

---

# Index

---

- accused embodiment 202, 206–7
  - access to information on 205
  - examining 204, 208, 231
  - Germany 213–14, 215, 224
  - and PHOSITA 226
  - US 209, 210–11
- Acontius, Jacobus 3
- Agreement on Trade Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights *see* TRIPS
- ALI Principles of the Law Intellectual Property 319–21
  - choice of law 320
    - public policy exception 320
  - coordination and enforcement framework 320–21
    - exceptions 321
  - as focused instrument 319
  - identifying appropriate jurisdictions 319
  - predictability concerns 319–20
- America
  - Board of Examiners 8
  - Patent Act (1790) 8, 23, 456
  - Patent Act (1793) 456
  - Patent Law (1836) 23
  - patent registration 8
  - see also* United States
- Anton Piller orders 346
- Australia
  - IP Australia 98
  - Raising the Bar initiative 459
- Berne Convention 40, 41
  - scope of 303
- best mode requirement 52, 379
  - Europe not having 162
- bifurcated procedures 262, 332, 333, 396
  - see also* injunction gap
- Budapest Treaty on the International Recognition of the Deposit of Microorganisms for the Purposes of Patent Procedure 30
- Canada
  - Eli Lilly v. Canada, Notice of Arbitration* 448–9
  - Intellectual Property Office 98
- central claim definition theory 208, 216
- China
  - specialized IP courts 323
  - State Intellectual Property Office (SIPO) 88, 94, 105
- claim construction
  - accused embodiment *see* accused embodiment
  - embodiment
  - additional hearings 210
  - central claim definition theory 208
  - claim scope and patent scope 206, 207
  - doctrine of equivalents 208–9
    - see also* doctrine of equivalents
  - and EPC 207–8
- Germany 203–4, 224–8
  - accused embodiment 215, 226
  - additional evidence 210
  - claims determine extent of protection 230
  - construction and application 213–14
  - decision-makers 210, 213
  - disclaimers and limitations in 232
  - disclosed embodiments 224, 231
  - doctrine of equivalents 214
  - expert testimonies 234–235
  - focus 217, 224
  - function-guided approach 225–7
  - fundamental rule 205, 230, 235
  - further steps in claims 214–15
  - interpretation 228–35
    - functional wording 228
    - limited to prescribed sources 228, 229
    - no use of prosecution history 228–9, 231–2
    - use of description and drawings 229
    - use of specification 229, 230–31, 235
  - inventor as lexicographer 227
  - priority rule 231
  - role of PHOSITA in 224, 225, 227, 236
  - steps in claims 213–14
  - use of prior art 234
- infringement/literal infringement distinction 214
- in invalidation proceedings 233–4
- language interpretation/construction
  - distinction 207
- peripheral claim definition theory 207–8
- US 202–3, 237–8
  - accused embodiment 210
  - additional evidence 210–11

- construction and application 209–11
- decision-makers 210, 213
- disclosed embodiments 222–3
- doctrine of equivalents 211–12
- focus 217–18
- fundamental rule 205, 216–19, 235
- further steps in claims 211–12
- infringement/literal infringement
  - distinction 212
- interpretation 216–17, 219–24
  - extrinsic evidence 219–20
    - flaw in 235
  - intrinsic evidence 219
  - statement explaining invention 221–2
  - supremacy of the specification 220–21
  - use of prosecution history 222–3
  - use of specification 235
- inventor as lexicographer 227
- Markman v Westview* (1996) 209–10
- proposed reforms 205, 235–7
- role of PHOSITA in 216, 217, 218, 219–20
- special rule 218–19
- steps in claims 209–11
  - Markman* hearings 210, 211–12
  - separate steps 209–11
- wording 204–5
  - inherently ambiguous 206–9
- claim for inspection 256
  - appeal against dismissal of 260
  - evidence collection 261
  - and filing of complaint 257
  - and infringer's business secrets 260
  - inspection proceedings 259–61
    - (1) ordering of inspection 259
    - (2) expert written opinion 259
    - (3) release/non-release of opinion 259–60
  - deadlines 260–61
    - no appeal against 260
  - as last resort 257
  - liability for damages 261
  - objects of 258
  - proportionality in 257–8
  - searching premises, 258–9
  - sufficient likelihood in 257
- Clennel, John
  - 'Expediency of Disclosing the Process of Manufactories' 18, 20
- Collier, John Dyer 18
  - 'Essay on the Law of Patents' 18–20
- community patent 56, 316, 317
  - 1997 Green Paper 114
  - courts 326, 327
- Community Patent Convention 338, 349
  - Common Appeal Court of (COPAC) 326
- competition law 245
  - England 246–7
    - passing off 246
  - Germany 246
  - US 247
- Congress of Vienna for Patent Reform (1873) 32
  - see also* Vienna Convention
- consideration 6, 11
  - inventor's 4
  - patentee's 3
- Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) 44, 45
- copyright 2, 23, 40, 140, 243, 275, 405
  - arising automatically 303
  - predicate act approach 300
- cross-retaliation 41
- Davies, Seaborne 4, 7, 9
- damages 263, 272–3
  - calculation methods 275–6
    - infringer's profits 289–91
    - lost profit analysis 276–8
    - reasonable royalty 278–81
  - deductible costs 290
  - Georgia-Pacific Corp. v. U.S. Plywood Corp.* 279–80
  - In re Seagate Tech. LLC* 282
  - Japan 283–4
    - secondary nature of 284
    - see also* Japan
    - liability for in claim construction 261
    - marking requirement 247, 275
    - notice requirement 274–5
      - exceptions to 274
    - Panduit Corp. v. Stahlin Bros* 276–8
    - presumptive 289–90
    - total profit rule 402–4
  - USA 273–4
    - see also* USA
  - USA/Japan comparison 293–5
  - willful infringement and enhanced damages 281–3
  - working requirement 289, 290
    - see also* infringer's profits; lost profits; reasonable royalty
- deposit
  - of microorganisms 30
  - of physical samples of DNA sequences 177–8, 179
  - mere 178
  - satisfying LWD 179, 184
  - sufficiency of 184
- design
  - association with underlying functions 401

- and consumer recognition 400–401
- dual protection 416–17
- patent *see* design patent
- patentability 408–9
  - inventive genius threshold 409–11
  - nonobviousness requirement 407–9
- as shorthand for underlying technological attributes 402
- trade dress protection 416–18
  - inherently distinctive design 417
  - secondary meaning requirement 416, 417
- USPTO/designer difference in understanding 405
- design law 243–4
  - European 244
  - repair clauses 244
  - US 244
- design patent
  - Apple v Samsung* cases 400, 401–2, 417–18
  - claim construction 411–12
  - of complex tech products 402–4
  - damages, total profit rule 402–4
  - designs eligible for patenting 404–5
  - experimental use defense 414
  - functionality defense 413–14
  - functionality doctrine 412–13
  - In re Laverne* test 408
  - inventive faculty requirement 407–9
    - Knapp v Will & Baumer Co* 407
  - inventive genius threshold 409–11
  - novelty 406–7
  - public use defense 414–16
  - total profit rule 399
  - utility patent intersection 399–400
    - legal regime 404–6
  - see also* design
- digital rights management 117–18
- disclosure
  - insufficient 161, 162
  - of inventions 20, 43
  - as inventor's payment 64
  - in medical use claims 162
  - sufficient 161–2, 164
    - see also* sufficiency
    - and the skilled person 161, 162
  - by way of incorporation by reference 163–4
- dispute resolution 296–9, 322
  - ALI Principles 319–21
    - see also* Ali Principles
  - choice of law 310
  - consolidation of claims 304, 311
    - cost savings 304
    - in Europe 307–8
    - exclusive jurisdiction 308, 309
    - irreconcilability 310
    - not damaging to sovereign interests 304–5
    - procedural difficulties 309
    - in public interest 304
    - reduction of liability 304
    - supplemental claims 306
    - supplemental jurisdiction 309
    - in USA 305–307
  - enforcing foreign judgments 311
  - expanding bases of jurisdiction 319
  - extraterritorial application of local law 299–304
    - comity 302–3, 306
    - limitations 301
    - method claims 300
    - predicate act approach 300
    - prescriptive authority 301–2, 305
  - inter partes* adjudication 310
  - private agreements 311–14
    - arbitration 311–12
    - choice of forum 312, 313
    - choice of law 312, 313
  - serial litigation 310
  - state mediated approaches 314
    - coordinated adjudication 317–21
    - deep harmonization 315–17
    - validity determinations 311
- divided claims 150, 296, 298, 299–30, 304, 315
- doctrine of equivalents 206, 208–9
  - insubstantial difference tests 212
  - limitation doctrine 212
  - literal infringement/infringement distinction
    - Germany 214–15
    - US 211–12
- doctrine of exhaustion 239–40
- doctrine of misappropriation 247
- Doha Public Health Declaration (2001) 422, 432, 433, 434, 437, 445
  - Decision on the Implementation of Paragraph 6 of the Doha Declaration (2003) 45
- dominant position 247–8
- Dossier Access Systems 93–4
- draft Patent Harmonization Treaty (1991) 35, 36, 41
  - filing date provisions 37, 38
- issues with
  - disclosure of origin of genetic resources 43–44
  - flexibility 43
  - national differences 43
  - see also* harmonization
- economic theories
  - received 60, 61
  - incentive theory 27, 61

- recent 61
  - patent rights and disclosures as governance mechanism 63–4
  - property rights as governance mechanism 61, 62–3
- economics 27, 81–3
  - competition 58
  - economic theories *see* economic theories
  - financing models 57
  - growth and innovation 58–9
  - innovation models 57
  - and patent system 57–9
  - patenting paradox 59
  - restriction of competition 58
  - Swedish growth paradox 59
  - Swedish study on economic aspects of patenting *see* Swedish study
- enablement
  - /possession overlap 181
  - reasonable correlation test 183
  - requirement *see* enablement requirement
  - /written description overlap 180
    - Capon v Eshhar* 180–81, 190–91
    - Univ. of Rochester v G.D. Searle & Co.* 180, 182–3, 193
- enablement requirement 161–2, 170, 228
  - claim scope 171
  - compliance 162
  - enablement/support distinction 161
  - enablement/written description distinction 170, 173
  - in Germany 165
  - lack of enablement 164–5
  - limiting patent scope 170
  - PHOSITA test 170
  - reasonable correlation test 170, 171
    - Amgen, Inc. v Chugai Pharmaceutical Co.* 171–2, 182, 200
    - In re Fisher* 161, 170–71
  - satisfying 170
    - Wands* factors 170, 181, 195
  - see also* written description
- England and Wales
  - 18th century patent development 4–5, 21
  - early patents 2–3
  - Statute of Monopolies (1623–4) 3
  - see also* United Kingdom
- entrepreneurship
  - academic 65
  - autonomous 65
  - corporate 65
  - state 65
  - see also* innovation
- EPC 22, 106, 297
  - Art 52 138
  - Art 52(1) 106, 138, 139
  - Art 52(2) 106, 107, 140
  - Art 52(3) 106–107
  - Art 52(4) 79
  - Art 53 140, 142–3
  - Art 53(b) 141
  - Art 54 148
  - Art 54(1) 147
  - Art 54(2) 147
  - Art 54(3) 148
  - Art 54(4) 151
  - Art 54(5) 151
  - Art 57 157
  - Art 64(2) 338
  - Art 69 133, 204, 335
  - Interpretation Protocol 204, 207–8, 232
  - Art 83 141
  - Art 84 133
  - Art 87(1) 150
  - Art 88(2) 150
  - Art 88(3) 150
  - Art 138 335
  - Art 153(5) 148
  - Conference for the Revision of the EPC 232
  - contribution to patent enforcement 338
  - as first-to-file system 148
  - Rule 26 135, 141–142
  - Rule 28 140, 141
  - Rule 29(3) 158
- EPO 22, 70
  - application backlog 90
  - Boards of Appeal 107, 325
  - Enlarged Board of Appeal 141
  - Epoline file inspection 93
  - Guidelines for Examination 122, 143
  - increase in applications 89
  - Mastering the Workload 90
  - shared jurisdiction 325
  - on software-related inventions *see* software-related inventions
  - see also* Trilateral Offices
- EU
  - Agreement on the European Union Patent Court 327
  - Biotech Directive (98/44/EC) 158
  - Art 6(2)(c) 143
  - Brussels Regulation
  - Art 6(1) 307, 308
  - Art 22(4) 307, 308
  - Brussels I Regulation (EU) No 1215/2012 331
  - Art 29(1) 264
  - Charter of Fundamental Rights, Art 47(2) 339

- Community Design Regulation
  - § 4(2) 243
  - § 8(1) 243
- Community trademark 244
- Directive 2004/48/EC (enforcement) 256, 346
- European Human Rights Convention, Art 6 339
- European patent 316
- European Patent Convention *see* EPC
- European Patent Office *see* EPO
- harmonization attempts 326–8
  - see also* harmonization
- patentability 139–40
  - exclusions *see* exclusions
- Regulation (EU) No 1257/2012 (unitary patent)
  - Art 5 349
  - Art 7 349
- relatively little patent litigation 325–6
- Trademark Directive 244, 245
- Treaty to Exclusionary Abuses, Art 82 248
- Unified Patent Court proposal 317, 326–7
  - see also* Unified Patent Court
- Unitary Patent Agreement 316–17
  - see also* UPC Agreement
- evergreening 427
- exclusions
  - EU
    - cloning human beings 141
    - commercial/industrial use of human embryos 141
    - computer programs 140
    - diagnostic methods 142
      - determining 143
    - difficulty defining limits of 143–4
    - discoveries scientific theories and mathematical methods 140
    - doing business 140
    - essentially biological processes 141
    - human genetic manipulation 141
    - human treatment methods 142
    - inventions contrary to *ordre public* 141
    - limited purpose of 140–41
    - noninventions 140
    - non-technical aesthetic creations 140
    - plant or animal varieties 141
    - playing games 140
    - presentations of information 140
    - schemes rules and methods for performing mental acts 140
  - exceptions to
    - case law 142–3
      - computer-implemented inventions 140
      - medical treatment methods 142
      - medical use 142
    - US *see* judicial exceptions
- Finland, NBPR 98
- first to file 43, 48–9, 148
- first to invent 43, 48
- France
  - limited monopoly rights 23, 24
  - Patent Law (1791) 23, 456
  - Société d'encouragement pour l'industrie nationale 24
  - specialized patent courts 324
  - spread of patent system *see* spread of patent system
- free trade agreements 46
  - draft Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership (RCEP) 46–7
  - Most Favoured Nation treatment 47
  - Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) 46
- GATT 26
  - dispute settlement provisions 40–41
  - TRIPS Agreement *see* TRIPS
  - Uruguay Round (1986) 36
- General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade *see* GATT
- Germany
  - Code of Civil Procedure
    - § 32 250
    - § 265(2) 253
    - § 485 260
    - § 567 260
  - Constitution, Art 5 135
  - Court Fees Act 269
  - Federal Cartel Office 247
  - Federal Patent Court 262
  - Gebrauchsmuster 25
  - invalidation suits 233
  - Patents Act
    - § 1(2) 110, 112, 149
    - § 1a 149, 160
    - § 2(a) 140, 160
    - § 21 160
    - § 30(3)(No 2) 252
    - § 34(3)(No 3) 133, 165
    - § 140(c) 256, 257, 259
  - Patent Law (1877) 24
  - patentability case law *see* patentability
    - German case law
  - Red Dove Doctrine 107–8
  - specialized patent courts 324
  - spread of patent system *see* spread of patent system

- Trademark Act
  - § 23(3) 245
- Unfair competition Act
  - § 4(3) 246
- Unification (1871) 24
- goodwill 2
- Group B+ countries 47, 100
- growth of cross-border licensing revenues 296
- Hague Diplomatic Conference (1991) 35–6, 312
  - Choice of Court Agreement 318
  - Convention on Jurisdiction and Foreign Judgments in Civil and Commercial Matters proposal 318
- harmonization 27, 31, 33, 41, 46–8, 53–4
  - assignee filing 52–3
  - concerns over 42
  - current state 31
  - deep 315–17
  - EU attempts 326–8
  - first to file 35, 36, 48–9
  - free trade agreements 46
    - see also* free trade agreements
  - grace periods 35–36, 50–51
  - limited 47
  - multilateral initiatives 46
  - practice-oriented measures in 47
  - prior art 49–50
  - prior user rights 52
  - standard format proposal 100–101
  - unilateral initiatives
  - urgent need for 100
  - US initiatives 48
    - see also* USA
  - see also* EPC; international norms; international treaties; TRIPS
- Hulme, Wyndham 4–5, 18, 26
- India
  - ability to make generic drugs 441
  - Ayyangar Report (1959) 468
  - enhanced therapeutic efficacy requirement 470
  - independence 468
  - inventive step requirement 468
  - IP policy 470–71
  - Patent Act, § 3(d) 469–70
  - Patent Examination Guidelines 470
  - patent law amendments 458–9
  - shifting patentability standard 470
  - and TRIPS 469
- industrial applicability 43, 157–60
  - bio-tech inventions 158–9
  - function identical to 159
  - inventive step 159
  - sufficiency of the invention 159
  - chemistry and pharma 158
  - exclusions 157
  - extrinsic use of invention in 159
  - Germany 159–60
    - DNA sequences 160
    - human genome sequences 160
  - industrial application criterion 158, 159
  - medical methods 158
  - utility requirement 157–8
    - see also* utility
- Industry Trilateral 100–101
- infringer's profits 263, 275
  - higher awards from 285
  - in damages 289–91
- injunction gap 262, 333
- innovation
  - and entrepreneurship 66
  - spiral 64, 65, 82
    - see also* entrepreneurship
- inspection orders 346
- Institute for Healthcare Informatics 132
- intellectual capital 55
- intellectual property, definition 40
- Intellectual Property Digital Library (IPDL) 93
- international depositary authority 30
- international norms 29, 31
  - common rules 30, 31
  - equal treatment 29–30
    - permissible discrimination 30
    - limited mutual recognition 30
- International Patent Classification 31
- international preliminary examining
  - authorities 34, 97
  - international preliminary examination report 97
- international searching authorities 33, 97
- international treaties 28–31
  - Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights *see* TRIPS
  - draft Patent Harmonization Treaty (1991)
    - see* draft Patent Harmonization Treaty (1991)
  - draft Substantive Patent Law Treaty (SPLT) 43
  - establishing international norms 29
    - see also* international norms
  - Paris Convention *see* Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property
  - Patent Cooperation Treaty *see* Patent Cooperation Treaty
  - Patent Law Treaty *see* Patent Law Treaty

- Strasbourg Agreement Concerning the International Patent Classification *see* Strasbourg Agreement
- Trademark Law Treaty (1994) 36
- Treaty on Intellectual Property in Respect of Integrated Circuits (IPIC) 41
- Vienna Convention *see* Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties
- internet bubble 71, 113
- inventive step 22, 43, 139, 153–7, 476
- in biotechnology 159
- Canadian standard 465
- comparative approach 454
- India *see* India
- Singapore *see* Singapore
- South Africa *see* South Africa
- cross-disciplinary claims 462
- Cuno Engineering v. Automatic Devices* 458, 463
- denial of 154
- in design patent 407–9
- Dutch approach 157
- EPO problem solution approach 154–5
- plausibility assessment 155
- postfiling of data 155
- postpublished evidence 155
- secondary indicia 155
- flexibilities 459
- German extrinsic analysis approach 156
- history 456
- lack of 155–156
- extrinsic lack of reproducibility 156
- intrinsic lack of reproducibility 156
- medical innovations 153–4
- obvious to try standard 464, 466–7
- PHOSITA
- ability to engage in experimentation 463–4, 465
- as blank slate 462–3
- capability standards 463, 464–5
- UK standard 465–6
- US *Graham* framework 460
- see also* PHOSITA
- prior art definition 460–61
- problem solution approach 460
- purpose 455–6
- and TRIPS flexibility 457–9
- KSR International v. Teleflex Inc.* 375, 376, 458
- UK approach 156–7
- Windsurfing* test 156, 157, 460
- use of experts in proceedings 157
- inventor
- as lexicographer 216, 227
- as PHOSITA 217
- biotech 190
- obligation of disclosure 196
- permitted to claim invention 170
- /PHOSITA distinction 217
- scope of patent coverage 171, 172
- inventorship 148
- IP wars 55
- IP5 Offices 88, 101–2, 105
- Global Dossier initiative 47, 102, 103
- One Portal Dossier 102
- task force 103
- USPTO-hosted user interface 103
- international cooperation 102, 105
- patent filings 101
- short-term priorities 103
- Japan
- Civil Code, Art 709 286
- IP High Court 273
- exclusive jurisdiction 323
- Japanese Intellectual Property Association (JIPA) 92
- Ministry of Economy, Trade and Industry 94
- USDOC-METI Initiative 94
- Patent Act
- Art 102 284
- Art 102(1) 286
- Art 102(2) 289
- Art 102(4) 285
- Art 103 284
- Art 105(2) 289
- Art 105(3) 289
- patent damages *see* damages
- alignment with equitable remedies 283
- as ancillary remedy 283–4
- calculation methods 284, 285–6
- infringer's profits 289–91
- lost profit analysis 286–9
- reasonable royalty 291–3
- see also* infringer's profits; lost profits; reasonable royalty
- on negligence 284–5
- no non-infringing substitute requirement 287–8
- Patent Office *see* JPO
- US–JP Collaborative Search Pilot Program 104–5
- JPO 98, 285
- Advanced Industrial Property Network 93
- application backlog 90
- increase in applications 88–9
- Intellectual Property Digital Library 93
- machine translation of applications 93–4
- promoting PCT route for patent applications 92

- Strategic Program 90
  - see also* Trilateral Offices
- judicial exceptions 144
  - abstract ideas 144
  - antibiotics as isolated from the environment 145
  - diagnostic assays based on serum markers 145
  - DNA sequences 145
  - effect on diagnostic method claims 145–6
  - human organisms 146–7
  - laws of nature/natural principles 144
  - natural phenomena 144
  - natural products 144
  - proteins 145
- Korea
  - Intellectual Property Office (KIPO) 88
    - pilot PPH programs 96
    - USPTO–KIPO pilot program 105
    - WIPO–CASE link 102
  - Intellectual Property Tribunal 324
  - specialized IP courts 323–4
- Liardet v Johnson* (1778) 4–5, 6, 10–12, 19, 21
  - cements 13–14
  - injunction 14
  - patent 10–13
  - records of case 14–17
  - significance of 4–5
- Lilly* written description 168–169, 179–80
  - academic opposition to 193–4, 200
  - Ariad Pharm. Inc. v Eli Lilly & Co.* 169, 179, 183, 194–7
    - affirming traditional LWD 180, 194–5
    - amicus briefs 194
    - broad principles 195
    - compliance standard 195
    - split decision 194
    - test for satisfaction 195
    - validity of generic claims 195
  - as biotech-specific super-enablement requirement 180, 181–2, 183, 188–9
    - Ariad* rejecting 196
    - post-*Ariad* 199
  - Carnegie Mellon University v Hoffmann La-Roche* 190–91
  - court-created 176
  - criticism of 169
    - as doctrinal wildcard 168, 169
    - /enablement distinction issues 169, 173, 195
  - Enzo Biochem Inc. v Gen-Probe Inc.* (Enzo I) 168, 176–8, 179, 184
    - policy concerns over 178
    - Enzo Biochem Inc. v Gen-Probe Inc.* (Enzo II) 178–9, 180, 184, 190
    - reversing Enzo I 193
  - Federal Circuit not addressing inconsistencies in 179
  - genus possession requirement 187–93
    - disclosure of structure-function relationship 188, 189
    - Ex parte Kubin* 185, 188, 190
    - impairing patent protection 190
    - inconsistent application of 189, 190–91
    - post-*Ariad* 198–200
      - as super-enablement requirement 188–9, 190
  - judicial opposition to 193, 196–7, 200
  - post-*Ariad* 197–200
  - post-*Enzo II* 181
  - redundant with enablement requirement 180–83, 190
  - Regents of the University of California v Eli Lilly & Co.* (1997) 168, 173–6
    - blurring enablement/written description distinction 173, 174–5
    - controversial decision 176
    - effects of 174
    - failure to satisfy written description requirement 174
    - limited disclosure in 173–4
    - potential for use of enablement requirement 175
  - species possession requirement 184, 195–6, 197
    - In re Kubin* 185
    - In re Wallach* 184–5, 186, 197, 198
    - interpretation and application issues 185–7
    - sufficiency of deposit 184
    - see also* enablement; written description
- litigation costs 382, 383
  - in cases brought by patent assertion entities 385, 388
  - in Germany 268–9, 270
  - reducing 392–5
- loser pays principle 348
- lost profits 263
  - higher awards from 285
  - in patent damages 275, 276–8, 286–9, 292
- Mansfield Court Notebooks 5
- manufactures 18
- Markman* hearings 210, 211–12
- means plus function 167
- medical innovations 132–3, 167
  - claim formats 133–1
  - method claims 134



- purpose limited compound protection 133–4
- ‘use’ claims 134
- closeness to nature issues 135
- ethical concerns 136
- indigenous knowledge 135–6
- patentability of natural things 135
- prohibitive effects on scientific research 136
- public opinion 136
- D’Arcy v Myriad Genetics* 147
- definition of medical patents 133
- DNA sequences 176–9
- European patentability 138, 139–40
  - exclusions *see* exclusions
  - first to file system 148
- inventive step 153–7
  - see also* inventive step
- novelty 147–52
  - grace periods 148
  - medical use claims 151–2
  - novelty-destroying disclosures 147, 148–9
  - poisonous divisional applications 150
  - prior filings 150–151
  - purpose-limited substance claims 151
  - selection inventions 149–50
  - state of the art 147–8
  - synthesized/extracted chemicals 149
- patentability
  - in Argentina 147
  - in Australia 147
  - in Brazil 147
  - comparative tests for inventive step 137–8
  - in Cuba 147
  - natural substances 139–40
  - novelty *see* novelty above
  - requirements 138–9
  - technical character requirement 139
    - see also* patentability; technical character
- patentability in US 138, 144–7
  - first inventor to file system 148
  - judicial exceptions *see* judicial exceptions
- PHOSITA in 137–8
  - see also* PHOSITA
- veterinary 132
- monopolies 2
  - in inventions 3
  - over existing things 3
  - patent 3
  - proprietary monopoly in books 9
- Nasmyth’s Patent (1711) 6–7
- new economy 55, 109, 113
- nonobviousness *see* inventive step
- novelty 4, 8, 22, 43, 139
  - in design patent 407
  - medical use claims 151–2
    - purpose-limited substance claims 151
    - purpose-related product claims 151–2
    - reachthrough claims 152
  - in US 152–3
- obviousness 22, 374, 409
  - see also* inventive step
- Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property (1883) 25, 27, 31–2, 40, 53
  - Art 2(2) 29
  - Art 2(3) 30, 306
  - Art 3 29
  - Art 4 30, 308–9
  - Art 4bis 32–3, 306
  - Art 4ter 32
  - Art 5A 32
  - Art 5bis 32
  - Art 5ter 32
  - Art 11 32, 38
  - long-term success of 54
  - not self-executing 308
  - priority right 25
  - right to national treatment 32
- patentability 43, 107
  - chemical compounds 133–4
  - core doctrine 108, 109, 111, 124
  - enablement requirement *see* enablement
  - exclusions *see* exclusions
  - general 138–9
  - in India 147
    - India’s exception 426, 427, 429
  - industrial applicability *see* industrial applicability
  - inventive step *see* inventive step
  - judicial exceptions *see* judicial exceptions
  - medical innovations *see* medical innovations
  - non-, of discoveries 139
  - non-human transgenic animals 141
  - post-*Myriad* 147
  - Red Dove Doctrine* 107–8, 124
  - software-related inventions *see* software-related inventions
  - subject matter *see* subject matter
  - US case law
    - Ass’n for Molecular Pathology v Myriad Genetics, Inc.* 145–6, 197
    - Mayo Collaborative Servs. v Prometheus Labs., Inc.* 139, 145–6
  - utility *see* utility
    - see also* EU; United Kingdom; USA
- patent applications 70–71

- backlogs 89–90
- co-filing 70
- duplication of search and examination 90
- EPO 70
- grace periods 148
- growth in 296
- increase in filings 88–9
- national 70
- Patent Cooperation Treaty 70, 92
- petrification 148
- written opinions 97
- see also* Patent Cooperation Treaty; Trilateral Offices
- patent assertion entities *see* patent trolls
- Patent Cooperation Treaty (1970) 25, 33–5, 204, 297
  - Art 27(1) 34, 39
  - Art 27(5) 34
  - Chapter I International Search 25–6
  - Chapter II International Preliminary Examination 26
  - formality requirements 39
    - form or content 39
  - objectives 33
  - patent procedures 30, 33
    - international phase 33–4
    - national phase 34
  - Regulations and Administrative Instructions 39
  - see also* harmonization
- patent damages *see* damages
- patent enforcement
  - declaratory judgment actions for noninfringement 263
- Germany
  - attorney's fees 270, 271
  - bifurcation of infringement and validity procedures 262
  - burden of proof 251, 253, 254
  - claim for inspection 256–9
  - costs 268–9, 270
  - court fees 270
  - defendants 253–4
  - evidence 256
  - extraterritorial jurisdiction 251–2
  - forum shopping 250–51
  - injunction gap 262
  - injunctions 262
  - jurisdiction 250–52
  - liability for damages 263, 267–8
  - procedures 254–6
  - protective letters 268
  - specialized patent courts 250
  - speed of decisions 251, 255
  - standing to sue 252–3
  - preliminary injunctions 264–8
    - appeals 267
    - assessment of patent validity 265–6
    - assessment of urgency 266–7
    - cross-border 268
    - ex parte* injunctions 267
      - as fast estoppel method 265
    - proceedings on the merits 265
    - protective letters 268
    - requirements 265
  - torpedo proceedings 263–4
  - see also* patent infringement
- patent infringement
  - actual notice 274
  - burden of proof 251, 253, 254
  - claim for inspection *see* claim for inspection
  - constructive notice 274
  - damages 263, 272
    - see also* damages
  - direct 253–4
  - fishing expeditions 257
  - injunctions 262
  - injunctive relief 272
  - US, as strict liability tort 274
  - see also* patent enforcement
- patent law
  - international 27
    - see also* harmonization
    - not harmonized 303
- Patent Law Treaty (2000) 30, 35, 39
  - Art 5 37, 38
  - Art 6(1) 39
  - Art 11 38
  - Art 12 38
  - Art 13 38
  - excluding substantive requirements 36
  - filing date provisions 37–8
    - reference filing 38
  - formality requirements 37–8
    - form or content 39
  - rectifying filing mistakes 38
- patent litigation reform 378–9, 398
  - concerns motivating 379
    - high costs of litigation 382–3
    - litigation explosion 380
    - patent assertion entities (patent trolls) 384–6
      - renegade jurisdictions 383–4
      - weak/frivolous cases 380–82
  - evaluation 389
    - preventing/punishing weak/frivolous suits 389–91
    - protecting end users/small businesses 391–2
    - reducing litigation costs 392–5

- legislative changes 386–8
- proposed reforms 378
- questioning need for 388–9
- staged litigation 395–8
  - already within judges' discretion 397
  - conceptually straightforward 395
  - need to mandate 397–8
  - overlooked 396–7
  - phases of 395–6
  - potential benefits 396
  - reducing costs 396
- Patent Prosecution Highway *see* PPH
- patent protection
  - increasingly aggressive 55
  - licences
    - exclusive 252–3, 264
    - nonexclusive 253
  - for pharmaceutical products 45–6
    - see also* medical innovations
  - for spare parts *see* spare parts
- patent rights
  - exceptions 421–422
  - and public health 419–20, 452
    - delinking drug costs from development costs 451–2
    - proposed research and development treaty 452
    - search for costs solutions 450–51
    - UNITAID patent pool 450
  - as territorial rights 28
  - in TRIPS 423–4
  - see also* TRIPS; TRIPS-Plus Agreements
- patent system
  - criticism of 57–8
  - designed to stimulate invention 57
  - developing countries maximizing use of TRIPS flexibilities 467–8
  - economics of *see* economics; economic theories
  - history
    - America *see* America
    - England and Wales *see* England and Wales
    - imperialist origins 467
    - origins 2
    - Paris Convention 25
    - types of patent 3
    - Venice 2
  - monopolies *see* monopolies
  - reform 22
  - spread of *see* spread of patent system
- patent trolls 333, 384–5
  - bottom-feeder trolls 385–6
- patents
  - applications *see* patent applications
  - availability 296
  - challenging validity 19
  - definition 19
  - divided claims 150, 296, 298, 299–30, 304
  - earliest 2
    - as instrument of economic policy 3
  - parallel/counterpart 305, 307, 308, 310
  - patentable subject matter 41
  - problem of cost 42
  - protecting priority 19–20
    - see also* priority
  - quality of 42
  - void
- PCT *see* Patent Cooperation Treaty
- peripheral claim definition theory 216
  - flaw in 235
- person of skill *see* PHOSITA
- pharmaceutical patents 353–4, 376–7
  - abbreviated new drug applications 357–8
  - branded
    - introducing own generics 364
    - marketing exclusivity 360–61
  - certification for Orange Book-listed patents 358–9
  - challenges of industry-specific law 373
    - private sector and public goals 373–4
  - declaratory judgment actions 370–73
  - jurisdiction 372
    - predicated upon actual controversy 370–71
    - reversal of roles in 370
  - enforcement 259–60
    - injunctions 365, 374–5
  - Federal Trade Commission v Actavis, Inc.* 367–9
  - generic
    - authorized 362–5
    - marketing exclusivity 361, 365
  - law 374–375
  - MedImmune, Inc. v Genentech, Inc.* 371–2, 374
  - new chemical entities 360
  - reverse payment settlements 365–9
  - Roche Products Inc. v Bolar Pharmaceutical Co.* 354, 355–6
  - statutory experimental use exception 357
  - term extension 360
  - Teva Pharmaceuticals USA Inc. v Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corp* 371–2
  - see also* USA, Hatch-Waxman Act
- PHOSITA
  - capability 462
  - distinguishing permissible interpretation from importation of limitations 216
  - in medical field 137–8

- /inventor distinction 217
- role in German claim construction 224, 225, 227
- role in US claim construction 216, 218, 219–20, 221, 223
- test in enablement requirement 170
- test in medical innovations 137–8
- possession
  - /enablement overlap 181
  - genus possession requirement 187–93
  - inventor's 172–3
  - species possession requirement 184, 195–6, 197
- piracy 7, 9, 40
- POSITA *see* PHOSITA
- PPH
  - advantages of 99
  - Global (GPPH) 98–9
  - office of first filing 98
  - office of second filing 98
  - PCT- 97
  - trilateral 97
  - pilot program 94–7
  - PPH MOTTAINAI Pilot 98
- prior art 43, 49–50, 139
  - definition 460–1
  - filing date determining 43
- prior disclosure 4
- priority 43
  - lodging caveats 19–20
  - right 25
  - rule 231
  - Special 301 list 439
- prominent feature 111–12, 122–3, 124
- pro-patent era 55–6
- reasonable royalty 263, 275
  - Georgia-Pacific* factors 279–80
  - in patent damages 273, 278–81, 291–3, 402
- rent seeking 23
- Russia, ROSPATENT 98
- saisie-contrefaçon* 345–7
- Singapore
  - adopting TRIPS-Plus provisions 471
  - Economic Development Board 471
  - high protection IP policy 471–2
  - independence 471
  - inventive step, applying Windsurfing test 472
- software-related inventions 106
  - British practice 126–8
    - (1) construe claim 127
    - (2) identify contribution 127
  - (3) examine whether excluded subject matter 127
  - (4) examine whether contribution is technical 127
  - common law approach 128
- case law 107, 109–10
  - Computer Program Product* (T1173/97) 110, 111, 115, 120
  - Computer-related Invention/Vicom* (T 208/84) 108, 109, 127, 129, 139
  - Comvik* (T641/00) 114
  - Hitachi* (T258/03) 114, 116–17
  - Macrossan* 126–8
  - Merrill Lynch's Application* 109, 126, 127
  - Programs for Computers* (opinion G 3/08) 114, 115, 128
- EPO practice 114, 121
  - (1) examination of technical features 115
  - (2) examination of inventive step 115–16
- computer program/computer-implemented method differentiation 115–16
  - Hitachi/Comvik* approach 114–15, 119, 120, 121, 122
  - problem solution approach 115
- EPO/British/German comparison 129–30
- EU policy developments 113–14
- German practice 122–6
  - defining technical problem 123, 124
  - inventive step 124–5, 126
  - solving concrete technical problem by technical means 122–3, 125–6
  - technical character 122, 126
- patentability 106–8, 110, 111, 129, 130–31
  - computer-implemented business methods 113
  - human interaction 110
  - inventive step 111, 112–13
  - novelty 112
  - program product 109, 112
  - subject matter 108–9, 111–12
  - technical character 110, 111
  - technical contribution approach 109–10
  - technical solution to technical problem 112
- South Africa 472
  - inventive step requirement 473–4
  - and national priorities 475–6
- IP policy 473
- National Development Plan (2030) 474–5
- registration-based patent system 473
- and TRIPS flexibilities 474
- Spain, SPTO 98
- spare parts 239
  - and antitrust law 247, 249

- Europe 247–8
- Germany 247–8
- Microsoft* cases 247–8, 280–81, 300, 302, 309
- US 248–9
- British Leyland Motor Corp. Ltd. v Armstrong Patents Co. Ltd.* 243
- extension of patent protection 243
  - competition law 245
    - see also* competition law
  - copyright law 243
  - design law 243–4
  - trademark law 244–5
- scope of patent protection 239–40, 242–3
  - Germany 240–41
  - Great Britain 241–2
  - US 242
- specialized IP courts 323–5
  - EPO *see* EPO
  - procedures 350–51
  - Unified Patent Court *see* Unified Patent Court
  - see also* individual countries
- specifications 19
  - drafting 20–21
  - enrolment 6, 7, 8
    - Nasmyth's Patent* (1711) 6–7
    - as requirement 9
  - filing
    - non-filing 7–8
    - time limits 7
  - provisional 22
- split proceedings 332–3
- spread of patent system 22
  - France 23–4
  - Germany 24–5
  - United States 23
- Standing Committee on the Law of Patent (SCP) 42
  - current discussions 44
- state of the art 147–8
  - extension of 148
- Strasbourg Agreement Concerning the International Patent Classification 30
  - International Patent Classification 31
- Sturtevant's Patent 7
- subject matter 108–9, 111–12, 139
  - excluded 107, 108, 113, 116, 121
  - further technical effect 120–21
  - graphical user interfaces (GUI)/user displays 118–19
  - Hitachi/Comvik* approach 119–20, 121–2
  - mathematical methods 123
  - nontechnical 117
    - abstract models/concepts 118
    - algorithms 117
    - data structuring 118
    - programming language 118
    - simulations 118
  - patentable 41, 422–3, 425
  - permissible 432–3
  - technical
    - data security 117
    - digital rights management 117–18
  - sufficiency of disclosure *see* disclosure
- Sweden
  - decline in patent applications 70–71
  - growth paradox 59
  - Patent and Trademark Office 69
    - quality and cost efficiency 71
  - study on economic aspects of patenting *see* Swedish study
- Swedish study 82
  - design 65, 67, 68
  - dominance of large companies 67, 69
  - entrepreneurship identified 65, 66
  - frame of reference 64–5
  - IP education 69–70
  - methodology 68
  - patent applications 69
  - patent awareness 69
  - patenting as commercialization strategy 69
  - patenting frequency 70–71
  - policy recommendations
    - general 72–3, 83–4
    - implementation 82–3
    - inventive stop requirement 75–6
    - patentability criteria 75
    - special 73–5, 83, 84–6
  - surgical therapeutic and diagnostic methods 79–80
    - technical character requirement 76–9
  - possible international application 80–81
  - product innovation 69
  - R&D implications 69
  - remit 64
    - structural problems in Swedish system 67
- Switzerland, specialized patents court 325
- technical character 116, 139
  - indications of 139
  - interpreting 'technical' 78, 79
  - lack of 108, 111
  - requirement 73, 75, 76–9, 110, 122, 126, 139
    - not signed into European law 77
    - reform proposal 83
  - support of 166
  - technical effect as indication of 139
- techno-nationalism 55
- the Netherlands, specialized patent courts 324

- trademarks 2, 244–5
  - control of secondary markets 244
  - European community trademark 244
  - exclusions 244–5
  - refilling 245
  - third party suppliers 245
- Trilateral Conferences 88
  - 1st (1983) 89
  - 19th (2001) 94
  - Tokyo (2003) 91–2
  - Trilateral Meeting for Workload Reduction of Offices and Associated Costs (2001) 89
- Trilateral Offices 88
  - bilateral projects 91–2
  - cooperation 89
  - mutual exploitation 93
    - Advanced Industrial Property Network (AIPN) 93–4
    - first pillar 93–4
    - second pillar 94–9
    - third pillar 100–101
  - patent applications 91
  - Patent Prosecution Highway Pilot Program 94–7
    - see also* PPH
  - timing issues 92
    - office of first filing 92, 95
    - office of second filing 92
- Trilateral Meeting and Meeting of the Working Group on Strategic Issues and Work Sharing (2004) 91
- working groups 94
  - see also* EPO; JPO; USPTO
- TRIPS 26, 39–41, 419–20
  - Art 3.1 30
  - Art 7 (objectives) 421, 437
  - Art 8 (principles) 43, 421
  - Art 27 41
  - Art 27(1) 41
  - Art 27(3)(b) 44
  - Art 30 41, 424, 430, 431, 442, 445
  - Art 31 424, 430–31, 432–3, 434, 437, 445
  - Art 31(f) 45–46
  - Art 31*bis* 46
  - Art 71.1 44, 45
  - binding on WTO members 40
  - /CBD relationship 44, 45
  - compulsory licensing 42, 430–32
    - conditions governing 431
    - decision basis 437
    - and national emergencies 433–4, 435–6
    - permissible subject matter 432–3
    - political pressure against 439–40
    - prior negotiation 434–5
    - public noncommercial use 436–7
    - retaliatory action against 438–9
    - scope 430–31
    - worsening access to medicine 438
  - concerns over compliance 42
  - contentious negotiations 420
  - Council for 44, 45
  - data protection 424–5
    - and developing countries 420–21
    - as dispute settlement mechanism 40–41
  - Doha Ministerial Declaration (2001) 45
  - enforcement 425
  - flexibility, and inventive step 457–9
  - genesis of 420–22
  - geographic coverage 40
  - implementation
    - periods 40
    - reviews 44–5
  - investor-state challenges 447–50
    - awards 447–448
    - Eli Lilly v. Canada, Notice of Arbitration* 448–9
    - no appeal 447
  - issues with 45, 440–41
  - language of social norms 421–2
  - mailbox provision 429–30
  - minimum level of patent rights 419, 422
    - benefiting developed countries 421
  - Most Favoured Nation treatment 47
  - negotiations 36
  - non-violation complaints 442
  - not requiring uniform definitions 449
  - parallel imports 42, 257
  - Part II 40
  - Part III 40
  - Part IV 40
  - patent rights 423–4
    - exceptions 424
    - limited exception 429–30
  - patentability 426–9
    - and India's exception 427–8
  - patentable subject matter 422–3, 425
  - on patents 41
  - problems with 41–2
    - WIPO 42–4
    - WTO 44–6
  - transitional period 41
  - TRIPS-plus Agreements *see* TRIPS-plus Agreements
    - see also* harmonization
- TRIPS-plus Agreements
  - bilateral investment agreements 448
  - free trade agreements 442–3, 447
  - international investment agreements 448
  - limited compulsory licensing 445

- patent term 444–5
- patentability 443–4
- regulatory protection 445–7
- UN, High Level Panel on Access to Medicine 451
- Unified Patent Court 323–5, 328–9, 351
  - committees 329, 331
  - contracting states 328
  - cost decisions 344
  - court fees 335
  - Court of Appeal 329, 330
  - Court of First Instance 329, 333
    - interim procedure 343–4
    - oral procedure 344
    - written procedure 342–3
  - damages awards 349–50
  - decision on merits 344–5
  - draft Rules of Procedure 336, 337
    - application 338
    - Rule 170 340
  - immediacy principle 340
  - injunction rights 349–50
  - judges 334, 345
    - impartiality 340
    - independence 339
  - jurisdiction
    - appeals 332
    - divisional 332
    - exclusive UPC 331–3
      - and national courts 333
    - opt out 333, 335
    - in split proceedings 332–3
  - late filings 347–8
  - oral hearings 340–41
    - importance of 341
  - Panel composition 334
  - powers 337
  - procedural remedies 337
  - Protocol on Privileges and Immunities of 334
  - recoverable costs 348–9
  - regional divisions 329
  - Registry 329
  - representation 336
  - saisie-contrefaçon* under 345–7
  - service of documents 340
  - statements of claim 341–2
  - task of 345
- United Kingdom
  - 18th century patent development 4–5
  - enrolment of specifications 7–9
    - see also* specifications
  - filing of plans 10
  - history of 6–10
    - increasingly technical nature 10
  - Anton Piller orders 346
  - Committee of Patentees (1785) 17
  - emergence as industrial nation 3–4
  - Fry Committee (1901) 22
  - Intellectual Property Enterprise Court 324
  - Intellectual Property Office 98
  - Patent Law Amendment Act (1852) 22
  - patent law in (1800) 17–21
  - Patent Office 22
  - Patents Act (1883) 22
  - Patents Act (1949) 134
  - Patents Act (1977) 22
  - Patents Court 324–325
  - Report of the Select Committee on Patents (1851) 22
    - see also* England and Wales
- United Nations *see* UN
- unpredictable arts 137, 164
- UPC Agreement 327–328
  - Art 25 338, 349
  - Art 26 338, 349
  - Art 27 349
  - Art 53 340
  - Art 69 348
  - establishing clear rules 335
- USA
  - 35 USC § 101 138, 145, 160
  - 35 USC § 102 49, 50, 52, 100, 153
  - 35 USC § 112 165, 177
  - 35 USC § 118 52
  - 35 USC § 171, 157, 399, 402, 403, 404, 406, 408
  - 35 USC § 271 52, 244, 371, 372
  - 35 USC § 273
  - 35 USC § 284 52, 402
  - 35 USC § 285 391
  - 35 USC § 287 142
  - 35 USC § 289 402–3, 404
  - American Law Institute 318–319
    - Principles of the Law, Intellectual Property *see* ALI Principles of the Law
  - American Type Culture Collection 177
  - best mode requirement 52
  - Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (BPAI) 181, 188
  - Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, exclusive jurisdiction 323
  - Department of Commerce 94
  - DOC–METI Initiative 94
  - FDA, Approved Drug Products with Therapeutic Equivalence Evaluations (Orange Book) 358
  - federal court diversity jurisdiction 305

- federal question jurisdiction 305
- Hatch–Waxman Act (1984) 353–4, 355, 356–7
  - abbreviated new drug application 357–8
  - controversies over 361–2
  - extending 375–6
  - generic exclusivity period 365
  - lack of predictability as result of 374–5
  - statutory experimental use exception 357
  - term extension 360
  - thirty-month stay 360
  - see also* pharmaceutical patents
- Lanham (Trademark) Act (1946) 302, 245 § 43(a) 416
- Leahy-Smith America Invents Act (2011) 48, 378
  - assignee filing 52–3
  - first to file 48–9
  - grace period 50–51
  - prior art 49–50
  - prior user rights 52
  - repeal of *Hilmer* doctrine 50
  - § (33) 146
- litigation tax 389
- National Institutes of Health 160
- novelty in 152–153
- Patent Act 138
  - § 101 160
  - § 102 138
  - § 103 138
  - § 112 168
  - § 271(f) 300
  - § 287(a) 274
- written description requirement *see* written description
- Patent and Trademark Office *see* USPTO
- patent damages
  - calculation methods 275–6
    - lost profit analysis 276–8
    - reasonable royalty 278–81
  - Georgia-Pacific* factors 279–80, 292
  - notice requirement 274–5
    - exceptions to 274
  - Panduit* test 276–8, 287–8
  - Seagate* test 282
  - willful infringement and enhanced damages 281–3
  - see also* damages
- patent litigation reform 378
- patent litigation reform *see* patent litigation reform
- patentability 144–7
  - exclusions *see* judicial exceptions
  - isolated/purified natural substances 144–5, 146
  - marked differences 146
  - statutory categories 144
  - utility *see* utility
  - see also* patentability
- Promoting Automotive Repair, Trade and Sales Act 244
- Semiconductor Chip Protection Act 374
- spread of patent system *see* spread of patent system
- US Patent No 141,072 (1873) 144
- US Patent No 644,077 (1898) 144
- US Patent No 730,176 (1903) 144
- US Patent No 2,449,866 (1948) 145
- USTR Special 301 priority list 439
- US–JP Collaborative Search Pilot Program 104–5
  - see also* America
- USPTO 48, 71, 98
  - 21st Century Strategic Plan 90
  - application backlog 89–90
  - /designer difference in understanding of design 405
  - first patent grant 378
  - increase in applications 89
  - issuing unwarranted patents 382
  - Manual of Patent Examining Procedure 404–5
  - PAIR 93
  - revised examination guidelines 146
  - USPTO–KIPO pilot program 105
  - Utility Examination Guidelines 161
    - see also* utility
  - Written Description Training Materials 186
    - Example 11A 191–2
    - Example 11B 191, 192–3
    - Example (13) 186, 187
  - see also* Trilateral Offices
- utility 157, 160–61
  - expressed sequence tags (ESTs) 160–61
  - immediate public benefit 160
  - In re Fisher* 161, 170–71
  - patent 275
    - claim construction 411–12
    - Congressional overhaul 408
    - /design patent intersection 399–400, 404–6
    - inventive faculty 407–9
    - inventive genius 409–11
    - public testing 414
  - requirement in industrial applicability 157–8
  - see also* industrial applicability
- validity
  - challenging 19
  - determinations 265–6, 311



- of generic claims 195
- procedures 262
- Venice
  - patent statute (1474) 2
- Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties
  - Art 2(1)(a) 28
  - Art 18(a) 28–9
- void patents 9
- WHO, UNITAID, patent pool 450
- WIPO 25
  - administered treaties 28
  - CASE platform 47
  - deep harmonization 315
  - Intergovernmental Committee on Intellectual Property and Genetic Resources, Traditional Knowledge and Folklore 44, 136
  - International Bureau 71
  - and IP5 102
  - proposed Substantive Patent Law Treaty (SPLT) 315
  - Standards Recommendations and Guidelines 30
  - Standing Committee on the Law of Patent 42–3
    - see also* international treaties; IP5 Offices
  - ‘work for hire’ doctrine 25
  - work sharing 47
- World Health Organization *see* WHO
- World Intellectual Property Organization *see* WIPO
- World Trade Organization *see* WTO
- written description 165–6, 168–9
  - Ariad v Eli Lilly see Lilly* written description
  - /enablement distinction 170
  - /enablement overlap 180
    - Capon v Eshhar* 180–81
    - Univ. of Rochester v G.D. Searle & Co.* 180
  - Enzo Biochem Inc. v Gen-Probe Inc. see Lilly* written description
  - must be of technical character 166
  - Regents of the University of California v Eli Lilly & Co.* (1997) *see Lilly* written description
  - traditional 168, 170, 198–9
    - and inventor’s possession 172–3
    - /Lilly differentiation 175
  - support in 165–7
    - see also* enablement requirement
- WTO
  - Agreement (1994) 39
  - Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU) 425
  - Doha Public Health Declaration (2001) 422
  - revision of rules 45
  - Trade-Related Intellectual Property Agreement *see* TRIPS
  - Understanding on Rules and Procedures Governing the Settlement of Disputes 40

