

ANNOTATED PATENT DIGEST

by Robert A. Matthews, Jr.

© 2005-07 Thomson-West, All Rights Reserved

CHAPTER 18 OBVIOUSNESS

I. ORIGINS OF OBVIOUSNESS

- § 18:1 The Constitutional Requirement of Invention
- § 18:2 The Supreme Court's Historical Requirement of "Invention" as Requiring More than the Work of a Skillful Mechanic
- § 18:3 Statutory Codification of Obviousness Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)
- § 18:4 The Analytical Framework of Obviousness Under *Graham v. John Deere*

II. PROCEDURAL ASPECTS REGARDING OBVIOUSNESS CHALLENGES

- § 18:5 Overall Two-Step Analysis with Claim Construction First
- § 18:6 Question of Law with Underlying Factual Inquires
- § 18:7 May be Decided by a Jury
- § 18:8 District Court Must Consider and Make Findings Regarding *Graham* Factors
- § 18:9 Applicability of Rule 52(c) to District Court's Findings on *Graham* Factors
- § 18:10 Clearly Erroneous Standard of Review Applies to the Underlying Findings of Fact
- § 18:11 Expert Testimony in Obviousness Analyses
- § 18:12 Conclusory Expert Testimony Not Sufficient to Establish Obviousness
- § 18:13 Presumption of Validity
- § 18:14 The Patent Examiner's *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness

III. SPECIFIC FACTORS IN ANALYZING OBVIOUSNESS

A. Overall Factors

- § 18:15 The *Graham* Factors
- § 18:16 Must Consider Claimed Invention as a Whole

LATIMER, MAYBERRY & MATTHEWS

Intellectual Property Law, LLP

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

- § 18:17 Based on the Totality of the Circumstances
- § 18:18 Differences Alone Do Not Establish Nonobviousness
- § 18:18.50 Differences Based on Unclaimed Characteristics
- § 18:19 Hindsight Impermissible
- § 18:20 Reasonable Expectation of Success
- § 18:21 Obvious-to-Try
- § 18:22 Simplicity of Invention Irrelevant
- § 18:23 Manner Invention Conceived Irrelevant
- § 18:24 Inherent Aspects of the Invention

B. Scope of Prior Art and Analogous Art

- § 18:25 Prior-Art Reference Applicable for All That it Teaches
- § 18:26 Level of Enablement for Prior-Art References
- § 18:27 Prior Art Must be Analogous
- § 18:28 Test for Analogous Art
- § 18:29 Question of Fact
- § 18:30 Field of the Endeavor
- § 18:31 Reasonably Pertinent Reference

C. Level of Skill in the Art

- § 18:32 Obviousness Must be Based on One of Ordinary Skill in the Art
- § 18:33 Determining the Level of Skill in the Art
- § 18:34 The “Hypothetical Person of Ordinary Skill”
- § 18:35 Inventor’s Level of Skill not Relevant
- § 18:36 Geographic Considerations
- § 18:37 Level Based on Skill at the Time Invention was Made

D. Other Considerations

- § 18:38 Unpredictable Arts
- § 18:39 Anticipation is the Ultimate Form of Obviousness
- § 18:40 Obvious for Some Embodiments While Unobvious for Others

IV. MODIFYING OR COMBINING REFERENCES TO ESTABLISH OBVIOUSNESS

- § 18:41 Modification of Reference Rendering Claim Obvious

LATIMER, MAYBERRY & MATTHEWS

Intellectual Property Law, LLP

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

- § 18:42 Prior Art References Can be Combined for Obviousness, but not Anticipation
- § 18:43 Required Motivation to Combine References Independent From the Invention
- § 18:44 Motivation Explicit in the Prior Art
- § 18:45 Motivation May be Implicit in the Prior Art
- § 18:46 In Narrow Field Motivation May Come From Reference Itself
- § 18:47 Inherent Knowledge of One Skilled in the Art
- § 18:48 Nature of Problem May Provide Motivation
- § 18:49 Motivation May be Proven by Evidence that Does not Rise to the Level of Prior Art
- § 18:50 Resulting Combination Does not Need to be the Preferred Combination
- § 18:51 Motivation to Combine Does Not Have to Match Inventor's Reasons
- § 18:52 References that Teach Away Cannot be Combined
- § 18:53 Inability to Physically Combine Aspects of Prior Art
- § 18:54 Cases Finding Motivation to Combine References to Render Claim Obvious
- § 18:55 Cases Finding Motivation Lacking to Combine References to Render Claim Obvious
- § 18:56 Patent Office Filling In Gaps With "Common Knowledge"
- § 18:57 Approved Jury Instructions
- § 18:58 Limitation on Combining Some Types of Prior Art Under § 103(c)

V. CASE EXAMPLES REGARDING SPECIFIC TYPES OF INVENTIONS

- § 18:59 Substituting Material of Manufacture or Selecting Material From List
- § 18:60 —Cases Finding Material Substitution was Obvious
- § 18:61 —Cases Finding Material Substitution was Not Obvious
- § 18:62 Combining Items in Prior Art
- § 18:63 —Aggregation Versus Invention
- § 18:64 —Cases Finding Unpatentable Aggregation or Combination
- § 18:65 —Cases Finding Patentable Combination
- § 18:66 New Use, Modification, or Application of an Old Device
- § 18:67 —Cases Finding New Application of Old Device Obvious
- § 18:68 —Cases Finding New Application of Old Device Patentable
- § 18:69 New Use or Application of an Old Process
- § 18:70 —Cases Finding New Use of Old Process Obvious
- § 18:70.5 {Reserved}—Cases Finding New Use of Old Process Patentable
- § 18:71 Better Practice of the Prior Art but Without New Components or Steps

LATIMER, MAYBERRY & MATTHEWS

Intellectual Property Law, LLP

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

- § 18:72 —Cases Finding Enhanced Performance Obvious
- § 18:73 —Cases Finding Enhanced Performance was Patentable
- § 18:74 Omitting Element From Prior Art
- § 18:74.25 —Cases Finding Omitting Element Obvious
- § 18:74.50 —Cases Finding Omitting Element Patentable
- § 18:75 Increasing or Decreasing Quantity of a Specific Element
- § 18:76 Changing Size
- § 18:77 —Cases Finding Change in Size Obvious
- § 18:77.50 {Reserved}—Cases Finding Change in Size Patentable
- § 18:78 Changing Location
- § 18:79 —Cases Finding Location Change Obvious
- § 18:80 —Cases Finding Location Change Patentable
- § 18:81 Prior Art Process Rendering Resulting Product Obvious
- § 18:82 Prior Art Product and Process for Using Product
- § 18:83 Prior Art Product and Process for Making Product
- § 18:84 Overlap of Claimed Ranges with Ranges Shown in Prior Art
- § 18:85 Chemicals with Structural Similarities
- § 18:86 —Cases Finding Chemical Invention Not Obvious Despite Structural Similarity
- § 18:87 —Cases Finding Structural Similarity in Chemicals Rendered Invention Obvious

VI. SECONDARY (OBJECTIVE) CONSIDERATIONS IN AN OBVIOUSNESS ANALYSIS

A. General Aspects of Using Secondary Considerations

- § 18:88 In General
- § 18:89 District Court and PTO Must Evaluate Secondary Considerations When Offered
- § 18:90 Secondary Considerations are Part of the Obviousness Determination, They do Not Apply as Rebuttal Evidence
- § 18:91 Required Nexus
- § 18:92 Can't Trump Clear Case of Obviousness
- § 18:93 Secondary Considerations Can Preclude Summary Judgment

B. Commercial Success

- § 18:94 Commercial Success Attributed to Patented Invention

LATIMER, MAYBERRY & MATTHEWS

Intellectual Property Law, LLP

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

§ 18:95 Commercial Success Not a Requirement for Validity

1. Requirement of Nexus

§ 18:96 Commercial Success Must Have Nexus with Claimed Invention

§ 18:97 Patented Invention Need Not be Sole Reason for the Success

§ 18:98 Presumption of Nexus

§ 18:99 Success of any One Embodiment May Suffice

§ 18:100 Features in Prior Art

§ 18:101 Unclaimed Features

2. Proving Commercial Success by Sales Data

§ 18:102 Gross Sales Data Without Market Share Data Insufficient

§ 18:103 Use of Survey Evidence to Show Nexus

§ 18:104 Foreign Sales Count for Commercial Success

§ 18:105 Infringer's Sales Count

3. Case Examples Regarding Commercial Success

§ 18:106 Cases Finding Commercial Success Overcame Obviousness Challenge

§ 18:107 Cases Finding Insufficient Proof of Nexus Between Sales and Claimed Invention

§ 18:108 Cases Finding Commercial Success Proven But Nevertheless Insufficient to Defeat Obviousness

§ 18:109 Cases Finding Commercial Success Insufficient to Overcome Aggregation

C. Teaching Away

§ 18:110 Substantive Aspects of "Teaching Away" Showing Nonobviousness

§ 18:111 Cases Finding Not Obvious Because Prior Art Taught Away

§ 18:112 Cases Rejecting Contention That Prior Art Taught Away

D. Long Felt Need

§ 18:113 Substantive Aspects of "Long-Felt Need" Showing Nonobviousness

§ 18:114 Cases Finding Long-Felt Need Overcame Obviousness Challenge

§ 18:115 Cases Finding Alleged Long-Felt Need Insufficient to Defeat Obviousness Challenge

E. Unexpected Results

§ 18:116 Substantive Aspects of "Unexpected Results" Showing Nonobviousness

LATIMER, MAYBERRY & MATTHEWS

Intellectual Property Law, LLP

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

- § 18:117 “Unexpected Results” is a Factual Inquiry
- § 18:118 Proving “Unexpectedness” of the Results
- § 18:119 Must be Based on Knowledge at the Time of the Invention
- § 18:120 Use of Post-Issuance Evidence and Discovered Properties or Benefits
- § 18:121 Results Must be Commensurate with Scope of Claim
- § 18:122 Any Single Property or Use, Even if Unclaimed, Must be Considered
- § 18:123 Unexpected Results From Claimed Ranges
- § 18:124 Unexpected Results of Examples Disclosed but Not Claimed Don’t Count
- § 18:125 Compare the Claimed Invention with the Closest Prior Art
- § 18:126 —Identifying the “Closest Prior Art”
- § 18:127 Indirect Comparisons Permitted
- § 18:128 No Requirement that Unexpected Results Must be Achieved
- § 18:129 Cases Finding Unexpected Results Overcame Obviousness Challenge
- § 18:130 Cases Finding Unexpected Results Proven, but Not Sufficient to Overcome Obviousness Shown by Prior Art
- § 18:131 Cases Finding Alleged Unexpected Results Did Not Compare with the Closest Prior Art or Claimed Invention
- § 18:132 Cases Finding Alleged Superior Results Not Shown to Rise to Level of Being Unexpected

F. Copying

- § 18:133 Substantive Aspects of “Copying” Showing Nonobviousness
- § 18:134 Nexus of Copying to the Claimed Invention
- § 18:135 Cases Finding Evidence of Copying Helped Overcome Obviousness Challenge
- § 18:136 Cases Finding Evidence of Copying Did Not Defeat Obviousness Challenge

G. Other Secondary Considerations

- § 18:137 Unsuccessful Attempts by Others, Including the Accused Infringer, to Make the Invention
- § 18:138 Acquiescence by Licensing or the Like
- § 18:139 Skepticism, Incredulity or Surprise of Skilled Artisans
- § 18:140 Peer Recognition
- § 18:141 Contemporaneous Invention by Others or Absence Thereof