



PATENT LAW AND POLICY:  
CASES AND MATERIALS

FIFTH EDITION



Robert Patrick Merges  
John Fitzgerald Duffy



LexisNexis

# Patent Law and Policy: Cases and Materials

---

## Fifth Edition

Robert Patrick Merges  
Wilson Sonsini Goodrich & Rosati Professor of Law and Technology; Director,  
Berkeley Center for Law & Technology

John Fitzgerald Duffy  
Professor of Law  
University of Virginia School of Law



ISBN: 978-1-4224-8030-4

This publication is designed to provide accurate and authoritative information in regard to the subject matter covered. It is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks and Michie is a trademark of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. Matthew Bender and the Matthew Bender Flame Design are registered trademarks of Matthew Bender Properties Inc.

Copyright © 2011 Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., a member of the LexisNexis Group.  
All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material exceeding fair use, 17 U.S.C. § 107, may be licensed for a fee of 25¢ per page per copy from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

#### NOTE TO USERS

To ensure that you are using the latest materials available in this area, please be sure to periodically check the LexisNexis Law School web site for downloadable updates and supplements at [www.lexisnexis.com/lawschool](http://www.lexisnexis.com/lawschool).

Editorial Offices  
121 Chanlon Rd., New Providence, NJ 07974 (908) 464-6800  
201 Mission St., San Francisco, CA 94105-1831 (415) 908-3200  
[www.lexisnexis.com](http://www.lexisnexis.com)

MATTHEW  BENDER

(2011-Pub.3090)

# LexisNexis Law School Publishing Advisory Board

---

**William Araiza**

*Professor of Law*

Brooklyn Law School

**Lenni B. Benson**

*Professor of Law & Associate Dean for Professional Development*

New York Law School

**Raj Bhala**

*Rice Distinguished Professor*

University of Kansas, School of Law

**Ruth Colker**

*Distinguished University Professor & Heck-Faust Memorial Chair in Constitutional Law*

Ohio State University, Moritz College of Law

**David Gamage**

*Assistant Professor of Law*

UC Berkeley School of Law

**Joan Heminway**

*College of Law Distinguished Professor of Law*

University of Tennessee College of Law

**Edward Imwinkelried**

*Edward L. Barrett, Jr. Professor of Law*

UC Davis School of Law

**David I. C. Thomson**

*LP Professor & Director, Lawyering Process Program*

University of Denver, Sturm College of Law

**Melissa Weresh**

*Director of Legal Writing and Professor of Law*

Drake University Law School

# SUMMARY OF TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                  |   |          |
|------------------|---|----------|
| <b>Chapter 1</b> | <b>INTRODUCTION</b>                               | <b>1</b> |
| A.               | HISTORICAL OVERVIEW OF PATENT LAW                 | 1        |
| B.               | THE ARCHITECTURE OF A MODERN PATENT               | 13       |
| C.               | PATENT CLAIM DRAFTING EXERCISES                   | 26       |
| 1.               | The Basics of Claim Drafting                      | 26       |
| a.               | Preamble  | 27       |
| b.               | Transition  | 28       |
| (i)              | “Open” Claims: “Comprising”                       | 28       |
| (ii)             | “Closed” Claims: “Consisting of”                  | 28       |
| (iii)            | An In-between Format: “Consisting Essentially of” | 28       |
| c.               | The Body  | 28       |
| (i)              | Three Formal Requirements for Claim Drafting      | 29       |
| (ii)             | Independent and Dependent Claims                  | 30       |
| (iii)            | Means-Plus-Function Elements                      | 31       |
| (iv)             | <i>Jepson</i> Claims                              | 32       |
| 2.               | Drafting a Set of Claims for the Pencil           | 32       |
| a.               | The Invention Disclosure                          | 34       |
| b.               | The Prior Art                                     | 34       |
| 3.               | A New Cup Holder                                  | 35       |
| a.               | The Prior Art                                     | 40       |
| b.               | Summary of the Prior Art                          | 44       |
| c.               | Drafting Around the Prior Art                     | 45       |
| d.               | A Growing Foundation for Future Invention         | 48       |
| D.               | OVERVIEW OF THE PATENT SYSTEM                     | 48       |
| 1.               | Patent Prosecution                                | 50       |
| 2.               | Enforcement Actions                               | 53       |
| E.               | GLOBALIZATION AND PATENT RIGHTS                   | 54       |
| 1.               | The Late 19th Century: The Paris Convention       | 54       |
| 2.               | The 1970’s: Process Consolidation                 | 55       |
| 3.               | TRIPS: Substantive Harmonization                  | 56       |
| a.               | The Patent Term                                   | 58       |
| b.               | Provisional Applications                          | 60       |
| c.               | Eighteen Month Publication of Applications        | 61       |
| 4.               | Continuing Evolution                              | 63       |

---

## SUMMARY OF TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                  |  |           |
|------------------|--|-----------|
| <b>Chapter 2</b> | <b>PATENTABLE SUBJECT MATTER</b>   | <b>67</b> |
| A.               | INTRODUCTION TO THE PATENT ACT   | 67        |
|                  | <i>Diamond v. Chakrabarty</i>  | 68        |
|                  | Notes  | 76        |
|                  | <i>Bilski v. Kappos</i>  | 79        |
|                  | Notes and Questions on <i>Bilski</i>                                       | 104       |
| B.               | THE BAR TO PATENTING LAWS OF NATURE, PHYSICAL PHENOMENA AND ABSTRACT IDEAS | 107       |
| 1.               | The Rule Against Patenting Natural Laws                                    | 108       |
|                  | <i>O'reilly v. Morse</i>   | 108       |
|                  | Notes  | 114       |
|                  | Note on Patenting Scientific Principles and Discoveries                    | 119       |
|                  | <i>The Telephone Cases</i>   | 121       |
|                  | Notes  | 124       |
|                  | <i>Lab. Corp. of America v. Metabolite Labs., Inc.</i>                     | 127       |
|                  | Notes and Comments   | 134       |
| 2.               | Abstract Ideas & Software: <i>Benson</i> and its Progeny                   | 134       |
|                  | <i>Gottschalk v. Benson</i>  | 135       |
|                  | Notes on <i>Benson</i>   | 140       |
|                  | Note on the "Mental Steps" Doctrine  | 143       |
|                  | <i>Diamond v. Diehr</i>  | 145       |
|                  | Notes  | 154       |
| 3.               | Natural Products and Substances  | 159       |
| a.               | Naturally Occurring, But Artificially Packaged                             | 160       |
|                  | <i>Funk Bros. Seed Co. v. Kalo Inoculant Co.</i>                           | 160       |
|                  | Notes  | 163       |
| b.               | Naturally Occurring But Isolated and Purified                              | 164       |
|                  | <i>Parke-davis &amp; Co. v. H.k. Mulford &amp; Co.</i>                     | 164       |
|                  | Notes on <i>Parke-Davis</i> , Purified Products and CDNA                   | 168       |
|                  | <i>Ass'n for Molecular Pathology v. U.S. PTO (The "Myriad" Case)</i>       | 170       |
|                  | Notes and Questions on <i>Myriad</i>                                       | 180       |
|                  | Notes on Property Rights in Plant Discoveries                              | 181       |
| c.               | Patenting of Higher Life Forms   | 186       |
|                  | Notes on Patenting Humans and Chimeras                                     | 186       |
| C.               | FIELD RESTRICTIONS: DISFAVORED AREAS OF PATENTING                          | 189       |
| 1.               | Medical Procedures   | 190       |
|                  | Notes on Patenting of Medical Procedures                                   | 190       |
| 2.               | Software   | 195       |
|                  | Computer Program Product/IBM   | 196       |
|                  | Note on the EPC's Ban on Software Patents                                  | 200       |

---

## SUMMARY OF TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                  |   |            |
|------------------|---|------------|
| 3.               | Sports Methods and Other Traditionally Disfavored Areas . . . . .   | 204        |
|                  | U.S. Patent No. 5,913,738 . . . . .   | 204        |
|                  | Notes on Patents in Sports and Other Fields . . . . .   | 205        |
| <b>Chapter 3</b> | <b>UTILITY . . . . .</b>  | <b>211</b> |
| A.               | INTRODUCTION . . . . .  | 211        |
|                  | Notes on Operability . . . . .  | 212        |
| B.               | BENEFICIAL UTILITY . . . . .  | 216        |
|                  | <i>Lowell v. Lewis</i> . . . . .  | 216        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 217        |
|                  | <i>Juicy Whip, Inc. v. Orange Bang, Inc.</i> . . . . .  | 218        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 221        |
|                  | Merges, Intellectual Property in Higher Life Forms: The Patent System<br>and Controversial Technologies . . . . .   | 223        |
|                  | Notes on Morality and Biotechnology Inventions . . . . .  | 223        |
| C.               | PRACTICAL OR SPECIFIC UTILITY . . . . .   | 225        |
|                  | <i>Brenner v. Manson</i> . . . . .  | 226        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 231        |
|                  | <i>In re Brana</i> . . . . .  | 234        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 240        |
|                  | <i>In re Fisher</i> . . . . .   | 244        |
|                  | Questions and Comments . . . . .  | 253        |
|                  | Note on the Economics of the Utility Requirement: Races, Rent<br>Dissipation and Anticommons Problems . . . . .     | 256        |
| <b>Chapter 4</b> | <b>DISCLOSURE AND ENABLEMENT . . . . .</b>  | <b>261</b> |
| A.               | INTRODUCTION . . . . .  | 261        |
| B.               | ENABLEMENT . . . . .  | 265        |
| 1.               | Patent Breadth and “Undue Experimentation” . . . . .  | 266        |
|                  | The Incandescent Lamp Patent . . . . .  | 266        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 273        |
|                  | <i>In re Wands</i> . . . . .  | 277        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 284        |
| 2.               | Speculation and Prophecy . . . . .  | 287        |
|                  | <i>Janssen Pharmaceutica v. Teva Pharms. USA Inc. (In re '319 Patent<br/>    Infringement Litigation)</i> . . . . . | 287        |
|                  | Notes on <i>Janssen</i> . . . . .   | 293        |
| 3.               | Problems in Enablement, U.S. and Abroad . . . . .   | 296        |
| a.               | Enablement and the Temporal Paradox . . . . .   | 298        |
| b.               | Enablement: Some Economic Considerations . . . . .  | 301        |
| C.               | THE WRITTEN DESCRIPTION REQUIREMENT . . . . .   | 302        |

---

## SUMMARY OF TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                  |   |            |
|------------------|---|------------|
| 1.               | Limitations on Amendments . . . . .                                   | 302        |
|                  | <i>The Gentry Gallery, Inc. v. The Berklene Corp.</i> . . . . .       | 306        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 310        |
| 2.               | Limitations on Claim Breadth . . . . .                                | 312        |
|                  | <i>Ariad Pharmaceuticals, Inc. v. Eli Lilly &amp; Co.</i> , . . . . . | 316        |
|                  | Notes on <i>Ariad</i> . . . . .                                       | 332        |
| D.               | DEFINITE CLAIMS . . . . .   | 336        |
|                  | <i>Orthokinetics, Inc. v. Safety Travel Chairs, Inc.</i> . . . . .    | 337        |
|                  | Notes on Orthokinetics . . . . .                                      | 339        |
|                  | Notes on Ambiguous Language . . . . .                                 | 342        |
|                  | Notes on Functional Claiming . . . . .                                | 349        |
| E.               | THE BEST MODE REQUIREMENT . . . . .                                   | 350        |
|                  | <i>Randomex, Inc. v. Scopus Corp.</i> . . . . .                       | 350        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 355        |
|                  | <i>Chemcast Corp. v. Arco Industries</i> . . . . .                    | 358        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 363        |
|                  | Comment on Chemcast . . . . .   | 364        |
|                  | Comparative Notes: Best Mode . . . . .                                | 365        |
| <b>Chapter 5</b> |   |            |
|                  | <b>NOVELTY . . . . .</b>  | <b>367</b> |
| A.               | INTRODUCTION TO NOVELTY AND § 102 . . . . .                           | 367        |
| B.               | THE STANDARD FOR ANTICIPATION . . . . .                               | 370        |
| 1.               | The Identity Requirement . . . . .                                    | 371        |
|                  | <i>In re Robertson</i> . . . . .                                      | 371        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 376        |
| 2.               | Accidental and Unknown Anticipations . . . . .                        | 380        |
|                  | <i>In re Seaborg</i> . . . . .  | 380        |
|                  | Notes on Accidental Anticipation . . . . .                            | 382        |
|                  | <i>Schering Corp. v. Geneva Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</i> . . . . .       | 384        |
|                  | Notes on Inherent Anticipation and the Public Domain . . . . .        | 389        |
| 3.               | The “Enablement Standard” for Anticipation . . . . .                  | 391        |
|                  | <i>In re Hafner</i> . . . . .   | 391        |
|                  | Notes on Anticipatory Enablement . . . . .                            | 393        |
|                  | Discussion: New Use Patents . . . . .                                 | 398        |
| C.               | REFERENCES UNDER SECTION 102(a) . . . . .                             | 403        |
| 1.               | The Domestic Inquiry: “Known or Used By Others” . . . . .             | 404        |
| a.               | “Known . . . by others” . . . . .                                     | 404        |
|                  | <i>National Tractor Pullers Ass’n v. Watkins</i> . . . . .            | 404        |
|                  | Notes on Prior Knowledge . . . . .                                    | 406        |
| b.               | “Used by others” . . . . .  | 409        |
|                  | <i>Rosaire v. Baroid Sales Division, National Lead Co.</i> . . . . .  | 409        |



---

## SUMMARY OF TABLE OF CONTENTS

|    |   |     |
|----|---|-----|
|    | Notes on Public Uses  | 411 |
| 2. | Global Inquiries: Patents and Printed Publications              | 413 |
| a. | “Printed publications”  | 413 |
|    | <i>Jockmus v. Leviton</i>                                       | 413 |
|    | Notes   | 415 |
|    | <i>In re Klopfenstein</i>                                       | 415 |
|    | Notes on the Publication Standard                               | 420 |
| b. | “Patented”  | 423 |
|    | <i>Reeves Bros. v. United States Laminating Corp.</i>           | 424 |
|    | Notes   | 425 |
| 3. | Novelty and the Economics of Search                             | 427 |
|    | Notes   | 430 |
| D. | SECTION 102(e): DISCLOSURES IN EARLIER-FILED U.S. APPLICATIONS  | 432 |
|    | <i>Alexander Milburn Co. v. Davis-bournonville Co.</i>          | 432 |
|    | Notes   | 434 |
|    | Comparative and Philosophical Note on § 102(e)                  | 438 |
|    | Problems: § 102(e)  | 440 |
| E. | SECTION 102(f): DERIVATION FROM ANOTHER                         | 441 |
|    | <i>Campbell v. Spectrum Automation Co.</i>                      | 441 |
|    | Notes   | 446 |
| F. | TIMING ISSUES: § 102(g) & PRIORITY OF INVENTION                 | 448 |
| 1. | Section 102(G): The Basic Rules of Priority                     | 449 |
|    | <i>Brown v. Barbacid</i>  | 451 |
|    | Notes on Priority Fights  | 456 |
|    | <i>Peeler v. Miller</i>   | 465 |
|    | Notes on Abandoned, Suppressed, or Concealed Work               | 469 |
|    | Note on the Multiple Interference Paradox                       | 475 |
| 2. | Prior Art Uses of § 102(G)                                      | 477 |
|    | <i>Dow Chemical Company v. Astro-valcour, Inc.</i>              | 477 |
|    | Notes   | 483 |
| G. | ESTABLISHING A DATE OF INVENTION: RULE 131                      | 491 |
|    | <i>In re Moore</i>  | 492 |
|    | Notes on Antedating Prior Art                                   | 495 |
| H. | INTERNATIONAL CONSIDERATIONS                                    | 497 |
| 1. | Foreign Activities to Establish Priority                        | 498 |
| a. | The Paris Convention and § 119 of the Patent Act                | 498 |
| b. | TRIPs and the Reformation of § 104 of the Patent Act            | 502 |
| 2. | Foreign Activities to Create Prior Art                          | 504 |
|    | <i>Westinghouse Machine Co. v. General Electric Co.</i>         | 505 |
|    | Notes on the Imported Knowledge Problem                         | 508 |
| 3. | International Practice: Obtaining Patents in Multiple Countries | 512 |

---

## SUMMARY OF TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                  |  |            |
|------------------|--|------------|
| a.               | The Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) . . . . .  | 512        |
| b.               | Foreign Filing Licenses . . . . .  | 513        |
|                  | Problems: Foreign Priority and Prior Art . . . . .                                     | 514        |
| <b>Chapter 6</b> | <b>STATUTORY BARS . . . . .</b>  | <b>517</b> |
| A.               | INTRODUCTION . . . . .   | 517        |
|                  | <i>Pennock v. Dialogue</i> . . . . .   | 519        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .  | 525        |
| B.               | SECTION 102(b): THE GENERAL STATUTORY BARS . . . . .                                   | 527        |
| 1.               | Review of Patents and Printed Publications . . . . .                                   | 528        |
| 2.               | “In Public Use or On Sale” . . . . .   | 529        |
| a.               | Public Use . . . . .   | 530        |
|                  | <i>Egbert v. Lippmann</i> . . . . .  | 530        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .  | 534        |
|                  | <i>Moleculon Research Corp. v. CBS, Inc.</i> . . . . .                                 | 536        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .  | 539        |
|                  | <i>Metallizing Engineering Co. v. Kenyon Bearing &amp; Auto Parts Co.</i><br>. . . . . | 541        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .  | 543        |
| b.               | On Sale . . . . .  | 544        |
|                  | <i>Pfaff v. Wells Electronics, Inc.</i> . . . . .                                      | 544        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .  | 551        |
|                  | <i>Abbott Laboratories v. Geneva Pharmaceuticals, Inc.</i> . . . . .                   | 558        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .  | 561        |
| 3.               | The Experimental Use Exception . . . . .   | 562        |
|                  | <i>City of Elizabeth v. American Nicholson Pavement Co.</i> . . . . .                  | 562        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .  | 566        |
|                  | <i>Lough v. Brunswick Corp.</i> . . . . .  | 569        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .  | 573        |
| 4.               | Third Party Statutory Bar Activity . . . . .   | 577        |
|                  | <i>Baxter International v. Cobe Laboratories, Inc.</i> . . . . .                       | 577        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .  | 584        |
|                  | <i>W. L. Gore &amp; Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.</i> . . . . .                    | 586        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .  | 588        |
|                  | Note on Widely Known But Contractually Confidential<br>Information . . . . .           | 592        |
| 5.               | International Considerations . . . . .   | 593        |
| 6.               | Summary . . . . .  | 596        |
|                  | Problems . . . . .   | 596        |
| C.               | PARTY-SPECIFIC STATUTORY BARS: §§ 102(c) & (d) . . . . .                               | 600        |
| 1.               | Section 102(C): Abandonment . . . . .  | 600        |

---

## SUMMARY OF TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                  |   |            |
|------------------|---|------------|
|                  | <i>Macbeth-evans Glass Co. v. General Electric Co.</i> . . . . .  | 600        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 606        |
| 2.               | Section 102(D): Prior Foreign Filing . . . . .  | 609        |
|                  | <i>In re Kathawala</i> . . . . .  | 610        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 613        |
|                  | Problems: § 102(d) . . . . .  | 616        |
| <b>Chapter 7</b> | <b>NONOBVIOUSNESS</b> . . . . .   | <b>619</b> |
| A.               | INTRODUCTION: NONOBVIOUSNESS AND “INVENTION” . . . . .  | 619        |
|                  | <i>Hotchkiss v. Greenwood</i> . . . . .   | 625        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 631        |
|                  | Note on the Evolution of the “Invention” Standard . . . . .   | 634        |
| B.               | SECTION 103 AND THE BASIC <i>GRAHAM</i> INQUIRY . . . . .   | 638        |
|                  | <i>Graham v. John Deere Co.</i> . . . . .   | 638        |
|                  | <i>United States v. Adams</i> . . . . .   | 661        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 668        |
| C.               | SUBTESTS OF NONOBVIOUSNESS . . . . .  | 670        |
| 1.               | The <i>Post-Graham</i> Split and <i>KSR v. Teleflex</i> . . . . .   | 671        |
|                  | <i>Ksr International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.</i> . . . . .   | 673        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 688        |
| 2.               | Obviousness at the Federal Circuit After <i>KSR</i> . . . . .   | 692        |
|                  | <i>In re Kubin</i> . . . . .  | 693        |
|                  | Obviousness After <i>KSR</i> . . . . .  | 699        |
| 3.               | Objective Indicia in Obviousness Analysis . . . . .   | 706        |
|                  | <i>Arkie Lures, Inc. v. Gene Larew Tackle, Inc.</i> . . . . .   | 706        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 713        |
|                  | Note on the Economic Function of § 103 . . . . .  | 715        |
|                  | <i>Hybritech, Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.</i> . . . . .   | 722        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 730        |
|                  | <i>Robert Patrick Merges, Commercial Success and Patent Standards: Economic Perspectives on Innovation,</i> . . . . . | 735        |
| D.               | THE “SCOPE AND CONTENT OF THE PRIOR ART” . . . . .  | 740        |
| 1.               | The “Winslow Tableau” . . . . .   | 741        |
|                  | <i>In re Winslow</i> . . . . .  | 741        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 746        |
| 2.               | “Prior Art” for Purposes of Section 103 . . . . .   | 747        |
| a.               | The Novelty Provisions of Section 102 . . . . .   | 747        |
|                  | <i>Hazeltine Research, Inc. v. Brenner</i> . . . . .  | 748        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 749        |
|                  | <i>In re Bass</i> . . . . .   | 751        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 757        |

---

## SUMMARY OF TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                  |  |            |
|------------------|--|------------|
|                  | Note: An Economic Rationale for § 103(c) .....                 | 760        |
|                  | <i>Oddzon Products, Inc. v. Just Toys, Inc.</i> .....          | 761        |
|                  | Notes .....  | 764        |
| b.               | The Statutory Bars of Section 102 .....                        | 767        |
|                  | <i>In re Foster</i> .....                                      | 768        |
|                  | Notes .....  | 773        |
|                  | Note: Strategic Disclosure and Patent Racing .....             | 775        |
| 3.               | The Nonanalogous Arts Limitation .....                         | 780        |
|                  | <i>In re Clay</i> .....  | 780        |
|                  | Notes .....  | 784        |
| E.               | COMPARATIVE NOTE: TAKING AN “INVENTIVE STEP”<br>OVERSEAS ..... | 788        |
| 1.               | The European Countries .....                                   | 788        |
| a.               | Relevancy of the Problem Solved .....                          | 790        |
| b.               | Combining References .....                                     | 791        |
| c.               | “Obvious to Try” .....   | 791        |
| d.               | Second Indications — The New Use Problem .....                 | 792        |
| e.               | Secondary Considerations .....                                 | 793        |
| 2.               | Japan .....  | 794        |
| a.               | “Easily Made” Inventions Unpatentable .....                    | 794        |
| b.               | <i>Koka</i> , or Meritorious Effect .....                      | 794        |
| <b>Chapter 8</b> | <b>INFRINGEMENT</b> .....                                      | <b>797</b> |
| A.               | INTRODUCTION: THE PRIMACY OF PATENT CLAIMS .....               | 797        |
|                  | <i>Merrill v. Yeomans</i> .....                                | 798        |
|                  | Notes .....  | 801        |
| B.               | INTERPRETING CLAIMS .....                                      | 804        |
| 1.               | Basic Doctrine .....   | 804        |
|                  | <i>Phillips v. Awh Corporation</i> .....                       | 805        |
|                  | Notes .....  | 817        |
|                  | Note on Canons of Claim Interpretation .....                   | 821        |
| 2.               | Equivalents and Means-Plus-Function Claims .....               | 829        |
|                  | <i>Wright Co. v. Paulhan</i> .....                             | 829        |
|                  | Notes .....  | 833        |
| 3.               | Interpreting Product-By-Process Claims .....                   | 838        |
|                  | <i>Abbott Laboratories v. Sandoz, Inc.</i> .....               | 838        |
|                  | Notes on <i>Abbott v. Sandoz</i> .....                         | 846        |
| 4.               | Joint and Divided Infringement .....                           | 847        |
|                  | <i>Bmc Resources, Inc. v. Paymentech, L.p.</i> .....           | 847        |
|                  | Notes on <i>Paymentech</i> .....                               | 851        |
| 5.               | Procedural Aspects of Claim Interpretation .....               | 852        |

---

## SUMMARY OF TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                  |   |            |
|------------------|---|------------|
|                  | <i>Markman v. Westview Instruments, Inc.</i> . . . . .  | 853        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 862        |
| C.               | THE DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS . . . . .   | 865        |
|                  | <i>Winans v. Denmead</i> . . . . .  | 865        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 869        |
|                  | <i>Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co., Ltd.</i> . . . . .  | 871        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 881        |
| D.               | THE REVERSE DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS . . . . .   | 888        |
|                  | <i>Westinghouse v. Boyden Power Brake Co.</i> . . . . .   | 888        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 894        |
| 1.               | Modern Case Study: <i>Scripps Clinic v. Genentech</i> . . . . .   | 896        |
| 2.               | An Economic Approach to Reverse Equivalents . . . . .   | 898        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 901        |
| E.               | THE EXPERIMENTAL USE “EXCEPTION” . . . . .  | 902        |
|                  | <i>Madey v. Duke University</i> . . . . .   | 903        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 906        |
|                  | Rebecca S. Eisenberg, <i>Patents and the Progress of Science: Exclusive Rights and Experimental Use</i> . . . . . | 909        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 912        |
| F.               | INDIRECT INFRINGEMENT . . . . .   | 914        |
|                  | <i>Aro Manufacturing. Co. v. Convertible Top Co. (ARO II)</i> . . . . .   | 916        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 921        |
|                  | <i>C.R. Bard, Inc. v. Advanced Cardiovascular Systems</i> . . . . .   | 923        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 926        |
| G.               | INFRINGEMENT AND FOREIGN ACTIVITY . . . . .   | 931        |
|                  | <i>Brown v. Duchesne</i> . . . . .  | 931        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 934        |
|                  | <i>Microsoft Corp. v. AT&amp;T</i> . . . . .  | 934        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 937        |
| <b>Chapter 9</b> | <b>REMEDIES</b> . . . . .   | <b>941</b> |
| A.               | INJUNCTIVE RELIEF . . . . .   | 941        |
| 1.               | Permanent Injunctions . . . . .   | 942        |
|                  | <i>Ebay Inc. v. Mercexchange, L.L.C.</i> . . . . .  | 942        |
|                  | Notes and Comments . . . . .  | 946        |
|                  | Additional Notes on the Reaction to Ebay . . . . .  | 954        |
| 2.               | Preliminary Injunctions . . . . .   | 956        |
|                  | <i>Amazon.com, Inc. v. Barnesandnoble.com, Inc.</i> . . . . .   | 956        |
|                  | Notes . . . . .   | 964        |
| B.               | REASONABLE ROYALTY DAMAGES . . . . .  | 966        |
|                  | <i>Lucent Technologies, Inc. v. Gateway, Inc.</i> . . . . .   | 966        |

---

## SUMMARY OF TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |  |             |
|--|--|-------------|
|  | Notes on <i>Lucent</i> . . . . .   | 985         |
| C.   | LOST PROFITS . . . . .   | 987         |
|  | <i>Rite-hite Corp. v. Kelley Co.</i> . . . . .                               | 987         |
|  | Notes . . . . .  | 998         |
| 1.   | Noninfringing Substitutes . . . . .  | 1002        |
|  | <i>Grain Processing Corp. v. American Maize-products Co.</i> . . . . .       | 1002        |
|  | Notes . . . . .  | 1009        |
| 2.   | The Market Share Rule . . . . .  | 1017        |
|  | <i>State Industries v. Mor-flo Industries</i> . . . . .                      | 1017        |
|  | Notes . . . . .  | 1021        |
| 3.   | The “Entire Market Value” and “Tag-Along Sales” . . . . .                    | 1023        |
|  | Notes . . . . .  | 1025        |
| D.   | WILLFUL INFRINGEMENT . . . . .   | 1027        |
|  | <i>In re Seagate Technology, LLC</i> . . . . .                               | 1027        |
|  | Notes . . . . .  | 1035        |
| E.   | PATENT MARKING: STATUTORY NOTICE . . . . .                                   | 1037        |
|  | <i>Soverain Software L.L.C. v. Amazon.com, Inc.</i> . . . . .                | 1037        |
|  | Constructive Notice . . . . .  | 1039        |
|  | Notes . . . . .  | 1040        |
| <b>Chapter 10 THE LEGAL PROCESS OF THE PATENT SYSTEM . . . . .</b> |  | <b>1045</b> |
| A.   | THE ALLOCATION OF POWER . . . . .  | 1045        |
| 1.   | Decisions of Fact . . . . .  | 1048        |
|  | <i>Dennison Manufacturing Co. v. Panduit Corp.</i> . . . . .                 | 1048        |
|  | <i>Panduit Corp. v. Dennison Manufacturing Co.</i> . . . . .                 | 1049        |
|  | Notes . . . . .  | 1050        |
|  | <i>Dickinson v. Zurko</i> . . . . .  | 1052        |
|  | Notes on Appellate Review of Factual Questions . . . . .                     | 1057        |
| 2.   | Decisions of Law . . . . .   | 1058        |
|  | <i>Merck &amp; Co., Inc. v. Kessler</i> . . . . .                            | 1058        |
|  | Notes . . . . .  | 1059        |
| 3.   | Defining the Fact/Law Distinction . . . . .                                  | 1063        |
| 4.   | The Jurisdiction of the Federal Circuit . . . . .                            | 1065        |
|  | <i>Holmes Group, Inc. v. Vornado Air Circulation Systems, Inc.</i> . . . . . | 1065        |
|  | Notes . . . . .  | 1070        |
| 5.   | Administrative Rulemaking . . . . .  | 1073        |
|  | Note on the PTO’s 2007 Rules and <i>Tafas</i> Litigation . . . . .           | 1073        |
| 6.   | Presumption of Validity and Court Review . . . . .                           | 1077        |
| B.   | ADMINISTRATIVE CORRECTION AND REISSUE . . . . .                              | 1080        |
| 1.   | Correction Versus Reissue . . . . .  | 1081        |
|  | <i>Superior Fireplace Co. v. Majestic Products Co.</i> . . . . .             | 1082        |

---

## SUMMARY OF TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                       |  |             |
|---------------------------------------|--|-------------|
|                                       | Notes on Superior Fireplace . . . . .  | 1085        |
| 2.                                    | Errors Correctable in Reissue Proceedings . . . . .  | 1086        |
|                                       | <i>Mentor Corp. v. Coloplast Inc.</i> . . . . .  | 1086        |
|                                       | Notes on Recapture and Other Limitations on Reissue . . . . .  | 1089        |
| 3.                                    | Intervening Rights and the Enforcement of Reissue Patents . . . . .                                  | 1092        |
|                                       | <i>Seattle Box Co. v. Industrial Crating &amp; Packing, Inc.</i> . . . . .                           | 1093        |
|                                       | Notes on Intervening Rights . . . . .  | 1097        |
| C.                                    | REEXAMINATION . . . . .  | 1099        |
| 1.                                    | Ex Parte Reexamination . . . . .   | 1100        |
|                                       | <i>Quantum Corp. v. Rodime, PLC</i> . . . . .  | 1102        |
|                                       | Notes on <i>Quantum Corp.</i> and Ex Parte Reexamination . . . . .                                   | 1104        |
| 2.                                    | Inter Partes Reexamination . . . . .   | 1106        |
| 3.                                    | Foreign Opposition Proceedings . . . . .   | 1107        |
| D.                                    | INEQUITABLE CONDUCT . . . . .  | 1109        |
| 1.                                    | Nondisclosure . . . . .  | 1110        |
|                                       | <i>J.P. Stevens &amp; Co. v. Lex Tex Ltd.</i> . . . . .  | 1113        |
|                                       | Notes . . . . .  | 1114        |
|                                       | Note on Supreme Court Precedent . . . . .  | 1115        |
| a.                                    | Materiality . . . . .  | 1117        |
|                                       | <i>Critikon, Inc. v. Becton Dickinson Vascular Access, Inc.</i> . . . . .                            | 1118        |
|                                       | Notes . . . . .  | 1124        |
| b.                                    | Intent . . . . .   | 1128        |
|                                       | <i>Kingsdown Medical Consultants, Ltd. v. Hollister, Inc.</i> . . . . .                              | 1128        |
|                                       | Notes . . . . .  | 1135        |
| 2.                                    | Laches . . . . .   | 1137        |
|                                       | <i>Symbol Technologies, Inc. v. Lemelson Medical, Ed. &amp; Res. FDN.,</i><br><i>L. P.</i> . . . . . | 1137        |
|                                       | Notes . . . . .  | 1143        |
| <b>Chapter 11</b>                     |  | <b>1147</b> |
| <b>INVENTORS AND OWNERS . . . . .</b> |  | <b>1147</b> |
| A.                                    | INVENTORSHIP AND MISJOINDER . . . . .  | 1147        |
| 1.                                    | The Basics of Inventorship . . . . .   | 1147        |
|                                       | <i>Burroughs Wellcome Co. v. Barr Laboratories, Inc.</i> . . . . .                                   | 1148        |
|                                       | Notes . . . . .  | 1153        |
| 2.                                    | Judicial Correction of Inventorship . . . . .  | 1155        |
|                                       | <i>Stark v. Advanced Magnetics, Inc.</i> . . . . .   | 1155        |
|                                       | Notes . . . . .  | 1162        |
|                                       | <i>Eli Lilly and Co. v. Aradigm Corp.</i> . . . . .  | 1164        |
|                                       | Notes . . . . .  | 1168        |
| 3.                                    | Joint Inventors and Multiple Claims . . . . .  | 1169        |
|                                       | <i>Ethicon, Inc. v. United States Surgical Corp.</i> . . . . .                                       | 1169        |

---

## SUMMARY OF TABLE OF CONTENTS

|                                    |   |             |
|------------------------------------|---|-------------|
|                                    | Notes   | 1183        |
| B.                                 | ASSIGNMENT AND OWNERSHIP  | 1187        |
|                                    | <i>Waterman v. Mackenzie</i>  | 1187        |
|                                    | Notes   | 1190        |
| 1.                                 | Section 261: Patent Recording Statute   | 1191        |
|                                    | <i>Filmtec Corp. v. Allied-Signal Inc.</i>  | 1191        |
|                                    | Notes   | 1196        |
| 2.                                 | Rights of the Employed Inventor   | 1200        |
|                                    | <i>United States v. Dubilier Condenser Corp.</i>  | 1200        |
|                                    | Notes   | 1205        |
| 3.                                 | Co-Ownership of Patents   | 1208        |
|                                    | Robert P. Merges & Lawrence A. Locke, <i>Co-Ownership of Patents: A Comparative and Economic View</i> | 1208        |
| C.                                 | DOUBLE PATENTING  | 1214        |
| 1.                                 | The Basics of Double Patenting  | 1216        |
|                                    | <i>Miller v. Eagle Manufacturing Co.</i>  | 1216        |
|                                    | <i>In re Vogel</i>  | 1219        |
|                                    | Notes   | 1223        |
| 2.                                 | The Claiming Requirement.   | 1225        |
|                                    | <i>In re Kaplan</i>   | 1225        |
|                                    | Notes   | 1229        |
| 3.                                 | Order of Filing and Issuance  | 1230        |
|                                    | <i>In re Berg</i>   | 1231        |
|                                    | Notes   | 1235        |
| 4.                                 | Effect of Patent Office Restriction Requirement   | 1237        |
|                                    | Notes on Restrictions   | 1239        |
| 5.                                 | The Economic Rationale for a Vigorous Double Patenting Doctrine                                       | 1240        |
| <b>Chapter 12</b>                  |   | <b>1245</b> |
| <b>ANTITRUST AND PATENT MISUSE</b> |   |             |
| A.                                 | CONTROL BEYOND A PATENT'S SCOPE   | 1246        |
| 1.                                 | Tying Agreements  | 1246        |
|                                    | <i>Illinois Tool Works Inc. v. Independent Ink, Inc.</i>  | 1246        |
|                                    | Notes on the Demise of <i>Per Se</i> Patent Tying Doctrine  | 1255        |
|                                    | Notes on Other Licensing Terms  | 1259        |
| 2.                                 | Temporal Extensions   | 1263        |
|                                    | <i>Brulotte v. Thys Co.</i>   | 1263        |
|                                    | Notes   | 1266        |
| B.                                 | EXHAUSTION AND THE "FIRST SALE" DOCTRINE  | 1268        |
|                                    | <i>Quanta Computer, Inc. v. LG Electronics, Inc.</i>  | 1268        |
|                                    | Notes and Questions on <i>Quanta Computer</i>   | 1278        |
| C.                                 | PATENT POOLS  | 1281        |



---

## SUMMARY OF TABLE OF CONTENTS

|    |  |      |
|----|--|------|
|    | <i>Princo Corp. v. International Trade Commission</i> .....                        | 1281 |
|    | Notes on Patent Pools .....  | 1297 |
| D. | PATENT ACQUISITION AND ENFORCEMENT AS AN ANTITRUST VIOLATION .....                 | 1300 |
|    | <i>Walker Process Equipment, Inc. v. Food Machinery &amp; Chemical Corp.</i> ..... | 1300 |
|    | Notes .....  | 1302 |
| E. | LICENSEE AND ASSIGNOR ESTOPPEL .....   | 1309 |
|    | <i>Lear, Inc. v. Adkins</i> .....  | 1309 |
|    | Notes .....  | 1315 |
|    | <i>Medimmune, Inc., Petitioner v. Genentech, Inc., Et Al.</i> .....                | 1316 |
|    | Notes .....  | 1323 |
|    | <i>Diamond Scientific Co. v. Ambico, Inc.</i> .....                                | 1324 |
|    | Notes .....  | 1328 |
| F. | HATCH-WAXMAN AND REVERSE PAYMENTS .....  | 1329 |
|    | Notes on Reverse Payments .....  | 1330 |