

Patent Laws and Regulations

or 1.535, will be delayed until the reexamination proceedings have been terminated.

(b) If the person making the citation wishes his or her identity to be excluded from the patent file and kept confidential, the citation papers must be submitted without any identification of the person making the submission.

(c) Citations of patent or printed publications by the public in patent files should either:

- (1) Reflect that a copy of the same has been mailed to the patent owner at the address as provided for in § 1.33(c); or in the event service is not possible
- (2) be filed with the Office in duplicate.

[46 FR 29185, May 29, 1981, effective July 1, 1981]

REQUEST FOR REEXAMINATION

37 CFR 1.510 Request for reexamination.

(a) Any person may, at any time during the period of enforceability of a patent, file a request for reexamination by the Patent and Trademark Office of any claim of the patent on the basis of prior art patents or printed publications cited under § 1.501. The request must be accompanied by the fee for requesting reexamination set in § 1.20(c).

(b) Any request for reexamination must include the following parts:

- (1) A statement pointing out each substantial new question of patentability based on prior patents and printed publications.
- (2) An identification of every claim for which reexamination is requested, and a detailed explanation of the pertinency and manner of applying the cited prior art to every claim for which reexamination is requested. If appropriate the party requesting reexamination may also point out how claims distinguish over cited prior art.
- (3) A copy of every patent or printed publication relied upon or referred to in paragraph (b)(1) and (2) of this section accompanied by an English language translation of all the necessary and pertinent parts of any non-English language patent or printed publication.
- (4) The entire specification (including claims) and drawings of the patent for which reexamination is requested must be furnished in the form of cut-up copies of the original patent with only a single column of the printed patent securely mounted or reproduced in permanent form on one side of a separate paper. A copy of any disclaimer, certificate of correction, or reexamination certificate issued in the patent must also be included.
- (5) A certification that a copy of the request filed by a person other than the patent owner has been served in its entirety on the patent owner at the address as provided for in § 1.33(c). The name and address of the party served must be indicated. If service was not possible, a duplicate copy must be supplied to the Office.

(c) If the request does not include the fee for requesting reexamination or all of the parts required by paragraph (b) of this section, the person identified as requesting reexamination will be so notified and given an opportunity to complete the request within a specified time. If the fee for requesting reexamination has been paid but the defect in the request is not corrected within the specified time, the determination whether or not to institute reexamination will be made on the request as it then exists. If the fee for requesting reexamination has not been paid, no determination will be made and the request will be placed in the patent file as a citation if it complies with the requirements of § 1.501(a).

(d) The filing of the request is:

- (1) The date on which the request including the entire fee for requesting

Patent Laws and Regulations

reexamination is received in the Patent and Trademark Office; or

- (2) the date on which the last portion of the fee for requesting reexamination is received.

(e) A request filed by the patent owner may include a proposed amendment in accordance with § 1.121(f).

(f) If a request is filed by an attorney or agent identifying another party on whose behalf the request is being filed, the attorney or agent must have a power of attorney from that party or be acting in a representative capacity pursuant to § 1.34(a).

[46 FR 29185, May 29, 1981, effective July 1, 1981; para. (a), 47 FR 41282, Sept. 17, 1982, effective Oct. 1, 1982]

37 CFR 1.515 Determination of the request for reexamination.

(a) Within three months following the filing date of a request for reexamination, an examiner will consider the request and determine whether or not a substantial new question of patentability affecting any claim of the patent is raised by the request and the prior art cited therein, with or without consideration of other patents or printed publications. The examiner's determination will be based on the claims in effect at the time of the determination and will become a part of the official file of the patent and will be given or mailed to the patent owner at the address as provided for in § 1.33(c) and to the person requesting reexamination.

(b) Where no substantial new question of patentability has been found, a refund of a portion of the fee for requesting reexamination will be made to the requester in accordance with § 1.26(c).

(c) The requester may seek review by a petition to the Commissioner under § 1.181 within one month of the mailing date of the examiner's determination refusing reexamination. Any such petition must comply with § 1.181(b). If no petition is timely filed or if the decision on petition affirms that no substantial new question of patentability has been raised, the determination shall be final and non-appealable.

[46 FR 29185, May 29, 1981, effective July 1, 1981]

37 CFR 1.520 Reexamination at the initiative of the Commissioner.

The Commissioner, at any time during the period of enforceability of a patent, may determine whether or not a substantial new question of patentability is raised by patents or printed publications which have been discovered by the Commissioner or which have been brought to the Commissioner's attention even though no request for reexamination has been filed in accordance with § 1.510. The Commissioner may initiate reexamination without a request for reexamination pursuant to § 1.510. Normally requests from outside the Patent and Trademark Office that the Commissioner undertake reexamination on his own initiative will not be considered. Any determination to initiate reexamination under this section will become a part of the official file of the patent and will be given or mailed to the patent owner at the address as provided for in § 1.33(c).

[46 FR 29186, May 29, 1981, effective July 1, 1981]

REEXAMINATION**37 CFR 1.525 Order to reexamine.**

(a) If a substantial new question of patentability is found pursuant to § 1.515 or § 1.520, the determination will include an order for reexamination of the patent for resolution of the question. If the order for reexamination resulted from a petition pursuant to § 1.515(c), the reexamination will ordinarily be conducted by an examiner other than the examiner responsible for the initial determination under § 1.515(a).

(b) If the order for reexamination of the patent mailed to the patent owner at the address as provided for in § 1.33(c) is returned to the Office undelivered, the notice published in the Official Gazette under § 1.11(c) will be considered to be constructive notice and reexamination will proceed.

[46 FR 29186, May 29, 1981, effective July 1, 1981]

*Patent Laws and Regulations***37 CFR 1.530 Statement and amendment by patent owner.**

(a) Except as provided in § 1.510(e), no statement or other response by the patent owner shall be filed prior to the determinations made in accordance with §§ 1.515 or 1.520. If a premature statement or other response is filed by the patent owner it will not be acknowledged or considered in making the determination.

(b) The order for reexamination will set a period of not less than two months from the date of the order within which the patent owner may file a statement on the new question of patentability including any proposed amendments the patent owner wishes to make.

(c) Any statement filed by the patent owner shall clearly point out why the subject matter as claimed is not anticipated or rendered obvious by the prior art patents or printed publications, either alone or in any reasonable combinations. Any statement filed must be served upon the reexamination requester in accordance with § 1.248.

(d) Any proposed amendment to the description and claims must be made in accordance with § 1.121(f). No amendment may enlarge the scope of the claims of the patent or introduce new matter. No amended or new claims may be proposed for entry in an expired patent. Moreover, no amended or new claims will be incorporated into the patent by certificate issued after the expiration of the patent.

(e) Although the Office actions will treat proposed amendments as though they have been entered, the proposed amendments will not be effective until the reexamination certificate is issued.

[46 FR 29186, May 29, 1981, effective July 1, 1981]

37 CFR 1.535 Reply by requester.

A reply to the patent owner's statement under 1.530 may be filed by the reexamination requester within two months from the date of service of the patent owner's statement. Any reply by the requester must be served upon the patent owner in accordance with § 1.248. If the patent owner does not file a statement under § 1.530, no reply or other submission from the reexamination requester will be considered.

[46 FR 29186, May 29, 1981, effective July 1, 1981]

37 CFR 1.540 Consideration of responses.

The failure to timely file or serve the documents set forth in §§ 1.530 or in 1.535 may result in their being refused consideration. No submissions other than the statement pursuant to § 1.530 and the reply by the requester pursuant to § 1.535 will be considered prior to examination.

[46 FR 29186, May 29, 1981, effective July 1, 1981]

37 CFR 1.550 Conduct of reexamination proceedings.

(a) All reexamination proceedings, including any appeals to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, will be conducted with special dispatch within the Office. After issuance of the reexamination order and expiration of the time for submitting any responses thereto, the examination will be conducted in accordance with §§ 1.104 through 1.119 and will result in the issuance of a reexamination certificate under § 1.570.

(b) The patent owner will be given at least 30 days to respond to any Office action. Such response may include further statements in response to any rejections and/or proposed amendments or new claims to place the patent in a condition where all claims, if amended as proposed, would be patentable.

(c) The time for taking any action by a patent owner in a reexamination proceeding will be extended only for sufficient cause, and for a reasonable time specified. Any request for such extension must be filed on or before the day on which action by the patent owner is due, but in no case will the mere filing of a request effect any extension. See § 1.304(a) for extensions of time for filing a notice of appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or for commencing a civil action.

(d) If the patent owner fails to file a timely and appropriate response to any Office action, the

Patent Laws and Regulations

reexamination proceeding will be terminated and the Commissioner will proceed to issue a certificate under § 1.570 in accordance with the last action of the Office.

(e) The reexamination requester will be sent copies of Office actions issued during the reexamination proceeding. Any document filed by the patent owner must be served on the requester in the manner provided in § 1.248. The document must reflect service or the document may be refused consideration by the Office. The active participation of the reexamination requester ends with the reply pursuant to § 1.535, and no further submissions on behalf of the reexamination requester will be acknowledged or considered. Further, no submissions on behalf of any third parties will be acknowledged or considered unless such submissions are

- (1) in accordance with § 1.510 or
- (2) entered in the patent file prior to the date of the order to reexamine pursuant to § 1.525.

Submissions by third parties, filed after the date of the order to reexamine pursuant to § 1.525, must meet the requirements of and will be treated in accordance with § 1.501(a).

[46 FR 29186, May 29, 1981, effective July 1, 1981; para. (c), 49 FR 556, Jan. 4, 1984, effective Apr. 1, 1984; para. (a), 49 FR 48416, Dec. 12, 1984, effective Feb. 11, 1985; para. (c), 54 FR 29553, July 13, 1989, effective Aug. 20, 1989]

37 CFR 1.552 Scope of reexamination in reexamination proceedings.

- (a) Patent claims will be reexamined on the basis of patents or printed publications.
- (b) Amended or new claims presented during a reexamination proceeding must not enlarge the scope of the claims of the patent and will be examined on the basis of patents or printed publications and also for compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112 and the new matter prohibition of 35 U.S.C. 132.
- (c) Questions other than those indicated in paragraph (a) and (b) of this section will not be resolved in a reexamination proceeding. If such questions are discovered during a reexamination proceeding, the existence of such questions will be noted by the examiner in an Office action, in which case the patent owner may desire to consider the advisability of filing a reissue application to have such questions considered and resolved.

[46 FR 29186, May 29, 1981, effective July 1, 1981]

37 CFR 1.555 Information material to patentability in reexamination proceedings.

(a) A patent by its very nature is affected with a public interest. The public interest is best served, and the most effective reexamination occurs when, at the time a reexamination proceeding is being conducted, the Office is aware of and evaluates the teachings of all information material to patentability in a reexamination proceeding. Each individual associated with the patent owner in a reexamination proceeding has a duty of candor and good faith in dealing with the Office, which includes a duty to disclose to the Office all information known to that individual to be material to patentability in a reexamination proceeding. The individuals who have a duty to disclose to the Office all information known to them to be material to patentability in a reexamination proceeding are the patent owner, each attorney or agent who represents the patent owner, and every other individual who is substantively involved on behalf of the patent owner in a reexamination proceeding. The duty to disclose the information exists with respect to each claim pending in the reexamination proceeding until the claim is cancelled. Information material to the patentability of a cancelled claim need not be submitted if the information is not material to patentability of any claim remaining under consideration in the reexamination proceeding. The duty to disclose all information known to be material to patentability in a reexamination proceeding is deemed to be satisfied if all information known to be material to patentability of any claim in the patent after issuance of the reexamination certificate was cited by the Office or submitted to the Office in an information disclosure statement. However, the duties of candor, good faith, and disclosure have not been complied with if any fraud on the Office was practiced or attempted or the duty of disclosure was violated through bad faith or intentional misconduct by, or on behalf of, the patent owner in the reexamination proceeding. Any information disclosure statement must be filed with the items listed

Patent Laws and Regulations

in § 1.98(a) as applied to individuals associated with the patent owner in a reexamination proceeding, and should be filed within two months of the date of the order for reexamination, or as soon thereafter as possible.

(b) Under this section, information is material to patentability in a reexamination proceeding when it is not cumulative to information of record or being made of record in the reexamination proceeding, and

- (1) It is a patent or printed publication that establishes, by itself or in combination with other patents or printed publications, a prima facie case of unpatentability of a claim; or
- (2) It refutes, or is inconsistent with, a position the patent owner takes in:
 - (i) Opposing an argument of unpatentability relied on by the Office, or
 - (ii) Asserting an argument of patentability.

A prima facie case of unpatentability of a claim pending in a reexamination proceeding is established when the information compels a conclusion that a claim is unpatentable under the preponderance of evidence, burden-of-proof standard, giving each term in the claim its broadest reasonable construction consistent with the specification, and before any consideration is given to evidence which may be submitted in an attempt to establish a contrary conclusion of patentability.

(c) The responsibility for compliance with this section rests upon the individuals designated in paragraph (a) of this section and no evaluation will be made by the Office in the reexamination proceeding as to compliance with this section. If questions of compliance with this section are discovered during a reexamination proceeding, they will be noted as unresolved questions in accordance with § 1.552(c).

[46 FR 29187, May 29, 1981, effective July 1, 1981; 47 FR 21752, May 19, 1982, effective July 1, 1982; paras. (a) and (b), 49 FR 556, Jan. 4, 1984, effective Apr. 1, 1984; revised 57 FR 2021, Jan. 17, 1992, effective Mar. 16, 1992]

37 CFR 1.560 Interviews in reexamination proceedings.

(a) Interviews in reexamination proceedings pending before the Office between examiners and the owners of such patents or their attorneys or agents of record must be had in the Office at such times, within Office hours, as the respective examiners may designate. Interviews will not be permitted at any other time or place without the authority of the Commissioner. Interviews for the discussion of the patentability of claims in patents involved in reexamination proceedings will not be had prior to the first official action thereon. Interviews should be arranged for in advance. Requests that reexamination requesters participate in interviews with examiners will not be granted.

(b) In every instance of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the patent owner. An interview does not remove the necessity for response to Office actions as specified in § 1.111.

[46 FR 29187, May 29, 1981, effective July 1, 1981]

37 CFR 1.565 Concurrent office proceedings.

(a) In any reexamination proceeding before the Office, the patent owner shall call the attention of the Office to any prior or concurrent proceedings in which the patent is or was involved such as interferences, reissue, reexaminations, or litigation and the results of such proceedings.

(b) If a patent in the process of reexamination is or becomes involved in litigation or a reissue application for the patent is filed or pending, the Commissioner shall determine whether or not to stay the reexamination or reissue proceeding.

(c) If reexamination is ordered while a prior reexamination proceeding is pending, the reexamination proceedings will be consolidated and result in the issuance of a single certificate under § 1.570.

(d) If a reissue application and a reexamination proceeding on which an order pursuant to

Patent Laws and Regulations

§ 1.525 has been mailed are pending concurrently on a patent, a decision will normally be made to merge the two proceedings or to stay one of the two proceedings. Where merger of a reissue application and a reexamination proceeding is ordered, the merged examination will be conducted in accordance with § 1.171 through § 1.179 and the patent owner will be required to place and maintain the same claims in the reissue application and the reexamination proceeding during the pendency of the merged proceeding. The examiner's actions and any responses by the patent owner in a merged proceeding will apply to both the reissue application and the reexamination proceeding and be physically entered into both files. Any reexamination proceeding merged with a reissue application shall be terminated by the grant of the reissued patent.

(e) If a patent in the process of reexamination is or becomes involved in an interference, the Commissioner may stay reexamination or the interference. The Commissioner will not consider a request to stay an interference unless a motion (§ 1.635) to stay the interference has been presented to, and denied by, an examiner-in-chief and the request is filed within ten (10) days of a decision by an examiner-in-chief denying the motion for a stay or such other time as the examiner-in-chief may set.

[46 FR 29187, May 29, 1981, effective July 1, 1981; paras. (b) and (d), 47 FR 21753, May 19, 1982, effective July 1, 1982; paras. (b) & (e), 49 FR 48416, Dec. 12, 1984, 50 FR 23123, May 31, 1985, effective Feb. 11, 1985]

CERTIFICATE**37 CFR 1.570 Issuance of reexamination certificate after reexamination proceedings.**

(a) Upon the conclusion of reexamination proceedings, the Commissioner will issue a certificate in accordance with 35 U.S.C. 307 setting forth the results of the reexamination proceeding and the content of the patent following the reexamination proceeding.

(b) A certificate will be issued in each patent in which a reexamination proceeding has been ordered under § 1.525. Any statutory disclaimer filed by the patent owner will be made part of the certificate.

(c) The certificate will be mailed on the day of its date to the patent owner at the address as provided for in § 1.33(c). A copy of the certificate will also be mailed to the requester of the reexamination proceeding.

(d) If a certificate has been issued which cancels all of the claims of the patent, no further Office proceedings will be conducted with regard to that patent or any reissue applications or reexamination requests relating thereto.

(e) If the reexamination proceeding is terminated by the grant of a reissued patent as provided in § 1.565(d) the reissued patent will constitute the reexamination certificate required by this section and 35 U.S.C. 307.

(f) A notice of the issuance of each certificate under this section will be published in the Official Gazette on its date of issuance.

[46 FR 29187, May 29, 1981, effective July 1, 1981; para. (e), 47 FR 21753, May 19, 1982, effective date July 1, 1982]

SUBPART E-INTERFERENCES**37 CFR 1.601 Scope of rules, definitions.**

This subpart governs the procedure in patent interferences in the Patent and Trademark Office. This subpart shall be construed to secure the just, speedy, and inexpensive determination of every interference. For the meaning of terms in the Federal Rules of Evidence as applied to interferences, see § 1.671(c). Unless otherwise clear from the context, the following definitions apply to this subpart:

(a) Additional discovery is discovery to which a party may be entitled under § 1.687 in addition to discovery to which the party is entitled as a matter of right under § 1.673(a) and (b).

Patent Laws and Regulations

(b) Affidavit means affidavit, declaration under § 1.68, or statutory declaration under 28 U.S.C. § 1746. A transcript of an ex parte deposition may be used as an affidavit.

(c) Board means the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences.

(d) Case-in-chief means that portion of a party's case where the party has the burden of going forward with evidence.

(e) Case-in-rebuttal means that portion of a party's case where the party presents evidence in rebuttal to the case-in-chief of another party.

(f) A count defines the interfering subject matter between two or more applications or between one or more applications and one or more patents. At the time the interference is initially declared, a count should be broad enough to encompass all of the claims that are patentable over the prior art and designated to correspond to the count. When there is more than one count, each count shall define a separate patentable invention. Any claim of an application or patent that is designated to correspond to a count is a claim involved in the interference within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 135(a). A claim of a patent or application that is designated to correspond to a count and is identical to the count is said to correspond exactly to the count. A claim of a patent or application that is designated to correspond to a count but is not identical to the count is said to correspond substantially to the count. When a count is broader in scope than all claims which correspond to the count, the count is a phantom count.

(g) The effective filing date of an application is the filing date of an earlier application, benefit of which is accorded to the application under 35 U.S.C. 119, 120, 121, or 365 or, if no benefit is accorded, the filing date of the application. The effective filing date of a patent is the filing date of an earlier application, benefit of which is accorded to the patent under 35 U.S.C. 119, 120, 121, or 365 or, if no benefit is accorded, the filing date of the application which issued as the patent.

(h) In the case of an application, filing date means the filing date assigned to the application. In the case of a patent, "filing date" means the filing date assigned to the application which issued as the patent.

(i) An interference is a proceeding instituted in the Patent and Trademark Office before the Board to determine any question of patentability and priority of invention between two or more parties claiming the same patentable invention. An interference may be declared between two or more pending applications naming different inventors when, in the opinion of an examiner, the applications contain claims for the same patentable invention. An interference may be declared between one or more pending applications and one or more unexpired patents naming different inventors when, in the opinion of an examiner, any application and any unexpired patent contain claims for the same patentable invention.

(j) An interference-in-fact exists when at least one claim of a party that is designated to correspond to a count and at least one claim of an opponent that is designated to correspond to the count define the same patentable invention.

(k) A lead attorney or agent is a registered attorney or agent of record who is primarily responsible for prosecuting an interference on behalf of a party and is the attorney or agent whom an administrative patent judge may contact to set times and take other action in the interference.

(l) A party is an applicant or patentee involved in the interference or a legal representative or an assignee of record in the Patent and Trademark Office of an applicant or patentee involved in an interference. Where acts of a party are normally performed by an attorney or agent, "party" may be construed to mean the attorney or agent. An inventor is the individual named as inventor in an application involved in an interference or the individual named as inventor in a patent involved in an interference.

(m) A senior party is the party with the earliest effective filing date as to all counts or, if there is no party with the earliest effective filing date as to all counts, the party with the earliest filing date. A junior party is any other party.

(n) Invention "A" is the same patentable invention as an invention "B" when invention "A" is the same as (35 U.S.C. 102) or is obvious (35 U.S.C. 103) in view of invention "B" assuming invention "B" is prior art with respect to invention "A". Invention "A" is a separate patentable invention with

Patent Laws and Regulations

respect to invention "B" when invention "A" is new (35 U.S.C. 102) and non-obvious (35 U.S.C. 103) in view of invention "B" assuming invention "B" is prior art with respect to invention "A".

(o) Sworn means sworn or affirmed.

(p) United States means the United States of America, its territories and possessions.

(q) A final decision is a decision awarding judgment as to all counts. An interlocutory order is any other action taken by an administrative patent judge or the Board in an interference, including the notice declaring an interference.

(r) NAFTA country means NAFTA country as defined in section 2(4) of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act, Pub. L. 103-182, 107 Stat. 2060 (19 U.S.C. 3301).

(s) WTO member country means WTO member country as defined in section 2(10) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act, Pub. L. 103-465, 108 Stat. 4813 (19 U.S.C. 3501).

[49 FR 48416, Dec. 12, 1984, effective Feb. 11, 1985; 50 FR 23123, May 31, 1985; para. (q) added, 58 FR 49432, Sept. 23, 1993, effective Oct. 25, 1993; paras. (f), (g), (j)-(n), and (q) revised, paras. (r) and (s) added, 60 FR 14488, Mar 17, 1995, effective Apr. 21, 1995]

37 CFR 1.602 Interest in applications and patents involved in an interference.

(a) Unless good cause is shown, an interference shall not be declared or continued between

(1) applications owned by a single party or

(2) applications and an unexpired patent owned by a single party.

(b) The parties, within 20 days after an interference is declared, shall notify the Board of any and all right, title, and interest in any application or patent involved or relied upon in the interference unless the right, title, and interest is set forth in the notice declaring the interference.

(c) If a change of any right, title, and interest in any application or patent involved or relied upon in the interference occurs after notice is given declaring the interference and before the time expires for seeking judicial review of a final decision of the Board, the parties shall notify the Board of the change within 20 days after the change.

[49 FR 48416, Dec. 12, 1984, added effective Feb. 11, 1985; para. (c) revised, 60 FR 14488, Mar 17, 1995, effective Apr. 21, 1995]

37 CFR 1.603 Interference between applications; subject matter of the interference.

Before an interference is declared between two or more applications, the examiner must be of the opinion that there is interfering subject matter claimed in the applications which is patentable to each applicant subject to a judgment in the interference. The interfering subject matter shall be defined by one or more counts. Each application must contain, or be amended to contain, at least one claim that is patentable over the prior art and corresponds to each count. All claims in the applications which define the same patentable invention as a count shall be designated to correspond to the count.

[Added, 49 FR 48416, Dec. 12, 1984, effective Feb. 11, 1985; revised, 60 FR 14488, Mar. 17, 1995, effective Apr. 21, 1995]

37 CFR 1.604 Request for interference between applications by an applicant.

(a) An applicant may seek to have an interference declared with an application of another by,

(1) Suggesting a proposed count and presenting at least one claim corresponding to the proposed count or identifying at least one claim in its application that corresponds to the proposed count,

(2) Identifying the other application and, if known, a claim in the other application which corresponds to the proposed count, and

(3) Explaining why an interference should be declared.

Patent Laws and Regulations

(b) When an applicant presents a claim known to the applicant to define the same patentable invention claimed in a pending application of another, the applicant shall identify that pending application, unless the claim is presented in response to a suggestion by the examiner. The examiner shall notify the Commissioner of any instance where it appears an applicant may have failed to comply with the provisions of this paragraph.

[49 FR 48416, Dec. 12, 1984, added effective Feb. 11, 1985; para. (a)(1) revised, 60 FR 14488, Mar 17, 1995; effective Apr. 21, 1995]

37 CFR 1.605 Suggestion of claim to applicant by examiner.

(a) If no claim in an application is drawn to the same patentable invention claimed in another application or patent, the examiner may suggest that an applicant present a claim drawn to an invention claimed in another application or patent for the purpose of an interference with another application or a patent. The applicant to whom the claim is suggested shall amend the application by presenting the suggested claim within a time specified by the examiner, not less than one month. Failure or refusal of an applicant to timely present the suggested claim shall be taken without further action as a disclaimer by the applicant of the invention defined by the suggested claim. At the time the suggested claim is presented, the applicant may also call the examiner's attention to other claims already in the application or presented with the suggested claim and explain why the other claims would be more appropriate to be designated to correspond to a count in any interference which may be declared.

(b) The suggestion of a claim by the examiner for the purpose of an interference will not stay the period for response to any outstanding Office action. When a suggested claim is timely presented, ex parte proceedings in the application will be stayed pending a determination of whether an interference will be declared.

[49 FR 48416, Dec. 12, 1984, added effective Feb. 11, 1985; para. (a) revised, 60 FR 14488, Mar 17, 1995; effective Apr. 21, 1995]

37 CFR 1.606 Interference between an application and a patent; subject matter of the interference.

Before an interference is declared between an application and an unexpired patent, an examiner must determine that there is interfering subject matter claimed in the application and the patent which is patentable to the applicant subject to a judgment in the interference. The interfering subject matter will be defined by one or more counts. The application must contain, or be amended to contain, at least one claim that is patentable over the prior art and corresponds to each count. The claim in the application need not be, and most often will not be, identical to a claim in the patent. All claims in the application and patent which define the same patentable invention as a count shall be designated to correspond to the count. At the time an interference is initially declared (§ 1.611), a count shall not be narrower in scope than any application claim that is patentable over the prior art and designated to correspond to the count or any patent claim designated to correspond to the count. Any single patent claim designated to correspond to the count will be presumed, subject to a motion under § 1.633(c), not to contain separate patentable inventions.

[49 FR 48416, Dec. 12, 1984, added effective Feb. 11, 1985; revised, 60 FR 14488, Mar 17, 1995; effective Apr. 21, 1995]

37 CFR 1.607 Request by applicant for interference with patent.

(a) An applicant may seek to have an interference declared between an application and an unexpired patent by,

- (1) Identifying the patent,
- (2) Presenting a proposed count,
- (3) Identifying at least one claim in the patent corresponding to the proposed count,
- (4) Presenting at least one claim corresponding to the proposed count or identifying at least one claim already pending in its application that corresponds to the proposed count, and, if any claim of the patent or application identified as corresponding to

Patent Laws and Regulations

the proposed count does not correspond exactly to the proposed count, explaining why each such claim corresponds to the proposed count, and

- (5) Applying the terms of any application claim
 - (i) Identified as corresponding to the count and
 - (ii) Not previously in the application to the disclosure of the application.
- (6) Explaining how the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 135(b) are met, if the claim presented or identified under paragraph (a)(4) of this section was not present in the application until more than one year after the issue date of the patent.

(b) When an applicant seeks an interference with a patent, examination of the application, including any appeal to the Board, shall be conducted with special dispatch within the Patent and Trademark Office. The examiner shall determine whether there is interfering subject matter claimed in the application and the patent which is patentable to the applicant subject to a judgment in an interference. If the examiner determines that there is any interfering subject matter, an interference will be declared. If the examiner determines that there is no interfering subject matter, the examiner shall state the reasons why an interference is not being declared and otherwise act on the application.

(c) When an applicant presents a claim which corresponds exactly or substantially to a claim of a patent, the applicant shall identify the patent and the number of the patent claim, unless the claim is presented in response to a suggestion by the examiner. The examiner shall notify the Commissioner of any instance where an applicant fails to identify the patent.

(d) A notice that an applicant is seeking to provoke an interference with a patent will be placed in the file of the patent and a copy of the notice will be sent to the patentee. The identity of the applicant will not be disclosed unless an interference is declared. If a final decision is made not to declare an interference, a notice to that effect will be placed in the patent file and will be sent to the patentee.

[49 FR 48416, Dec. 12, 1984, added effective Feb. 11, 1985, para. (a) amended 53 FR 23735, June 23, 1988, effective Sept. 12, 1988; para. (a)(5)(i) revised, 58 FR 54504, Oct. 22, 1993, effective Jan. 3, 1994; para. (a)(4) revised, para. (a)(6) added, 60 FR 14488, Mar 17, 1995; effective Apr. 21, 1995]

37 CFR 1.608 Interference between an application and a patent; prima facie showing by applicant.

(a) When the effective filing date of an application is three months or less after the effective filing date of a patent, before an interference will be declared, either the applicant or the applicant's attorney or agent of record shall file a statement alleging that there is a basis upon which the applicant is entitled to a judgment relative to the patentee.

(b) When the effective filing date of an application is more than three months after the effective filing date of a patent, the applicant, before an interference will be declared, shall file evidence which may consist of patents or printed publications, other documents, and one or more affidavits which demonstrate that applicant is prima facie entitled to a judgment relative to the patentee and an explanation stating with particularity the basis upon which the applicant is prima facie entitled to the judgment. Where the basis upon which an applicant is entitled to judgment relative to a patentee is priority of invention, the evidence shall include affidavits by the applicant, if possible, and one or more corroborating witnesses, supported by documentary evidence, if available, each setting out a factual description of acts and circumstances performed or observed by the affiant, which collectively would prima facie entitle the applicant to judgment on priority with respect to the effective filing date of the patent. To facilitate preparation of a record § 1.653(g) for final hearing, an applicant should file affidavits on paper which is 21.8 by 27.9 cm. (8½ x 11 inches). The significance of any printed publication or other document which is self-authenticating within the meaning of Rule 902 of the Federal Rules of Evidence or § 1.671(d) and any patent shall be discussed in an affidavit or the explanation. Any printed publication or other document which is not self-authenticating shall be authenticated and discussed with particularity in an affidavit. Upon a showing of good cause, an affidavit may be based on information and belief. If an examiner finds an application to be in condition for declaration of an interference, the examiner will consider the evidence and explanation

Patent Laws and Regulations

only to the extent of determining whether a basis upon which the application would be entitled to a judgment relative to the patentee is alleged and, if a basis is alleged, an interference may be declared.

[49 FR 48416, Dec. 12, 1984, added effective Feb. 11, 1985; revised, 60 FR 14488, Mar 17, 1995, effective Apr. 21, 1995]

37 CFR 1.609 Preparation of interference papers by examiner.

When the examiner determines that an interference should be declared, the examiner shall forward to the Board:

- (a) All relevant application and patent files and
- (b) A statement identifying:
 - (1) The proposed count or counts and, if there is more than one count proposed, explaining why the counts define different patentable inventions;
 - (2) The claims of any application or patent which correspond to each count, explaining why each claim designated as corresponding to a count is directed to the same patentable invention as the count;
 - (3) The claims in any application or patent which do not correspond to each count and explaining why each claim designated as not corresponding to any count is not directed to the same patentable invention as any count; and
 - (4) Whether an applicant or patentee is entitled to the benefit of the filing date of an earlier application and, if so, sufficient information to identify the earlier application.

[49 FR 48416, Dec. 12, 1984, added effective Feb. 11, 1985; paras. (b)(1)-(b)(3) revised, 60 FR 14488, Mar 17, 1995; effective Apr. 21, 1995]

37 CFR 1.610 Assignment of interference to administrative patent judge, time period for completing interference.

(a) Each interference will be declared by an administrative patent judge who may enter all interlocutory orders in the interference, except that only the Board shall hear oral argument at final hearing, enter a decision under §§ 1.617, 1.640(e), 1.652, 1.656(i) or 1.658, or enter any other order which terminates the interference.

(b) As necessary, another administrative patent judge may act in place of the one who declared the interference. At the discretion of the administrative patent judge assigned to the interference, a panel consisting of two or more members of the Board may enter interlocutory orders.

(c) Unless otherwise provided in this subpart, times for taking action by a party in the interference will be set on a case-by-case basis by the administrative patent judge assigned to the interference. Times for taking action shall be set and the administrative patent judge shall exercise control over the interference such that the pendency of the interference before the Board does not normally exceed two years.

(d) An administrative patent judge may hold a conference with the parties to consider simplification of any issues, the necessity or desirability of amendments to counts, the possibility of obtaining admissions of fact and genuineness of documents which will avoid unnecessary proof, any limitations on the number of expert witnesses, the time and place for conducting a deposition (§ 1.673(g)), and any other matter as may aid in the disposition of the interference. After a conference, the administrative patent judge may enter any order which may be appropriate.

(e) The administrative patent judge may determine a proper course of conduct in an interference for any situation not specifically covered by this part.

[49 FR 48416, Dec. 12, 1984, added effective Feb. 11, 1985; revised, 60 FR 14488, Mar 17, 1995; effective Apr. 21, 1995]

*Patent Laws and Regulations***37 CFR 1.611 Declaration of interference.**

- (a) Notice of declaration of an interference will be sent to each party.
- (b) When a notice of declaration is returned to the Patent and Trademark Office undelivered, or in any other circumstance where appropriate, an administrative patent judge may send a copy of the notice to a patentee named in a patent involved in an interference or the patentee's assignee of record in the Patent and Trademark Office or order publication of an appropriate notice in the Official Gazette.
- (c) The notice of declaration shall specify:
 - (1) The name and residence of each party involved in the interference;
 - (2) The name and address of record of any attorney or agent of record in any application or patent involved in the interference;
 - (3) The name of any assignee of record in the Patent and Trademark Office;
 - (4) The identity of any application or patent involved in the interference;
 - (5) Where a party is accorded the benefit of the filing date of an earlier application, the identity of the earlier application;
 - (6) The count or counts and, if there is more than one count, the examiner's explanation why the counts define different patentable inventions;
 - (7) The claim or claims of any application or any patent which correspond to each count;
 - (8) The examiner's explanation as to why each claim designated as corresponding to a count is directed to the same patentable invention as the count and why each claim designated as not corresponding to any count is not directed to the same patentable invention as any count; and
 - (9) The order of the parties.
- (d) The notice of declaration may also specify the time for:
 - (1) Filing a preliminary statement as provided in § 1.621(a);
 - (2) Serving notice that a preliminary statement has been filed as provided in § 1.621(b); and
 - (3) Filing preliminary motions authorized by § 1.633.
- (e) Notice may be given in the Official Gazette that an interference has been declared involving a patent.

[49 FR 48416, Dec. 12, 1984, effective Feb. 11, 1985; 50 FR 23123, May 31, 1985, paras. (b), (c)(6), (c)(7), (c)(8), (c)(9) & (d) revised, 60 FR 14488, Mar 17, 1995; effective Apr. 21, 1995]

37 CFR 1.612 Access to applications.

- (a) After an interference is declared, each party shall have access to and may obtain copies of the files of any application set out in the notice declaring the interference, except for affidavits filed under § 1.131 and any evidence and explanation under § 1.608 filed separate from an amendment. A party seeking access to any abandoned or pending application referred to in the opponent's involved application or access to any pending application referred to in the opponent's patent must file a motion under § 1.635. See § 1.11(e) concerning public access to interference files.
- (b) After preliminary motions under § 1.633 are decided (§ 1.640(b)), each party shall have access to and may obtain copies of any affidavit filed under § 1.131 and any evidence and explanation filed under § 1.608 in any application set out in the notice declaring the interference.
- (c) Any evidence and explanation filed under § 1.608 in the file of any application identified in the notice declaring the interference shall be served when required by § 1.617(b).
- (d) The parties at any time may agree to exchange copies of papers in the files of any

Patent Laws and Regulations

application identified in the notice declaring the interference.

[49 FR 48416, Dec. 12, 1984, effective Feb. 11, 1985; 50 FR 23124, May 31, 1985; para. (a) amended 53 FR 23735, June 23, 1988, effective Sept. 12, 1988; para. (a) revised, 60 FR 14488, Mar 17, 1995, effective Apr. 21, 1995]

37 CFR 1.613 Lead attorney, same attorney representing different parties in an interference, withdrawal of attorney or agent.

(a) Each party may be required to designate one attorney or agent of record as the lead attorney or agent.

(b) The same attorney or agent or members of the same firm of attorneys or agents may not represent two or more parties in an interference except as may be permitted in this Chapter.

(c) An administrative patent judge may make necessary inquiry to determine whether an attorney or agent should be disqualified from representing a party in an interference. If an administrative patent judge is of the opinion that an attorney or agent should be disqualified, the administrative patent judge shall refer the matter to the Commissioner. The Commissioner will make a final decision as to whether any attorney or agent should be disqualified.

(d) No attorney or agent of record in an interference may withdraw as attorney or agent of record except with the approval of an administrative patent judge and after reasonable notice to the party on whose behalf the attorney or agent has appeared. A request to withdraw as attorney or agent of record in an interference shall be made by motion (§ 1.635).

[49 FR 48416, Dec. 12, 1984, added effective Feb. 11, 1985; para. (c) & (d) revised, 60 FR 14488, Mar 17, 1995, effective Apr. 21, 1995]

37 CFR 1.614 Jurisdiction over interference.

(a) The Board acquires jurisdiction over an interference when the interference is declared under § 1.611.

(b) When the interference is declared the interference is a contested case within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 24.

(c) The examiner shall have jurisdiction over any pending application until the interference is declared. An administrative patent judge may for a limited purpose restore jurisdiction to the examiner over any application involved in the interference.

[49 FR 48416, Dec. 12, 1984, added effective Feb. 11, 1985; para. (a) & (c) revised, 60 FR 14488, Mar 17, 1995; effective Apr. 21, 1995]

37 CFR 1.615 Suspension of ex parte prosecution.

(a) When an interference is declared, ex parte prosecution of an application involved in the interference is suspended. Amendments and other papers related to the application received during pendency of the interference will not be entered or considered in the interference without the consent of an administrative patent judge.

(b) Ex parte prosecution as to specified matters may be continued concurrently with the interference with the consent of the administrative patent judge.

[49 FR 48416, Dec. 12, 1984, added effective Feb. 11, 1985; 50 FR 23124, May 31, 1985; revised, 60 FR 14488, Mar 17, 1995; effective Apr. 21, 1995]

37 CFR 1.616 Sanctions for failure to comply with rules or order or for taking and maintaining a frivolous position.

(a) An administrative patent judge or the Board may impose an appropriate sanction against a party who fails to comply with the regulations of this part or any order entered by an administrative patent judge or the Board. An appropriate sanction may include among others entry of an order:

(1) Holding certain facts to have been established in the interference;

Patent Laws and Regulations

- (2) Precluding a party from filing a paper;
- (3) Precluding a party from presenting or contesting a particular issue;
- (4) Precluding a party from requesting, obtaining, or opposing discovery;
- (5) Awarding compensatory expenses and/or compensatory attorney fees; or
- (6) Granting judgment in the interference.

(b) An administrative patent judge or the Board may impose a sanction, including a sanction in the form of compensatory expenses and/or compensatory attorney fees, against a party for taking and maintaining a frivolous position in papers filed in the interference.

(c) To the extent that an administrative patent judge or the Board has authorized a party to compel the taking of testimony or the production of documents or things from an individual or entity located in a NAFTA country or a WTO member country concerning knowledge, use, or other activity relevant to proving or disproving a date of invention (§ 1.671(h)), but the testimony, documents or things have not been produced for use in the interference to the same extent as such information could be made available in the United States, the administrative patent judge or the Board shall draw such adverse inferences as may be appropriate under the circumstances, or take such other action permitted by statute, rule, or regulation, in favor of the party that requested the information in the interference, including imposition of appropriate sanctions under paragraph (a) of this section.

(d) A party may file a motion (§ 1.635) for entry of an order imposing sanctions, the drawing of adverse inferences or other action under paragraph (a), (b) or (c) of this section. Where an administrative patent judge or the Board on its own initiative determines that a sanction, adverse inference or other action against a party may be appropriate under paragraph (a), (b) or (c) of this section, the administrative patent judge or the Board shall enter an order for the party to show cause why the sanction, adverse inference or other action is not appropriate. The Board shall take action in accordance with the order unless, within 20 days after the date of the order, the party files a paper which shows good cause why the sanction, adverse inference or other action would not be appropriate.

[49 FR 48416, Dec. 12, 1984, added effective Feb. 11, 1985, 50 FR 23124, May 31, 1985; revised, 60 FR 14488, Mar 17, 1995; effective Apr. 21, 1995]

37 CFR 1.617 Summary judgment against applicant.

(a) An administrative patent judge shall review any evidence filed by an applicant under § 1.608(b) to determine if the applicant is prima facie entitled to a judgment relative to the patentee. If the administrative patent judge determines that the evidence shows the applicant is prima facie entitled to a judgment relative to the patentee, the interference shall proceed in the normal manner under the regulations of this part. If in the opinion of the administrative patent judge the evidence fails to show that the applicant is prima facie entitled to a judgment relative to the patentee, the administrative patent judge shall, concurrently with the notice declaring the interference, enter an order stating the reasons for the opinion and directing the applicant, within a time set in the order, to show cause why summary judgment should not be entered against the applicant.

(b) The applicant may file a response to the order, which may include an appropriate preliminary motion under § 1.633(c), (f) or (g), and state any reasons why summary judgment should not be entered. Any request by the applicant for a hearing before the Board shall be made in the response. Additional evidence shall not be presented by the applicant or considered by the Board unless the applicant shows good cause why any additional evidence was not initially presented with the evidence filed under § 1.608(b). At the time an applicant files a response, the applicant shall serve a copy of any evidence filed under § 1.608(b) and this paragraph.

(c) If a response is not timely filed by the applicant, the Board shall enter a final decision granting summary judgment against the applicant.

(d) If a response is timely filed by the applicant, all opponents may file a statement and may oppose any preliminary motion filed under § 1.633(c), (f) or (g) by the applicant within a time set by the administrative patent judge. The statement may set forth views as to why summary judgment should be granted against the applicant, but the statement shall be limited to discussing why all the

Patent Laws and Regulations

evidence presented by the applicant does not overcome the reasons given by the administrative patent judge for issuing the order to show cause. Except as required to oppose a motion under § 1.633(c), (f) or (g) by the applicant, evidence shall not be filed by any opponent. An opponent may not request a hearing.

(e) Within a time authorized by the administrative patent judge, an applicant may file a reply to any statement or opposition filed by any opponent.

(f) When more than two parties are involved in an interference, all parties may participate in summary judgment proceedings under this section.

(g) If a response by the applicant is timely filed, the administrative patent judge or the Board shall decide whether the evidence submitted under (§ 1.608(b) and any additional evidence properly submitted under paragraphs (b) and (e) of this section shows that the applicant is *prima facie* entitled to a judgment relative to the patentee. If the applicant is not *prima facie* entitled to a judgment relative to the patentee, the Board shall enter a final decision granting summary judgment against the applicant. Otherwise, an interlocutory order shall be entered authorizing the interference to proceed in the normal manner under the regulations of this subpart.

(h) Only an applicant who filed evidence under § 1.608(b) may request a hearing. If that applicant requests a hearing, the Board may hold a hearing prior to entry of a decision under paragraph (g) of this section. The administrative patent judge shall set a date and time for the hearing. Unless otherwise ordered by the administrative patent judge or the Board, the applicant and any opponent will each be entitled to no more than 30 minutes of oral argument at the hearing.

[49 FR 48416, Dec. 12, 1984, added effective Feb. 11, 1985; 50 FR 23124, May 31, 1985; paras. (a), (b), (d), (e), (g), & (h) revised, 60 FR 14488, Mar 17, 1995; effective Apr. 21, 1995]

37 CFR 1.618 Return of unauthorized papers.

(a) An administrative patent judge or the Board shall return to a party any paper presented by the party when the filing of the paper is not authorized by, or is not in compliance with the requirements of, this subpart. Any paper returned will not thereafter be considered in the interference. A party may be permitted to file a corrected paper under such conditions as may be deemed appropriate by an administrative patent judge or the Board.

(b) When presenting a paper in an interference, a party shall not submit with the paper a copy of a paper previously filed in the interference.

[49 FR 48416, Dec. 12, 1984, added effective Feb. 11, 1985; amended 60 FR 14488-536, Mar 17, 1995]

37 CFR 1.621 Preliminary statement, time for filing, notice of filing.

(a) Within the time set for filing preliminary motions under § 1.633, each party may file a preliminary statement. The preliminary statement may be signed by any individual having knowledge of the facts recited therein or by an attorney or agent of record.

(b) When a party files a preliminary statement, the party shall also simultaneously file and serve on all opponents in the interference a notice stating that a preliminary statement has been filed. A copy of the preliminary statement need not be served until ordered by the administrative patent judge.

[49 FR 48416, Dec. 12, 1984, added effective Feb. 11, 1985; 50 FR 23124, May 31, 1985; revised, 60 FR 14488, Mar 17, 1995; effective Apr. 21, 1995]

37 CFR 1.622 Preliminary statement, who made invention, where invention made.

(a) A party's preliminary statement must identify the inventor who made the invention defined by each claim and must state on behalf of the inventor the facts required by paragraph (a) of §§ 1.623, 1.624, and 1.625 as may be appropriate. When an inventor identified in the preliminary statement is not an inventor named in the party's application or patent, the party shall file a motion under § 1.634 to correct inventorship.

(b) The preliminary statement shall state whether the invention was made in the United States, a NAFTA country (and, if so, which NAFTA country), a WTO member country (and if so,