

ANNOTATED PATENT DIGEST

by Robert A. Matthews, Jr.

© 2005-07 Thomson-West, All Rights Reserved

CHAPTER 13

DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS

I. GENERAL ASPECTS OF THE DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS

- § 13:1 Introduction to the Doctrine of Equivalents
- § 13:2 Seeks to Prevent a Fraud on the Patent
- § 13:3 Provides Relief from Literalism of Claim Language
- § 13:4 Doctrine Does not Expand the Scope of a Claim

II. PROCEDURAL ASPECTS OF PROVING INFRINGEMENT UNDER THE DOCTRINE OF EQUIVALENTS

- § 13:5 Equivalence is a Fact Issue
- § 13:6 Question for the Jury
- § 13:7 Application of Doctrine of Equivalents is Non-Discretionary
- § 13:8 Particularized Testimony and Linking Argument Required
- § 13:9 Error in Claim Construction
- § 13:10 Special Verdicts

III. SUBSTANTIVE TEST FOR SHOWING EQUIVALENTS

A. The All-Elements Rule

1. General Aspect of All-Elements Rule

- § 13:11 Equivalents Must be Assessed on a Limitation-by-Limitation Basis
- § 13:12 Each Element is Deemed Equally Material and None May be Vitiating
- § 13:13 Compliance is Question of Law Separate from Factual Equivalency

2. Determining Whether an Element is Missing

- § 13:14 One-to-One Element Correspondence is Not Necessary
- § 13:15 —Equivalents to Claim Limitations, Not Individual Components of Limitations

- § 13:16 —Two Components in Accused Device Perform that Done by One Claim Limitation
- § 13:17 —Single Component in Accused Device Satisfies Two Claim Limitations
- § 13:18 Literal Absence of Element Does Not Preclude Equivalents
- § 13:19 Cases Finding Element Missing in Accused Product

3. Vitiating Claim Limitations

- § 13:20 Theory of Equivalence too Broad and Reads Out Limitation
- § 13:21 Cases Finding Theory of Equivalence Vitiating Claim Limitation
- § 13:22 Cases Finding Theory of Equivalence did Not Vitate Claim Limitation

B. The Insubstantial Difference Test

1. General Aspects of the Insubstantial Difference Test

- § 13:23 Insubstantial Differences as the Overriding Test for Doctrine of Equivalence
- § 13:24 Substantiality of Differences Measured from the Perspective of One of Ordinary Skill in the Art
- § 13:25 Substantiality of Differences Measured by Specific Claim Limitations, Not General Attributes of the Invention
- § 13:26 Evidence of Deliberate Copying
- § 13:27 Inferences From Design Around Attempts
- § 13:28 Inferences from Prosecution History as to Substantiality of Differences
- § 13:29 Inferences from Inventor's Statements Outside of PTO

2. Known Interchangeability

- § 13:30 Known Interchangeability Can Support Equivalents
- § 13:31 Physical Interchangeability Not Required
- § 13:32 Need for Independent Experimentation May Defeat Equivalency
- § 13:33 Failed Attempts by Inventor to Use Alleged Equivalent
- § 13:34 Equivalents Not Defeated Because Interchangeability is in the Prior Art

3. Case Examples on Insubstantial Differences

- § 13:35 Cases Finding Differences Were Insubstantial
- § 13:36 Cases Finding Differences Were Substantial

C. The Function-Way-Result Test

§ 13:37 General Aspects of the Function-Way-Result Test

1. Aspects of the “Function”

§ 13:38 Alleged Equivalent Must Perform Same Function

§ 13:39 Inherent Functions of Limitation

§ 13:40 Improper to Read in Additional Functions

§ 13:41 Performance of Additional Functions

§ 13:42 Case Examples Finding Function Absent or Not the Same

2. Aspects of the “Way”

§ 13:43 “Way” Must be the Same

§ 13:44 Cases Finding “Way” Different

§ 13:45 Cases Finding “Way” the Same

3. Aspects of the “Results”

§ 13:46 Same “Result” Must be Achieved, But is Not Sufficient By Itself

§ 13:47 Non-Equivalence at Non-Working Conditions

§ 13:48 Alleged Equivalent Provides Advantages or Better Results than Claimed Element

4. Some Additional Case Examples of Function-Way-Result Test

§ 13:49 Cases Finding Function/Way/Result Met

§ 13:50 Cases Finding Function/Way/Result Not Met

D. Applying the Doctrine of Equivalents to Means-Plus-Function Limitations

§ 13:51 Equivalents of the Claimed Function

§ 13:52 Equivalents of a Structural Equivalent and After-Arising Technology

§ 13:53 Cases Applying Doctrine of Equivalence Analysis Before *Kemco*,
Chiuminatta and *Al-Site*

E. Miscellaneous Aspects of Showing Equivalents

§ 13:54 Future Non-contemplated Equivalents are Protected

§ 13:55 Treatment of Equivalents for Pioneer Inventions

§ 13:56 Separately Patented Accused Device

§ 13:57 Equivalents of an Equivalent

F. Other Case Examples on Specific Contexts Regarding Equivalency

- § 13:58 Difference from Claimed Location
- § 13:59 —Change in Location Did Not Avoid Infringement
- § 13:60 —Change in Location That Avoided Infringement
- § 13:61 Fixed vs. Moveable
- § 13:62 Pair vs. Single Member
- § 13:62.50 – Chemical Inventions
- § 13:62.75 – Biological Inventions

IV. LIMITATIONS ON THE SCOPE OF EQUIVALENTS (NOT INCLUDING PROSECUTION HISTORY ESTOPPEL)

A. Limitations Arising From Narrow Claiming

- § 13:63 Inherent Narrowness of the Specific Claim Language
- § 13:64 Deliberately Claiming Invention Narrowly
- § 13:64.50 Equivalents of Claimed Ranges
- § 13:65 Effect of Availability of Reissue

B. Prior Art Limiting the Range of Equivalents

- § 13:66 Scope of Equivalents Cannot Ensnare the Prior Art
- § 13:67 Accused Infringer Bears Burden to Prove it Practices The Prior Art
- § 13:68 Question of Law

1. The Hypothetical Claim Test

- § 13:69 General Aspects of the Hypothetical Claim Test
- § 13:70 Patentee has Ultimate Burden of Persuasion that the Prior Art Would Permit the Asserted Scope of Equivalents
- § 13:71 Impermissible to Narrow Claim in any Respect
- § 13:72 No Obligation of District Court to Perform Hypothetical Claim Analysis
- § 13:73 Scope of Permissible Equivalents Not Necessarily As Broad As the Prior Art Might Permit
- § 13:74 Prior Art Must be Applied to Claim as a Whole, Not Just an Individual Element

C. Disclaimers of Equivalents

- § 13:75 Disclaimers of Equivalents May Arise from the Claims or Specification
- § 13:76 Disclaimed Equivalent is Question of Law

LATIMER, MAYBERRY & MATTHEWS

Intellectual Property Law, LLP

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

- § 13:77 Disclaimer from Express Claim Language
- § 13:78 —Cases Finding Alleged Equivalent Disclaimed by Express Claim Language
- § 13:79 —Cases Finding Alleged Equivalent Not Disclaimed
- § 13:80 Disclaimers Resulting from Statements in Specification
- § 13:81 —Cases Finding Statements in Specification Disclaimed Alleged Equivalent
- § 13:81.50 {Reserved} —Cases Finding Statements did Not Disclaim Equivalent

D. Disclosure-Dedication Rule for Nonclaimed Alternatives In Specification

- § 13:82 Public Dedication of Equivalents Disclosed but not Claimed
- § 13:83 Question of Law
- § 13:84 Level of Specificity of Disclosed Alleged Equivalent
- § 13:85 Cases Finding Alleged Equivalent Dedicated to the Public
- § 13:86 Cases Finding Alleged Equivalent Not Dedicated to the Public