

Effective Affidavit Practice

U.S. PTO • Jan. 20, 2011

Jeffrey A. Wolfson

Haynes and Boone, LLP



haynesboone

Setting precedent.

Affidavit/Declaration - Overview

- Rule 130 Declarations – Used with Terminal Disclaimer in very limited circumstances
- Rule 131 Declarations – To show invention before the §§ 102(a) & (e) reference priority date
- Rule 132 Declarations – Secondary Factors + More
 - Submit evidence of surprising/unexpected results
 - Commercial Success
 - Long-felt need and failure of others, *etc.*



Declarations - Overview

- Timely submitted, *i.e.*, as early as possible (MPEP § 715.09)
- Written document signed under oath by declarant with personal knowledge of facts
- Careful explanation of facts with no material omissions
- Submitted with supporting documents or exhibits

Rule 130 Declarations

- 37 C.F.R. § 1.130
 - Obviousness-type double patenting rejection over commonly owned patent or published application; and
 - Inventor is the prior inventor of the subject matter in the reference
- Rarely used, requires the Declaration and a Terminal Disclaimer; other options often better

Rule 131 Declarations

102(a) or 102(e)

Prior Art


Invention

“Swear Behind”

What does “Invention” mean? (e.g., MPEP § 715.07)


- Reduction to practice
- Conception + diligence until reduction to practice

Rule 131 Declarations



- “Nexus”: The declaration must tie the claim features to the facts showing prior invention, as evidenced by one or more exhibits.

Conception



- “Formation in the mind ... of a definite and permanent idea of the complete and operative invention...”
- Conception must encompass all claimed features.

Conception


- Types of proof of conception (*e.g.*, MPEP § 715.07):
 - Lab notebook
 - Sketches / diagrams
 - Scientific test results (*e.g.*, from lab)
 - Invention disclosure form
 - Draft patent application
 - Contemporaneous email explaining any of the above

Reduction to Practice

- Actual reduction to practice
- Constructive reduction to practice
 - Filing an application that satisfies written description and enablement
 - Relying on 35 U.S.C. § 119 priority claim
- *See, e.g.*, MPEP § 2138.05 for guidance

Diligence

- Working towards either actual or constructive reduction to practice (See MPEP § 2138.06)





Rule 132 Declarations

- Traverse 101 or 112 rejection
- Remove a prior art reference
- Traverse 102 rejection
- Traverse 103 rejection



Removing a Reference

- By showing that portion in reference derives from inventor's own work
- By showing co-ownership
- By showing a later date of publication, or by showing lack of public availability



Traversing 102 Rejections

- Prior art reference is not enabled
- Alleged inherent disclosure is incorrect
- A claim element is missing from the reference

Traversing 103 Rejections


- No *prima facie* case
- Rebutting *prima facie* case with secondary considerations

Prima Facie Case

- Requires teaching, suggestion, or motivation (or other test) to modify references or combine features (MPEP § 2143.01)
- Requires reasonable expectation of success (MPEP § 2143.02)
- Requires that all elements are disclosed or suggested (MPEP § 2143.03)
- Deficiencies in any of these provide grounds for declaration to show no *prima facie* case exists

Secondary Considerations

- Must show nexus between merits of claimed invention and secondary considerations (MPEP §716.01(b))





Secondary Considerations

- Surprising and unexpected results
- Commercial success
- Long-felt need and failure of others
- Skepticism of experts
- Copying



Surprising and Unexpected Results

- Results must be surprisingly superior
- Comparison of claimed invention with closest prior art (if feasible)
- Any characteristic flowing from disclosed invention may be suitable



Commercial Success

- Nexus between success and claimed invention
- Market share trend
- Differences between claimed invention and other products on the market
- Pricing / advertising

Long-Felt Need and Failure of Others

- Persistent need over time
- Claimed invention must satisfy the need
- Failed attempts by others to solve the problem



Skepticism of Experts and Copying

- Invention met with initial incredulity
- Copying coupled with failed attempts to develop competing products
- Independent declarant or evidence likely required to best show
- Copying evidence introduces other issues



Risk of Inequitable Conduct

- Misrepresentation or failure to disclose material information
- Intent to deceive
- Results in unenforceability of entire patent





Inequitable Conduct

- Failure to disclose complete testing conditions
- Failure to disclose all test results
- Failure to disclose relationship of declarant to inventor or assignee



Conclusion

- Declarations are useful to overcome rejections; possibly the only option short of appeal
- Declarations must be complete, accurate, and truthful because of heavy reliance by PTO
- Benefit of a declaration often outweighs the risks due to possibly expedited prosecution



Thanks for your attention –
Questions?

Jeff Wolfson

202.654.4565

jeff.wolfson@haynesboone.com