

ANNOTATED PATENT DIGEST

by Robert A. Matthews, Jr.

© 2005-07 Thomson-West, All Rights Reserved

CHAPTER 20 UTILITY & ENABLEMENT

I. STATUTORY SUBJECT MATTER UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

A. General Aspects of Determining Statutory Subject Matter

- § 20:1 Extent of Patentable Subject Matter
- § 20:2 —Process
- § 20:3 —Machine
- § 20:4 —Manufacture
- § 20:5 —Composition of Matter
- § 20:6 Non-patentable Subject Matter
- § 20:7 Question of Law or of Fact
- § 20:8 Must Analyze Claim as a Whole to Determine if Statutory Subject Matter is Claimed

B. Specific Types of Subject Matter

- § 20:9 Ideas or Results by Themselves are Not Patentable
- § 20:10 Laws of Nature and Natural Products
- § 20:11 —Application of Natural Laws
- § 20:12 Plants
- § 20:13 Living Organisms
- § 20:14 Mathematical Algorithms/Computer Programs
- § 20:15 —Cases Finding Invention With Mathematical Algorithm Had Patentable Statutory Subject Matter
- § 20:16 —Cases Finding Invention With Mathematical Algorithm Lacked Patentable Statutory Subject Matter
- § 20:17 Pure or Synthetic Forms of Naturally Occurring Compositions
- § 20:18 Methods of Doing Business
- § 20:19 Printed Matter

LATIMER, MAYBERRY & MATTHEWS

Intellectual Property Law, LLP

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

- § 20:20 —Only Machine Readable Printed Matter
- § 20:21 Illegal or Immoral Subject Matter
- § 20:21.50 “Use” Claims

II. UTILITY UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 101

A. Substantive Aspects on Utility

- § 20:22 Requirement of Utility
- § 20:23 Definition of “Useful” – Provide Some Benefit
- § 20:24 Commercial Success and Utility
- § 20:25 Total Inoperability Defeats Utility
- § 20:26 Inventor Does Not Have to Understand or Explain Scientific Principles of the Invention
- § 20:27 Inventions Only Constructively Reduced to Practice
- § 20:28 Utility for Chemical Process and Product Patents

B. Challenges on Whether Claimed Invention Lacks Utility

- § 20:29 Lack of Utility is a Question of Fact
- § 20:30 Measured by the Scope of the Claimed Invention
- § 20:31 Utility as a Defense to Infringement
- § 20:32 Utility Challenges in the PTO
- § 20:33 Cases Finding Invention Lacked Utility
- § 20:34 Cases Finding Sufficient Utility Existed

III. ENABLEMENT UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 1

- § 20:35 General Aspects of the Requirement of an Enabling Disclosure

A. Procedural Aspects

- § 20:36 Question of Law
- § 20:37 Clear and Convincing Evidence
- § 20:38 Claim Construction First
- § 20:39 Presumption of Validity Not Heightened
- § 20:40 Patent Office’s Burden

B. Scope of Enablement

- § 20:41 How to Make
- § 20:42 —Starting Materials

LATIMER, MAYBERRY & MATTHEWS

Intellectual Property Law, LLP

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

- § 20:43 How to Use
- § 20:44 Commensurate with Claim Scope
- § 20:44.50 Open-Ended Claim Limitations
- § 20:45 No Lower Requirement for Pioneer Inventions
- § 20:46 Enabling Unclaimed Elements Generally Not Required
- § 20:47 Impact of Accused Product in the Enablement Analysis
- § 20:48 Enabling of any One Mode Suffices
- § 20:49 Need Not Enable Commercial Embodiment
- § 20:50 Chemical versus Mechanical Inventions

C. Standards of Determining Enablement

- § 20:51 Basic Test – Undue Experimentation
- § 20:52 —Some Experimentation Is Permissible
- § 20:53 —The *Wands* Factors
- § 20:54 Based on One of Ordinary Skill in the Art
- § 20:55 Judge by Entire Specification
- § 20:56 Working and Prophetic Examples
- § 20:57 Need Not Teach What is Well Known
- § 20:58 May Need Greater Disclosure for Emerging Technology
- § 20:59 Failed Attempts to Make Invention
- § 20:60 Disclosing a Predicted Results But Not How to Actually Achieve that Result Does not Suffice
- § 20:61 Judged as of the Application Filing Date
- § 20:62 § 103 Secondary Considerations Generally Not Relevant
- § 20:62.50 —Patent Specification Itself Teaches Away
- § 20:63 Cannot Use Post-Filing Publications to Fill in Gaps in State of the Art
- § 20:63.50 Post-Filing Publications Showing the State of the Art as of the Filing Date
- § 20:64 Post-Filing Developments Cannot Defeat Previously Enabled Claims

D. Inoperable Embodiments

- § 20:65 Wholly Inoperative Devices
- § 20:66 Inoperative Species Within Scope of Claim
- § 20:67 Inoperability Arising from Adding Something
- § 20:68 Alternative Inoperative Embodiments in Specification

E. Enablement of Specific Types of Subject Matter

- § 20:69 Enablement of Software Disclosures

LATIMER, MAYBERRY & MATTHEWS

Intellectual Property Law, LLP

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

F. Representative Enablement Cases

- § 20:70 Affirming a Finding Disclosure Enabling
- § 20:71 Reversing a Finding The Disclosure was Not Enabling
- § 20:72 Affirming a Finding Disclosure Not Enabling
- § 20:73 Reversing a Finding that Disclosure was Enabling