Claim Interpretation: From *Cybor* (Fed. Cir. 1998) to *Teva* (U.S. 2015)
 - a. Federal Circuit’s *De Novo* Standard of Review
 - b. Supreme Court Requires Deference for Fact Finding: *Teva* (U.S. 2015)

- c. Federal Circuit Application of the *Teva* Standard
 - 7. Claim Interpretation Canons
- C. Step Two: Comparing the Properly Interpreted Claims to the Accused Device
 - 1. Literal Infringement
 - 2. Infringement Under the Doctrine of Equivalents
 - a. Historical Origins
 - b. Policy Rationales
 - c. Tension with the Notice Function of Claims
 - d. All-Limitations Rule
 - e. What Is a Limitation?
 - f. Determining Technologic Equivalence
 - g. Reverse Doctrine of Equivalents
- D. Legal Limitations on the Doctrine of Equivalents
 - 1. Overview
 - 2. Prosecution History Estoppel
 - a. Definition
 - b. Scope of Estoppel
 - c. Presumption of Estoppel Under *Warner-Jenkinson*
 - d. Federal Circuit's Complete Bar Rule of *Festo I*
 - e. Supreme Court's Presumptive Bar Rule of *Festo II*
 - f. Federal Circuit's Remand Decision in *Festo III*
 - g. Federal Circuit Decisions Applying the *Festo* Rebuttal Criteria
 - 3. Prior Art (Hypothetical Claim Analysis)
 - 4. Dedication to the Public
 - 5. Vitiating of Claim Limitations
- E. Aspects of Infringement Beyond 35 U.S.C. §271(a)
 - 1. Inducing Infringement Under §271(b)
 - a. Overview
 - b. Direct Infringement Predicate
 - c. Intent Requirement
 - d. *Global-Tech* (U.S. 2011): "Willful Blindness" Standard

- e. Commil USA (U.S. 2015): Rejecting Belief of Invalidity as Inducement Defense
- 2. Contributory Infringement Under §271(c)
- 3. Drug Marketing Application Filings Under §271(e)
- 4. Component Exports Under §271(f)
- 5. Importation Under §271(g)

Chapter 10 Defenses to Patent Infringement

- A. Introduction
- B. Noninfringement
- C. Absence of Liability for Infringement
 - 1. License
 - a. Express License
 - b. Implied License
 - 2. Prior User Rights
 - 3. Experimental Use
 - 4. Expiration of Damages Limitation Period of 35 U.S.C. §286
 - 5. Laches and Equitable Estoppel in Initiating Patent Infringement Litigation
 - a. Introduction
 - (i) *Aukerman* (Fed. Cir. 1992) (*en banc*)
 - (ii) *Petrella* (U.S. 2014)
 - (iii) *SCA Hygiene II* (Fed. Cir. 2015) (*en banc*)
 - b. Laches
 - (i) Unreasonable Delay by Patentee
 - (ii) Material Prejudice to Accused Infringer
 - (iii) “Should Have Known”
 - c. Equitable Estoppel
 - 6. State Sovereign Immunity
 - 7. Temporary Presence Exemption
 - 8. Patent Exhaustion
 - 9. Plaintiff’s Lack of Standing to Sue for Infringement
- D. Unenforceability

1. Inequitable Conduct
 - a. Materiality
 - b. Intent to Deceive
 - c. Balancing
 - d. Burden of Proof and Standard of Review
 2. Patent Misuse
 - a. Introduction
 - b. Historical Development
 - (i) Tying
 - (ii) Post-Patent Expiration Royalties
 - c. Limitations on Patent Misuse: §271(d)
 3. Prosecution History Laches
- E. Invalidity
1. Burden of Proof
 2. Collateral Estoppel Effect of Invalidity Adjudication
 3. Statutory Grounds for Invalidity
 4. Limits on Accused Infringer's Standing to Assert Invalidity: Licensee Repudiation and Assignor Estoppel
 - a. Licensee Repudiation
 - b. Assignor Estoppel
- F. Antitrust Counterclaims
1. Market Power
 2. Anticompetitive Conduct
- G. Patent Declaratory Judgment Actions
1. Federal Circuit's Pre-*MedImmune* "Reasonable Apprehension" Test
 2. Supreme Court's Decision in *MedImmune*
 3. Post-*MedImmune* Federal Circuit Decisions

Chapter 11 Remedies for Patent Infringement

- A. Introduction
- B. Injunctions
 1. Permanent Injunctions

- a. The *eBay v. MercExchange* Standard
 - b. “Causal Nexus” Requirement for Irreparable Harm
- 2. Preliminary Injunctions
 - a. Likelihood of Success on the Merits
 - b. Irreparable Harm
 - c. Balance of the Hardships Tipping in Movant’s Favor
 - d. Public Interest
 - e. Appellate Standard of Review
- C. Ongoing Royalties for Future Infringements
- D. Damages for Past Infringements
 - 1. Introduction
 - 2. Compensatory Damages
 - a. Lost Profits
 - (1) The *Panduit* analysis
 - (i) Demand for the patented product
 - (ii) Absence of acceptable noninfringing substitutes
 - (iii) Manufacturing and marketing capability
 - (iv) Amount of profit
 - (2) The *Rite-Hite* expansion
 - b. Entire Market Value Rule/Convoyed Sales
 - c. Reasonable Royalty
 - (1) Hypothetical negotiation
 - (2) Analytical approach
 - d. Price Erosion
 - 3. Enhanced Damages and Willful Infringement
 - a. Overview
 - b. Early Federal Circuit Decision on Willfulness
 - c. *Seagate* (Fed. Cir. 2007) (*en banc*)
 - d. America Invents Act (2011) Codification
 - e. Supreme Court to Review Willful Infringement (2015)
 - (1) *Halo v. Pulse* (Fed. Cir. 2014)

(2) *Stryker v. Zimmer* (Fed. Cir. 2015)

- E. Attorney Fees
 - 1. Overview
 - 2. Statutory Basis
 - 3. Discretionary
 - 4. Prevailing Party
 - 5. “Exceptional” Case
 - a. *Octane Fitness II* (U.S. 2014)
 - b. *Highmark III* (U.S. 2014)
- F. Prejudgment Interest
- G. Costs
- H. Patent Marking
- I. Provisional Compensation Remedy

Chapter 12 International Patenting Issues

- A. Introduction
 - 1. Territorial Scope of Patents
 - 2. Obtaining Foreign Patent Protection Prior to the Paris Convention
- B. The Paris Convention
 - 1. Introduction
 - 2. National Treatment
 - 3. Right of Priority
 - 4. U.S. Implementation of the Paris Right of Priority: 35 U.S.C. §119
 - 5. The *Hilmer* Rule (Pre-America Invents Act of 2011)
 - 6. Limitations of the Paris Convention
- C. The Patent Cooperation Treaty
- D. The World Trade Organization’s Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS)
- E. Patent Harmonization
 - 1. First-to-File Versus First-to-Invent
 - 2. Absolute Versus Qualified Novelty: Grace Period
- F. Gray Market Goods and the International Exhaustion Debate

1. Domestic Exhaustion
 2. Regional (European Community-Wide) Exhaustion
 3. International Exhaustion
- G. Enforcement of Foreign Patents in U.S. Courts
- H. Patent Protection in Europe
1. Routes to Obtain Protection
 2. Routes to Enforce Patents
 - a. Unitary Patent System
 - b. Unified Patent Court

Glossary

Table of Cases

Index