

ANNOTATED PATENT DIGEST

by Robert A. Matthews, Jr.

© 2005-07 Thomson-West, All Rights Reserved

CHAPTER 5

USING THE SPECIFICATION

TO CONSTRUE CLAIMS

I. GENERAL ASPECTS OF USING THE PATENT SPECIFICATION TO CONSTRUE CLAIMS

- § 5:1 Construe Claim in Light of Specification and Drawings
- § 5:2 Must Consider Specification in Claim-Construction Analysis
- § 5:3 Specification does Not Measure the Scope of Exclusionary Rights
- § 5:4 Whether Claim Term Should be Ambiguous Before Resorting to the Specification
- § 5:5 Interpretations Contrary to Specification are Suspect
- § 5:6 No “Nose of Wax” – Specification Altering Ordinary Meaning That is Otherwise Clear
- § 5:7 Specification May Not be Used to Expand a Claim Beyond the Scope Allowed by the Patent Office
- § 5:8 Varied Use of Term in Specification Demonstrates Breadth
- § 5:9 Conflicts in the Specification

II. USING EMBODIMENTS OF THE INVENTION TO CONSTRUE CLAIMS

A. Using Aspects of Described Embodiments

- § 5:10 Problem Inventor Seeking to Solve or Purpose of the Invention Can Be Considered
- § 5:11 —When Multiple Problems Identified
- § 5:12 Functions of Claim Element Described in Specification may be Relevant to Construction
- § 5:13 —Cases Reading in Functions Described in Specification to Construe Claims
- § 5:14 —Cases Finding Error in Reading in Functions Described in Specification
- § 5:15 Claims May be Broader than Described Embodiments

B. Effect of Best Mode or Preferred Embodiments

- § 5:16 Preferred Embodiments are Not Claim Limitations
- § 5:17 Construe so Preferred Embodiment is Within the Claim
- § 5:18 Cases Rejecting Construction That Omitted Preferred Embodiment or Purposefully Construing Claim to Include Preferred Embodiment
- § 5:19 Cases Construing Term in a Manner Omitting Preferred Embodiment

C. Commercial Embodiments

- § 5:20 Accused Product Generally Irrelevant to Claim Construction
- § 5:21 Patentee's Commercial Embodiment
- § 5:22 Manufacturing Tolerances

III. USE OF SPECIFIC PORTIONS OF SPECIFICATION

A. Use of Specific Portions of the Specific Claim

- § 5:23 Preamble May be Given Effect
- § 5:24 Cases Finding Preamble was a Claim Limitation
- § 5:25 Cases Finding Preamble did Not Act as a Claim Limitation
- § 5:26 *Jepson* Claims
- § 5:27 Using Preamble to Give Context for Construing Other Limitations in Claim
- § 5:28 "Whereby" or "Wherein" Clauses

B. Use of Certain Portions of the Written Description

1. Title of Patent

- § 5:29 Patent Title can Aide in Interpretation

2. Abstract

- § 5:30 Use of Abstract to Construe the Claim

3. Drawings

- § 5:31 Drawings Useful as a Claim Construction Tool
- § 5:32 Infringement Not Determined by Comparing Drawing to Accused Product
- § 5:33 Quantitative Values Derived from a Drawing Generally may Not be Read Into a Claim
- § 5:34 Generally Should Not Limit Claim to Drawn Embodiment
- § 5:35 Drawing Should Not Override Express Detailed Teaching of Written Description or Other Drawings

4. Aspects of the Written Description

- § 5:36 “Summary of the Invention”
- § 5:37 Examples in Written Description as a Claim Construction Tool
- § 5:37.50 Reference Numerals
- § 5:38 “Objects of the Invention”
- § 5:39 Broad Statements in Ending Paragraphs of Written Description

**IV. USING SPECIFICATION TO READ IN
OR READ OUT LIMITATIONS**

A. Courts May Not Effectively Redraft Claims to Enlarge or Narrow Scope

- § 5:40 Redrafting to Enlarge Claim Prohibited
- § 5:41 Redrafting to Narrow Claim Prohibited

B. Reading Out Limitations

- § 5:42 Improper to Read Out or Render Meaningless a Claim Limitation
- § 5:43 —Patentee Stuck With the Claim Language Chosen
- § 5:43.25 —Inventor “Could Have Claimed” Contentions to Support Narrow Claim Construction
- § 5:43.50 —Inventor “Could Have Claimed” Contentions to Support Broad Claim Construction

C. Reading in Limitations

- § 5:44 Generally Improper to Read In or Add Extraneous Limitations from Specification
- § 5:45 Unclaimed Components Needed to Make a Working Device
- § 5:46 Unclaimed Operational Characteristics Should Not be Read Into Claim
- § 5:47 Cannot Read In Use Requirement to Composition Claims
- § 5:48 Cannot Read Process Steps into Product Claims when Not Claimed
- § 5:49 Level of Detail of Other Limitations Cannot Justify Reading in Limitations
- § 5:50 Case Examples Refusing to Read in Limitations or Finding Limitations Impermissibly Read Into Claims
- § 5:51 Case Examples Where Usage of Term in Specification Used to Reject Narrow Construction
- § 5:52 Case Examples Where Specification Used to Construe and Limit Claim Term
- § 5:53 Patent Office Should Not Read in Limitations

V. DISCLAIMERS OF CLAIM SCOPE IN SPECIFICATION

A. Disclaimers From Statements in the Specification Narrowly Characterizing the Invention

- § 5:54 Explicit Statements Limiting Scope of Claimed Invention
- § 5:55 Cases Finding a Disclaimer of Claim Scope
- § 5:56 Cases Refusing to Find a Disclaimer of Claim Scope
- § 5:57 Disclaimer From Merely Deleting Material in Specification

B. Disclaimers Arising from Negative Statements Regarding Prior Art

- § 5:58 Statements in the Specification Disparaging Prior Art
- § 5:59 Cases Finding Coverage Disavowed
- § 5:60 Cases Finding No Disavowal

VI. USE OF OTHER CLAIMS AND THE DOCTRINE OF CLAIM DIFFERENTIATION

- § 5:61 Using Other Claims in Same Patent to Construe Claim
- § 5:62 Using Dependent Claim to Interpret Independent Claim
- § 5:63 Cannot Read Limitation from One Claim into Another

A. The Doctrine of Claim Differentiation

- § 5:64 Avoid Interpretations that Render a Claim Redundant with Another Claim
- § 5:65 Case Examples Applying Claim Differentiation to Broadly Construe Independent Claim Based on Dependent Claim
- § 5:65.50 Case Examples Applying Claim Differentiation to Construe Dependent Claim Narrowly Based on Independent Claim
- § 5:66 Case Examples Applying Claim Differentiation to Construe First Claim Different From Second Claim Without Regard to Dependency

B. Limitations on Using Claim Differentiation

- § 5:67 Limitations on Applying Claim Differentiation
- § 5:68 Does Not Apply Where There is no Redundancy
- § 5:69 Cannot be Used to Alter Plain Meaning Given in, Derived From, or Not Supported by, the Specification
- § 5:70 Cannot be Used to Avoid Prosecution History Estoppel
- § 5:71 Cannot be Used to Expand a Claim Beyond the Scope Supported by the Specification

LATIMER, MAYBERRY & MATTHEWS

Intellectual Property Law, LLP

ROBERT A. MATTHEWS, JR.
Direct Dial: 434-525-1141
e-mail: robert.matthews@latimerIP.com

- § 5:72 Does Not Avoid § 112 ¶ 6 Limitations on Scope of Corresponding Structure
- § 5:73 Cases Refusing to Apply Claim Differentiation

VII. USE OF SPECIFICATIONS OF OTHER RELATED APPLICATIONS

- § 5:74 Continuing Applications
- § 5:75 Incorporation by Reference
- § 5:76 Foreign Counterpart Applications
- § 5:77 Use Specification in Which the Claim Resides
- § 5:78 Unsigned Draft Applications