

ANNOTATED PATENT DIGEST

by Robert A. Matthews, Jr.

© 2005-07 Thomson-West, All Rights Reserved

CHAPTER 29 DESIGN PATENTS

I. GENERAL ASPECTS OF DESIGN PATENTS

- § 29:1 Availability of Design Patents
- § 29:2 Applicability of Provisions of Title 35 Relating to Utility Patents
- § 29:3 Modification of § 119 Priority and § 102(d) Foreign Patent Grace Period
- § 29:4 Fourteen-Year Term
- § 29:5 Content of a Design Patent Application
- § 29:6 —Design Drawing
- § 29:7 —Single Claim – Drawing as Shown

II. CLAIM CONSTRUCTION OF DESIGN PATENTS

- § 29:8 Design Patents Subject to Claim Construction
- § 29:9 Construction Should Focus on Ornamental Features from Visual Perspective
- § 29:10 Intrinsic Evidence for Construing Design Patent
- § 29:11 Claimed Design may be Only for a Portion of the Article
- § 29:12 Color may Count

III. VALIDITY OF DESIGN PATENTS

A. General Aspects of Validity Considerations for Design Patents

- § 29:13 Validity Requirement of Utility Patents Generally Applicable to Design Patents
- § 29:14 Presumption of Validity Applied to Design Patents
- § 29:15 Utility Does Not Equate with Beauty
- § 29:16 Design Must be Ornamental, Not Functional
- § 29:17 Some Functionality Will Not Invalidate Claim
- § 29:17.50 Originality
- § 29:18 Manner Design Created Irrelevant

LATIMER, MAYBERRY & MATTHEWS

Intellectual Property Law, LLP

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

- § 29:19 Patentability of Mating Component Not Relevant to Validity
- § 29:20 Visibility to Observer During Normal and Intended Use

B. Novelty Requirements for Design Patents

- § 29:21 Test for Anticipation
- § 29:22 —Application of the Point of Novelty Test
- § 29:23 On-Sale and Public-Use Bar
- § 29:24 Limited Experimental-Use Negation

C. Obviousness Requirements for Design Patents

- § 29:25 The Requirement of Nonobviousness Applies to Design Patents
- § 29:26 Restrict Analysis to Claimed Visual Appearance and Not Generalized Design Concept
- § 29:27 Viewed From Perspective of Ordinary Designer
- § 29:28 Combining References – “The Primary Reference” Requirement
- § 29:29 Scope of Prior Art and Analogous Art
- § 29:30 Graham Factors are Applicable
- § 29:31 —Commercial Success
- § 29:32 —Copying
- § 29:30 —Teaching Away

D. Other Validity Considerations

- § 29:34 Indefiniteness and Claiming What the Applicant Regards as Its Invention
- § 29:35 Best Mode, Enablement, and Written Description Requirements
- § 29:36 Benefit of Filing Date of Earlier Applications
- § 29:37 Inventorship
- § 29:38 Double Patenting with Utility Patents

IV. INFRINGEMENT OF DESIGN PATENTS

A. Statutory Basis of Infringement Liability

- § 29:39 The Statutory Provisions Relevant to Defining Infringement
- § 29:40 Question of Fact that Patentee Must Prove
- § 29:41 Overview of Tests for Design Patent Infringement

B. The First Test – Substantial Similarity to an Ordinary Observer

1. General Aspects of the Ordinary Observer Test

- § 29:42 The Supreme Court’s Ordinary Observer Test of *Gorham*
- § 29:43 Question of Fact
- § 29:44 Comparison Limited to Ornamental Features of the Claimed Design
- § 29:45 Comparison is Not to the Overall Design Concept
- § 29:46 Whole Ornamental Design Must be Considered
- § 29:47 Ornamental Differences in Accused Product may Not be Ignored
- § 29:48 Presence of Same Functional Features Not Relevant
- § 29:49 Comparison to Patentee’s Commercial Embodiment
- § 29:50 Features Visible During Product Life, Not Just Those Visible When Sold
- § 29:51 The Ordinary Observer is the Actual Purchaser
- § 29:52 Empirical Evidence of Consumer Confusion
- § 29:53 Differences in Intended Market Not a Defense
- § 29:54 Accused Infringer’s Intent to Copy Commercial Embodiment Irrelevant
- § 29:55 Labeling Does Not Avoid Infringement

2. Case Examples Applying Ordinary-Observer Test

- § 29:56 Finding Infringement
- § 29:57 Finding Noninfringement

C. The Second Test – Point of Novelty

1. General Aspects of the Point of Novelty Test

- § 29:58 Case Origin of the Point of Novelty Test
- § 29:59 Definition of the “Points of Novelty”
- § 29:60 Proving the Points of Novelty
- § 29:61 Point-of-Novelty Test May Not be Merged with the Ordinary Observer Test to Ignore Non-novel Ornamental Differences
- § 29:62 Entire Design May Not be the “Point of Novelty”
- § 29:62.50 Point of Novelty May Not be the “New” Combination of Features in the Prior Art
- § 29:63 Point-of-Novelty Test Need Not be Applied if the Ordinary Observer Test Not Met
- § 29:64 Potential Relevance to Determining Materiality for Inequitable Conduct

LATIMER, MAYBERRY & MATTHEWS

Intellectual Property Law, LLP

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

2. Case Examples Applying Point-of-Novelty Test

- § 29:65 Points of Novelty Not Appropriated
- § 29:66 Points of Novelty Found In Design

D. Doctrine of Equivalents Applied to Design Patents

- § 29:67 Confusion Created by *Gorham*
- § 29:68 Total Absence of a Point of Novelty Precludes Infringement Under the Doctrine of Equivalents

E. Prosecution-History Estoppel

- § 29:69 Prosecution-History Estoppel Arising from Restriction Requirement

V. REMEDIES FOR DESIGN PATENT INFRINGEMENT

A. Compensatory Damages for Infringement Under § 284

- § 29:70 Reasonable Royalty or Lost Profits
- § 29:70.50 Entire Market Value Rule

B. Alternative Profit Recovery for Design Patent Infringement Under § 289

- § 29:71 Disgorgement of Infringer's Profits § 289
- § 29:71.50 Joint Infringers and Joint Liability Under § 289
- § 29:72 Limited to Profit From Sales of Infringing Product
- § 29:73 No Apportionment Between Design and Unpatented Article to Which it is Affixed
- § 29:74 Potentially No Double Recovery if Utility Patent also Infringed
- § 29:75 Enhanced Damages Not Available
- § 29:76 Must Comply with Marking Statute

C. Preliminary Injunctive Relief

- § 29:77 Preliminary Injunctive Relief
- § 29:78 Cases Reversing or Vacating a Preliminary Injunction or Affirming a Denial Thereof
- § 29:79 Cases Affirming a Preliminary Injunction or Reversing or Vacating a Denial Thereof