

Chapter 200 Types, Cross-Noting, and Status of Application

- 201 Types of Applications
 - 201.01 Sole
 - 201.02 Joint
 - 201.03 Convertibility of Application
 - 201.04 Original or Parent
 - 201.05 Reissue
 - 201.06 Divisional
 - 201.07 Continuation
 - 201.08 Continuation-in-part
 - 201.09 Substitute
 - 201.10 Refile
 - 201.11 Continuity Between Applications: When Entitled to Filing Date
 - 201.12 Assignment Carries Title
 - 201.13 Right of Priority of Foreign Application
 - 201.14 Right of Priority, Formal Requirements
 - 201.15 Right of Priority, Overcoming a Reference
 - 201.16 Extension of Period of Priority, Public Law 690
 - 201.17 Government Cases
- 202 Cross-Noting
 - 202.01 In Specification
 - 202.02 On File Wrapper of Division, Continuation, Substitute, or Continuation-in-part
 - 202.03 On File Wrapper When Foreign Application Is Acknowledged
 - 202.04 In Oath
 - 202.05 In Case of Reissues
- 203 Status of Applications
 - 203.01 New
 - 203.02 Rejected
 - 203.03 Amended
 - 203.04 Allowed
 - 203.05 Abandoned
 - 203.06 Incomplete
 - 203.07 Forfeited
 - 203.08 "Status Letters"

201 Types of Applications

Patent applications fall under three broad types; applications for patent under 35 U. S. C. 101 relating to a "new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, etc.", applications for plant patents under 35 U. S. C. 161, and applications for design patents under 35 U. S. C. 171. The first type of

patents are sometimes referred to as "utility" patents or "mechanical" patents when being contrasted with plant or design patents. The specialized procedure which pertains to the examination of applications for design and plant patents will be treated in detail in Chapters 1500 and 1600, respectively.

201.01 Sole

An application wherein the invention is presented as that of a single person is termed a sole application.

201.02 Joint

A joint application is one in which the invention is presented as that of two or more persons.

201.03 Convertibility of Application

Rule 45. Joint Inventors (Second Paragraph). (b) If an application for patent has been made through error and without any deceptive intention by two or more persons as joint inventors when they were not in fact joint inventors, the application may be amended to remove the names of those not inventors upon filing a statement of the facts verified by all of the original applicants, and an oath as required by rule 65 by the applicant who is the actual inventor, provided the amendment is diligently made.

It is possible to file a sole application to take the place of the joint application, subject to the requirements of Rule 45. This would be equivalent to amending the original joint application.

When a joint application is amended to a sole application, the file should be sent to the Application Branch for a revision of its record.

See *In re Roberts*, 1920 C. D. 158; 273 O. G. 410, for a general discussion of the conversion of a joint to a sole application.

See *McGavack v. Strube*, 50 U. S. P. Q. 513 for situations which may arise when the several joint applicants seek to file individual sole applications based on the original joint application.

For the procedure to be followed when the joint application is involved in an interference, see 1111.07 and 1112.09 (m) to 1112.09 (p).

Conversion from a sole to a joint application, which was not possible prior to January 1, 1953, is now permitted by 35 U. S. C. 116, and a paragraph has been added to Rule 45 paralleling the procedure of the second paragraph.

Rule 45. (Third Paragraph) Joint Inventors. If an application for patent has been made through error and without any deceptive intention by less than all the actual joint inventors, the application may be amended to include all the joint inventors upon filing a statement of the facts verified by, and an oath as required by Rule 65 executed by, all the actual joint inventors, provided the amendment is diligently made.

An attempted second conversion, of either type, in the same application must be referred to the Supervisory Examiner. Any attempt to make both types of conversions in the same application must also be referred to the Supervisory Examiner.

201.04 Original or Parent

The terms *original* and *parent*, are interchangeably applied to the first of a series of applications of an inventor, all disclosing a given invention. Such invention may or may not be claimed in the first application. Either type of conversion must have the written consent of any assignee.

201.05 Reissue

A reissue application is an application for a patent to take the place of an unexpired patent that is defective in some one or more particulars. A detailed treatment of reissues will be found in chapter 1400.

201.06 Divisional

A later application for a distinct or independent invention, carved out of a pending application and disclosing and claiming nothing not disclosed in the earlier or parent application, is known as a divisional application. Both the parent and the divisional application must be by the same applicant, except when the divisional application is a sole application converted from a prior joint application. (See below.) The divisional application should set forth only that portion of the earlier disclosure which is germane to the invention as claimed in the divisional application.

While a divisional application may depart from the phraseology used in the parent case

there may be no departure therefrom in substance or variation in the drawing that would amount to "new matter" if introduced by amendment into the parent case.

A divisional application is also referred to as a "division" of the parent case.

Rule 147. Separate application for invention not elected. The nonelected inventions, those not elected after a requirement for restriction (rule 142), may be made the subjects of separate applications, which must conform to the rules applicable to original applications and which will be examined in the same manner as original applications. However, if such an application is filed before the original application is patented or becomes abandoned, and if it is identical with the original application as filed, the drawings being identical and the papers constituting an exact copy of the original papers which were signed and executed by the applicant, signing and execution by the applicant may be omitted; such application may consist of the filing fee, a copy of the drawings complying to rules relating to drawings and a certified typewritten copy of the original application as filed, together with a proposed amendment cancelling the irrelevant claims or other matter.

For notation to be put on the file jacket by the Examiner in the case of a divisional application see 202.02.

Since a joint application may, when the facts warrant it, be transformed into a sole application, a sole application may be a division of a joint application if the joint application contained an invention which was solely that of one of the joint applicants.

However, the following conditions must be present:

(a) It must appear that the joint application was filed "through error and without any deceptive intention."

(b) On discovery of the mistake the party filing the sole application must act with reasonable diligence and must assume the burden of establishing his good faith.

(c) There must be filed in the sole application a disclaimer under oath by each of the other parties of the joint application.

201.07 Continuation

A continuation is a second application for the same invention claimed in a prior application and filed before the original becomes abandoned. The applicant in the continuing application must be the same as in the prior application, unless the continuation is a sole converted from a joint application. The disclosure presented in the continuation must be the same as that of the original application, i. e., the continua-

tion should not include anything which would constitute new matter if inserted in the original application.

Where an application has been prosecuted to a final rejection an applicant may have recourse to filing a continuation in order to introduce into the case a new set of claims and to establish a right to further examination by the Primary Examiner.

For notation to be put on the file jacket by the Examiner in the case of a continuation application see 202.02.

201.08 Continuation-in-Part

A continuation-in-part is an application filed during the lifetime of an earlier application by the same applicant, repeating some substantial portion or all of the earlier application *and adding matter not disclosed* in the said earlier case. (In re Klein, 1930, C. D. 2; 393 O. G. 519.)

A continuation-in-part filed by a sole applicant may also derive from an earlier joint application showing a portion only of the subject matter of the later application, subject to the conditions stated in the case of a sole divisional application stemming from a joint application (201.06) and the further condition that the applicant present an exact line of division between matters of joint invention and sole invention. (In re Perrin, 1944 C. D. 380; 565 O. G. 151.)

For notation to be put on the file jacket by the Examiner in the case of a continuation-in-part application see 202.02.

201.09 Substitute

The use of the term "Substitute" to designate an application which is in essence the duplicate of an application by the same applicant abandoned before the filing of the later case, finds official recognition in the decision, *Ex parte Komenak*, 1940 C. D. 1; 512 O. G. 739.

As is explained in 201.11 a "Substitute" does not obtain the benefit of the filing date of the prior application.

For notation to be put on the file jacket by the Examiner in the case of a substitute application see 202.02.

201.10 Re-file

No official definition has been given the term Re-file, though it is sometimes used as an alternative for the term Substitute.

If the applicant designates his application as "re-file" and the Examiner finds that the application is in fact a duplicate of a former application by the same party which was abandoned

prior to the filing of the second case, the Examiner should require the substitution of the word *substitute* for "re-file," since the former term has official recognition. The endorsement on the file wrapper that the case is a "substitute" will result in the further endorsement by the Assignment Branch of any assignment of the parent case that may have been made.

201.11 Continuity Between Applications: When Entitled to Filing Date

Under certain circumstances an application for patent is entitled to the benefit of the filing date of a prior application of the same inventor. The conditions are specified in 35 U. S. C. 120, which contains a few variations over the practice prior to January 1, 1953, which was not based upon any specific provision of the statute.

35 U. S. C. 120. Benefit of earlier filing date in the United States. An application for patent for an invention disclosed in the manner provided by the first paragraph of section 112 of this title in an application previously filed in the United States by the same inventor shall have the same effect, as to such invention, as though filed on the date of the prior application, if filed before the patenting or abandonment of or termination of proceedings on the first application or on an application similarly entitled to the benefit of the filing date of the first application and if it contains or is amended to contain a specific reference to the earlier filed application.

There are three conditions:

1. The second application (which is called a continuing application) must be an application for a patent for an invention which is also disclosed in the first application (the parent or original application); the disclosure of invention in the first application (and obviously in the second application as well) must be sufficient to comply with the requirements of the first paragraph of 35 U. S. C. 112.

2. The second application must be "copending" with the first application.

3. The second application must contain a specific reference to the first application in the specification or oath.

When these three conditions obtain, the second application is entitled to have the same effect as though filed on the same date that the first application was filed, with respect to the invention disclosed in both applications.

Copendency is defined in the statute in the clause which requires that the second application must be filed before (a) the patenting, or (b) the abandonment of, or (c) the termination of proceedings in the first application.

If the first application issues as a patent, it is sufficient for the second application to be copending with it if the second application is filed before the patenting of the first application. Thus, the second application may be filed while the first is still pending before the Examiner, while it is in issue, or even between the time the final fee is paid and the patent issues.

If the first application is abandoned, the second application must be filed before the abandonment in order for it to be copending with the first. The term "abandoned," strictly used, refers to abandonment for failure to prosecute (Section 711.02) and express abandonment (Section 711.01). If an abandoned application is revived by the Commissioner (Section 711.03 (c)), it becomes reinstated as a pending application and the preceding period of abandonment has no effect.

The expression "termination of proceedings" is new in the statute, although not new in practice. Proceedings in an application are obviously terminated when it is abandoned or when a patent has been issued, and hence this expression is the broadest of the three. There are several other situations in which proceedings are terminated as is explained in Section 711.02 (c).

When proceedings in an application are terminated, the application is treated in the same manner as an abandoned application, and the term "abandoned application" may be used broadly to include such applications.

The term "continuity" is used to express the relationship of copendency of the same subject matter in two different applications of the same inventor, and the second application may be referred to as a continuing application. Continuing applications include those applications which are called divisions, continuations, and continuations-in-part. As far as the right under the statute is concerned the name used is immaterial, the names being merely expressions developed for convenience. The statute is so worded that the first application may contain more than the second, or the second application may contain more than the first, and in either case the second application is entitled to the benefit of the filing date of the first as to the common subject matter.

The third requirement of the statute is that the second application must contain a specific reference to the first application. In view of this requirement, the right to rely on a prior application may be waived or refused by an applicant by refraining from inserting a reference to the prior application in the later one. The examiner cannot require the applicant to insert a reference in the second application. If the

examiner is aware of the fact that an application is a continuing application of a prior one, he should merely call attention to this in an Office action, for example, in the following language:

"It is noted that this application appears to claim subject matter disclosed in applicant's prior copending application Serial No. _____, filed _____. A reference to this prior application must be inserted in the specification of the present application if applicant intends to rely on the filing date of the prior application, Rule 78."

The end of the first sentence of revised Rule 78 states that if the second application (and by "application" is meant the specification and oath) does not contain a reference to the prior application, the prior application must be referred to in a separate paper filed in the later application. This provision is merely for the purpose of requiring the applicant to call the examiner's attention to the fact that there was a prior application. If the examiner is aware of a prior application and notes it in an Office action, as indicated above, the rule is satisfied and the examiner should not require the applicant to call attention to the prior application.

Applications are sometimes filed with a division, continuation, or continuation-in-part oath, in which the oath refers back to a prior application. Such reference to the prior application satisfies the requirement of the statute. If there is no reference in the specification, in such cases, the examiner should require its insertion or he may make the insertion by Examiner's Amendment.

A second application which is not copending with the first application, which includes those called substitutes in sec. 201.09, is not entitled to the benefit of the filing date of the prior application and the bars to the grant of a patent all date from the filing date of the second application. An applicant is not now required to refer to such applications in the specification of the later filed application. If the examiner is aware of such a prior abandoned application he should make a reference to it in an Office action in order that the record of the second application will show this fact.

If an applicant refers to a prior noncopending abandoned application in the specification, the manner of referring to it should make it evident that it was abandoned before filing the second.

For notations to be placed on the file wrapper in the case of continuing applications secs. 202.02 and 1302.09.

201.12 Assignment Carries Title

Assignment of an original application carries title to any divisional, continuation, substitute or reissue application stemming from the original application and filed after the date of assignment.

201.13 Right of Priority of Foreign Application

Under certain conditions and on fulfilling certain requirements, an application for patent filed in the United States may be entitled to the benefit of the filing date of a prior application filed in a foreign country, to overcome an intervening reference or for similar purposes. The conditions are specified in the first paragraph of 35 U. S. C. 119.

35 U. S. C. 119. Benefit of earlier filing date in foreign country; right of priority. An application for patent for an invention filed in this country by any person who has, or whose legal representatives or assigns have, previously regularly filed an application for a patent for the same invention in a foreign country which affords similar privileges in the case of applications filed in the United States or to citizens of the United States, shall have the same effect as the same application would have if filed in this country on the date on which the application for patent for the same invention was first filed in such foreign country, if the application in this country is filed within twelve months from the earliest date on which such foreign application was filed; but no patent shall be granted on any application for patent for an invention which had been patented or described in a printed publication in any country more than one year before the date of the actual filing of the application in this country, or which had been in public use or on sale in this country more than one year prior to such filing.

The period of twelve months specified in this section is six months in the case of designs, 35 U. S. C. 172.

The conditions may be listed as follows:

1. The foreign application must be one filed in "a foreign country which affords similar privileges in the case of applications filed in the United States or to citizens of the United States."
2. The foreign application must have been filed by the same applicant (inventor) as the applicant in the United States, or by his legal representatives or assigns.
3. The application in the United States must be filed within twelve months from the date of the earliest foreign filing.

4. The foreign application must be for the same invention as the application in the United States.

The right to rely on a foreign application is known as the right of priority in international patent law and this phrase has been adopted in our statute. The right of priority originated in a multilateral treaty of 1883, to which the United States adhered in 1887, known as the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property. This treaty has been revised several times, the last revision being one signed at London in 1934. One of the many provisions of the treaty requires each of the adhering countries to accord the right of priority to the nationals of the other countries and the first United States statute relating to this subject was enacted to carry out this obligation. There is another treaty between the United States and some Latin American countries which also provides for the right of priority, and a foreign country may also provide for this right by reciprocal legislation. A list of the countries, 52 in number, with respect to which the right of priority is recognized is given in a note following Rule 55 in the rule book.

NOTE: Following is a list of countries with respect to which the right of priority referred to in 35 U. S. C. 119 has been recognized. The authority in the case of these countries is the International Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property (613 O. G. 23, 53 Stat. 1748), indicated by the letter I following the name of the country; the Inter-American Convention relating to Inventions, Patents, Designs and Industrial Models, signed at Buenos Aires August 20, 1910 (207 O. G. 935, 30 Stat. 1811), indicated by the letter P after the name of the country; or reciprocal legislation in the particular country, indicated by the letter L following the name of the country. Australia (I), Austria (I), Belgium (I), Brazil (I,P), Bulgaria (I), Canada (I), Costa Rica (P), Cuba (I,P), Czechoslovakia (I), Denmark (I), Dominican Republic (I,P), Ecuador (P), Egypt (I), Finland (I), France (I), Germany (I), Great Britain (I), Greece (I), Guatemala (P), Haiti (P), Honduras (P), Hungary (I), Indonesia (I), Ireland (I), Israel (I), Italy (I), Japan (I), Lebanon (I), Liechtenstein (I), Luxembourg (I), Mexico (I), Morocco, French Zone (I), Netherlands (I), New Zealand (I), Nicaragua (P), Norway (I), Panama (P), Paraguay (P), Philippines (L), Poland (I), Portugal (I), Roumania (I), Spain (I), Sweden (I), Switzerland (I), Syria (I), Tangier Zone (I), Tunis (I), Turkey (I), Union of South Africa (I), Uruguay (P), Yugoslavia (I).

If any applicant asserts the benefit of the filing date of an application filed in a country not on this list, the examiner should institute an in-

quiry to determine if there has been any change in the status of that country. It should be noted that the right is based on the *country* of the foreign filing and not upon the citizenship of the applicant.

The application in the foreign country may have been filed by the assignee, or by the legal representative or agent of the inventor which is permitted in some foreign countries, rather than by the inventor himself.

The United States application must be filed within twelve months of the foreign filing. In computing this twelve months, the first day is not counted; thus, if an application was filed in Canada on January 2, 1952, the U. S. application may be filed on January 2, 1953. The Convention specifies in Article 4 C (2) that "the day of filing is not counted in this period." (This is the usual method of computing periods, for example the six months for reply to an Office action dated January 2 does not expire on July 1 but the reply may be made on July 2.) If the last day of the twelve months is a Sunday or a holiday within the District of Columbia, the U. S. application is in time if filed on the next succeeding business day; thus, if the foreign application was filed on September 6, 1952, the U. S. application is in time if filed on September 8, 1953, since September 6, 1953 was a Sunday and September 7, 1953 was a holiday. After January 1, 1953, the Patent Office has not received applications on Saturdays and, in view of 35 U. S. C. 21, and the Convention which provides "If the last day of the period is a legal holiday, or a day on which the Patent Office is not open to receive applications in the country where protection is claimed, the period shall be extended until the next working day" (Article 4 C 3), if the twelve months expires on Saturday, the U. S. application may be filed on the following Monday.

The twelve months is from the earliest foreign filing. If an inventor has filed an application in France on January 2, 1952, and an application in Great Britain on March 3, 1952, and then files in the United States on February 2, 1953, he is not entitled to the right of priority at all; he would not be entitled to the benefit of the date of the French application since this application was filed more than twelve months before the U. S. application, and he would not be entitled to the benefit of the date of the British application since this application is not the first one filed.

The right to rely on the foreign filing extends to overcoming the effects of intervening references or uses, but there are certain restrictions.

The one year bar of 35 U. S. C. 102 (b) dates from the U. S. filing date and not from the foreign filing date; thus if an invention was described in a printed publication, or was in public use in this country, in November 1952, a foreign application filed in January 1953, and a U. S. application filed in December 1953, granting a patent on the U. S. application is barred by the printed publication or public use occurring more than one year prior to its actual filing.

201.14 Right of Priority, Formal Requirements

Prior to January 1, 1953, the statute contained no requirements for obtaining the right of priority. This right existed in favor of any applicant or patentee whenever the conditions specified in the statute obtained, and the applicant was not required to do anything to obtain it except when he wished to assert the earlier date to overcome a reference or establish a date in interference. Patents granted prior to January 1, 1953 are still subject to the old law in this respect. Under the new statute, however, an applicant who wishes to secure the right of priority must comply with certain formal requirements within a time specified. If these requirements are not complied with the right of priority is lost and cannot thereafter be asserted. The second paragraph of 35 U. S. C. 119 reads:

No application for patent shall be entitled to this right of priority unless a claim therefor and a certified copy of the original foreign application, specification and drawings upon which it is based are filed in the Patent Office before the patent is granted, or at such time during the pendency of the application as required by the Commissioner not earlier than six months after the filing of the application in this country. Such certification shall be made by the patent office of the foreign country in which filed and show the date of the application and of the filing of the specification and other papers. The Commissioner may require a translation of the papers filed if not in the English language and such other information as he deems necessary.

The requirements of the statute are (a) that the applicant must file a claim for the right and (b) he must also file a certified copy of the original foreign application; these papers must be filed within a certain time limit. The maximum time limit specified in the statute is that the papers must be filed before the patent is granted, but the statute gives the Commissioner authority to set this time limit at an earlier time during the pendency of the applica-

tion. If the required papers are not filed within the time limit set the right of priority is lost. It should be particularly noted that these papers must be filed in all cases even though they may not be necessary during the pendency of the application to overcome the date of any reference. The statute also gives the Commissioner authority to require a translation of the foreign documents if not in the English language and such other information as he may deem necessary.

Before going into the procedure on the filing of the papers, reference must be made to the requirements of the oath. Rule 65, relating to the oath, requires that the oath shall state whether or not any application for patent on the same invention has been filed in any foreign country either by the applicant or by his legal representatives or assigns; if any foreign application has been filed the applicant must state the country and the date of filing of the earliest such application and he must also identify every foreign application which was filed more than twelve months before the filing of the application in this country. If all foreign applications have been filed within twelve months of the U. S. filing the applicant is required to recite only the first such application and it should be clear in the recitation that the foreign application referred to is the first filed foreign application. The requirements for reciting foreign applications before January 1, 1953, included more information than the present rule and any oath following the requirements of the old rule would still be acceptable.

(It may be pointed out here that a paragraph, (d), of Rule 65 was canceled on January 1, 1953. The statute referred to in this paragraph is still in force with respect to barring the patenting of certain inventions made by Germans or Japanese but the former requirement in the oath was omitted because of the fact that the critical date of January 1, 1946, is now so old that the recitation in the oath is no longer considered of any practical value.)

The requirements for recitation of foreign applications in the oath, while serving other purposes as well, are used in connection with the right of priority.

The time for filing the papers required by the statute is specified in the second paragraph of Rule 55.

An applicant may claim the benefit of the filing date of a prior foreign application under the conditions specified in 35 U. S. C. 119. The claim to priority need be in no special form and may be made by the attorney or agent if the foreign application is referred

to in the oath as required by rule 65. The claim for priority and the certified copy of the foreign application specified in the second paragraph of 35 U. S. C. 119 must be filed in the case of interference when specified in rules 216 and 224; when necessary to overcome the date of a reference relied upon by the examiner; or when specifically required by the examiner; and in all other cases they must be filed not later than the date the final fee is paid. If the papers filed are not in the English language, a translation need not be filed except in the three particular instances specified in the preceding sentence, in which event a sworn translation or a translation certified as accurate by a sworn or official translator must be filed.

It should first be noted that the Commissioner has by rule specified an earlier ultimate date than the date of the patent. The latest time at which the papers may be filed is the date of the payment of the final fee, except that, under certain circumstances, they are required at an earlier date. These circumstances are specified in the rule as (1) in the case of interferences in which event the papers must be filed within the time specified in the interference rules, (2) when necessary to overcome the date of a reference relied upon by the examiner, and (3) when specifically required by the examiner.

Before going into the practice with respect to those instances in which the priority papers are used to overcome a reference, there will first be described the practice when there is no occasion to use the papers, which will be in the majority of cases. In what follows in this section it is assumed that no reference has been cited which requires the priority date to be overcome.

The main purpose in amending the statute to require the filing of the papers mentioned was to make the record of the file of the United States patent complete. The Patent Office does not examine the papers to determine whether the applicant is in fact entitled to the right of priority and does not grant or refuse the right of priority, except as described in the next section (and also in cases of interferences).

The papers required are the claim for priority and the certified copy of the foreign application. The claim to priority need be in no special form, and may be made by the attorney or agent at the time of transmitting the certified copy if the foreign application is the one referred to in the oath of the U. S. application. No special language is required in making the claim for priority and any expression which can be reasonably interpreted as claiming the benefit of the foreign application is accepted as the claim for priority. The claim

for priority may appear in the oath with the recitation of the foreign application.

The certified copy which must be filed is a copy of the original foreign application with a certification by the patent office of the foreign country in which it was filed. Certified copies ordinarily consist of a copy of the specification and drawings of the application as filed with a certificate of the foreign patent office giving certain information. Application in this connection is not considered to include formal papers such as a petition. A copy of the foreign patent as issued does not comply since the application as filed is required; however, a copy of the printed specification and drawing of the foreign patent is sufficient if the certification indicates that it corresponds to the application as filed.

When the claim to priority and the certified copy of the foreign application are received while the application is pending before the Examiner, the Examiner should make no examination of the papers except to see that they correspond in date and country to the application identified in the oath and contain no obvious formal defects. The subject matter of the application is not examined to determine whether the applicant is actually entitled to the benefit of the foreign filing date on the basis of the disclosure thereof.

When the papers under Section 119 are received they are to be endorsed on the contents page of the file as "Letter (or amendment) and foreign application". Assuming that the papers are regular in form and that there are no irregularities in dates, the Examiner in the next Office action will advise the applicant that the papers have been received. The form of acknowledgment may be as follows: "Receipt is acknowledged on ----- of papers pur-

(date)
porting to comply with the requirements of 35 U. S. C. 119, which papers have been placed of record in the file." The Examiner will write the notation "Foreign application received" in red ink on the face of the file wrapper at the bottom adjacent to the country and date of foreign filing, the data placed there by the Application Branch.

If application is in interference when papers under Section 119 are received see 1111.10.

If the certified copy filed does not correspond to the application identified in the application oath, or if the application oath does not refer to the particular foreign application, the applicant has not complied with the requirements of the rule relating to the oath. In such instances the examiner's letter, after acknowledg-

ing receipt of the papers, should require the applicant to explain the inconsistency and to file a new oath stating correctly the facts concerning foreign applications required by Rule 65. A letter in such cases may read:

"Receipt is acknowledged of the papers filed September 18, 1953, claiming priority under 35 U. S. C. 119 based on an application filed in Germany on February 17, 1950.

"The applicant has not complied with the requirements of the rule relating to the oath since the original application oath does not acknowledge the filing of any foreign applications. The oath states that 'no application for patent on this invention or discovery has been filed by us or our representatives or assigns in any country foreign to the United States.' If the German application is what it purports to be in support of the claim for priority, then the original oath contains an erroneous statement.

"Applicant is required to explain this inconsistency and to file a new oath stating correctly the facts required by the rule regarding foreign filing."

Other situations requiring some action by the examiner are exemplified by the following sample letters.

A. Certified copy filed without a claim for priority.

"Receipt is acknowledged of a certified copy, filed September 18, 1953, of the Italian application referred to in the oath. If this copy is being filed to obtain the benefits of the foreign filing date under 35 U. S. C. 119, applicant should also file a claim for priority as required by said section."

NOTE: Where the accompanying letter states that the certified copy is filed for priority purposes or for the convention date, it is accepted as a claim for priority.

B. Foreign application filed more than a year before filing of U. S. application.

"Receipt is acknowledged of the filing on September 18, 1953, of a certified copy of the French application referred to in the oath.

"It is not seen how a claim for priority can be based on the application filed in France on March 4, 1948, since the United States application was filed more than one year thereafter.

"The certified copy, therefore, is herewith returned."

C. British provisional specification filed more than a year before U. S. application, but British complete filed within the year.

"Receipt is acknowledged of papers filed on September 18, 1953, purporting to comply with the requirements of 35 U. S. C. 119.

"It is not seen how the claim for priority can be based on the British application filed January 23, 1948, since the instant application was filed more than one year thereafter; however, the papers are left in the file."

D. Certified copy not the first filed foreign application.

"Receipt is acknowledged of papers filed on September 18, 1953, purporting to comply with the requirements of 35 U. S. C. 119.

"In view of the fact that the subject matter of the U. S. application was apparently first presented in an application filed in Germany on July 5, 1949, it is not seen how the claim for priority can be based on the German application filed May 8, 1950.

"Attention is directed to 35 U. S. C. 119, which requires that the priority be based on the *first filed* application for the same invention. The papers submitted, however, are left in the file."

E. Claim of priority not accompanied by a certified copy.

"Receipt is acknowledged of the paper filed March 9, 1953, claiming priority based on an application filed in France on November 16, 1948. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the French application as required by 35 U. S. C. 119."

The above letters are merely typical ones which have been used, and any unusual situation may be referred to the Supervisory Examiner.

The priority papers may be received while the application is in issue. When the papers are apparently regular in form and correspond to the earliest foreign application recited in the oath and this application is not too old, the Issue Branch will enter the papers, acknowledge their receipt, and make the notation on the face of the file. In other cases the allowed application, together with the papers, will be forwarded to the examining division for consideration and taking any appropriate action. If foreign application papers are received after the final fee has been paid, they will not be entered in the file and the Issue Branch will return them, advising the applicant that the papers were received too late to be admitted.

Where the benefit of a foreign filing date is claimed in a continuing application and a certified copy has been received in the parent case, it is not necessary to file an additional certified copy in the later case. The applicant when making the claim for priority may simply call attention to the fact that the certified copy is in the parent application.

If priority papers are filed in an interference, it is not necessary to file an additional certified copy in the application file. The interference examiner will place them in the application file.

201.15 Right of Priority, Overcoming a Reference

The only time during *ex parte* prosecution that the Examiner considers the merits of an applicant's claim of priority is when a reference is found with an effective date between the date of the foreign filing and the date of filing in the United States. If at the time of making an action the Examiner has found such a reference, he simply rejects whatever claims may be considered unpatentable thereover, without paying any attention to the priority date (assuming the papers have not yet been filed). The applicant in his response may argue the rejection if it is of such a nature that it can be argued, or he may present the foreign papers for the purpose of overcoming the date of the reference. If the applicant argues the reference, the Examiner, in his next action in the case, may, if he so desires, specifically require the foreign papers to be filed in addition to repeating the rejection if it is still considered applicable, or he may merely continue the rejection. In those cases where the applicant files the foreign papers for the purpose of overcoming the effective date of a reference a translation is required, if the foreign papers are not in the English language. When the Examiner requires the filing of the papers the translation should also be required at the same time. This translation must be a sworn translation or a translation certified as accurate by a sworn or official translator. When the necessary papers are filed to overcome the date of the reference, the examiner's action, if he determines that the applicant is not entitled to the priority date, is to repeat the rejection on the reference, stating the reasons why the applicant is not considered entitled to the date. If it is determined that he is entitled to the date, the rejection is withdrawn in view of the priority date.

If the priority papers are already in the file when the examiner finds a reference with the intervening effective date, the examiner will study the papers, if they are in the English language, to determine if the applicant is entitled to their date. If the applicant is found to be entitled to the date, the reference is simply not used. If the applicant is found not entitled to the date, the unpatentable claims are rejected on the reference with an explanation. If the

papers are not in the English language and there is no translation, the examiner may reject the unpatentable claims and at the same time require an English translation for the purpose of determining the applicant's right to rely on the foreign filing date.

If the named applicant in the foreign application differs from the applicant in the U. S. application, the examiner should refuse to recognize the priority date until the matter is taken care of, unless the priority papers show that the inventor in the foreign application is the same as the inventor in the U. S. application.

The most important aspect of the examiner's action pertaining to a right of priority is the determination of the identity of invention between the U. S. and the foreign application. The foreign application may be considered in the same manner as if it had been filed in this country on the same date that it was filed in the foreign country, and the applicant is ordinarily entitled to any claims based on such foreign application that he would be entitled to under our laws and practice. The foreign application must be examined for the question of sufficiency of the disclosure under 35 U. S. C. 112, as well as to determine if there is a basis for the claims sought.

In applications filed from Great Britain there may be submitted a certified copy of the British "provisional specification", which may also in some cases be accompanied by a copy of the "complete specification." The nature and function of the British provisional specification is described in an article in the Journal of the Patent Office Society for November 1936, pages 770-774. According to British law the provisional specification need not contain a complete disclosure of the invention in the sense of 35 U. S. C. 112, but need only describe the general nature of the invention, and neither claims nor drawings are required. Consequently, in considering such provisional specifications, the question of completeness of disclosure is important. If it is found that the British provisional specification is insufficient for lack of disclosure, reliance may then be had on the complete specification and its date, if one has been presented, the complete specification then being treated as a different application.

In some instances the specification and drawing of the foreign application may have been filed at a date subsequent to the filing of the petition in the foreign country. Even though the petition is called the application and the filing date of this petition is the filing date of the application in a particular country, the date ac-

corded here is the date on which the specification and drawing were filed.

It may occasionally happen that the U. S. application will be found entitled to the filing date of the foreign application with respect to some claims and not with respect to others. Occasionally an applicant may rely on two different foreign applications and may be entitled to the filing date of one of them with respect to certain claims and to the other with respect to other claims.

201.16 Extension of Period of Priority, Public Law 690

The twelve months period of priority is fixed by statute and the Patent Office has no power to extend it in any manner.

On August 8, 1946, Congress passed an act, Public Law 690 (sometimes referred to as the Boykin Act), providing for extensions of the period to take care of delays during the war, and two supplementary acts, Public Law 220, July 23, 1947 and Public Law 380, August 6, 1947, were subsequently enacted. These laws were not included in the new Patent Code because of their temporary nature and remain as independent enactments; they are reprinted in the back of the Patent Law pamphlet.

The latest date on which an application could have been filed in the United States and obtain the benefit of an extension was February 29, 1948. Almost all of the applications affected are now disposed of. Those still pending are subject to the practice relating to them set forth in 201.16 (a) to 201.16 (u) of the first edition of the Manual, which sections are omitted from the present edition because they will soon be obsolete.

The Notice of December 17, 1952, stated:

"In connection with Boykin Act cases, examiners are reminded that if an applicant claims the benefit of the filing of an application in a country not given in the list of countries in Section 201.16 (b) of the first edition of the Manual, the application must be called to the attention of the Supervisor who will institute an inquiry concerning that particular country. Since the publication of the Manual, Greece has been added to the list of countries. The final date in the case of Brazil may be extended and any application asserting the benefit of the filing of an application in Brazil later than the date given in the Manual should be called to the attention of the Supervisory Examiner."

If an application having a request under Public Law 690 is to be put in interference see secs. 1102.01 (a) and 1111.10.

201.17 Government Cases

The term "Act of 1883 application" was used in referring to applications of government employees filed without fee under an act dated March 3, 1883, which was amended April 30, 1928. This act is now 35 U. S. C. 266. Such applications are not always owned by the government. Other applications, not inventions of government employees, may be assigned to and owned by the government. See 607.01.

202 Cross-Noting**202.01 In Specification**

See Rule 78 (a) and Section 201.11.

There is seldom a reason for one application to refer to the application of another applicant not assigned to a common assignee. Such reference ordinarily should not be permitted.

202.02 Notation as to Parent Application on Jacket and in File of a Divisional, Continuation, Continuation-in-Part, or Substitute Application

The identifying data of a parent or prior application, when given in the specification, must be inserted by the Examiner on the left margin of the file jacket in the case of a **DIVISION**, a **CONTINUATION**, or a **SUBSTITUTE** Application. The file jacket bears on the left hand margin, the legend: "Division of Application No. ----, filed -----, 19___." This is to be filled in no later than the first action with the serial number and date of any prior application of which the one in question is a division, a continuation, or a substitute, the word "Division" being replaced by *Continuation*, and the words "Division of" replaced by *Substitute for abandoned*, as may be required. If the prior application has issued as a patent, the patent number and date should also be supplied. If the application at hand is a division of a division, the data of all cases involved should be given. (Order No. 1832, Revised.)

In the case of a continuation-in-part, when the identifying data of the parent or prior application is given in the specification the Examiner must stamp only the letter C-P. on the file jacket.

These notations indicate to the Docket Clerk when an application is a **DIVISION**, **CONTINUATION**, **CONTINUATION-IN-PART**, or a **SUBSTITUTE**. These four types of applications must be sent to the Assignment Branch for a title search when in condition for allowance even though there

is an earlier title search in the file. (Order No. 3411, Revised.) See 306 for work done by the Assignment Branch pertaining to these particular types of applications.

In those cases where the benefit of the filing date of the parent application is not claimed but where it is in fact otherwise a division, continuation or continuation-in-part, the Examiner should nevertheless refer the application at the time of allowance to the Assignment Branch for title search. A substitute application in which the first application is not referred to should similarly be referred to the Assignment Branch.

Only the letters C-P. (without data) are placed on the file jacket in the case of a continuation-in-part because the printer does not use the data of the prior application in setting up the heading when printing a continuation-in-part patent.

202.03 On File Wrapper When Foreign Application Is Acknowledged

When the applicant acknowledges a prior foreign application in the oath the Application Branch notes the country and date of filing of the earliest foreign application mentioned, at the bottom of the face of the file wrapper. When satisfactory papers have been filed under 35 U. S. C. 119, an additional notation is made. See 201.14, twelfth and thirteenth paragraphs.

Prior to November 1, 1953 the country and date of the earliest foreign application were printed in the heading of the patent in all cases. After this date, this heading is printed only in case the papers required for the right of priority have been filed, and the heading now reads, "Claims priority, application (country) (date)". In cases where there is some discrepancy or ambiguity, the notation may be omitted from the heading of the patent. If the dates of several foreign filed applications are claimed for different subject matter (sec. 201.15, last paragraph) the date of only the earliest such application is noted in the heading.

202.04 In Oath

As will be noted by reference to 201.14, Rule 65 requires that the oath include certain information concerning applications filed in any foreign country. If no applications for patent have been filed in any foreign country, the oath should so state.

202.05 In Case of Reissues

Rule 179 requires that a notice be placed in the file of an original patent for which an application for reissue has been filed. For the form employed for this notice see Clerk's Manual.

203 Status of Applications**203.01 New**

A "new" application is one that has not yet received an action by the Examiner. An amendment filed prior to the first Office Action does not alter the status of a "new" application.

203.02 Rejected

An application which, during its prosecution in the examining division and before allowance, contains an unanswered Examiner's action is designated as a "rejected" application. Its status as a "rejected" application continues as such until acted upon by the applicant in response to the Examiner's action (within the allotted response period), or until it becomes abandoned.

203.03 Amended

An "amended" or "old" application is one that, having been acted on by the Examiner, has in turn been acted on by the applicant in response to the Examiner's action. The applicant's response may be confined to a traverse of the action taken by the Examiner or may include an amendment of the application.

203.04 Allowed or in Issue

An "allowed" application or an application "in issue" is one which, having been examined, is passed for issue as a patent subject to payment of the final fee. Its status as an "allowed" case continues from the date of allowance until it is withdrawn from issue or until it issues as a patent or becomes forfeited.

The files of allowed cases are kept in the Issue and Gazette Branch, arranged in the order of dates of allowance.

203.05 Abandoned

An abandoned application is, *inter alia*, one which is removed from the Office docket of pending cases through formal abandonment by the applicant (acquiesced in by the assignee if there is one) or through failure of applicant to take

appropriate action at some stage in the prosecution of the case. (711 to 711.02 (b))

203.06 Incomplete

An application lacking some of the essential parts and not accepted for filing is termed an incomplete application. (506 and 506.01)

203.07 Forfeited

A forfeited application is one which had the status of an allowed case for six months and on which the final fee was not paid. See Rule 316 in 712.

203.08 Examiners To Answer "Status Letters"

Inquiries as to the status of applications, by persons entitled to the information, should be answered promptly. Simple letters of inquiry regarding the status of applications will be transmitted from the Correspondence and Mail Branch, to the examining divisions for direct action. Such letters will be stamped "Status Letters."

If the correspondent is not entitled to the information, in view of Rule 14, he should be so informed.

If the inquiry is directed to an application awaiting action by the Office, a prediction should be made of the probable date of reaching the case for action. The examiner's reply should be typed on the letter of inquiry whenever possible, and signed by the Primary Examiner. The original letter of inquiry should be returned to the correspondent together with the reply. Such reply does not count as an action in the case. This prediction of a date is not to be considered as binding upon the examiner in making his next action.

In cases of allowed applications, a memorandum should be pinned to the inquiry with a statement of date of notice of allowance, and transmitted to the Issue Branch for its appropriate action. This Branch will notify the inquirer of the date of the notice of allowance and the status of the application with respect to payment of the final fee and forfeiture.

In those instances where the letter of inquiry goes beyond mere matters of inquiry, it should not be marked as a "status letter", or returned to the correspondent. Such letters must be entered in the application file as a permanent part of the record. The inquiry should be answered by the examiner, however, and in a manner consistent with the provisions of Rule 14. (Notices of June 22, 1921, and May 6, 1948, revised.)