

Contents

Preface

xxvii

Chapter 1	Foundations of the U.S. Patent System	1
A.	Introduction and Chapter Overview	1
B.	Why Study Patent Law?	2
1.	Rise of the Information-Based Economy	2
2.	Educational Prerequisites	7
C.	What Is a Patent?	8
1.	Patents as a Form of Intellectual Property	8
2.	The Appropriability Problem of Intellectual Property	8
3.	Public Goods	9
4.	Exception to the General Rule of Competition by Imitation	11
5.	The Patent Document and Its Components	12
6.	The Negative Right to Exclude	18
7.	The Patent Term	21
D.	Economic Considerations	25
1.	Is a Patent a Monopoly?	26
2.	Cost/Benefit Analysis for Patents	27
a.	Costs	28
b.	Benefits	31
E.	Philosophical Rationales for Patent Protection	33
1.	Natural Rights	34
2.	Reward for Services Rendered	35
3.	Monopoly Profits Incentive	35
4.	Exchange for Secrets	36
F.	Primary Sources of U.S. Patent Law	37
1.	The Constitution	37
2.	Federal Statutes and Regulations	38
3.	Case Law	41
G.	Adjudicatory Forums for Patent Matters	45
1.	U.S. District Courts	45
a.	Subject Matter Jurisdiction and Venue	45
(i)	Subject Matter Jurisdiction	45

Contents

(ii) Venue	49
b. Civil Actions Against the USPTO Director in the Eastern District of Virginia	53
2. U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit	54
3. USPTO Patent Trial and Appeal Board (PTAB)	59
4. U.S. International Trade Commission	60
H. Patent Prosecution Overview	63
1. Introduction	63
2. Filing the Application	63
3. Examination by the USPTO	66
a. Sample Office Action and Applicant's Response	70
4. Publication of Pending Patent Applications	73
5. Continuing Application Practice	76
6. Double Patenting	82
a. Introduction	82
b. Two Forms	82
c. Policy Concerns	83
d. Comparing Claims with Claims	86
e. Case Study	86
f. Terminal Disclaimers	89
Chapter 2 Patent Claims	91
A. Introduction	91
1. Historical Development of Patent Claiming	91
2. Definition of a Patent Claim	92
3. A Key Reference Work	94
B. Claim Definiteness Requirement (35 U.S.C. §112(b))	94
1. Own Lexicographer Rule	94
2. Definiteness Standards	96
a. Introduction	96
b. Supreme Court Adjusts the Standard (<i>Nautilus</i> (U.S. 2014))	101
c. Judicial Correction of Errors in Patent Claims	117
3. Antecedent Basis	120
C. Anatomy of a Patent Claim	121
1. Preamble	121
2. Transition	123
a. "Comprising" Transition	123
b. "Consisting of" Transition	126
c. "Consisting Essentially of" Transition	127
3. Body	127
D. Independent and Dependent Claims	130
E. Specialized Claiming Formats	132

Contents

1. Means-Plus-Function Claim Elements (35 U.S.C. §112(f))	132
a. Introduction	132
b. Interpreting the Scope of Means-Plus-Function Elements	135
(i) Scope-Narrowing Operation	135
(ii) Timing of Statutory Equivalents	136
(iii) Presumptions	137
c. Distinguishing §112(f) Statutory Equivalents and the Doctrine of Equivalents	144
2. Product-by-Process Claims	145
3. <i>Jepson</i> Claims	150
4. <i>Markush</i> Claims	151
5. <i>Beauregard</i> Claims	152
Chapter 3 Disclosure Requirements (35 U.S.C. §112(a))	159
A. Introduction	159
1. The Statutory Framework	159
2. Disclosure as <i>Quid Pro Quo</i>	161
3. Timing of Disclosure Compliance	162
B. The Enablement Requirement	166
1. Undue Experimentation	166
2. <i>Wands</i> Factor: Predictable Versus Unpredictable Inventions	170
3. <i>Wands</i> Factor: Scope of the Claims	172
4. <i>Wands</i> Factor: Working Examples	182
5. Nascent and After-Arising Technology	183
C. The Best Mode Requirement	185
1. Best Mode Scale-Back by America Invents Act of 2011	185
2. Distinguishing Best Mode from Enablement	187
3. Policy Rationale	188
4. The <i>Chemcast</i> Analysis	190
a. Step 1: Subjective Inquiry	190
b. Step 2: Objective Inquiry	191
5. Scope of the Best Mode Obligation	192
6. Is Intentional Concealment Required?	195
D. The Written Description of the Invention Requirement	200
1. Timing Mechanism	201
2. How an Application Conveys Possession of an Invention	203
3. Distinguishing Written Description from Enablement	209

Contents

4. Typical Fact Scenarios Invoking Written Description Scrutiny	210
5. Federal Circuit’s Expansion of the Written Description Requirement	212
a. Regents of Univ. of Cal. v. Eli Lilly (1997)	213
b. Univ. of Rochester v. G.D. Searle (2004)	217
c. Carnegie Mellon Univ. v. Hoffman-La Roche (2008)	220
d. Ariad Pharms. v. Eli Lilly (2010) (en banc)	221
e. AbbVie Deutschland v. Janssen Biotech (2014)	231
f. Concluding Thoughts	237

Chapter 4 Novelty, Loss of Right, and Priority Pre- and Post-America Invents Act of 2011 (35 U.S.C. §102) 239

<i>Guide to This Chapter</i>	239
<i>Part I: General Principles of Anticipation</i>	240
A. The Meaning of Anticipation	241
B. Burden of Proof	241
C. The Strict Identity Rule of Anticipation	242
1. In General	242
2. The Special Case of Species/Genus Anticipation	243
D. Anticipation by Inherency	245
E. Enablement Standard for Anticipatory Prior Art	247
F. What Is a Printed Publication?	250
<i>Part II: Novelty, Loss of Right, and Priority Pre-America Invents Act of 2011</i>	260
G. Introduction	260
1. Statutory Basis	260
2. Geographic Distinctions	263
3. Who Is the Actor?	264
4. Distinguishing Novelty from Loss of Right	265
H. “Known or Used” Under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) (Pre-AIA)	266
I. The Statutory Bars of 35 U.S.C. §102(b) (Pre-AIA)	269
1. Introduction	269
2. Grace Period	271
3. Section 102(b) Public Use	273
a. Inventor’s Control	273
b. Acts by Third Parties	276
c. “Secret” Public Use?	278
d. Adding a “Ready for Patenting” Requirement for “Public Use”	279

Contents

4.	Section 102(b) On Sale Bar	289
a.	Introduction	289
b.	Is Claimed Invention “Ready for Patenting”?	291
c.	Is Claimed Invention the Subject of a Commercial Offer for Sale?	292
5.	Experimental Use Negation of the §102(b) Bars	305
J.	Abandonment Under 35 U.S.C. §102(c) (Pre-AIA)	310
K.	Foreign Patenting Bar of 35 U.S.C. §102(d) (Pre-AIA)	311
L.	Description in Another’s Earlier-Filed Patent or Published Patent Application Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) (Pre-AIA)	313
1.	In General	313
2.	Attempted Reliance on Provisional Application Filing Date as Effective Date for §102(e) Reference (Rule of <i>In re Wertheim</i>)	317
M.	Derivation and Inventorship Under 35 U.S.C. §102(f) (Pre-AIA)	322
1.	Derivation	323
2.	Who Is an Inventor?	324
3.	Correction of Inventorship	325
4.	Joint Inventors	326
N.	Prior Invention Under 35 U.S.C. §102(g) (Pre-AIA)	326
1.	Introduction	326
2.	Interference Proceedings Under §102(g)(1)	327
3.	Anticipation Under §102(g)(2)	329
a.	Introduction	329
b.	Prior Invention Must Not Be “Abandoned, Suppressed, or Concealed”	330
c.	Geographic Requirements	332
d.	Section 102(g)(2) as Invalidity Defense	337
e.	Expansion of the Role of §102(g)	337
4.	Applying the Priority Rule of §102(g)	338
O.	Antedating (or “Swearing Behind”) Prior Art (Pre-AIA)	341
	<i>Part III: Novelty and Priority Post-America Invents Act of 2011</i>	343
P.	Introduction	343
1.	Statutory Basis	347
2.	Sense of Congress and Legislative History	349
3.	Comparing Pre- and Post-AIA Frameworks	351
a.	What Section 3 of the AIA Retained	353
b.	What Section 3 of the AIA Changed	353
Q.	Presumptively Novelty-Destroying Events Under Post-AIA 35 U.S.C. §102(a)(1)	359
1.	Invention “Patented, Described in a Printed Publication, or in Public Use, [or] on Sale” Before Effective Filing Date	360

Contents

2.	Invention “Otherwise Available to the Public” Before Effective Filing Date	362
3.	Does the AIA Permit Secret Prior Art?	363
R.	Presumptively Novelty-Destroying Events Under Post-AIA 35 U.S.C. §102(a)(2)	378
S.	Novelty-Preserving Exceptions Under Post-AIA 35 U.S.C. §102(b)	382
1.	Introduction	382
2.	Post-AIA §102(b)(1): Shields Against Post-AIA §102(a)(1) Presumptively Novelty-Destroying Events	383
a.	(A)-Type Exceptions	383
b.	(B)-Type Exceptions	386
3.	Post-AIA §102(b)(2): Shields Against Post-AIA §102(a)(2) Presumptively Novelty-Destroying Events	387
a.	(A)-Type Exceptions	388
b.	(B)-Type Exceptions	390
T.	Effective Date for AIA §3 First-Inventor-to-File Amendments	390
U.	Common Ownership Under Joint Research Agreements	393

Chapter 5 The Nonobviousness Requirement (35 U.S.C. §103) 397

A.	Introduction	397
B.	Historical Context: The <i>Hotchkiss</i> “Ordinary Mechanic” and the Requirement for “Invention”	399
C.	Enactment of §103 of the Patent Act of 1952, Incorporating the Requirement of Nonobviousness	402
D.	The <i>Graham v. John Deere</i> Framework for Analyzing Nonobviousness	403
1.	Constitutionality of 35 U.S.C. §103	404
2.	<i>Graham</i> ’s Analytical Framework for a §103 Analysis	405
E.	<i>Graham</i> Factor: Level of Ordinary Skill in the Art	405
F.	<i>Graham</i> Factor: Scope and Content of the Prior Art	410
1.	Terminology	410
2.	Sources of Prior Art	411
3.	Section 102/103 Overlap	412
a.	Overview	412
b.	<i>In re Bass</i> (CCPA 1973)	414
c.	1984 Amendments	417
d.	AIPA (1999) Amendments	417
e.	CREATE Act (2004) Amendments	418
f.	AIA (2011) Amendments	419
g.	European Comparison	420
4.	Analogous Art	420

Contents

G.	<i>Graham</i> Factor: Differences Between Claimed Invention and Prior Art	430
H.	<i>Graham</i> Factor: Secondary Considerations	432
1.	The Weight to Be Accorded Secondary Considerations Evidence	434
a.	Criticality in Federal Circuit Era	434
b.	Diverging Views	434
2.	Requirement for Explicit Analysis	443
3.	The Nexus Requirement for Evidence of Commercial Success	445
I.	Combining the Disclosures of Prior Art References to Establish Obviousness	448
1.	Teaching, Suggestion, or Motivation to Combine	448
a.	Generally	448
b.	Nature of Problem	449
c.	Reasonable Expectation of Success	450
2.	<i>KSR v. Teleflex</i> : Combinations, Predictability, and “Common Sense”	452
3.	Teaching Away	458
4.	“Obvious to Try”	463
5.	Unexpected Results	466
a.	Generally	466
b.	Timing of Evidence	469
c.	Placement in <i>Graham</i> Framework	478
J.	The <i>Prima Facie</i> Case of Obviousness	479
K.	Federal Circuit Standards of Review in §103 Determinations	486
1.	USPTO	486
2.	Federal District Court	489
Chapter 6 The Utility Requirement (35 U.S.C. §101)		491
A.	Introduction	491
B.	Practical/Real-World Utility	491
C.	The Supreme Court View	495
1.	<i>Brenner v. Manson</i> (1966)	495
2.	USPTO Implementing Guidelines	496
D.	The Federal Circuit View	498
1.	Chemical Compounds	498
2.	Methods of Medical Treatment	503
3.	Genetic Inventions	505
E.	Inoperability	508
1.	Examples of Inoperable Inventions	508
2.	Inoperable Species Within a Genus	509

Contents

F.	Immoral or Deceptive Inventions	510
G.	Relationship Between Utility Requirement of §101 and How-to-Use Requirement of §112(a)	513
H.	Utility Requirement in Foreign Patent Systems	513
	1. Industrial Applicability	513
	2. Morality Criterion	514

Chapter 7 Potentially Patentable Subject Matter (35 U.S.C. §101) 517

A.	Introduction	517
	1. The General Nature of §101	517
	2. The Statutory Categories of §101	519
	3. Claiming the Inventive Concept Within Different Statutory Categories	520
	4. Exceptions to §101	522
B.	Section 101 Processes	525
	1. Basic Principles	525
	2. Process Versus Product	527
	3. Computer-Implemented Processes	527
	4. Business Methods	530
	a. <i>State Street Bank</i> (Fed. Cir. 1998)	530
	b. <i>Bilski</i> (U.S. 2010)	534
	c. <i>Mayo</i> (U.S. 2012)	545
	d. <i>Alice Corp.</i> (U.S. 2014)	546
	e. Federal Circuit “Abstract Idea” Cases After <i>Alice Corp.</i>	554
	(i) Decisions Sustaining Patent Eligibility at Step One	560
	(ii) Decisions Sustaining Patent Eligibility at Step Two	572
	5. Methods of Medical Treatment	591
	a. <i>Mayo v. Prometheus</i> (U.S. 2012)	591
	b. Federal Circuit Applications of <i>Mayo</i>	597
C.	Section 101 Machines	616
D.	Section 101 Compositions of Matter	618
	1. Structure Versus Properties	619
	2. Products of Nature	620
	a. Purified Forms of Natural Products	620
	b. Genetic Materials	621
	(i) <i>Myriad Genetics</i> (U.S. 2013)	623
	(ii) <i>Post-Myriad</i> (U.S. 2013) Federal Circuit Decisions	634
	c. Spontaneously-Generated Compositions	640

Contents

3.	Life Forms	641
a.	Foundation: <i>Diamond v. Chakrabarty</i> (U.S. 1980)	641
b.	Multicellular Organisms	643
c.	Clones	644
E.	Section 101 Manufactures	646
1.	Computer Media Claims	646
2.	Electrical Signals	649
3.	Device Profiles	651
F.	Nonpatentable Subject Matter	653
G.	Medical/Surgical Procedures	654
H.	Patentable Subject Matter Beyond §101: Plant Patents and Design Patents	655
1.	Plant Patents	656
2.	Design Patents	659
a.	Criteria for Obtaining Design Patents	660
b.	Establishing Infringement of Design Patents	662
c.	Unique Remedy for Design Patent Infringement	665
(i)	Statutory Basis: 35 U.S.C. §289	665
(ii)	No Apportionment	668
Chapter 8 Correcting and Challenging Issued Patents in the USPTO		671
A.	Introduction	671
B.	Certificates of Correction	672
C.	Reissue	674
1.	Overview	674
2.	Historical Development	675
3.	Statutory Basis	677
4.	Broadening Reissues	678
5.	Reissue Error	679
6.	The Recapture Rule	682
7.	Effect of Reissue: Intervening Rights	685
8.	Strategic Considerations for Reissue	689
D.	Reexamination	691
1.	Introduction	691
2.	<i>Ex Parte</i> Reexamination	693
a.	Who Can Request	693
b.	Statutory Grounds for Reexamination	694
c.	Substantial New Question of Patentability	694
d.	Legislative Changes in Response to <i>Portola</i>	696
e.	Reexamination Compared to Reissue	697
3.	<i>Inter Partes</i> Reexamination (Pre-AIA)	698

Contents

E.	AIA-Implemented Procedures for Challenging Issued Patents	701
1.	<i>Inter Partes</i> Review	710
a.	Introduction	710
b.	Time Limits	710
c.	Scope of Review	711
d.	Standard to Institute Review and Non-Reviewability of Institution Decisions	712
e.	PTAB as Adjudicator	722
f.	Estoppel	724
2.	Post-Grant Review	724
3.	“Broadest Reasonable Construction” Rule for Claims	729

Chapter 9 Patent Infringement 735

A.	Introduction	735
1.	Statutory Framework	735
a.	Direct Versus Indirect Infringement Under 35 U.S.C. §271	736
b.	“Divided” Infringement by Multiple Parties Under §271(a)	738
2.	Two-Step Analysis for Patent Infringement	750
B.	Step One: Patent Claim Interpretation	751
1.	The Central Role of Claims	751
2.	Judge or Jury as Interpreter? The <i>Markman</i> Revolution	753
3.	Evidentiary Sources for Claim Interpretation	756
4.	The <i>Phillips</i> Debate: “Contextualist” Versus “Literalist” Approaches	758
5.	<i>Markman</i> Hearings	763
6.	Appellate Review of Claim Interpretation: From <i>Cybor</i> (Fed. Cir. 1998) to <i>Teva</i> (U.S. 2015)	764
a.	Federal Circuit’s <i>De Novo</i> Standard of Review	765
b.	Supreme Court Requires Deference for Fact Finding: <i>Teva</i> (2015)	768
c.	Federal Circuit Application of the <i>Teva</i> Standard	776
7.	Claim Interpretation Canons	779
C.	Step Two: Comparing the Properly Interpreted Claims to the Accused Device	782
1.	Literal Infringement	782
2.	Infringement Under the Doctrine of Equivalents	783
a.	Historical Origins	784
b.	Policy Rationales	785
c.	Tension with the Notice Function of Claims	786

Contents

d.	All-Limitations Rule	787
e.	What Is a Limitation?	787
f.	Determining Technologic Equivalence	790
g.	Reverse Doctrine of Equivalents	793
D.	Legal Limitations on the Doctrine of Equivalents	794
1.	Overview	794
2.	Prosecution History Estoppel	796
a.	Definition	796
b.	Scope of Estoppel	798
c.	Presumption of Estoppel Under <i>Warner-Jenkinson</i>	799
d.	Federal Circuit's Complete Bar Rule of <i>Festo I</i>	800
e.	Supreme Court's Presumptive Bar Rule of <i>Festo II</i>	801
f.	Federal Circuit's Remand Decision in <i>Festo III</i>	804
g.	Federal Circuit Decisions Applying the <i>Festo</i> Rebuttal Criteria	806
3.	Prior Art (Hypothetical Claim Analysis)	813
4.	Dedication to the Public	815
5.	Vitiation of Claim Limitations	820
E.	Aspects of Infringement Beyond 35 U.S.C. §271(a)	822
1.	Inducing Infringement Under §271(b)	822
a.	Overview	822
b.	Direct Infringement Predicate	824
c.	Intent Requirement	825
d.	<i>Global-Tech</i> (U.S. 2011): "Willful Blindness" Standard	827
e.	<i>Commil USA</i> (U.S. 2015): Rejecting Belief of Invalidity as Inducement Defense	829
2.	Contributory Infringement Under §271(c)	834
3.	Drug Marketing Application Filings Under §271(e)	836
4.	Component Exports Under §271(f)	841
a.	Overview	841
b.	Liability	843
c.	Remedy	847
5.	Importation Under §271(g)	850

Chapter 10 Defenses to Patent Infringement 853

A.	Introduction	853
B.	Noninfringement	854
C.	Absence of Liability for Infringement	854
1.	License	855
a.	Express License	855
b.	Implied License	856

Contents

2.	Prior User Rights	860
3.	Experimental Use	864
4.	Expiration of Damages Limitation Period of 35 U.S.C. §286	867
5.	Laches and Equitable Estoppel in Initiating Patent Infringement Litigation	868
a.	Introduction	868
(i)	<i>Aukerman</i> (Fed. Cir. 1992) (<i>en banc</i>)	869
(ii)	<i>Petrella</i> (U.S.2014)	871
(iii)	<i>SCA Hygiene II</i> (Fed. Cir. 2015) (<i>en banc</i>)	873
(iv)	<i>SCA Hygiene III</i> (U.S. 2017): Substantial Repeal of Laches Defense	877
b.	Elements of Laches	884
(i)	Unreasonable Delay by Patentee	886
(ii)	Material Prejudice to Accused Infringer	888
(iii)	“Should Have Known”	889
c.	Equitable Estoppel	890
6.	State Sovereign Immunity	894
7.	Temporary Presence Exemption	897
8.	Patent Exhaustion	899
9.	Plaintiff’s Lack of Standing to Sue for Infringement	911
D.	Unenforceability	913
1.	Inequitable Conduct	913
a.	Materiality	915
b.	Intent to Deceive	924
c.	Balancing	927
d.	Burden of Proof and Standard of Review	928
2.	Patent Misuse	929
a.	Introduction	929
b.	Historical Development	933
(i)	Tying	933
(ii)	Post-Patent Expiration Royalties	934
c.	Limitations on Patent Misuse: §271(d)	944
3.	Prosecution History Laches	948
4.	Unclean Hands Based on Misconduct Independent of Inequitable Conduct in Patent Procurement	950
E.	Invalidity	959
1.	Burden of Proof	959
2.	Collateral Estoppel Effect of Invalidity Adjudication	962
3.	Statutory Grounds for Invalidity	962
4.	Limits on Accused Infringer’s Standing to Assert Invalidity: Licensee Repudiation and Assignor Estoppel	963
a.	Licensee Repudiation	964
b.	Assignor Estoppel	965

Contents

F.	Antitrust Counterclaims	968
1.	Market Power	969
2.	Anticompetitive Conduct	974
G.	Patent Declaratory Judgment Actions	980
1.	Federal Circuit’s Pre- <i>MedImmune</i> “Reasonable Apprehension” Test	982
2.	Supreme Court’s Decision in <i>MedImmune</i>	983
3.	Post- <i>MedImmune</i> Federal Circuit Decisions	985
Chapter 11 Remedies for Patent Infringement		991
A.	Introduction	991
B.	Injunctions	992
1.	Permanent Injunctions	993
a.	The <i>eBay v. MercExchange</i> Standard	995
b.	“Causal Nexus” Requirement for Irreparable Harm	997
2.	Preliminary Injunctions	1001
a.	Likelihood of Success on the Merits	1003
b.	Irreparable Harm	1004
c.	Balance of the Hardships Tipping in Movant’s Favor	1007
d.	Public Interest	1008
e.	Appellate Standard of Review	1009
C.	Ongoing Royalties for Future Infringements	1009
D.	Damages for Past Infringements	1012
1.	Introduction	1012
2.	Compensatory Damages	1014
a.	Lost Profits	1015
(i)	The <i>Panduit</i> Analysis	1015
(a)	Demand for the Patented Product	1016
(b)	Absence of Acceptable Noninfringing Substitutes	1016
(c)	Manufacturing and Marketing Capability	1019
(d)	Amount of Profit	1019
(ii)	The <i>Rite-Hite</i> Expansion	1019
(iii)	Territoriality Limitations	1021
b.	Entire Market Value Rule/Convoyed Sales	1024
c.	Reasonable Royalty	1028
(i)	Hypothetical Negotiation	1028
(ii)	Analytical Approach	1030
d.	Price Erosion	1033
e.	Apportionment	1034

Contents

3.	Enhanced Damages and Willful Infringement	1043
a.	Overview	1043
b.	Early Federal Circuit Decisions on Willfulness	1045
c.	<i>Seagate</i> (Fed. Cir. 2007) (<i>en banc</i>)	1047
d.	America Invents Act (2011) Codification	1050
e.	Supreme Court Rewrites Law of Willful Infringement (2016)	1051
	(i) <i>Halo v. Pulse</i> (Fed. Cir. 2014)	1052
	(ii) <i>Stryker v. Zimmer</i> (Fed. Cir. 2015)	1055
4.	<i>Halo v. Pulse</i> (U.S. 2016)	1057
E.	Attorney Fees	1065
1.	Overview	1065
2.	Statutory Basis	1066
3.	Discretionary	1067
4.	Prevailing Party	1067
5.	“Exceptional” Case	1068
a.	<i>Octane Fitness II</i> (U.S. 2014)	1072
b.	<i>Highmark III</i> (U.S. 2014)	1077
6.	No Attorney Fee Shifting to Patent Office in §145 Actions	1079
F.	Prejudgment Interest	1082
G.	Costs	1084
H.	Patent Marking	1086
I.	Provisional Compensation Remedy	1089

Chapter 12 International Patenting Issues 1095

A.	Introduction	1095
1.	Territorial Scope of Patents	1095
2.	Obtaining Foreign Patent Protection Prior to the Paris Convention	1097
B.	The Paris Convention	1100
1.	Introduction	1100
2.	National Treatment	1101
3.	Right of Priority	1102
4.	U.S. Implementation of the Paris Right of Priority: 35 U.S.C. §119	1105
5.	The <i>Hilmer</i> Rule (Pre-America Invents Act of 2011)	1108
6.	Limitations of the Paris Convention	1111
C.	The Patent Cooperation Treaty	1112
D.	The World Trade Organization’s Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS)	1114
E.	Patent Harmonization	1118
1.	First-to-File Versus First-to-Invent	1119
2.	Absolute Versus Qualified Novelty: Grace Period	1123

Contents

F.	Gray Market Goods and the International Exhaustion Debate	1125
	1. Domestic Exhaustion	1126
	2. Regional (European Community-Wide) Exhaustion	1127
	3. International Exhaustion	1127
G.	Enforcement of Foreign Patents in U.S. Courts	1142
H.	Patent Protection in Europe	1145
	1. Routes to Obtain Protection	1145
	2. Routes to Enforce Patents	1147
	a. Unitary Patent System	1147
	b. Unified Patent Court	1149
	<i>Glossary</i>	<i>1151</i>
	<i>Table of Cases</i>	<i>1169</i>
	<i>Index</i>	<i>1215</i>