

AMERICA INVENTS ACT

JUNE 1, 2011.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. SMITH of Texas, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted the following

R E P O R T

together with

DISSENTING VIEWS AND ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 1249]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H.R. 1249) to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide for patent reform, having considered the same, reports favorably thereon with an amendment and recommends that the bill as amended do pass.

CONTENTS

The Amendment	Page 1
Purpose and Summary	38
Background and Need for the Legislation	40
Hearings	57
Committee Consideration	58
Committee Votes	58
Committee Oversight Findings	63
New Budget Authority and Tax Expenditures	63
Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate	63
Performance Goals and Objectives	73
Advisory on Earmarks	73
Section-by-Section Analysis	73
Agency Views	85
Changes in Existing Law Made by the Bill, as Reported	89
Dissenting Views	162
Additional Views	163

The Amendment

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

- (a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “America Invents Act”.
 (b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
 Sec. 2. Definitions.
 Sec. 3. First inventor to file.
 Sec. 4. Inventor’s oath or declaration.
 Sec. 5. Defense to infringement based on earlier inventor.
 Sec. 6. Post-grant review proceedings.
 Sec. 7. Patent Trial and Appeal Board.
 Sec. 8. Preissuance submissions by third parties.
 Sec. 9. Venue.
 Sec. 10. Fee setting authority.
 Sec. 11. Fees for patent services.
 Sec. 12. Supplemental examination.
 Sec. 13. Funding agreements.
 Sec. 14. Tax strategies deemed within the prior art.
 Sec. 15. Best mode requirement.
 Sec. 16. Marking.
 Sec. 17. Advice of counsel.
 Sec. 18. Transitional program for covered business method patents.
 Sec. 19. Jurisdiction and procedural matters.
 Sec. 20. Technical amendments.
 Sec. 21. Travel expenses and payment of administrative judges.
 Sec. 22. Patent and Trademark Office funding.
 Sec. 23. Satellite offices.
 Sec. 24. Designation of Detroit satellite office.
 Sec. 25. Patent Ombudsman Program for small business concerns.
 Sec. 26. Priority examination for technologies important to American competitiveness.
 Sec. 27. Calculation of 60-day period for application of patent term extension.
 Sec. 28. Study on implementation.
 Sec. 29. Pro bono program.
 Sec. 30. Effective date.
 Sec. 31. Budgetary effects.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

- (1) DIRECTOR.—The term “Director” means the Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.
 (2) OFFICE.—The term “Office” means the United States Patent and Trademark Office.
 (3) PATENT PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The term “Patent Public Advisory Committee” means the Patent Public Advisory Committee established under section 5(a)(1) of title 35, United States Code.
 (4) TRADEMARK ACT OF 1946.—The term “Trademark Act of 1946” means the Act entitled “An Act to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes”, approved July 5, 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1051 et seq.) (commonly referred to as the “Trademark Act of 1946” or the “Lanham Act”).
 (5) TRADEMARK PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE.—The term “Trademark Public Advisory Committee” means the Trademark Public Advisory Committee established under section 5(a)(1) of title 35, United States Code.

SEC. 3. FIRST INVENTOR TO FILE.

- (a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 100 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—
 (1) in subsection (e), by striking “or inter partes reexamination under section 311”; and
 (2) by adding at the end the following:
 “(f) The term ‘inventor’ means the individual or, if a joint invention, the individuals collectively who invented or discovered the subject matter of the invention.
 “(g) The terms ‘joint inventor’ and ‘coinventor’ mean any 1 of the individuals who invented or discovered the subject matter of a joint invention.
 “(h) The term ‘joint research agreement’ means a written contract, grant, or cooperative agreement entered into by 2 or more persons or entities for the performance of experimental, developmental, or research work in the field of the claimed invention.
 “(j)(1) The term ‘effective filing date’ for a claimed invention in a patent or application for patent means—
 “(A) if subparagraph (B) does not apply, the actual filing date of the patent or the application for the patent containing a claim to the invention; or

“(B) the filing date of the earliest application for which the patent or application is entitled, as to such invention, to a right of priority under section 119, 365(a), or 365(b) or to the benefit of an earlier filing date un

“(2) The effective filing date for a claimed invention in an application for reissue or reissued patent shall be determined by deeming the claim to the invention to have been contained in the patent for which reissue was sought.

“(j) The term ‘claimed invention’ means the subject matter defined by a claim in a patent or an application for a patent.”.

(b) CONDITIONS FOR PATENTABILITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 102 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 102. Conditions for patentability; novelty

“(a) NOVELTY; PRIOR ART.—A person shall be entitled to a patent unless—

“(1) the claimed invention was patented, described in a printed publication, or in public use, on sale, or otherwise available to the public before the effective filing date of the claimed invention; or

“(2) the claimed invention was described in a patent issued under section 151, or in an application for patent published or deemed published under section 122(b), in which the patent or application, as the case may be, names another inventor and was effectively filed before the effective filing date of the claimed invention.

“(b) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(1) DISCLOSURES MADE 1 YEAR OR LESS BEFORE THE EFFECTIVE FILING DATE OF THE CLAIMED INVENTION.—A disclosure made 1 year or less before the effective filing date of a claimed invention shall not be prior art to the claimed invention under subsection (a)(1) if—

“(A) the disclosure was made by the inventor or joint inventor or by another who obtained the subject matter disclosed directly or indirectly from the inventor or a joint inventor; or

“(B) the subject matter disclosed had, before such disclosure, been publicly disclosed by the inventor or a joint inventor or another who obtained the subject matter disclosed directly or indirectly from the inventor or a joint inventor.

“(2) DISCLOSURES APPEARING IN APPLICATIONS AND PATENTS.—A disclosure shall not be prior art to a claimed invention under subsection (a)(2) if—

“(A) the subject matter disclosed was obtained directly or indirectly from the inventor or a joint inventor;

“(B) the subject matter disclosed had, before such subject matter was effectively filed under subsection (a)(2), been publicly disclosed by the inventor or a joint inventor or another who obtained the subject matter disclosed directly or indirectly from the inventor or a joint inventor; or

“(C) the subject matter disclosed and the claimed invention, not later than the effective filing date of the claimed invention, were owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

“(c) COMMON OWNERSHIP UNDER JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENTS.—Subject matter disclosed and a claimed invention shall be deemed to have been owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person in applying the provisions of subsection (b)(2)(C) if—

“(1) the subject matter disclosed was developed and the claimed invention was made by, or on behalf of, 1 or more parties to a joint research agreement that was in effect on or before the effective filing date of the claimed invention;

“(2) the claimed invention was made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of the joint research agreement; and

“(3) the application for patent for the claimed invention discloses or is amended to disclose the names of the parties to the joint research agreement.

“(d) PATENTS AND PUBLISHED APPLICATIONS EFFECTIVE AS PRIOR ART.—For purposes of determining whether a patent or application for patent is prior art to a claimed invention under subsection (a)(2), such patent or application shall be considered to have been effectively filed, with respect to any subject matter described in the patent or application—

“(1) if paragraph (2) does not apply, as of the actual filing date of the patent or the application for patent; or

“(2) if the patent or application for patent is entitled to claim a right of priority under section 119, 365(a), or 365(b), or to claim the benefit of an earlier filing date under section 120, 121, or 365(c), based upon 1 or more prior filed applications for patent, as of the filing date of the earliest such application that describes the subject matter.”.

(2) CONTINUITY OF INTENT UNDER THE CREATE ACT.—The enactment of section 102(c) of title 35, United States Code, under paragraph (1) of this subsection is done with the same intent to promote joint research activities that was expressed, including in the legislative history, through the enactment of the Cooperative Research and Technology Enhancement Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–453; the “CREATE Act”), the amendments of which are stricken by subsection (c) of this section. The United States Patent and Trademark Office shall administer section 102(c) of title 35, United States Code, in a manner consistent with the legislative history of the CREATE Act that was relevant to its administration by the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

(3) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 102 in the table of sections for chapter 10 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“102. Conditions for patentability; novelty.”

(c) CONDITIONS FOR PATENTABILITY; NONOBVIOUS SUBJECT MATTER.—Section 103 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 103. Conditions for patentability; non-obvious subject matter

“A patent for a claimed invention may not be obtained, notwithstanding that the claimed invention is not identically disclosed as set forth in section 102, if the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art are such that the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious before the effective filing date of the claimed invention to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the claimed invention pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.”

(d) REPEAL OF REQUIREMENTS FOR INVENTIONS MADE ABROAD.—Section 104 of title 35, United States Code, and the item relating to that section in the table of sections for chapter 10 of title 35, United States Code, are repealed.

(e) REPEAL OF STATUTORY INVENTION REGISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 157 of title 35, United States Code, and the item relating to that section in the table of sections for chapter 14 of title 35, United States Code, are repealed.

(2) REMOVAL OF CROSS REFERENCES.—Section 111(b)(8) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “sections 115, 131, 135, and 157” and inserting “sections 131 and 135”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect upon the expiration of the 18-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply to any request for a statutory invention registration filed on or after that effective date.

(f) EARLIER FILING DATE FOR INVENTOR AND JOINT INVENTOR.—Section 120 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “which is filed by an inventor or inventors named” and inserting “which names an inventor or joint inventor”.

(g) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) RIGHT OF PRIORITY.—Section 172 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “and the time specified in section 102(d)”.

(2) LIMITATION ON REMEDIES.—Section 287(c)(4) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “the earliest effective filing date of which is prior to” and inserting “which has an effective filing date before”.

(3) INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION DESIGNATING THE UNITED STATES: EFFECT.—Section 363 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “except as otherwise provided in section 102(e) of this title”.

(4) PUBLICATION OF INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION: EFFECT.—Section 374 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “sections 102(e) and 154(d)” and inserting “section 154(d)”.

(5) PATENT ISSUED ON INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION: EFFECT.—The second sentence of section 375(a) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “Subject to section 102(e) of this title, such” and inserting “Such”.

(6) LIMIT ON RIGHT OF PRIORITY.—Section 119(a) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “; but no patent shall be granted” and all that follows through “one year prior to such filing”.

(7) INVENTIONS MADE WITH FEDERAL ASSISTANCE.—Section 202(c) of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)—

(i) by striking “publication, on sale, or public use,” and all that follows through “obtained in the United States” and inserting “the 1-year period referred to in section 102(b) would end before the end of that 2-year period”; and

(ii) by striking “prior to the end of the statutory” and inserting “before the end of that 1-year”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “any statutory bar date that may occur under this title due to publication, on sale, or public use” and inserting “the expiration of the 1-year period referred to in section 102(b)”.

(h) DERIVED PATENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 291 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 291. Derived Patents

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The owner of a patent may have relief by civil action against the owner of another patent that claims the same invention and has an earlier effective filing date, if the invention claimed in such other patent was derived from the inventor of the invention claimed in the patent owned by the person seeking relief under this section.

“(b) FILING LIMITATION.—An action under this section may be filed only before the end of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the issuance of the first patent containing a claim to the allegedly derived invention and naming an individual alleged to have derived such invention as the inventor or joint inventor.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 291 in the table of sections for chapter 29 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“291. Derived patents.”.

(i) DERIVATION PROCEEDINGS.—Section 135 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 135. Derivation proceedings

“(a) INSTITUTION OF PROCEEDING.—An applicant for patent may file a petition to institute a derivation proceeding in the Office. The petition shall set forth with particularity the basis for finding that an inventor named in an earlier application derived the claimed invention from an inventor named in the petitioner’s application and, without authorization, the earlier application claiming such invention was filed. Any such petition may be filed only within the 1-year period beginning on the date of the first publication of a claim to an invention that is the same or substantially the same as the earlier application’s claim to the invention, shall be made under oath, and shall be supported by substantial evidence. Whenever the Director determines that a petition filed under this subsection demonstrates that the standards for instituting a derivation proceeding are met, the Director may institute a derivation proceeding. The determination by the Director whether to institute a derivation proceeding shall be final and nonappealable.

“(b) DETERMINATION BY PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD.—In a derivation proceeding instituted under subsection (a), the Patent Trial and Appeal Board shall determine whether an inventor named in the earlier application derived the claimed invention from an inventor named in the petitioner’s application and, without authorization, the earlier application claiming such invention was filed. The Director shall prescribe regulations setting forth standards for the conduct of derivation proceedings.

“(c) DEFERRAL OF DECISION.—The Patent Trial and Appeal Board may defer action on a petition for a derivation proceeding until the expiration of the 3-month period beginning on the date on which the Director issues a patent that includes the claimed invention that is the subject of the petition. The Patent Trial and Appeal Board also may defer action on a petition for a derivation proceeding, or stay the proceeding after it has been instituted, until the termination of a proceeding under chapter 30, 31, or 32 involving the patent of the earlier applicant.

“(d) EFFECT OF FINAL DECISION.—The final decision of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board, if adverse to claims in an application for patent, shall constitute the final refusal by the Office on those claims. The final decision of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board, if adverse to claims in a patent, shall, if no appeal or other review of the decision has been or can be taken or had, constitute cancellation of those claims, and notice of such cancellation shall be endorsed on copies of the patent distributed after such cancellation.

“(e) SETTLEMENT.—Parties to a proceeding instituted under subsection (a) may terminate the proceeding by filing a written statement reflecting the agreement of the parties as to the correct inventors of the claimed invention in dispute. Unless the Patent Trial and Appeal Board finds the agreement to be inconsistent with the evidence of record, if any, it shall take action consistent with the agreement. Any written settlement or understanding of the parties shall be filed with the Director. At the request of a party to the proceeding, the agreement or understanding shall be treated as business confidential information, shall be kept separate from the file of the involved patents or applications, and shall be made available only to Government agencies on written request, or to any person on a showing of good cause.

“(f) ARBITRATION.—Parties to a proceeding instituted under subsection (a) may, within such time as may be specified by the Director by regulation, determine such contest or any aspect thereof by arbitration. Such arbitration shall be governed by the provisions of title 9, to the extent such title is not inconsistent with this section. The parties shall give notice of any arbitration award to the Director, and such award shall, as between the parties to the arbitration, be dispositive of the issues to which it relates. The arbitration award shall be unenforceable until such notice is given. Nothing in this subsection shall preclude the Director from determining the patentability of the claimed inventions involved in the proceeding.”

(j) ELIMINATION OF REFERENCES TO INTERFERENCES.—(1) Sections 134, 145, 146, 154, and 305 of title 35, United States Code, are each amended by striking “Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences” each place it appears and inserting “Patent Trial and Appeal Board”.

(2)(A) Section 146 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(i) by striking “an interference” and inserting “a derivation proceeding”;

and

(ii) by striking “the interference” and inserting “the derivation proceeding”.

(B) The subparagraph heading for section 154(b)(1)(C) of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(C) GUARANTEE OF ADJUSTMENTS FOR DELAYS DUE TO DERIVATION PROCEEDINGS, SECRECY ORDERS, AND APPEALS.—”

(3) The section heading for section 134 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 134. Appeal to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board”.

(4) The section heading for section 146 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 146. Civil action in case of derivation proceeding”.

(5) The items relating to sections 134 and 135 in the table of sections for chapter 12 of title 35, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

“134. Appeal to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board.

“135. Derivation proceedings.”

(6) The item relating to section 146 in the table of sections for chapter 13 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“146. Civil action in case of derivation proceeding.”

(k) STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 32 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by inserting between the third and fourth sentences the following: “A proceeding under this section shall be commenced not later than the earlier of either the date that is 10 years after the date on which the misconduct forming the basis for the proceeding occurred, or 1 year after the date on which the misconduct forming the basis for the proceeding is made known to an officer or employee of the Office as prescribed in the regulations established under section 2(b)(2)(D).”

(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Director shall provide on a biennial basis to the Judiciary Committees of the Senate and House of Representatives a report providing a short description of incidents made known to an officer or employee of the Office as prescribed in the regulations established under section 2(b)(2)(D) of title 35, United States Code, that reflect substantial evidence of misconduct before the Office but for which the Office was barred from commencing a proceeding under section 32 of title 35, United States Code, by the time limitation established by the fourth sentence of that section.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall apply in any case in which the time period for instituting a proceeding under section 32 of title 35, United States Code, had not lapsed before the date of the enactment of this Act.

(l) SMALL BUSINESS STUDY.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection—

(A) the term “Chief Counsel” means the Chief Counsel for Advocacy of the Small Business Administration;

(B) the term “General Counsel” means the General Counsel of the United States Patent and Trademark Office; and

(C) the term “small business concern” has the meaning given that term under section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632).

(2) STUDY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Chief Counsel, in consultation with the General Counsel, shall conduct a study of the effects of eliminating the use of dates

of invention in determining whether an applicant is entitled to a patent under title 35, United States Code.

(B) AREAS OF STUDY.—The study conducted under subparagraph (A) shall include examination of the effects of eliminating the use of invention dates, including examining—

(i) how the change would affect the ability of small business concerns to obtain patents and their costs of obtaining patents;

(ii) whether the change would create, mitigate, or exacerbate any disadvantages for applicants for patents that are small business concerns relative to applicants for patents that are not small business concerns, and whether the change would create any advantages for applicants for patents that are small business concerns relative to applicants for patents that are not small business concerns;

(iii) the cost savings and other potential benefits to small business concerns of the change; and

(iv) the feasibility and costs and benefits to small business concerns of alternative means of determining whether an applicant is entitled to a patent under title 35, United States Code.

(3) REPORT.—Not later than the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Chief Counsel shall submit to the Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on Small Business and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives a report on the results of the study under paragraph (2).

(m) REPORT ON PRIOR USER RIGHTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than the end of the 4-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall report, to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate and the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, the findings and recommendations of the Director on the operation of prior user rights in selected countries in the industrialized world. The report shall include the following:

(A) A comparison between patent laws of the United States and the laws of other industrialized countries, including members of the European Union and Japan, Canada, and Australia.

(B) An analysis of the effect of prior user rights on innovation rates in the selected countries.

(C) An analysis of the correlation, if any, between prior user rights and start-up enterprises and the ability to attract venture capital to start new companies.

(D) An analysis of the effect of prior user rights, if any, on small businesses, universities, and individual inventors.

(E) An analysis of legal and constitutional issues, if any, that arise from placing trade secret law in patent law.

(F) An analysis of whether the change to a first-to-file patent system creates a particular need for prior user rights.

(2) CONSULTATION WITH OTHER AGENCIES.—In preparing the report required under paragraph (1), the Director shall consult with the United States Trade Representative, the Secretary of State, and the Attorney General.

(n) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, the amendments made by this section shall take effect upon the expiration of the 18-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, and shall apply to any application for patent, and to any patent issuing thereon, that contains or contained at any time—

(A) a claim to a claimed invention that has an effective filing date as defined in section 100(i) of title 35, United States Code, that is on or after the effective date described in this paragraph; or

(B) a specific reference under section 120, 121, or 365(c) of title 35, United States Code, to any patent or application that contains or contained at any time such a claim.

(2) INTERFERING PATENTS.—The provisions of sections 102(g), 135, and 291 of title 35, United States Code, as in effect on the day before the effective date set forth in paragraph (1) of this subsection, shall apply to each claim of an application for patent, and any patent issued thereon, for which the amendments made by this section also apply, if such application or patent contains or contained at any time—

(A) a claim to an invention having an effective filing date as defined in section 100(i) of title 35, United States Code, that occurs before the effective date set forth in paragraph (1) of this subsection; or

(B) a specific reference under section 120, 121, or 365(c) of title 35, United States Code, to any patent or application that contains or contained at any time such a claim.

(o) STUDY OF PATENT LITIGATION.—

(1) GAO STUDY.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study of the consequences of litigation by non-practicing entities, or by patent assertion entities, related to patent claims made under title 35, United States Code, and regulations authorized by that title.

(2) CONTENTS OF STUDY.—The study conducted under this subsection shall include the following:

(A) The annual volume of litigation described in paragraph (1) over the 20-year period ending on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) The volume of cases comprising such litigation that are found to be without merit after judicial review.

(C) The impacts of such litigation on the time required to resolve patent claims.

(D) The estimated costs, including the estimated cost of defense, associated with such litigation for patent holders, patent licensors, patent licensees, and inventors, and for users of alternate or competing innovations.

(E) The economic impact of such litigation on the economy of the United States, including the impact on inventors, job creation, employers, employees, and consumers.

(F) The benefit to commerce, if any, supplied by non-practicing entities or patent assertion entities that prosecute such litigation.

(3) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Comptroller General shall, not later than the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, submit to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a report on the results of the study required under this subsection, including recommendations for any changes to laws and regulations that will minimize any negative impact of patent litigation that was the subject of such study.

(p) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that converting the United States patent registration system from “first inventor to use” to a system of “first inventor to file” will promote the progress of science by securing for limited times to inventors the exclusive rights to their discoveries and provide inventors with greater certainty regarding the scope of protection granted by the exclusive rights to their discoveries.

(q) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of the Congress that converting the United States patent registration system from “first inventor to use” to a system of “first inventor to file” will harmonize the United States patent registration system with the patent registration systems commonly used in nearly all other countries throughout the world with whom the United States conducts trade and thereby promote a greater sense of international uniformity and certainty in the procedures used for securing the exclusive rights of inventors to their discoveries.

SEC. 4. INVENTOR'S OATH OR DECLARATION.

(a) INVENTOR'S OATH OR DECLARATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 115 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 115. Inventor's oath or declaration

“(a) NAMING THE INVENTOR; INVENTOR'S OATH OR DECLARATION.—An application for patent that is filed under section 111(a) or commences the national stage under section 371 shall include, or be amended to include, the name of the inventor for any invention claimed in the application. Except as otherwise provided in this section, each individual who is the inventor or a joint inventor of a claimed invention in an application for patent shall execute an oath or declaration in connection with the application.

“(b) REQUIRED STATEMENTS.—An oath or declaration under subsection (a) shall contain statements that—

“(1) the application was made or was authorized to be made by the affiant or declarant; and

“(2) such individual believes himself or herself to be the original inventor or an original joint inventor of a claimed invention in the application.

“(c) ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.—The Director may specify additional information relating to the inventor and the invention that is required to be included in an oath or declaration under subsection (a).

“(d) SUBSTITUTE STATEMENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—In lieu of executing an oath or declaration under subsection (a), the applicant for patent may provide a substitute statement under

the circumstances described in paragraph (2) and such additional circumstances that the Director may specify by regulation.

“(2) PERMITTED CIRCUMSTANCES.—A substitute statement under paragraph (1) is permitted with respect to any individual who—

“(A) is unable to file the oath or declaration under subsection (a) because the individual—

“(i) is deceased;

“(ii) is under legal incapacity; or

“(iii) cannot be found or reached after diligent effort; or

“(B) is under an obligation to assign the invention but has refused to make the oath or declaration required under subsection (a).

“(3) CONTENTS.—A substitute statement under this subsection shall—

“(A) identify the individual with respect to whom the statement applies;

“(B) set forth the circumstances representing the permitted basis for the filing of the substitute statement in lieu of the oath or declaration under subsection (a); and

“(C) contain any additional information, including any showing, required by the Director.

“(e) MAKING REQUIRED STATEMENTS IN ASSIGNMENT OF RECORD.—An individual who is under an obligation of assignment of an application for patent may include the required statements under subsections (b) and (c) in the assignment executed by the individual, in lieu of filing such statements separately.

“(f) TIME FOR FILING.—A notice of allowance under section 151 may be provided to an applicant for patent only if the applicant for patent has filed each required oath or declaration under subsection (a) or has filed a substitute statement under subsection (d) or recorded an assignment meeting the requirements of subsection (e).

“(g) EARLIER-FILED APPLICATION CONTAINING REQUIRED STATEMENTS OR SUBSTITUTE STATEMENT.—

“(1) EXCEPTION.—The requirements under this section shall not apply to an individual with respect to an application for patent in which the individual is named as the inventor or a joint inventor and who claims the benefit under section 120, 121, or 365(c) of the filing of an earlier-filed application, if—

“(A) an oath or declaration meeting the requirements of subsection (a) was executed by the individual and was filed in connection with the earlier-filed application;

“(B) a substitute statement meeting the requirements of subsection (d) was filed in connection with the earlier filed application with respect to the individual; or

“(C) an assignment meeting the requirements of subsection (e) was executed with respect to the earlier-filed application by the individual and was recorded in connection with the earlier-filed application.

“(2) COPIES OF OATHS, DECLARATIONS, STATEMENTS, OR ASSIGNMENTS.—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the Director may require that a copy of the executed oath or declaration, the substitute statement, or the assignment filed in connection with the earlier-filed application be included in the later-filed application.

“(h) SUPPLEMENTAL AND CORRECTED STATEMENTS; FILING ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any person making a statement required under this section may withdraw, replace, or otherwise correct the statement at any time. If a change is made in the naming of the inventor requiring the filing of 1 or more additional statements under this section, the Director shall establish regulations under which such additional statements may be filed.

“(2) SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENTS NOT REQUIRED.—If an individual has executed an oath or declaration meeting the requirements of subsection (a) or an assignment meeting the requirements of subsection (e) with respect to an application for patent, the Director may not thereafter require that individual to make any additional oath, declaration, or other statement equivalent to those required by this section in connection with the application for patent or any patent issuing thereon.

“(3) SAVINGS CLAUSE.—A patent shall not be invalid or unenforceable based upon the failure to comply with a requirement under this section if the failure is remedied as provided under paragraph (1).

“(i) ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF PENALTIES.—Any declaration or statement filed pursuant to this section shall contain an acknowledgment that any willful false statement made in such declaration or statement is punishable under section 1001 of title 18 by fine or imprisonment of not more than 5 years, or both.”.

(2) RELATIONSHIP TO DIVISIONAL APPLICATIONS.—Section 121 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “If a divisional application” and all that follows through “inventor.”.

(3) REQUIREMENTS FOR NONPROVISIONAL APPLICATIONS.—Section 111(a) of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(A) in paragraph (2)(C), by striking “by the applicant” and inserting “or declaration”;

(B) in the heading for paragraph (3), by inserting “OR DECLARATION” after “AND OATH”; and

(C) by inserting “or declaration” after “and oath” each place it appears.

(4) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 115 in the table of sections for chapter 11 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“115. Inventor’s oath or declaration.”.

(b) FILING BY OTHER THAN INVENTOR.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 118 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 118. Filing by other than inventor

“A person to whom the inventor has assigned or is under an obligation to assign the invention may make an application for patent. A person who otherwise shows sufficient proprietary interest in the matter may make an application for patent on behalf of and as agent for the inventor on proof of the pertinent facts and a showing that such action is appropriate to preserve the rights of the parties. If the Director grants a patent on an application filed under this section by a person other than the inventor, the patent shall be granted to the real party in interest and upon such notice to the inventor as the Director considers to be sufficient.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 251 of title 35, United States Code, is amended in the third undesignated paragraph by inserting “or the application for the original patent was filed by the assignee of the entire interest” after “claims of the original patent”.

(c) SPECIFICATION.—Section 112 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first undesignated paragraph—

(A) by striking “The specification” and inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—The specification”; and

(B) by striking “of carrying out his invention” and inserting “or joint inventor of carrying out the invention”;

(2) in the second undesignated paragraph—

(A) by striking “The specification” and inserting “(b) CONCLUSION.—The specification”; and

(B) by striking “applicant regards as his invention” and inserting “inventor or a joint inventor regards as the invention”;

(3) in the third undesignated paragraph, by striking “A claim” and inserting “(c) FORM.—A claim”;

(4) in the fourth undesignated paragraph, by striking “Subject to the following paragraph,” and inserting “(d) REFERENCE IN DEPENDENT FORMS.—Subject to subsection (e),”;

(5) in the fifth undesignated paragraph, by striking “A claim” and inserting “(e) REFERENCE IN MULTIPLE DEPENDENT FORM.—A claim”; and

(6) in the last undesignated paragraph, by striking “An element” and inserting “(f) ELEMENT IN CLAIM FOR A COMBINATION.—An element”.

(d) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Sections 111(b)(1)(A) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “the first paragraph of section 112 of this title” and inserting “section 112(a)”.

(2) Section 111(b)(2) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “the second through fifth paragraphs of section 112,” and inserting “subsections (b) through (e) of section 112.”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect upon the expiration of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to any patent application that is filed on or after that effective date.

SEC. 5. DEFENSE TO INFRINGEMENT BASED ON EARLIER INVENTOR.

Section 273 of title 35, United States Code, is amended as follows:

(1) Subsection (a) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by striking “use of a method in” and inserting “use of the subject matter of a patent in”; and

- (ii) by adding “and” after the semicolon;
 - (B) in paragraph (2), by striking the semicolon at the end of subparagraph (B) and inserting a period; and
 - (C) by striking paragraphs (3) and (4).
- (2) Subsection (b) is amended—
- (A) in paragraph (1)—
 - (i) by striking “for a method”; and
 - (ii) by striking “at least 1 year” and all that follows through the end and inserting “and commercially used the subject matter at least 1 year before the effective filing date of the claimed invention that is the subject matter of the patent.”;
 - (B) in paragraph (2), by striking “patented method” and inserting “patented process”;
 - (C) in paragraph (3)—
 - (i) by striking subparagraph (A);
 - (ii) by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

“(A) DERIVATION AND PRIOR DISCLOSURE TO THE PUBLIC.—A person may not assert the defense under this section if—

 - “(i) the subject matter on which the defense is based was derived from the patentee or persons in privity with the patentee; or
 - “(ii) the claimed invention that is the subject of the defense was disclosed to the public in a manner that qualified for the exception from the prior art under section 102(b) and the commercialization date relied upon under paragraph (1) of this subsection for establishing entitlement to the defense is less than 1 year before the date of such disclosure to the public.”;
 - (iii) by redesignating subparagraph (C) as subparagraph (B); and
 - (iv) by adding at the end the following:

“(C) FUNDING.—

 - “(i) DEFENSE NOT AVAILABLE IN CERTAIN CASES.—A person may not assert the defense under this section if the subject matter of the patent on which the defense is based was developed pursuant to a funding agreement under chapter 18 or by a nonprofit institution of higher education, or a technology transfer organization affiliated with such an institution, that did not receive funding from a private business enterprise in support of that development.
 - “(ii) DEFINITIONS.—In this subparagraph—
 - “(I) the term ‘institution of higher education’ has the meaning given that term in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)); and
 - “(II) the term ‘technology transfer organization’ means an organization the primary purpose of which is to facilitate the commercialization of technologies developed by one or more institutions of higher education.”; and
 - (D) by amending paragraph (6) to read as follows:

“(6) PERSONAL DEFENSE.—

 - “(A) IN GENERAL.—The defense under this section may be asserted only by the person who performed or caused the performance of the acts necessary to establish the defense, as well as any other entity that controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with such person, and, except for any transfer to the patent owner, the right to assert the defense shall not be licensed or assigned or transferred to another person except as an ancillary and subordinate part of a good faith assignment or transfer for other reasons of the entire enterprise or line of business to which the defense relates.
 - “(B) EXCEPTION.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), any person may, on the person’s own behalf, assert a defense based on the exhaustion of rights provided under paragraph (2), including any necessary elements thereof.”.

SEC. 6. POST-GRANT REVIEW PROCEEDINGS.

(a) INTER PARTES REVIEW.—Chapter 31 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“CHAPTER 31—INTER PARTES REVIEW

“Sec.

“311. Inter partes review.

“312. Petitions.

“313. Preliminary response to petition.

“314. Institution of inter partes review.

- “315. Relation to other proceedings or actions.
- “316. Conduct of inter partes review.
- “317. Settlement.
- “318. Decision of the Board.
- “319. Appeal.

“§ 311. Inter partes review

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the provisions of this chapter, a person who is not the owner of a patent may file with the Office a petition to institute an inter partes review of the patent. The Director shall establish, by regulation, fees to be paid by the person requesting the review, in such amounts as the Director determines to be reasonable, considering the aggregate costs of the review.

“(b) SCOPE.—A petitioner in an inter partes review may request to cancel as unpatentable 1 or more claims of a patent only on a ground that could be raised under section 102 or 103 and only on the basis of prior art consisting of patents or printed publications.

“(c) FILING DEADLINE.—A petition for inter partes review shall be filed after the later of either—

“(1) the date that is 1 year after the grant of a patent or issuance of a re-issue of a patent; or

“(2) if a post-grant review is instituted under chapter 32, the date of the termination of such post-grant review.

“§ 312. Petitions

“(a) REQUIREMENTS OF PETITION.—A petition filed under section 311 may be considered only if—

“(1) the petition is accompanied by payment of the fee established by the Director under section 311;

“(2) the petition identifies all real parties in interest;

“(3) the petition identifies, in writing and with particularity, each claim challenged, the grounds on which the challenge to each claim is based, and the evidence that supports the grounds for the challenge to each claim, including—

“(A) copies of patents and printed publications that the petitioner relies upon in support of the petition; and

“(B) affidavits or declarations of supporting evidence and opinions, if the petitioner relies on expert opinions;

“(4) the petition provides such other information as the Director may require by regulation; and

“(5) the petitioner provides copies of any of the documents required under paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) to the patent owner or, if applicable, the designated representative of the patent owner.

“(b) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—As soon as practicable after the receipt of a petition under section 311, the Director shall make the petition available to the public.

“§ 313. Preliminary response to petition

“If an inter partes review petition is filed under section 311, the patent owner shall have the right to file a preliminary response to the petition, within a time period set by the Director, that sets forth reasons why no inter partes review should be instituted based upon the failure of the petition to meet any requirement of this chapter.

“§ 314. Institution of inter partes review

“(a) THRESHOLD.—The Director may not authorize an inter partes review to commence unless the Director determines that the information presented in the petition filed under section 311 and any response filed under section 313 shows that there is a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition.

“(b) TIMING.—The Director shall determine whether to institute an inter partes review under this chapter pursuant to a petition filed under section 311 within 3 months after—

“(1) receiving a preliminary response to the petition under section 313; or

“(2) if no such preliminary response is filed, the last date on which such response may be filed.

“(c) NOTICE.—The Director shall notify the petitioner and patent owner, in writing, of the Director’s determination under subsection (a), and shall make such notice available to the public as soon as is practicable. Such notice shall include the date on which the review shall commence.

“(d) NO APPEAL.—The determination by the Director whether to institute an inter partes review under this section shall be final and nonappealable.

“§ 315. Relation to other proceedings or actions

“(a) INFRINGER’S CIVIL ACTION.—

“(1) INTER PARTES REVIEW BARRED BY CIVIL ACTION.—An inter partes review may not be instituted if, before the date on which the petition for such a review is filed, the petitioner, real party in interest, or privy of the petitioner filed a civil action challenging the validity of a claim of the patent.

“(2) STAY OF CIVIL ACTION.—If the petitioner, real party in interest, or privy of the petitioner files a civil action challenging the validity of a claim of the patent on or after the date on which the petitioner files a petition for inter partes review of the patent, that civil action shall be automatically stayed until either—

“(A) the patent owner moves the court to lift the stay;

“(B) the patent owner files a civil action or counterclaim alleging that the petitioner, real party in interest, or privy of the petitioner has infringed the patent; or

“(C) the petitioner, real party in interest, or privy of the petitioner moves the court to dismiss the civil action.

“(3) TREATMENT OF COUNTERCLAIM.—A counterclaim challenging the validity of a claim of a patent does not constitute a civil action challenging the validity of a claim of a patent for purposes of this subsection.

“(b) PATENT OWNER’S ACTION.—An inter partes review may not be instituted if the petition requesting the proceeding is filed more than 1 year after the date on which the petitioner, real party in interest, or privy of the petitioner is served with a complaint alleging infringement of the patent. The time limitation set forth in the preceding sentence shall not apply to a request for joinder under subsection (c).

“(c) JOINDER.—If the Director institutes an inter partes review, the Director, in his or her discretion, may join as a party to that inter partes review any person who properly files a petition under section 311 that the Director, after receiving a preliminary response under section 313 or the expiration of the time for filing such a response, determines warrants the institution of an inter partes review under section 314.

“(d) MULTIPLE PROCEEDINGS.—Notwithstanding sections 135(a), 251, and 252, and chapter 30, during the pendency of an inter partes review, if another proceeding or matter involving the patent is before the Office, the Director may determine the manner in which the inter partes review or other proceeding or matter may proceed, including providing for stay, transfer, consolidation, or termination of any such matter or proceeding.

“(e) ESTOPPEL.—

“(1) PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE OFFICE.—The petitioner in an inter partes review of a claim in a patent under this chapter that results in a final written decision under section 318(a), or the real party in interest or privy of the petitioner, may not request or maintain a proceeding before the Office with respect to that claim on any ground that the petitioner raised or reasonably could have raised during that inter partes review.

“(2) CIVIL ACTIONS AND OTHER PROCEEDINGS.—The petitioner in an inter partes review of a claim in a patent under this chapter that results in a final written decision under section 318(a), or the real party in interest or privy of the petitioner, may not assert either in a civil action arising in whole or in part under section 1338 of title 28 or in a proceeding before the International Trade Commission under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 that the claim is invalid on any ground that the petitioner raised or reasonably could have raised during that inter partes review.

“§ 316. Conduct of inter partes review

“(a) REGULATIONS.—The Director shall prescribe regulations—

“(1) providing that the file of any proceeding under this chapter shall be made available to the public, except that any petition or document filed with the intent that it be sealed shall, if accompanied by a motion to seal, be treated as sealed pending the outcome of the ruling on the motion;

“(2) setting forth the standards for the showing of sufficient grounds to institute a review under section 314(a);

“(3) establishing procedures for the submission of supplemental information after the petition is filed;

“(4) establishing and governing inter partes review under this chapter and the relationship of such review to other proceedings under this title;

“(5) setting forth standards and procedures for discovery of relevant evidence, including that such discovery shall be limited to—

“(A) the deposition of witnesses submitting affidavits or declarations;

and

“(B) what is otherwise necessary in the interest of justice;

“(6) prescribing sanctions for abuse of discovery, abuse of process, or any other improper use of the proceeding, such as to harass or to cause unnecessary delay or an unnecessary increase in the cost of the proceeding;

“(7) providing for protective orders governing the exchange and submission of confidential information;

“(8) providing for the filing by the patent owner of a response to the petition under section 313 after an inter partes review has been instituted, and requiring that the patent owner file with such response, through affidavits or declarations, any additional factual evidence and expert opinions on which the patent owner relies in support of the response;

“(9) setting forth standards and procedures for allowing the patent owner to move to amend the patent under subsection (d) to cancel a challenged claim or propose a reasonable number of substitute claims, and ensuring that any information submitted by the patent owner in support of any amendment entered under subsection (d) is made available to the public as part of the prosecution history of the patent;

“(10) providing either party with the right to an oral hearing as part of the proceeding;

“(11) requiring that the final determination in an inter partes review be issued not later than 1 year after the date on which the Director notices the institution of a review under this chapter, except that the Director may, for good cause shown, extend the 1-year period by not more than 6 months, and may adjust the time periods in this paragraph in the case of joinder under section 315(c);

“(12) setting a time period for requesting joinder under section 315(c); and

“(13) providing the petitioner with at least 1 opportunity to file written comments within a time period established by the Director.

“(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In prescribing regulations under this section, the Director shall consider the effect of any such regulation on the economy, the integrity of the patent system, the efficient administration of the Office, and the ability of the Office to timely complete proceedings instituted under this chapter.

“(c) PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD.—The Patent Trial and Appeal Board shall, in accordance with section 6, conduct each inter partes review instituted under this chapter.

“(d) AMENDMENT OF THE PATENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—During an inter partes review instituted under this chapter, the patent owner may file 1 motion to amend the patent in 1 or more of the following ways:

“(A) Cancel any challenged patent claim.

“(B) For each challenged claim, propose a reasonable number of substitute claims.

“(2) ADDITIONAL MOTIONS.—Additional motions to amend may be permitted upon the joint request of the petitioner and the patent owner to materially advance the settlement of a proceeding under section 317, or as permitted by regulations prescribed by the Director.

“(3) SCOPE OF CLAIMS.—An amendment under this subsection may not enlarge the scope of the claims of the patent or introduce new matter.

“(e) EVIDENTIARY STANDARDS.—In an inter partes review instituted under this chapter, the petitioner shall have the burden of proving a proposition of unpatentability by a preponderance of the evidence.

“§ 317. Settlement

“(a) IN GENERAL.—An inter partes review instituted under this chapter shall be terminated with respect to any petitioner upon the joint request of the petitioner and the patent owner, unless the Office has decided the merits of the proceeding before the request for termination is filed. If the inter partes review is terminated with respect to a petitioner under this section, no estoppel under section 315(e) shall attach to the petitioner, or to the real party in interest or privy of the petitioner, on the basis of that petitioner’s institution of that inter partes review. If no petitioner remains in the inter partes review, the Office may terminate the review or proceed to a final written decision under section 318(a).

“(b) AGREEMENTS IN WRITING.—Any agreement or understanding between the patent owner and a petitioner, including any collateral agreements referred to in such agreement or understanding, made in connection with, or in contemplation of, the termination of an inter partes review under this section shall be in writing and a true copy of such agreement or understanding shall be filed in the Office before the termination of the inter partes review as between the parties. At the request of a party to the proceeding, the agreement or understanding shall be treated as business confidential information, shall be kept separate from the file of the in-

volved patents, and shall be made available only to Federal Government agencies on written request, or to any person on a showing of good cause.

“§ 318. Decision of the Board

“(a) FINAL WRITTEN DECISION.—If an inter partes review is instituted and not dismissed under this chapter, the Patent Trial and Appeal Board shall issue a final written decision with respect to the patentability of any patent claim challenged by the petitioner and any new claim added under section 316(d).

“(b) CERTIFICATE.—If the Patent Trial and Appeal Board issues a final written decision under subsection (a) and the time for appeal has expired or any appeal has terminated, the Director shall issue and publish a certificate canceling any claim of the patent finally determined to be unpatentable, confirming any claim of the patent determined to be patentable, and incorporating in the patent by operation of the certificate any new or amended claim determined to be patentable.

“(c) AMENDED OR NEW CLAIM.—Any proposed amended or new claim determined to be patentable and incorporated into a patent following an inter partes review under this chapter shall have the same effect as that specified in section 252 for reissued patents on the right of any person who made, purchased, or used within the United States, or imported into the United States, anything patented by such proposed amended or new claim, or who made substantial preparation therefor, before the issuance of a certificate under subsection (b).

“(d) DATA ON LENGTH OF REVIEW.—The Office shall make available to the public data describing the length of time between the institution of, and the issuance of a final written decision under subsection (a) for, each inter partes review.

“§ 319. Appeal

“A party dissatisfied with the final written decision of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board under section 318(a) may appeal the decision pursuant to sections 141 through 144. Any party to the inter partes review shall have the right to be a party to the appeal.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for part III of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to chapter 31 and inserting the following:

“31. Inter Partes Review 311”.

(c) REGULATIONS AND EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) REGULATIONS.—The Director shall, not later than the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, issue regulations to carry out chapter 31 of title 35, United States Code, as amended by subsection (a) of this section.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect upon the expiration of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to any patent issued before, on, or after that effective date.

(B) GRADUATED IMPLEMENTATION.—The Director may impose a limit on the number of inter partes reviews that may be instituted under chapter 31 of title 35, United States Code, during each of the first 4 1-year periods in which the amendments made by subsection (a) are in effect, if such number in each year equals or exceeds the number of inter partes reexaminations that are ordered under chapter 31 of title 35, United States Code, in the last fiscal year ending before the effective date of the amendments made by subsection (a).

(d) POST-GRANT REVIEW.—Part III of title 35, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“CHAPTER 32—POST-GRANT REVIEW

“Sec.

“321. Post-grant review.

“322. Petitions.

“323. Preliminary response to petition.

“324. Institution of post-grant review.

“325. Relation to other proceedings or actions.

“326. Conduct of post-grant review.

“327. Settlement.

“328. Decision of the Board.

“329. Appeal.

“§ 321. Post-grant review

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the provisions of this chapter, a person who is not the patent owner may file with the Office a petition to institute a post-grant review of a patent. The Director shall establish, by regulation, fees to be paid by the person

requesting the review, in such amounts as the Director determines to be reasonable, considering the aggregate costs of the post-grant review.

“(b) SCOPE.—A petitioner in a post-grant review may request to cancel as unpatentable 1 or more claims of a patent on any ground that could be raised under paragraph (2) or (3) of section 282(b) (relating to invalidity of the patent or any claim).

“(c) FILING DEADLINE.—A petition for a post-grant review may only be filed not later than the date that is 1 year after the date of the grant of the patent or of the issuance of a reissue patent (as the case may be).

“§ 322. Petitions

“(a) REQUIREMENTS OF PETITION.—A petition filed under section 321 may be considered only if—

“(1) the petition is accompanied by payment of the fee established by the Director under section 321;

“(2) the petition identifies all real parties in interest;

“(3) the petition identifies, in writing and with particularity, each claim challenged, the grounds on which the challenge to each claim is based, and the evidence that supports the grounds for the challenge to each claim, including—

“(A) copies of patents and printed publications that the petitioner relies upon in support of the petition; and

“(B) affidavits or declarations of supporting evidence and opinions, if the petitioner relies on other factual evidence or on expert opinions;

“(4) the petition provides such other information as the Director may require by regulation; and

“(5) the petitioner provides copies of any of the documents required under paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) to the patent owner or, if applicable, the designated representative of the patent owner.

“(b) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—As soon as practicable after the receipt of a petition under section 321, the Director shall make the petition available to the public.

“§ 323. Preliminary response to petition

“If a post-grant review petition is filed under section 321, the patent owner shall have the right to file a preliminary response to the petition, within a time period set by the Director, that sets forth reasons why no post-grant review should be instituted based upon the failure of the petition to meet any requirement of this chapter.

“§ 324. Institution of post-grant review

“(a) THRESHOLD.—The Director may not authorize a post-grant review to commence unless the Director determines that the information presented in the petition filed under section 321, if such information is not rebutted, would demonstrate that it is more likely than not that at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition is unpatentable.

“(b) ADDITIONAL GROUNDS.—The determination required under subsection (a) may also be satisfied by a showing that the petition raises a novel or unsettled legal question that is important to other patents or patent applications.

“(c) TIMING.—The Director shall determine whether to institute a post-grant review under this chapter pursuant to a petition filed under section 321 within 3 months after—

“(1) receiving a preliminary response to the petition under section 323; or

“(2) if no such preliminary response is filed, the last date on which such response may be filed.

“(d) NOTICE.—The Director shall notify the petitioner and patent owner, in writing, of the Director’s determination under subsection (a) or (b), and shall make such notice available to the public as soon as is practicable. The Director shall make each notice of the institution of a post-grant review available to the public. Such notice shall include the date on which the review shall commence.

“(e) NO APPEAL.—The determination by the Director whether to institute a post-grant review under this section shall be final and nonappealable.

“§ 325. Relation to other proceedings or actions

“(a) INFRINGER’S CIVIL ACTION.—

“(1) POST-GRANT REVIEW BARRED BY CIVIL ACTION.—A post-grant review may not be instituted under this chapter if, before the date on which the petition for such a review is filed, the petitioner, real party in interest, or privy of the petitioner filed a civil action challenging the validity of a claim of the patent.

“(2) STAY OF CIVIL ACTION.—If the petitioner, real party in interest, or privy of the petitioner files a civil action challenging the validity of a claim of the pat-

ent on or after the date on which the petitioner files a petition for post-grant review of the patent, that civil action shall be automatically stayed until either—

“(A) the patent owner moves the court to lift the stay;

“(B) the patent owner files a civil action or counterclaim alleging that the petitioner, real party in interest, or privy of the petitioner has infringed the patent; or

“(C) the petitioner, real party in interest, or privy of the petitioner moves the court to dismiss the civil action.

“(3) TREATMENT OF COUNTERCLAIM.—A counterclaim challenging the validity of a claim of a patent does not constitute a civil action challenging the validity of a claim of a patent for purposes of this subsection.

“(b) PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIONS.—If a civil action alleging infringement of a patent is filed within 3 months after the date on which the patent is granted, the court may not stay its consideration of the patent owner’s motion for a preliminary injunction against infringement of the patent on the basis that a petition for post-grant review has been filed under this chapter or that such a post-grant review has been instituted under this chapter.

“(c) JOINDER.—If more than 1 petition for a post-grant review under this chapter is properly filed against the same patent and the Director determines that more than 1 of these petitions warrants the institution of a post-grant review under section 324, the Director may consolidate such reviews into a single post-grant review.

“(d) MULTIPLE PROCEEDINGS.—Notwithstanding sections 135(a), 251, and 252, and chapter 30, during the pendency of any post-grant review under this chapter, if another proceeding or matter involving the patent is before the Office, the Director may determine the manner in which the post-grant review or other proceeding or matter may proceed, including providing for the stay, transfer, consolidation, or termination of any such matter or proceeding. In determining whether to institute or order a proceeding under this chapter, chapter 30, or chapter 31, the Director may take into account whether, and reject the petition or request because, the same or substantially the same prior art or arguments previously were presented to the Office.

“(e) ESTOPPEL.—

“(1) PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE OFFICE.—The petitioner in a post-grant review of a claim in a patent under this chapter that results in a final written decision under section 328(a), or the real party in interest or privy of the petitioner, may not request or maintain a proceeding before the Office with respect to that claim on any ground that the petitioner raised or reasonably could have raised during that post-grant review.

“(2) CIVIL ACTIONS AND OTHER PROCEEDINGS.—The petitioner in a post-grant review of a claim in a patent under this chapter that results in a final written decision under section 328(a), or the real party in interest or privy of the petitioner, may not assert either in a civil action arising in whole or in part under section 1338 of title 28 or in a proceeding before the International Trade Commission under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 that the claim is invalid on any ground that the petitioner raised or reasonably could have raised during that post-grant review.

“(f) REISSUE PATENTS.—A post-grant review may not be instituted under this chapter if the petition requests cancellation of a claim in a reissue patent that is identical to or narrower than a claim in the original patent from which the reissue patent was issued, and the time limitations in section 321(c) would bar filing a petition for a post-grant review for such original patent.

“§ 326. Conduct of post-grant review

“(a) REGULATIONS.—The Director shall prescribe regulations—

“(1) providing that the file of any proceeding under this chapter shall be made available to the public, except that any petition or document filed with the intent that it be sealed shall, if accompanied by a motion to seal, be treated as sealed pending the outcome of the ruling on the motion;

“(2) setting forth the standards for the showing of sufficient grounds to institute a review under subsections (a) and (b) of section 324;

“(3) establishing procedures for the submission of supplemental information after the petition is filed;

“(4) establishing and governing a post-grant review under this chapter and the relationship of such review to other proceedings under this title;

“(5) setting forth standards and procedures for discovery of relevant evidence, including that such discovery shall be limited to evidence directly related to factual assertions advanced by either party in the proceeding;

“(6) prescribing sanctions for abuse of discovery, abuse of process, or any other improper use of the proceeding, such as to harass or to cause unnecessary delay or an unnecessary increase in the cost of the proceeding;

“(7) providing for protective orders governing the exchange and submission of confidential information;

“(8) providing for the filing by the patent owner of a response to the petition under section 323 after a post-grant review has been instituted, and requiring that the patent owner file with such response, through affidavits or declarations, any additional factual evidence and expert opinions on which the patent owner relies in support of the response;

“(9) setting forth standards and procedures for allowing the patent owner to move to amend the patent under subsection (d) to cancel a challenged claim or propose a reasonable number of substitute claims, and ensuring that any information submitted by the patent owner in support of any amendment entered under subsection (d) is made available to the public as part of the prosecution history of the patent;

“(10) providing either party with the right to an oral hearing as part of the proceeding; and

“(11) requiring that the final determination in any post-grant review be issued not later than 1 year after the date on which the Director notices the institution of a proceeding under this chapter, except that the Director may, for good cause shown, extend the 1-year period by not more than 6 months, and may adjust the time periods in this paragraph in the case of joinder under section 325(c).

“(b) CONSIDERATIONS.—In prescribing regulations under this section, the Director shall consider the effect of any such regulation on the economy, the integrity of the patent system, the efficient administration of the Office, and the ability of the Office to timely complete proceedings instituted under this chapter.

“(c) PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD.—The Patent Trial and Appeal Board shall, in accordance with section 6, conduct each post-grant review instituted under this chapter.

“(d) AMENDMENT OF THE PATENT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—During a post-grant review instituted under this chapter, the patent owner may file 1 motion to amend the patent in 1 or more of the following ways:

“(A) Cancel any challenged patent claim.

“(B) For each challenged claim, propose a reasonable number of substitute claims.

“(2) ADDITIONAL MOTIONS.—Additional motions to amend may be permitted upon the joint request of the petitioner and the patent owner to materially advance the settlement of a proceeding under section 327, or upon the request of the patent owner for good cause shown.

“(3) SCOPE OF CLAIMS.—An amendment under this subsection may not enlarge the scope of the claims of the patent or introduce new matter.

“(e) EVIDENTIARY STANDARDS.—In a post-grant review instituted under this chapter, the petitioner shall have the burden of proving a proposition of unpatentability by a preponderance of the evidence.

“§ 327. Settlement

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A post-grant review instituted under this chapter shall be terminated with respect to any petitioner upon the joint request of the petitioner and the patent owner, unless the Office has decided the merits of the proceeding before the request for termination is filed. If the post-grant review is terminated with respect to a petitioner under this section, no estoppel under section 325(e) shall attach to the petitioner, or to the real party in interest or privy of the petitioner, on the basis of that petitioner’s institution of that post-grant review. If no petitioner remains in the post-grant review, the Office may terminate the post-grant review or proceed to a final written decision under section 328(a).

“(b) AGREEMENTS IN WRITING.—Any agreement or understanding between the patent owner and a petitioner, including any collateral agreements referred to in such agreement or understanding, made in connection with, or in contemplation of, the termination of a post-grant review under this section shall be in writing, and a true copy of such agreement or understanding shall be filed in the Office before the termination of the post-grant review as between the parties. At the request of a party to the proceeding, the agreement or understanding shall be treated as business confidential information, shall be kept separate from the file of the involved patents, and shall be made available only to Federal Government agencies on written request, or to any person on a showing of good cause.

“§ 328. Decision of the Board

“(a) FINAL WRITTEN DECISION.—If a post-grant review is instituted and not dismissed under this chapter, the Patent Trial and Appeal Board shall issue a final written decision with respect to the patentability of any patent claim challenged by the petitioner and any new claim added under section 326(d).

“(b) CERTIFICATE.—If the Patent Trial and Appeal Board issues a final written decision under subsection (a) and the time for appeal has expired or any appeal has terminated, the Director shall issue and publish a certificate canceling any claim of the patent finally determined to be unpatentable, confirming any claim of the patent determined to be patentable, and incorporating in the patent by operation of the certificate any new or amended claim determined to be patentable.

“(c) AMENDED OR NEW CLAIM.—Any proposed amended or new claim determined to be patentable and incorporated into a patent following a post-grant review under this chapter shall have the same effect as that specified in section 252 of this title for reissued patents on the right of any person who made, purchased, or used within the United States, or imported into the United States, anything patented by such proposed amended or new claim, or who made substantial preparation therefor, before the issuance of a certificate under subsection (b).

“(d) DATA ON LENGTH OF REVIEW.—The Office shall make available to the public data describing the length of time between the institution of, and the issuance of a final written decision under subsection (a) for, each post-grant review.

“§ 329. Appeal

“A party dissatisfied with the final written decision of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board under section 328(a) may appeal the decision pursuant to sections 141 through 144. Any party to the post-grant review shall have the right to be a party to the appeal.”

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of chapters for part III of title 35, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“32. Post-Grant Review 321”.

(f) REGULATIONS AND EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) REGULATIONS.—The Director shall, not later than the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, issue regulations to carry out chapter 32 of title 35, United States Code, as added by subsection (d) of this section.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The amendments made by subsection (d) shall take effect upon the expiration of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and, except as provided in section 18 and in paragraph (3), shall apply to any patent that is described in section 3(n)(1).

(B) LIMITATION.—The Director may impose a limit on the number of post-grant reviews that may be instituted under chapter 32 of title 35, United States Code, during each of the first 4 1-year periods in which the amendments made by subsection (d) are in effect.

(3) PENDING INTERFERENCES.—

(A) PROCEDURES IN GENERAL.—The Director shall determine, and include in the regulations issued under paragraph (1), the procedures under which an interference commenced before the effective date set forth in paragraph (2)(A) is to proceed, including whether such interference—

(i) is to be dismissed without prejudice to the filing of a petition for a post-grant review under chapter 32 of title 35, United States Code; or

(ii) is to proceed as if this Act had not been enacted.

(B) PROCEEDINGS BY PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD.—For purposes of an interference that is commenced before the effective date set forth in paragraph (2)(A), the Director may deem the Patent Trial and Appeal Board to be the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, and may allow the Patent Trial and Appeal Board to conduct any further proceedings in that interference.

(C) APPEALS.—The authorization to appeal or have remedy from derivation proceedings in sections 141(d) and 146 of title 35, United States Code, as amended by this Act, and the jurisdiction to entertain appeals from derivation proceedings in section 1295(a)(4)(A) of title 28, United States Code, as amended by this Act, shall be deemed to extend to any final decision in an interference that is commenced before the effective date set forth in paragraph (2)(A) of this subsection and that is not dismissed pursuant to this paragraph.

(g) CITATION OF PRIOR ART AND WRITTEN STATEMENTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 301 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 301. Citation of prior art and written statements

“(a) IN GENERAL.—Any person at any time may cite to the Office in writing—

“(1) prior art consisting of patents or printed publications which that person believes to have a bearing on the patentability of any claim of a particular patent; or

“(2) statements of the patent owner filed in a proceeding before a Federal court or the Office in which the patent owner took a position on the scope of any claim of a particular patent.

“(b) OFFICIAL FILE.—If the person citing prior art or written statements pursuant to subsection (a) explains in writing the pertinence and manner of applying the prior art or written statements to at least 1 claim of the patent, the citation of the prior art or written statements and the explanation thereof shall become a part of the official file of the patent.

“(c) ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.—A party that submits a written statement pursuant to subsection (a)(2) shall include any other documents, pleadings, or evidence from the proceeding in which the statement was filed that addresses the written statement.

“(d) LIMITATIONS.—A written statement submitted pursuant to subsection (a)(2), and additional information submitted pursuant to subsection (c), shall not be considered by the Office for any purpose other than to determine the proper meaning of a patent claim in a proceeding that is ordered or instituted pursuant to section 304, 314, or 324. If any such written statement or additional information is subject to an applicable protective order, such statement or information shall be redacted to exclude information that is subject to that order.

“(e) CONFIDENTIALITY.—Upon the written request of the person citing prior art or written statements pursuant to subsection (a), that person’s identity shall be excluded from the patent file and kept confidential.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 301 in the table of sections for chapter 30 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“301. Citation of prior art and written statements.”.

(3) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this subsection shall take effect upon the expiration of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to any patent issued before, on, or after that effective date.

(h) REEXAMINATION.—

(1) DETERMINATION BY DIRECTOR.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 303(a) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “section 301 of this title” and inserting “section 301 or 302”.

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this paragraph shall take effect upon the expiration of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to any patent issued before, on, or after that effective date.

(2) APPEAL.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Section 306 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “145” and inserting “144”.

(B) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this paragraph shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to any appeal of a reexamination before the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences or the Patent Trial and Appeal Board that is pending on, or brought on or after, the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 7. PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD.

(a) COMPOSITION AND DUTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 6 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 6. Patent Trial and Appeal Board

“(a) IN GENERAL.—There shall be in the Office a Patent Trial and Appeal Board. The Director, the Deputy Director, the Commissioner for Patents, the Commissioner for Trademarks, and the administrative patent judges shall constitute the Patent Trial and Appeal Board. The administrative patent judges shall be persons of competent legal knowledge and scientific ability who are appointed by the Secretary, in consultation with the Director. Any reference in any Federal law, Executive order, rule, regulation, or delegation of authority, or any document of or pertaining to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences is deemed to refer to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board.

“(b) DUTIES.—The Patent Trial and Appeal Board shall—

“(1) on written appeal of an applicant, review adverse decisions of examiners upon applications for patents pursuant to section 134(a);

“(2) review appeals of reexaminations pursuant to section 134(b);

“(3) conduct derivation proceedings pursuant to section 135; and

“(4) conduct inter partes reviews and post-grant reviews pursuant to chapters 31 and 32.

“(c) 3-MEMBER PANELS.—Each appeal, derivation proceeding, post-grant review, and inter partes review shall be heard by at least 3 members of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board, who shall be designated by the Director. Only the Patent Trial and Appeal Board may grant rehearings.

“(d) TREATMENT OF PRIOR APPOINTMENTS.—The Secretary of Commerce may, in the Secretary’s discretion, deem the appointment of an administrative patent judge who, before the date of the enactment of this subsection, held office pursuant to an appointment by the Director to take effect on the date on which the Director initially appointed the administrative patent judge. It shall be a defense to a challenge to the appointment of an administrative patent judge on the basis of the judge’s having been originally appointed by the Director that the administrative patent judge so appointed was acting as a de facto officer.”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The item relating to section 6 in the table of sections for chapter 1 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“6. Patent Trial and Appeal Board.”

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS.—Section 134 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by striking “any reexamination proceeding” and inserting “a reexamination”; and

(2) by striking subsection (c).

(c) CIRCUIT APPEALS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 141 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 141. Appeal to Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

“(a) EXAMINATIONS.—An applicant who is dissatisfied with the final decision in an appeal to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board under section 134(a) may appeal the Board’s decision to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. By filing such an appeal, the applicant waives his or her right to proceed under section 145.

“(b) REEXAMINATIONS.—A patent owner who is dissatisfied with the final decision in an appeal of a reexamination to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board under section 134(b) may appeal the Board’s decision only to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

“(c) POST-GRANT AND INTER PARTES REVIEWS.—A party to an inter partes review or a post-grant review who is dissatisfied with the final written decision of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board under section 318(a) or 328(a) (as the case may be) may appeal the Board’s decision only to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

“(d) DERIVATION PROCEEDINGS.—A party to a derivation proceeding who is dissatisfied with the final decision of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board in the proceeding may appeal the decision to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, but such appeal shall be dismissed if any adverse party to such derivation proceeding, within 20 days after the appellant has filed notice of appeal in accordance with section 142, files notice with the Director that the party elects to have all further proceedings conducted as provided in section 146. If the appellant does not, within 30 days after the filing of such notice by the adverse party, file a civil action under section 146, the Board’s decision shall govern the further proceedings in the case.”

(2) JURISDICTION.—Section 1295(a)(4)(A) of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(A) the Patent Trial and Appeal Board of the United States Patent and Trademark Office with respect to a patent application, derivation proceeding, reexamination, post-grant review, or inter partes review under title 35, at the instance of a party who exercised that party’s right to participate in the applicable proceeding before or appeal to the Board, except that an applicant or a party to a derivation proceeding may also have remedy by civil action pursuant to section 145 or 146 of title 35; an appeal under this subparagraph of a decision of the Board with respect to an application or derivation proceeding shall waive the right of such applicant or party to proceed under section 145 or 146 of title 35;”

(3) PROCEEDINGS ON APPEAL.—Section 143 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(A) by striking the third sentence and inserting the following: “In an ex parte case, the Director shall submit to the court in writing the grounds for the decision of the Patent and Trademark Office, addressing all of the issues raised in the appeal. The Director shall have the right to intervene in an appeal from a decision entered by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board in a derivation proceeding under section 135 or in an inter partes or post-grant review under chapter 31 or 32.”; and

(B) by striking the last sentence.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect upon the expiration of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to proceedings commenced on or after that effective date, except that—

(1) the extension of jurisdiction to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit to entertain appeals of decisions of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board in reexaminations under the amendment made by subsection (c)(2) shall be deemed to take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall extend to any decision of the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences with respect to a reexamination that is entered before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act;

(2) the provisions of sections 6, 134, and 141 of title 35, United States Code, as in effect on the day before the effective date of the amendments made by this section shall continue to apply to inter partes reexaminations that are requested under section 311 of such title before such effective date;

(3) the Patent Trial and Appeal Board may be deemed to be the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences for purposes of appeals of inter partes reexaminations that are requested under section 311 of title 35, United States Code, before the effective date of the amendments made by this section; and

(4) the Director’s right under the fourth sentence of section 143 of title 35, United States Code, as amended by subsection (c)(3) of this section, to intervene in an appeal from a decision entered by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board shall be deemed to extend to inter partes reexaminations that are requested under section 311 of such title before the effective date of the amendments made by this section.

SEC. 8. PREISSUANCE SUBMISSIONS BY THIRD PARTIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 122 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(e) PREISSUANCE SUBMISSIONS BY THIRD PARTIES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—Any third party may submit for consideration and inclusion in the record of a patent application, any patent, published patent application, or other printed publication of potential relevance to the examination of the application, if such submission is made in writing before the earlier of—

“(A) the date a notice of allowance under section 151 is given or mailed in the application for patent; or

“(B) the later of—

“(i) 6 months after the date on which the application for patent is first published under section 122 by the Office, or

“(ii) the date of the first rejection under section 132 of any claim by the examiner during the examination of the application for patent.

“(2) OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—Any submission under paragraph (1) shall—

“(A) set forth a concise description of the asserted relevance of each submitted document;

“(B) be accompanied by such fee as the Director may prescribe; and

“(C) include a statement by the person making such submission affirming that the submission was made in compliance with this section.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect upon the expiration of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to any patent application filed before, on, or after that effective date.

SEC. 9. VENUE.

(a) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS RELATING TO VENUE.—Sections 32, 145, 146, 154(b)(4)(A), and 293 of title 35, United States Code, and section 21(b)(4) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1071(b)(4)), are each amended by striking “United States District Court for the District of Columbia” each place that term appears and inserting “United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia”.

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to any civil action commenced on or after that date.

SEC. 10. FEE SETTING AUTHORITY.

(a) **FEE SETTING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director may set or adjust by rule any fee established, authorized, or charged under title 35, United States Code, or the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1051 et seq.), for any services performed by or materials furnished by, the Office, subject to paragraph (2).

(2) **FEES TO RECOVER COSTS.**—Fees may be set or adjusted under paragraph (1) only to recover the aggregate estimated costs to the Office for processing, activities, services, and materials relating to patents (in the case of patent fees) and trademarks (in the case of trademark fees), including administrative costs of the Office with respect to such patent or trademark fees (as the case may be).

(b) **SMALL AND MICRO ENTITIES.**—The fees set or adjusted under subsection (a) for filing, searching, examining, issuing, appealing, and maintaining patent applications and patents shall be reduced by 50 percent with respect to the application of such fees to any small entity that qualifies for reduced fees under section 41(h)(1) of title 35, United States Code, and shall be reduced by 75 percent with respect to the application of such fees to any micro entity as defined in section 123 of that title (as added by subsection (g) of this section).

(c) **REDUCTION OF FEES IN CERTAIN FISCAL YEARS.**—In each fiscal year, the Director—

(1) shall consult with the Patent Public Advisory Committee and the Trademark Public Advisory Committee on the advisability of reducing any fees described in subsection (a); and

(2) after the consultation required under paragraph (1), may reduce such fees.

(d) **ROLE OF THE PUBLIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**—The Director shall—

(1) not less than 45 days before publishing any proposed fee under subsection (a) in the Federal Register, submit the proposed fee to the Patent Public Advisory Committee or the Trademark Public Advisory Committee, or both, as appropriate;

(2)(A) provide the relevant advisory committee described in paragraph (1) a 30-day period following the submission of any proposed fee, in which to deliberate, consider, and comment on such proposal;

(B) require that, during that 30-day period, the relevant advisory committee hold a public hearing relating to such proposal; and

(C) assist the relevant advisory committee in carrying out that public hearing, including by offering the use of the resources of the Office to notify and promote the hearing to the public and interested stakeholders;

(3) require the relevant advisory committee to make available to the public a written report setting forth in detail the comments, advice, and recommendations of the committee regarding the proposed fee; and

(4) consider and analyze any comments, advice, or recommendations received from the relevant advisory committee before setting or adjusting (as the case may be) the fee.

(e) **PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER.**—

(1) **PUBLICATION AND RATIONALE.**—The Director shall—

(A) publish any proposed fee change under this section in the Federal Register;

(B) include, in such publication, the specific rationale and purpose for the proposal, including the possible expectations or benefits resulting from the proposed change; and

(C) notify, through the Chair and Ranking Member of the Committees on the Judiciary of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Congress of the proposed change not later than the date on which the proposed change is published under subparagraph (A).

(2) **PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD.**—The Director shall, in the publication under paragraph (1), provide the public a period of not less than 45 days in which to submit comments on the proposed change in fees.

(3) **PUBLICATION OF FINAL RULE.**—The final rule setting or adjusting a fee under this section shall be published in the Federal Register and in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark Office.

(4) **CONGRESSIONAL COMMENT PERIOD.**—A fee set or adjusted under subsection (a) may not become effective—

(A) before the end of the 45-day period beginning on the day after the date on which the Director publishes the final rule adjusting or setting the fee under paragraph (3); or

(B) if a law is enacted disapproving such fee.

(5) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Rules prescribed under this section shall not diminish—

(A) the rights of an applicant for a patent under title 35, United States Code, or for a mark under the Trademark Act of 1946; or

(B) any rights under a ratified treaty.

(f) RETENTION OF AUTHORITY.—The Director retains the authority under subsection (a) to set or adjust fees only during such period as the Patent and Trademark Office remains an agency within the Department of Commerce.

(g) MICRO ENTITY DEFINED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 11 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 123. Micro entity defined

“(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this title, the term ‘micro entity’ means an applicant who makes a certification that the applicant—

“(1) qualifies as a small entity, as defined in regulations issued by the Director;

“(2) has not been named as an inventor on more than 4 previously filed patent applications, other than applications filed in another country, provisional applications under section 111(b), or international applications filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) for which the basic national fee under section 41(a) was not paid;

“(3) did not, in the calendar year preceding the calendar year in which the examination fee for the application is being paid, have a gross income, as defined in section 61(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, exceeding 3 times the median household income for that preceding calendar year, as reported by the Bureau of the Census; and

“(4) has not assigned, granted, or conveyed, and is not under an obligation by contract or law to assign, grant, or convey, a license or other ownership interest in the application concerned to an entity that, in the calendar year preceding the calendar year in which the examination fee for the application is being paid, had a gross income, as defined in section 61(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, exceeding 3 times the median household income for that preceding calendar year, as reported by the Bureau of the Census.

“(b) APPLICATIONS RESULTING FROM PRIOR EMPLOYMENT.—An applicant is not considered to be named on a previously filed application for purposes of subsection (a)(2) if the applicant has assigned, or is under an obligation by contract or law to assign, all ownership rights in the application as the result of the applicant’s previous employment.

“(c) FOREIGN CURRENCY EXCHANGE RATE.—If an applicant’s or entity’s gross income in the preceding calendar year is not in United States dollars, the average currency exchange rate, as reported by the Internal Revenue Service, during that calendar year shall be used to determine whether the applicant’s or entity’s gross income exceeds the threshold specified in paragraphs (3) or (4) of subsection (a).

“(d) PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, a micro entity shall include an applicant who certifies that—

“(A) the applicant’s employer, from which the applicant obtains the majority of the applicant’s income, is an institution of higher education, as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001), that is a public institution; or

“(B) the applicant has assigned, granted, conveyed, or is under an obligation by contract or law to assign, grant, or convey, a license or other ownership interest in the particular application to such public institution.

“(2) DIRECTOR’S AUTHORITY.—The Director may, in the Director’s discretion, impose income limits, annual filing limits, or other limits on who may qualify as a micro entity pursuant to this subsection if the Director determines that such additional limits are reasonably necessary to avoid an undue impact on other patent applicants or owners or are otherwise reasonably necessary and appropriate. At least 3 months before any limits proposed to be imposed pursuant to this paragraph take effect, the Director shall inform the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate of any such proposed limits.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Chapter 11 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“123. Micro entity defined.”

(h) ELECTRONIC FILING INCENTIVE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, a fee of \$400 shall be established for each application for an original patent, except for a design, plant, or provisional application, that is not filed by electronic means as prescribed by the Director. The fee established by this subsection shall be reduced by 50 percent for small entities that qualify for reduced fees under section 41(h)(1) of title 35, United States Code. All fees paid under this subsection shall be deposited in the Treasury as an offsetting receipt that shall not be available for obligation or expenditure.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection shall take effect upon the expiration of the 60-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(i) EFFECTIVE DATE; SUNSET.—

(1) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) SUNSET.—The authority of the Director to set or adjust any fee under subsection (a) shall terminate upon the expiration of the 6-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 11. FEES FOR PATENT SERVICES.

(a) GENERAL PATENT SERVICES.—Subsections (a) and (b) of section 41 of title 35, United States Code, are amended to read as follows:

“(a) GENERAL FEES.—The Director shall charge the following fees:

“(1) FILING AND BASIC NATIONAL FEES.—

“(A) On filing each application for an original patent, except for design, plant, or provisional applications, \$330.

“(B) On filing each application for an original design patent, \$220.

“(C) On filing each application for an original plant patent, \$220.

“(D) On filing each provisional application for an original patent, \$220.

“(E) On filing each application for the reissue of a patent, \$330.

“(F) The basic national fee for each international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) entering the national stage under section 371, \$330.

“(G) In addition, excluding any sequence listing or computer program listing filed in an electronic medium as prescribed by the Director, for any application the specification and drawings of which exceed 100 sheets of paper (or equivalent as prescribed by the Director if filed in an electronic medium), \$270 for each additional 50 sheets of paper (or equivalent as prescribed by the Director if filed in an electronic medium) or fraction thereof.

“(2) EXCESS CLAIMS FEES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—In addition to the fee specified in paragraph (1)—

“(i) on filing or on presentation at any other time, \$220 for each claim in independent form in excess of 3;

“(ii) on filing or on presentation at any other time, \$52 for each claim (whether dependent or independent) in excess of 20; and

“(iii) for each application containing a multiple dependent claim, \$390.

“(B) MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIMS.—For the purpose of computing fees under subparagraph (A), a multiple dependent claim referred to in section 112 or any claim depending therefrom shall be considered as separate dependent claims in accordance with the number of claims to which reference is made.

“(C) REFUNDS; ERRORS IN PAYMENT.—The Director may by regulation provide for a refund of any part of the fee specified in subparagraph (A) for any claim that is canceled before an examination on the merits, as prescribed by the Director, has been made of the application under section 131. Errors in payment of the additional fees under this paragraph may be rectified in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Director.

“(3) EXAMINATION FEES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—

“(i) For examination of each application for an original patent, except for design, plant, provisional, or international applications, \$220.

“(ii) For examination of each application for an original design patent, \$140.

“(iii) For examination of each application for an original plant patent, \$170.

“(iv) For examination of the national stage of each international application, \$220.

“(v) For examination of each application for the reissue of a patent, \$650.

“(B) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER FEE PROVISIONS.—The provisions of paragraphs (3) and (4) of section 111(a) relating to the payment of the fee for filing the application shall apply to the payment of the fee specified in subparagraph (A) with respect to an application filed under section 111(a). The provisions of section 371(d) relating to the payment of the national fee shall apply to the payment of the fee specified in subparagraph (A) with respect to an international application.

“(4) ISSUE FEES.—

“(A) For issuing each original patent, except for design or plant patents, \$1,510.

“(B) For issuing each original design patent, \$860.

“(C) For issuing each original plant patent, \$1,190.

“(D) For issuing each reissue patent, \$1,510.

“(5) DISCLAIMER FEE.—On filing each disclaimer, \$140.

“(6) APPEAL FEES.—

“(A) On filing an appeal from the examiner to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board, \$540.

“(B) In addition, on filing a brief in support of the appeal, \$540, and on requesting an oral hearing in the appeal before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board, \$1,080.

“(7) REVIVAL FEES.—On filing each petition for the revival of an unintentionally abandoned application for a patent, for the unintentionally delayed payment of the fee for issuing each patent, or for an unintentionally delayed response by the patent owner in any reexamination proceeding, \$1,620, unless the petition is filed under section 133 or 151, in which case the fee shall be \$540.

“(8) EXTENSION FEES.—For petitions for 1-month extensions of time to take actions required by the Director in an application—

“(A) on filing a first petition, \$130;

“(B) on filing a second petition, \$360; and

“(C) on filing a third or subsequent petition, \$620.

“(b) MAINTENANCE FEES.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall charge the following fees for maintaining in force all patents based on applications filed on or after December 12, 1980:

“(A) Three years and 6 months after grant, \$980.

“(B) Seven years and 6 months after grant, \$2,480.

“(C) Eleven years and 6 months after grant, \$4,110.

“(2) GRACE PERIOD; SURCHARGE.—Unless payment of the applicable maintenance fee under paragraph (1) is received in the Office on or before the date the fee is due or within a grace period of 6 months thereafter, the patent shall expire as of the end of such grace period. The Director may require the payment of a surcharge as a condition of accepting within such 6-month grace period the payment of an applicable maintenance fee.

“(3) NO MAINTENANCE FEE FOR DESIGN OR PLANT PATENT.—No fee may be established for maintaining a design or plant patent in force.”

(b) DELAYS IN PAYMENT.—Subsection (c) of section 41 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “(c)(1) The Director” and inserting:

“(c) DELAYS IN PAYMENT OF MAINTENANCE FEES.—

“(1) ACCEPTANCE.—The Director”; and

(2) by striking “(2) A patent” and inserting:

“(2) EFFECT ON RIGHTS OF OTHERS.—A patent”.

(c) PATENT SEARCH FEES.—Subsection (d) of section 41 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(d) PATENT SEARCH AND OTHER FEES.—

“(1) PATENT SEARCH FEES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall charge the fees specified under subparagraph (B) for the search of each application for a patent, except for provisional applications. The Director shall adjust the fees charged under this paragraph to ensure that the fees recover an amount not to exceed the estimated average cost to the Office of searching applications for patent either by acquiring a search report from a qualified search authority, or by causing a search by Office personnel to be made, of each application for patent.

“(B) SPECIFIC FEES.—The fees referred to in subparagraph (A) are—

- “(i) \$540 for each application for an original patent, except for design, plant, provisional, or international applications;
 - “(ii) \$100 for each application for an original design patent;
 - “(iii) \$330 for each application for an original plant patent;
 - “(iv) \$540 for the national stage of each international application;
- and
- “(v) \$540 for each application for the reissue of a patent.

“(C) APPLICABILITY OF OTHER PROVISIONS.—The provisions of paragraphs (3) and (4) of section 111(a) relating to the payment of the fee for filing the application shall apply to the payment of the fee specified in this paragraph with respect to an application filed under section 111(a). The provisions of section 371(d) relating to the payment of the national fee shall apply to the payment of the fee specified in this paragraph with respect to an international application.

“(D) REFUNDS.—The Director may by regulation provide for a refund of any part of the fee specified in this paragraph for any applicant who files a written declaration of express abandonment as prescribed by the Director before an examination has been made of the application under section 131.

“(E) APPLICATIONS SUBJECT TO SECRECY ORDER.—A search of an application that is the subject of a secrecy order under section 181 or otherwise involves classified information may be conducted only by Office personnel.

“(F) CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.—A qualified search authority that is a commercial entity may not conduct a search of a patent application if the entity has any direct or indirect financial interest in any patent or in any pending or imminent application for patent filed or to be filed in the Office.

“(2) OTHER FEES.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall establish fees for all other processing, services, or materials relating to patents not specified in this section to recover the estimated average cost to the Office of such processing, services, or materials, except that the Director shall charge the following fees for the following services:

- “(i) For recording a document affecting title, \$40 per property.
- “(ii) For each photocopy, \$.25 per page.
- “(iii) For each black and white copy of a patent, \$3.

“(B) COPIES FOR LIBRARIES.—The yearly fee for providing a library specified in section 12 with uncertified printed copies of the specifications and drawings for all patents in that year shall be \$50.”

(d) FEES FOR SMALL ENTITIES.—Subsection (h) of section 41 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(h) FEES FOR SMALL ENTITIES.—

“(1) REDUCTIONS IN FEES.—Subject to paragraph (3), fees charged under subsections (a), (b), and (d)(1) shall be reduced by 50 percent with respect to their application to any small business concern as defined under section 3 of the Small Business Act, and to any independent inventor or nonprofit organization as defined in regulations issued by the Director.

“(2) SURCHARGES AND OTHER FEES.—With respect to its application to any entity described in paragraph (1), any surcharge or fee charged under subsection (c) or (d) shall not be higher than the surcharge or fee required of any other entity under the same or substantially similar circumstances.

“(3) REDUCTION FOR ELECTRONIC FILING.—The fee charged under subsection (a)(1)(A) shall be reduced by 75 percent with respect to its application to any entity to which paragraph (1) applies, if the application is filed by electronic means as prescribed by the Director.”

(e) TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.—Section 41 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (e), in the first sentence, by striking “The Director” and inserting “WAIVER OF FEES; COPIES REGARDING NOTICE.—The Director”;

(2) in subsection (f), by striking “The fees” and inserting “ADJUSTMENT OF FEES.—The fees”;

(3) by repealing subsection (g); and

(4) in subsection (i)—

(A) by striking “(i)(1) The Director” and inserting the following:

“(i) ELECTRONIC PATENT AND TRADEMARK DATA.—

“(1) MAINTENANCE OF COLLECTIONS.—The Director”;

(B) by striking “(2) The Director” and inserting the following:

“(2) AVAILABILITY OF AUTOMATED SEARCH SYSTEMS.—The Director”;

(C) by striking “(3) The Director” and inserting the following:

“(3) ACCESS FEES.—The Director”; and

(D) by striking “(4) The Director” and inserting the following:

“(4) ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Director”.

(f) ADJUSTMENT OF TRADEMARK FEES.—Section 802(a) of division B of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–447) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by striking “During fiscal years 2005, 2006, and 2007,” and inserting “Until such time as the Director sets or adjusts the fees otherwise;” and

(2) in the second sentence, by striking “During fiscal years 2005, 2006, and 2007, the” and inserting “The”.

(g) EFFECTIVE DATE, APPLICABILITY, AND TRANSITION PROVISIONS.—Section 803(a) of division B of the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2005 (Public Law 108–447) is amended by striking “and shall apply only with respect to the remaining portion of fiscal year 2005 and fiscal year 2006”.

(h) REDUCTION IN FEES FOR SMALL ENTITY PATENTS.—The Director shall reduce fees for providing prioritized examination of utility and plant patent applications by 50 percent for small entities that qualify for reduced fees under section 41(h)(1) of title 35, United States Code, so long as the fees of the prioritized examination program are set to recover the estimated cost of the program.

(i) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Except as provided in subsection (h), this section and the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 12. SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 25 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 257. Supplemental examinations to consider, reconsider, or correct information

“(a) REQUEST FOR SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINATION.—A patent owner may request supplemental examination of a patent in the Office to consider, reconsider, or correct information believed to be relevant to the patent, in accordance with such requirements as the Director may establish. Within 3 months after the date a request for supplemental examination meeting the requirements of this section is received, the Director shall conduct the supplemental examination and shall conclude such examination by issuing a certificate indicating whether the information presented in the request raises a substantial new question of patentability.

“(b) REEXAMINATION ORDERED.—If the certificate issued under subsection (a) indicates that a substantial new question of patentability is raised by 1 or more items of information in the request, the Director shall order reexamination of the patent. The reexamination shall be conducted according to procedures established by chapter 30, except that the patent owner shall not have the right to file a statement pursuant to section 304. During the reexamination, the Director shall address each substantial new question of patentability identified during the supplemental examination, notwithstanding the limitations in chapter 30 relating to patents and printed publication or any other provision of such chapter.

“(c) EFFECT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A patent shall not be held unenforceable on the basis of conduct relating to information that had not been considered, was inadequately considered, or was incorrect in a prior examination of the patent if the information was considered, reconsidered, or corrected during a supplemental examination of the patent. The making of a request under subsection (a), or the absence thereof, shall not be relevant to enforceability of the patent under section 282.

“(2) EXCEPTIONS.—

“(A) PRIOR ALLEGATIONS.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to an allegation pled with particularity in a civil action, or set forth with particularity in a notice received by the patent owner under section 505(j)(2)(B)(iv)(II) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(j)(2)(B)(iv)(II)), before the date of a supplemental examination request under subsection (a) to consider, reconsider, or correct information forming the basis for the allegation.

“(B) PATENT ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS.—In an action brought under section 337(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1337(a)), or section 281 of this title, paragraph (1) shall not apply to any defense raised in the action that is based upon information that was considered, reconsidered, or corrected pursuant to a supplemental examination request under subsection (a), unless the supplemental examination, and any reexamination ordered pursuant to the request, are concluded before the date on which the action is brought.

“(C) FRAUD.—No supplemental examination may be commenced by the Director on, and any pending supplemental examination shall be immediately terminated regarding, an application or patent in connection with

which fraud on the Office was practiced or attempted. If the Director determines that such a fraud on the Office was practiced or attempted, the Director shall also refer the matter to the Attorney General for such action as the Attorney General may deem appropriate.

(d) FEES AND REGULATIONS.—

“(1) FEES.—The Director shall, by regulation, establish fees for the submission of a request for supplemental examination of a patent, and to consider each item of information submitted in the request. If reexamination is ordered under subsection (b), fees established and applicable to ex parte reexamination proceedings under chapter 30 shall be paid, in addition to fees applicable to supplemental examination.

“(2) REGULATIONS.—The Director shall issue regulations governing the form, content, and other requirements of requests for supplemental examination, and establishing procedures for reviewing information submitted in such requests.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

“(1) to preclude the imposition of sanctions based upon criminal or antitrust laws (including section 1001(a) of title 18, the first section of the Clayton Act, and section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act to the extent that section relates to unfair methods of competition);

“(2) to limit the authority of the Director to investigate issues of possible misconduct and impose sanctions for misconduct in connection with matters or proceedings before the Office; or

“(3) to limit the authority of the Director to issue regulations under chapter 3 relating to sanctions for misconduct by representatives practicing before the Office.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 25 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“257. Supplemental examinations to consider, reconsider, or correct information.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect upon the expiration of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to any patent issued before, on, or after that effective date.

SEC. 13. FUNDING AGREEMENTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 202(c)(7)(E)(i) of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “75 percent” and inserting “15 percent”;

(2) by striking “25 percent” and inserting “85 percent”; and

(3) by striking “as described above in this clause (D);” and inserting “described above in this clause;”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to any patent issued before, on, or after that date.

SEC. 14. TAX STRATEGIES DEEMED WITHIN THE PRIOR ART.

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of evaluating an invention under section 102 or 103 of title 35, United States Code, any strategy for reducing, avoiding, or deferring tax liability, whether known or unknown at the time of the invention or application for patent, shall be deemed insufficient to differentiate a claimed invention from the prior art.

(b) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term “tax liability” refers to any liability for a tax under any Federal, State, or local law, or the law of any foreign jurisdiction, including any statute, rule, regulation, or ordinance that levies, imposes, or assesses such tax liability.

(c) EXCLUSIONS.—This section does not apply to that part of an invention that—

(1) is a method, apparatus, technology, computer program product, or system, that is used solely for preparing a tax or information return or other tax filing, including one that records, transmits, transfers, or organizes data related to such filing; or

(2) is a method, apparatus, technology, computer program product, or system used solely for financial management, to the extent that it is severable from any tax strategy or does not limit the use of any tax strategy by any taxpayer or tax advisor.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to imply that other business methods are patentable or that other business method patents are valid.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE; APPLICABILITY.—This section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to any patent application that is pending on, or filed on or after, that date, and to any patent that is issued on or after that date.

SEC. 15. BEST MODE REQUIREMENT.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 282 of title 35, United States Code, is amended in the second undesignated paragraph by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

“(3) Invalidity of the patent or any claim in suit for failure to comply with—
 “(A) any requirement of section 112, except that the failure to disclose the best mode shall not be a basis on which any claim of a patent may be canceled or held invalid or otherwise unenforceable; or
 “(B) any requirement of section 251.”

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENT.**—Sections 119(e)(1) and 120 of title 35, United States Code, are each amended by striking “the first paragraph of section 112 of this title” and inserting “section 112(a) (other than the requirement to disclose the best mode)”.

(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this section shall take effect upon the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to proceedings commenced on or after that date.

SEC. 16. MARKING.

(a) **VIRTUAL MARKING.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 287(a) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “or when,” and inserting “or by fixing thereon the word ‘patent’ or the abbreviation ‘pat.’ together with an address of a posting on the Internet, accessible to the public without charge for accessing the address, that associates the patented article with the number of the patent, or when,”.

(2) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this subsection shall apply to any case that is pending on, or commenced on or after, the date of the enactment of this Act.

(3) **REPORT.**—Not later than the date that is 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit a report to Congress that provides—

(A) an analysis of the effectiveness of “virtual marking”, as provided in the amendment made by paragraph (1) of this subsection, as an alternative to the physical marking of articles;

(B) an analysis of whether such virtual marking has limited or improved the ability of the general public to access information about patents;

(C) an analysis of the legal issues, if any, that arise from such virtual marking; and

(D) an analysis of the deficiencies, if any, of such virtual marking.

(b) **FALSE MARKING.**—

(1) **CIVIL PENALTY.**—Section 292(a) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following: “Only the United States may sue for the penalty authorized by this subsection.”.

(2) **CIVIL ACTION FOR DAMAGES.**—Subsection (b) of section 292 of title 35, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(b) A person who has suffered a competitive injury as a result of a violation of this section may file a civil action in a district court of the United States for recovery of damages adequate to compensate for the injury.”.

(3) **EXPIRED PATENTS.**—Section 292 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) Whoever engages in an activity under subsection (a) for which liability would otherwise be imposed shall not be liable for such activity—

“(1) that is engaged in during the 3-year period beginning on the date on which the patent at issue expires; or

“(2) that is engaged in after the end of that 3-year period if the word ‘expired’ is placed before the word ‘patent’, ‘patented’, the abbreviation ‘pat’, or the patent number, either on the article or through a posting on the Internet, as provided in section 287(a).”.

(4) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendments made by this subsection shall apply to any case that is pending on, or commenced on or after, the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 17. ADVICE OF COUNSEL.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Chapter 29 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“§ 298. Advice of counsel

“The failure of an infringer to obtain the advice of counsel with respect to any allegedly infringed patent, or the failure of the infringer to present such advice to the court or jury, may not be used to prove that the accused infringer willfully in-

fringed the patent or that the infringer intended to induce infringement of the patent.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 29 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“298. Advice of counsel.”.

SEC. 18. TRANSITIONAL PROGRAM FOR COVERED BUSINESS METHOD PATENTS.

(a) TRANSITIONAL PROGRAM.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—Not later than the date that is 1 year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall issue regulations establishing and implementing a transitional post-grant review proceeding for review of the validity of covered business method patents. The transitional proceeding implemented pursuant to this subsection shall be regarded as, and shall employ the standards and procedures of, a post-grant review under chapter 32 of title 35, United States Code, subject to the following:

(A) Section 321(c) of title 35, United States Code, and subsections (b), (e)(2), and (f) of section 325 of such title shall not apply to a transitional proceeding.

(B) A person may not file a petition for a transitional proceeding with respect to a covered business method patent unless the person or the person’s real party in interest has been sued for infringement of the patent or has been charged with infringement under that patent.

(C) A petitioner in a transitional proceeding who challenges the validity of 1 or more claims in a covered business method patent on a ground raised under section 102 or 103 of title 35, United States Code, as in effect on the day before the effective date set forth in section 3(n)(1), may support such ground only on the basis of—

(i) prior art that is described by section 102(a) of such title of such title (as in effect on the day before such effective date); or

(ii) prior art that—

(I) discloses the invention more than 1 year before the date of the application for patent in the United States; and

(II) would be described by section 102(a) of such title (as in effect on the day before the effective date set forth in section 3(n)(1)) if the disclosure had been made by another before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

(D) The petitioner in a transitional proceeding, or the petitioner’s real party in interest, may not assert, either in a civil action arising in whole or in part under section 1338 of title 28, United States Code, or in a proceeding before the International Trade Commission under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1337), that a claim in a patent is invalid on any ground that the petitioner raised during a transitional proceeding that resulted in a final written decision.

(E) The Director may institute a transitional proceeding only for a patent that is a covered business method patent.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The regulations issued under paragraph (1) shall take effect upon the expiration of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to any covered business method patent issued before, on, or after that effective date, except that the regulations shall not apply to a patent described in section 6(f)(2)(A) of this Act during the period in which a petition for post-grant review of that patent would satisfy the requirements of section 321(c) of title 35, United States Code.

(3) SUNSET.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—This subsection, and the regulations issued under this subsection, are repealed effective upon the expiration of the 10-year period beginning on the date that the regulations issued under to paragraph (1) take effect.

(B) APPLICABILITY.—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), this subsection and the regulations issued under this subsection shall continue to apply, after the date of the repeal under subparagraph (A), to any petition for a transitional proceeding that is filed before the date of such repeal.

(b) REQUEST FOR STAY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If a party seeks a stay of a civil action alleging infringement of a patent under section 281 of title 35, United States Code, relating to a transitional proceeding for that patent, the court shall decide whether to enter a stay based on—

(A) whether a stay, or the denial thereof, will simplify the issues in question and streamline the trial;

(B) whether discovery is complete and whether a trial date has been set;

(C) whether a stay, or the denial thereof, would unduly prejudice the nonmoving party or present a clear tactical advantage for the moving party; and

(D) whether a stay, or the denial thereof, will reduce the burden of litigation on the parties and on the court.

(2) REVIEW.—A party may take an immediate interlocutory appeal from a district court's decision under paragraph (1). The United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit shall review the district court's decision to ensure consistent application of established precedent, and such review may be de novo.

(c) ATM EXEMPTION FOR VENUE PURPOSES.—In an action for infringement under section 281 of title 35, United States Code, of a covered business method patent, an automated teller machine shall not be deemed to be a regular and established place of business for purposes of section 1400(b) of title 28, United States Code.

(d) DEFINITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this section, the term “covered business method patent” means a patent that claims a method or corresponding apparatus for performing data processing or other operations used in the practice, administration, or management of a financial product or service, except that the term does not include patents for technological inventions.

(2) REGULATIONS.—To assist in implementing the transitional proceeding authorized by this subsection, the Director shall issue regulations for determining whether a patent is for a technological invention.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as amending or interpreting categories of patent-eligible subject matter set forth under section 101 of title 35, United States Code.

SEC. 19. JURISDICTION AND PROCEDURAL MATTERS.

(a) STATE COURT JURISDICTION.—Section 1338(a) of title 28, United States Code, is amended by striking the second sentence and inserting the following: “No State court shall have jurisdiction over any claim for relief arising under any Act of Congress relating to patents, plant variety protection, or copyrights. For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘State’ includes any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands.”

(b) COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT.—Section 1295(a)(1) of title 28, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“(1) of an appeal from a final decision of a district court of the United States, the District Court of Guam, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, or the District Court of the Northern Mariana Islands, in any civil action arising under, or in any civil action in which a party has asserted a compulsory counterclaim arising under, any Act of Congress relating to patents or plant variety protection;”.

(c) REMOVAL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 89 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 1454. Patent, plant variety protection, and copyright cases

“(a) IN GENERAL.—A civil action in which any party asserts a claim for relief arising under any Act of Congress relating to patents, plant variety protection, or copyrights may be removed to the district court of the United States for the district and division embracing the place where the action is pending.

“(b) SPECIAL RULES.—The removal of an action under this section shall be made in accordance with section 1446, except that if the removal is based solely on this section—

“(1) the action may be removed by any party; and

“(2) the time limitations contained in section 1446(b) may be extended at any time for cause shown.

“(c) CLARIFICATION OF JURISDICTION IN CERTAIN CASES.—The court to which a civil action is removed under this section is not precluded from hearing and determining any claim in the civil action because the State court from which the civil action is removed did not have jurisdiction over that claim.

“(d) REMAND.—If a civil action is removed solely under this section, the district court—

“(1) shall remand all claims that are neither a basis for removal under subsection (a) nor within the original or supplemental jurisdiction of the district court under any Act of Congress; and

“(2) may, under the circumstances specified in section 1367(c), remand any claims within the supplemental jurisdiction of the district court under section 1367.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 89 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“1454. Patent, plant variety protection, and copyright cases.”.

(d) TRANSFER BY COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE FEDERAL CIRCUIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 99 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 1632. Transfer by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

“When a case is appealed to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit under section 1295(a)(1), and no claim for relief arising under any Act of Congress relating to patents or plant variety protection is the subject of the appeal by any party, the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit shall transfer the appeal to the court of appeals for the regional circuit embracing the district from which the appeal has been taken.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 99 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“1632. Transfer by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.”.

(e) PROCEDURAL MATTERS IN PATENT CASES.—

(1) JOINDER OF PARTIES AND STAY OF ACTIONS.—Chapter 29 of title 35, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new section:

“§ 299. Joinder of parties

“(a) JOINDER OF ACCUSED INFRINGERS.—In any civil action arising under any Act of Congress relating to patents, other than an action or trial in which an act of infringement under section 271(e)(2) has been pled, parties that are accused infringers may be joined in one action as defendants or counterclaim defendants only if—

“(1) any right to relief is asserted against the parties jointly, severally, or in the alternative with respect to or arising out of the same transaction, occurrence, or series of transactions or occurrences relating to the making, using, importing into the United States, offering for sale, or selling of the same accused product or process; and

“(2) questions of fact common to all defendants or counterclaim defendants will arise in the action.

“(b) ALLEGATIONS INSUFFICIENT FOR JOINDER.—For purposes of this subsection, accused infringers may not be joined in one action or trial as defendants or counterclaim defendants based solely on allegations that they each have infringed the patent or patents in suit.”.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 29 of title 35, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following new item:

“299. Joinder of parties.”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to any civil action commenced on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 20. TECHNICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) JOINT INVENTIONS.—Section 116 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first undesignated paragraph, by striking “When” and inserting “(a) JOINT INVENTIONS.—When”;

(2) in the second undesignated paragraph, by striking “If a joint inventor” and inserting “(b) OMITTED INVENTOR.—If a joint inventor”; and

(3) in the third undesignated paragraph—

(A) by striking “Whenever” and inserting “(c) CORRECTION OF ERRORS IN APPLICATION.—Whenever”; and

(B) by striking “and such error arose without any deceptive intention on his part.”.

(b) FILING OF APPLICATION IN FOREIGN COUNTRY.—Section 184 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the first undesignated paragraph—

(A) by striking “Except when” and inserting “(a) FILING IN FOREIGN COUNTRY.—Except when”; and

(B) by striking “and without deceptive intent”;

- (2) in the second undesignated paragraph, by striking “The term” and inserting “(b) APPLICATION.—The term”; and
- (3) in the third undesignated paragraph, by striking “The scope” and inserting “(c) SUBSEQUENT MODIFICATIONS, AMENDMENTS, AND SUPPLEMENTS.—The scope”.
- (c) FILING WITHOUT A LICENSE.—Section 185 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “and without deceptive intent”.
- (d) REISSUE OF DEFECTIVE PATENTS.—Section 251 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—
- (1) in the first undesignated paragraph—
 - (A) by striking “Whenever” and inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—Whenever”; and
 - (B) by striking “without any deceptive intention”;
 - (2) in the second undesignated paragraph, by striking “The Director” and inserting “(b) MULTIPLE REISSUED PATENTS.—The Director”;
 - (3) in the third undesignated paragraph, by striking “The provisions” and inserting “(c) APPLICABILITY OF THIS TITLE.—The provisions”; and
 - (4) in the last undesignated paragraph, by striking “No reissued patent” and inserting “(d) REISSUE PATENT ENLARGING SCOPE OF CLAIMS.—No reissued patent”.
- (e) EFFECT OF REISSUE.—Section 253 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—
- (1) in the first undesignated paragraph, by striking “Whenever, without any deceptive intention,” and inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—Whenever”; and
 - (2) in the second undesignated paragraph, by striking “In like manner” and inserting “(b) ADDITIONAL DISCLAIMER OR DEDICATION.—In the manner set forth in subsection (a).”.
- (f) CORRECTION OF NAMED INVENTOR.—Section 256 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—
- (1) in the first undesignated paragraph—
 - (A) by striking “Whenever” and inserting “(a) CORRECTION.—Whenever”; and
 - (B) by striking “and such error arose without any deceptive intention on his part”; and
 - (2) in the second undesignated paragraph, by striking “The error” and inserting “(b) PATENT VALID IF ERROR CORRECTED.—The error”.
- (g) PRESUMPTION OF VALIDITY.—Section 282 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—
- (1) in the first undesignated paragraph—
 - (A) by striking “A patent” and inserting “(a) IN GENERAL.—A patent”; and
 - (B) by striking the third sentence;
 - (2) in the second undesignated paragraph—
 - (A) by striking “The following” and inserting “(b) DEFENSES.—The following”;
 - (B) in paragraph (1), by striking “unforceability,” and inserting “unenforceability.”; and
 - (C) in paragraph (2), by striking “patentability,” and inserting “patentability.”; and
 - (3) in the third undesignated paragraph—
 - (A) by striking “In actions involving the validity or infringement of a patent” and inserting “(c) NOTICE OF ACTIONS; ACTIONS DURING EXTENSION OF PATENT TERM.—In an action involving the validity or infringement of patent, the party asserting infringement shall identify, in the pleadings or otherwise in writing to the adverse party, all of its real parties in interest, and”;
 - (B) by striking “Claims Court” and inserting “Court of Federal Claims”.
- (h) ACTION FOR INFRINGEMENT.—Section 288 of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “, without deceptive intention.”.
- (i) REVISER’S NOTES.—
- (1) Section 3(e)(2) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “this Act,” and inserting “that Act.”.
 - (2) Section 202 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—
 - (A) in subsection (b)(3), by striking “the section 203(b)” and inserting “section 203(b)”;
 - (B) in subsection (c)(7)(D), by striking “except where it proves” and all that follows through “small business firms; and” and inserting: “except where it is determined to be infeasible following a reasonable inquiry, a

preference in the licensing of subject inventions shall be given to small business firms; and”.

(3) Section 209(d)(1) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “nontransferrable” and inserting “nontransferable”.

(4) Section 287(c)(2)(G) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “any state” and inserting “any State”.

(5) Section 371(b) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “of the treaty” and inserting “of the treaty.”.

(j) UNNECESSARY REFERENCES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Title 35, United States Code, is amended by striking “of this title” each place that term appears.

(2) EXCEPTION.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall not apply to the use of such term in the following sections of title 35, United States Code:

(A) Section 1(c).

(B) Section 101.

(C) Subsections (a) and (b) of section 105.

(D) The first instance of the use of such term in section 111(b)(8).

(E) Section 161.

(F) Section 164.

(G) Section 171.

(H) Section 251(c), as so designated by this section.

(I) Section 261.

(J) Subsections (g) and (h) of section 271.

(K) Section 287(b)(1).

(L) Section 289.

(M) The first instance of the use of such term in section 375(a).

(k) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect upon the expiration of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to proceedings commenced on or after that effective date.

SEC. 21. TRAVEL EXPENSES AND PAYMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGES.

(a) AUTHORITY TO COVER CERTAIN TRAVEL RELATED EXPENSES.—Section 2(b)(11) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by inserting “, and the Office is authorized to expend funds to cover the subsistence expenses and travel-related expenses, including per diem, lodging costs, and transportation costs, of persons attending such programs who are not Federal employees” after “world”.

(b) PAYMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE JUDGES.—Section 3(b) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(6) ADMINISTRATIVE PATENT JUDGES AND ADMINISTRATIVE TRADEMARK JUDGES.—The Director may fix the rate of basic pay for the administrative patent judges appointed pursuant to section 6 and the administrative trademark judges appointed pursuant to section 17 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1067) at not greater than the rate of basic pay payable for level III of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5. The payment of a rate of basic pay under this paragraph shall not be subject to the pay limitation under section 5306(e) or 5373 of title 5.”.

SEC. 22. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE FUNDING.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “Fund” means the United States Patent and Trademark Office Public Enterprise Fund established under subsection (c).

(b) FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 42 of title 35, United States Code, is amended—
(A) in subsection (b), by striking “Patent and Trademark Office Appropriation Account” and inserting “United States Patent and Trademark Office Public Enterprise Fund”; and

(B) in subsection (c), in the first sentence—

(i) by striking “To the extent” and all that follows through “fees” and inserting “Fees”; and

(ii) by striking “shall be collected by and shall be available to the Director” and inserting “shall be collected by the Director and shall be available until expended”.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by paragraph (1) shall take effect on the later of—

(A) October 1, 2011; or

(B) the first day of the first fiscal year that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) USPTO REVOLVING FUND.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established in the Treasury of the United States a revolving fund to be known as the “United States Patent and Trade-

mark Office Public Enterprise Fund". Any amounts in the Fund shall be available for use by the Director without fiscal year limitation.

(2) DERIVATION OF RESOURCES.—There shall be deposited into the Fund and recorded as offsetting receipts, on and after the effective date set forth in subsection (b)(2)—

(A) any fees collected under sections 41, 42, and 376 of title 35, United States Code, except that—

(i) notwithstanding any other provision of law, if such fees are collected by, and payable to, the Director, the Director shall transfer such amounts to the Fund; and

(ii) no funds collected pursuant to section 10(h) of this Act or section 1(a)(2) of Public Law 111–45 shall be deposited in the Fund; and

(B) any fees collected under section 31 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1113).

(3) EXPENSES.—Amounts deposited into the Fund under paragraph (2) shall be available, without fiscal year limitation, to cover—

(A) all expenses to the extent consistent with the limitation on the use of fees set forth in section 42(c) of title 35, United States Code, including all administrative and operating expenses, determined in the discretion of the Director to be ordinary and reasonable, incurred by the Director for the continued operation of all services, programs, activities, and duties of the Office relating to patents and trademarks, as such services, programs, activities, and duties are described under—

(i) title 35, United States Code; and

(ii) the Trademark Act of 1946; and

(B) all expenses incurred pursuant to any obligation, representation, or other commitment of the Office.

(d) ANNUAL REPORT.—Not later than 60 days after the end of each fiscal year, the Director shall submit a report to Congress which shall—

(1) summarize the operations of the Office for the preceding fiscal year, including financial details and staff levels broken down by each major activity of the Office;

(2) detail the operating plan of the Office, including specific expense and staff needs for the upcoming fiscal year;

(3) describe the long-term modernization plans of the Office;

(4) set forth details of any progress towards such modernization plans made in the previous fiscal year; and

(5) include the results of the most recent audit carried out under subsection (f).

(e) ANNUAL SPENDING PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 30 days after the beginning of each fiscal year, the Director shall notify the Committees on Appropriations of both Houses of Congress of the plan for the obligation and expenditure of the total amount of the funds for that fiscal year in accordance with section 605 of the Science, State, Justice, Commerce, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2006 (Public Law 109–108; 119 Stat. 2334).

(2) CONTENTS.—Each plan under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) summarize the operations of the Office for the current fiscal year, including financial details and staff levels with respect to major activities; and

(B) detail the operating plan of the Office, including specific expense and staff needs, for the current fiscal year.

(f) AUDIT.—The Director shall, on an annual basis, provide for an independent audit of the financial statements of the Office. Such audit shall be conducted in accordance with generally acceptable accounting procedures.

(g) BUDGET.—The Director shall prepare and submit each year to the President a business-type budget for the Fund in a manner, and before a date, as the President prescribes by regulation for the Federal budget.

SEC. 23. SATELLITE OFFICES.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Subject to available resources, the Director shall, by not later than the date that is 3 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, establish 3 or more satellite offices in the United States to carry out the responsibilities of the Office.

(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of the satellite offices established under subsection (a) are to—

(1) increase outreach activities to better connect patent filers and innovators with the Office;

(2) enhance patent examiner retention;

- (3) improve recruitment of patent examiners;
- (4) decrease the number of patent applications waiting for examination; and
- (5) improve the quality of patent examination.

(c) **REQUIRED CONSIDERATIONS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In selecting the location of each satellite office to be established under subsection (a), the Director—

(A) shall ensure geographic diversity among the offices, including by ensuring that such offices are established in different States and regions throughout the Nation;

(B) may rely upon any previous evaluations by the Office of potential locales for satellite offices, including any evaluations prepared as part of the Office’s Nationwide Workforce Program that resulted in the 2010 selection of Detroit, Michigan, as the first satellite office of the Office.

(2) **OPEN SELECTION PROCESS.**—Nothing in paragraph (1) shall constrain the Office to only consider its evaluations in selecting the Detroit, Michigan, satellite office.

(d) **REPORT TO CONGRESS.**—Not later than the end of the third fiscal year that begins after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Director shall submit a report to Congress on—

- (1) the rationale of the Director in selecting the location of any satellite office required under subsection (a);
- (2) the progress of the Director in establishing all such satellite offices; and
- (3) whether the operation of existing satellite offices is achieving the purposes under subsection (b).

SEC. 24. DESIGNATION OF DETROIT SATELLITE OFFICE.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—The satellite office of the United States Patent and Trademark Office to be located in Detroit, Michigan, shall be known and designated as the “Elijah J. McCoy United States Patent and Trademark Office”.

(b) **REFERENCES.**—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the satellite office of the United States Patent and Trademark Office to be located in Detroit, Michigan, referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the “Elijah J. McCoy United States Patent and Trademark Office”.

SEC. 25. PATENT OMBUDSMAN PROGRAM FOR SMALL BUSINESS CONCERNS.

Using available resources, the Director shall establish and maintain in the Office a Patent Ombudsman Program. The duties of the Program’s staff shall include providing support and services relating to patent filings to small business concerns.

SEC. 26. PRIORITY EXAMINATION FOR TECHNOLOGIES IMPORTANT TO AMERICAN COMPETITIVENESS.

Section 2(b)(2) of title 35, United States Code, is amended—

- (1) in subparagraph (E), by striking “and” after the semicolon;
- (2) in subparagraph (F), by inserting “and” after the semicolon; and
- (3) by adding at the end the following:

“(G) may, subject to any conditions prescribed by the Director and at the request of the patent applicant, provide for prioritization of examination of applications for products, processes, or technologies that are important to the national economy or national competitiveness without recovering the aggregate extra cost of providing such prioritization, notwithstanding section 41 or any other provision of law;”.

SEC. 27. CALCULATION OF 60-DAY PERIOD FOR APPLICATION OF PATENT TERM EXTENSION.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 156(d)(1) of title 35, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following flush sentence:

“For purposes of determining the date on which a product receives permission under the second sentence of this paragraph, if such permission is transmitted after 4:30 P.M., Eastern Time, on a business day, or is transmitted on a day that is not a business day, the product shall be deemed to receive such permission on the next business day. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term ‘business day’ means any Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday, excluding any legal holiday under section 6103 of title 5.”.

(b) **APPLICABILITY.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) shall apply to any application for extension of a patent term under section 156 of title 35, United States Code, that is pending on, that is filed after, or as to which a decision regarding the application is subject to judicial review on, the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 28. STUDY ON IMPLEMENTATION.

(a) PTO STUDY.—The Director shall conduct a study on the manner in which this Act and the amendments made by this Act are being implemented by the Office, and on such other aspects of the patent policies and practices of the Federal Government with respect to patent rights, innovation in the United States, competitiveness of United States markets, access by small businesses to capital for investment, and such other issues, as the Director considers appropriate.

(b) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—The Director shall, not later than the date that is 4 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, submit to the Committees on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on the results of the study conducted under subsection (a), including recommendations for any changes to laws and regulations that the Director considers appropriate.

SEC. 29. PRO BONO PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall work with and support intellectual property law associations across the country in the establishment of pro bono programs designed to assist financially under-resourced independent inventors and small businesses.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 30. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as otherwise provided in this Act, the provisions of this Act shall take effect upon the expiration of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and shall apply to any patent issued on or after that effective date.

SEC. 31. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

Purpose and Summary

The Constitution explicitly grants Congress the power to “promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to . . . inventors the exclusive right to their respective . . . discoveries.”¹ Congress has responded by authorizing patents to issue to inventors of new and useful inventions or improvements on inventions.² The patent law thus accomplishes two objectives, consistent with the authorization granted by the Constitution: first, it encourages inventors by granting them limited, but exclusive rights to their inventions; second, in exchange for the grant of those exclusive rights, the patent law requires disclosure of the invention and terminates the monopoly after a period of years.³ This disclosure and limited time benefits both society and future inventors by making the details of the invention available to the public immediately, and the right to make use of that invention after the expiration of 20 years from the date the patent application was filed.

Congress has not enacted comprehensive patent law reform in nearly 60 years.⁴ The object of the patent law today must remain true to the constitutional command, but its form needs to change, both to correct flaws in the system that have become unbearable, and to accommodate changes in the economy and the litigation

¹ U.S. Const. Art. 1, § 8.

² See 35 U.S.C. § 101.

³ See *Perspectives on Patents: Post-Grant Review Procedures and Other Litigation Reforms: Hearing before the Subcomm. on Intellectual Prop. of the Senate Comm. on the Judiciary*, 109th Cong. (2006) (statement of Nathan P. Myhrvold, Chief Executive Officer, Intellectual Ventures); *Perspectives on Patents: Hearing before the Subcomm. on Intellectual Prop. of the Senate Comm. on the Judiciary*, 109th Cong. (2005) (statement of Dean Kamen, President, DEKA Research and Development Corp.).

⁴ The last major revision of the patent laws was the Patent Act of 1952, P.L. 82–593.

practices in the patent realm. The need to update our patent laws has been meticulously documented in 15 hearings before the Committee or its Subcommittee on Courts, the Internet, and Intellectual Property, as well as eight hearings before the United States Senate Committee on the Judiciary. In addition, these legislative findings are augmented by the Federal Trade Commission and the National Academy of Sciences,⁵ both of which published authoritative reports on patent reform, and a plethora of academic commentary.⁶

While Congress has considered patent reform legislation over the last four Congresses, the need to modernize our patent laws has found expression in the courts, as well. The Supreme Court has reversed the Federal Circuit in six of the patent-related cases that it has heard since the beginning of the 109th Congress.⁷ The Court's decisions have moved in the direction of improving patent quality and making the determination of patent validity more efficient. The decisions reflect a growing sense that questionable patents are too easily obtained and are too difficult to challenge.⁸ Recent decisions by the Federal Circuit reflect a similar trend in response to these concerns.⁹ But the courts are constrained in their decisions by the text of the statutes at issue. It is time for Congress to act.

The voices heard during the debate over changes to the patent law have been diverse and their proposals have been far from uniform. They have focused the Committee's attention on the value of harmonizing our system for granting patents with the best parts of other major patent systems throughout the industrialized world for the benefit of U.S. patent holders; improving patent quality and providing a more efficient system for challenging patents that

⁵The National Academy of Sciences (NAS), and the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) conducted multi-year studies on the patent system and its need for reform. See *National Research Council of the National Academies, A Patent System for the 21st Century* (2004) (hereinafter "NAS Report"); and *Federal Trade Comm'n., To Promote Innovation: The Proper Balance of Competition and Patent Law and Policy* (2003) (hereinafter "FTC Report").

⁶See, e.g., Mark A. Lemley and Carl Shapiro, *Patent Holdup and Royalty Stacking*, 85 Tex. L. Rev. 1991 (2007); Donald S. Chisum, *Reforming Patent Law Reform*, 4 J. Marshall Rev. Intell. Prop. L. 336 (2005); Gerald J. Mossinghoff, *The First-to-Invent Rule in the U.S. Patent System has Provided no Advantage to Small Entities*, 87 JPTOS 514 (2005); Joseph Farrell & Robert P. Merges, *Incentives to Challenge and Defend Patents: Why Litigation Won't Reliably Fix Patent Office Errors and Why Administrative Patent Review Might Help*, 19 Berkeley Tech. L.J. 943, 958 (2004); see also Adam B. Jaffe & Josh Lerner, *Innovation and Its Discontents: How Our Broken Patent System is Endangering Innovation and Progress, and What to Do About It* (2004); Kevin G. Rivette & David Kline, *Rembrandts in the Attic, Unlocking the Hidden Value of Patents* (2000).

⁷See *Bilski v. Kappos*, _____ U.S. ____, 130 S.Ct. 3218 (2010) (reversing the Federal Circuit and holding that the machine-or-transformation test is not the sole test for determining the patent eligibility of a process); *Quanta Computer, Inc. v. LG Elecs. Inc.*, 553 U.S. 617 (2008) (reversing the Federal Circuit and holding that patent exhaustion applies to method patents when the essential or inventive feature of the invention is embodied in the product); *Microsoft Corp. v. AT&T Corp.*, 550 U.S. 437 (2007) (reversing the Federal Circuit and limiting the extraterritorial reach of section 271(f), which imposes liability on a party which supplies from the U.S. components of a patented invention for combination outside the U.S.); *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. 398 (2007) (reversing the Federal Circuit and strengthening the standard for determining when an invention is obvious under section 103); *MedImmune, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.*, 549 U.S. 118 (2007) (reversing the Federal Circuit and holding that the threat of a private enforcement action is sufficient to confirm standing under the Constitution); *eBay Inc. v. MercExchange, L.L.C.*, 547 U.S. 388 (2006) (reversing the Federal Circuit and holding that the generally applicable four-factor test for injunctive relief applies to disputes in patent cases).

⁸See generally *Patent Reform in the 111th Congress: Legislation and Recent Court Decisions*, Senate Judiciary Committee, 111th Cong. (2009) (statement of Professor Mark A. Lemley, Stanford Law School).

⁹See, e.g., *In re Seagate Tech., LLC*, 497 F.3d 1360 (Fed. Cir. 2007) (holding that willful infringement requires at least a demonstration of objectively reckless behavior and removing any affirmative obligation to obtain an opinion of counsel letter to combat an allegation of willful infringement).

should not have issued; and reducing unwarranted litigation costs and inconsistent damage awards.

The purpose of the “America Invents Act,” as reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, is to ensure that the patent system in the 21st century reflects the constitutional imperative. Congress must promote innovation by granting inventors temporally limited monopolies on their inventions in a manner that ultimately benefits the public through the disclosure of the invention to the public. The legislation is designed to establish a more efficient and streamlined patent system that will improve patent quality and limit unnecessary and counterproductive litigation costs.

If the United States is to maintain its competitive edge in the global economy, it needs a system that will support and reward all innovators with high quality patents. The Committee has taken testimony from and its members have held meetings with interested parties that have different and often conflicting perspectives on the patent system. The Committee has taken all of those views into consideration, and drafted and then amended the “America Invents Act” to balance the competing interests. The legislation ordered reported by the Committee on a vote of 32–3 is a consensus approach that will modernize the United States patent system in significant respects.

Background and Need for the Legislation

First Inventor to File

The “America Invents Act” creates a new “first-inventor-to-file” system. Every industrialized nation other than the United States uses a patent priority system commonly referred to as “first-to-file.” In a first-to-file system, when more than one application claiming the same invention is filed, the priority of a right to a patent is based on the earlier-filed application. The United States, by contrast, currently uses a “first-to-invent” system, in which priority is established through a proceeding to determine which applicant actually invented the claimed invention first. Differences between the two systems arise in large part from the date that is most relevant to each respective system. In a first-to-file system, the filing date of the application is most relevant;¹⁰ the filing date of an application is an objective date, simple to determine, for it is listed on the face of the patent. In contrast, in a first-to-invent system, the date the invention claimed in the application was actually invented is the determinative date. Unlike the objective date of filing, the date someone invents something is often uncertain, and, when disputed, typically requires corroborating evidence as part of an adjudication.

There are significant, practical differences between the two systems. Among them is the ease of determining the right to a claimed invention in the instance in which two different people file patent applications for the same invention. In a first-to-file system, the application with the earlier filing date prevails and will be awarded the patent, if one issues. In the first-to-invent system, a lengthy, complex and costly administrative proceeding (called an “interference proceeding”) must be conducted at the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”) to determine who actually in-

¹⁰When the term “filing date” is used herein, it is also meant to include, when appropriate, the effective filing date, *i.e.*, the earliest date the claim in an application-claims priority.

vented first.¹¹ Interference proceedings can take years to complete (even if there is no appeal to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit), cost hundreds of thousands of dollars, and require extensive discovery.¹² In addition, because it is always possible that an applicant could be involved in an interference proceeding, companies must maintain extensive recording and document retention systems in case they are later required to prove the date they invented the claimed invention.

Another important difference between the two systems is that in some first-to-file systems, prior art can include the inventor's own disclosure of his invention prior to the filing date of his application. Such systems do not provide the inventor any grace period during which time he is allowed to publish his invention without fear of its later being used against him as prior art. The Committee heard from universities and small inventors, in particular, about the importance of maintaining that grace period in our system.¹³ They argued that the grace period affords the necessary time to prepare and file applications, and in some instances, to obtain the necessary funding that enables the inventor to prepare adequately the application. In addition, the grace period benefits the public by encouraging early disclosure of new inventions, regardless of whether an application may later be filed for a patent on it.

Numerous organizations, institutions, and companies have advocated that the U.S. adopt a first-to-file system similar to those used in the rest of the world.¹⁴ The National Academy of Sciences made a similar recommendation after an extensive study of the patent system.¹⁵ When the United States patent system was first adopted, inventors did not typically file in other countries. It is now common for inventors and companies to file for protection in several countries at the same time.¹⁶ Thus, United States applicants, who also

¹¹ See 35 U.S.C. § 135.

¹² See, e.g., Robert W. Pritchard, *The Future is Now—The Case for Patent Harmonization*, 20 N.C. J. Int'l L. & Com. Reg. 291, 313 (1995).

¹³ See, e.g., *Perspectives on Patents: Harmonization and Other Matters: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Intellectual Prop. of the Senate Comm. on the Judiciary*, 109th Cong. (2005) (statement of Charles E. Phelps, Provost, University of Rochester, on behalf of the Association of American Universities); *Patent Law Reform: Injunctions and Damages: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Intellectual Prop. of the Senate Comm. on the Judiciary*, 109th Cong. (2005) (statement of Carl Gulbrandsen, Managing Director, Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation (WARF)); *Perspective on Patents: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Intellectual Prop. of the Senate Comm. on the Judiciary*, 109th Cong. (2005) (statement of William Parker, Diffraction, Ltd.).

¹⁴ See, e.g., *Perspectives on Patents: Harmonization and Other Matters: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Intellectual Prop. of the Senate Comm. on the Judiciary*, 109th Cong. (2005) (statement of Gerald J. Mossinghoff, Former Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks); *Perspectives on Patents: Harmonization and Other Matters: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Intellectual Prop. of the Senate Comm. on the Judiciary*, 109th Cong. (2005) (statement of Q. Todd Dickinson, Former Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office); *Patent Law Reform: Injunctions and Damages: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Intellectual Prop. of the Senate Comm. on the Judiciary*, 109th Cong. (2005) (statement of Jeffrey P. Kushan, Partner, Sidley Austin Brown & Wood, LLP); *Patent Law Reform: Injunctions and Damages: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Intellectual Prop. of the Senate Comm. on the Judiciary*, 109th Cong. (2005) (statement of Mark A. Lemley, Professor, Stanford Law School); *Perspectives on Patents: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Intellectual Prop. of the Senate Comm. on the Judiciary*, 109th Cong. (2005) (statement of Robert A. Armitage, Senior Vice President and General Patent Counsel, Eli Lilly and Company); *Perspectives on Patents: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Intellectual Prop. of the Senate Comm. on the Judiciary*, 109th Cong. (2005) (statement of Michael K. Kirk, Executive Director, American Intellectual Property Law Association).

¹⁵ See NAS Report at 124; see also *Perspectives on Patents: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Intellectual Prop. of the Senate Comm. on the Judiciary*, 109th Cong. (2005) (statement of Richard C. Levin, Yale University).

¹⁶ See *Perspectives on Patents: Harmonization and Other Matters: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Intellectual Prop. of the Senate Comm. on the Judiciary*, 109th Cong. (2005) (state-

want to file abroad, are forced to follow and comply with two different filing systems. Maintaining a filing system so different from the rest of the world disadvantages United States applicants who, in most instances, also file in other countries.¹⁷ A change is long overdue.¹⁸

Drawing on the best aspects of the two existing systems, the America Invents Act creates a new “first-inventor-to-file” system. This new system provides patent applicants in the United States the efficiency benefits of the first-to-file systems used in the rest of the world by moving the U.S. system much closer to a first-to-file system and making the filing date that which is most relevant in determining whether an application is patentable. The new system continues, however, to provide inventors the benefit of the 1-year grace period. As part of the transition to a simpler, more efficient first-inventor-to-file system, this provision eliminates costly, complex interference proceedings, because priority will be based on the first application. A new administrative proceeding—called a “derivation” proceeding—is created to ensure that the first person to file the application is actually a true inventor. This new proceeding will ensure that a person will not be able to obtain a patent for the invention that he did not actually invent. If a dispute arises as to which of two applicants is a true inventor (as opposed to who invented it first), it will be resolved through an administrative proceeding by the Patent Board. The Act also simplifies how prior art is determined, provides more certainty, and reduces the cost associated with filing and litigating patents.

The Act maintains a 1-year grace period for U.S. applicants. Applicants’ own publication or disclosure that occurs within 1 year prior to filing will not act as prior art against their applications. Similarly, disclosure by others during that time based on information obtained (directly or indirectly) from the inventor will not constitute prior art. This 1-year grace period should continue to give U.S. applicants the time they need to prepare and file their applications.

This provision also, and necessarily, modifies the prior-art sections of the patent law. Prior art will be measured from the filing date of the application and will typically include all art that publicly exists prior to the filing date, other than disclosures by the inventor within 1 year of filing. Prior art also will no longer have any geographic limitations. Thus, in section 102 the “in this country”

ment of Gerald J. Mossinghoff, Former Assistant Secretary of Commerce and Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks).

¹⁷ See *Perspectives on Patents: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Intellectual Prop. of the Senate Comm. on the Judiciary*, 109th Cong. (2005) (statement of Richard C. Levin, President, Yale University, and Mark B. Meyers, Visiting Executive Professor, Management Department at the Wharton Business School, University of Pennsylvania), estimating that it costs as much as \$750,000 to \$1 million to obtain worldwide patent protection on an important invention, and the lack of harmonization regarding filing systems adds unnecessary cost and delay.

¹⁸ The NAS recommended changing the U.S. to a first-to-file system, while maintaining a grace period. See NAS Report at 124–27. See also *Patent Reform in the 111th Congress: Legislation and Recent Court Decisions: Hearing Before the Senate Comm. on the Judiciary*, 111th Cong. (2009) (statement of Steven Appleton, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Micron Technologies, Inc.); *Patent Reform in the 111th Congress: Legislation and Recent Court Decisions: Hearing Before the Senate Comm. on the Judiciary*, 111th Cong. (2009) (statement of Philip S. Johnson, Chief Patent Counsel, Johnson & Johnson); *Patent Reform in the 111th Congress: Legislation and Recent Court Decisions: Hearing Before the Senate Comm. on the Judiciary*, 111th Cong. (2009) (statement of Herbert C. Wamsley, Executive Director, Intellectual Property Owners Association); *Patent Reform in the 111th Congress: Legislation and Recent Court Decisions: Hearing Before the Senate Comm. on the Judiciary*, 111th Cong. (2009) (statement of Mark A. Lemley, Professor, Stanford Law School).

limitation as applied to “public use” and “on sale” is removed, and the phrase “available to the public” is added to clarify the broad scope of relevant prior art, as well as to emphasize the fact that it must be publicly accessible. Prior art based on earlier-filed United States applications is maintained,¹⁹ as is current law’s grace period, which will apply to all actions by the patent owner during the year prior to filing that would otherwise create § 102(a) prior art.²⁰ Sections (and subsections) of the existing statute are renumbered, modified, or deleted consistent with converting to a first-inventor-to-file system.²¹ Finally, the intent behind the CREATE Act to promote joint research activities is preserved by including a prior art exception for subject matter invented by parties to a joint research agreement. The Act also provides that its enactment of new section 102(c) of title 35 is done with the same intent to promote joint research activities that was expressed in the Cooperative Research and Technology Enhancement Act of 2004 (Public Law 108–453), and that section 102(c) shall be administered in a manner consistent with such intent.

Inventor’s oath or declaration

The U.S. patent system, when first adopted in 1790, contemplated that individual inventors would file their own patent applications, or would have a patent practitioner do so on their behalf. It has become increasingly common for patent applications to be assigned to corporate entities, most commonly the employer of the inventor.²² In fact, many employment contracts require employees to assign their inventions to their employer.²³

Current law still reflects the antiquated notion that it is the inventor who files the application, not the company-assignee. For example, every inventor must sign an oath as part of the patent application stating that the inventor believes he or she is the true inventor of the invention claimed in the application.²⁴ By the time an application is eventually filed, however, the applicant filing as an assignee may have difficulty locating and obtaining every inventor’s signature for the statutorily required oath. Although the USPTO has adopted certain regulations to allow filing of an application when the inventor’s signature is unobtainable,²⁵ many have advocated that the statute be modernized to facilitate the filing of applications by assignees.²⁶

The Act updates the patent system by facilitating the process by which an assignee may file and prosecute patent applications. It

¹⁹ Compare current § 102(e) with new § 102(a)(2).

²⁰ See generally 157 Cong. Rec. S.1496–97 (daily ed. March 9, 2011), S. 1370–71 (daily ed. March 8, 2011).

²¹ The Committee does not intend a substantive change by replacing the word “negated” in section 103 of title 35 with “negated.”

²² See John R. Allison & Mark A. Lemley, *The Growing Complexity of the United States Patent System*, 82 B.U. L. Rev. 77, 97 (2002) (study showing that approximately 85% of the patents issued between 1996–98 were assigned by inventors to corporations; an increase from 79% during the period between 1976–78).

²³ See Jerry C. Liu, *Overview of Patent Ownership Considerations in Joint Technology Development*, 2005 Syracuse Sci. & Tech. L. Rep. 1 (2005).

²⁴ 35 U.S.C. § 115.

²⁵ See 37 C.F.R. § 1.47, which permits an applicant to petition the Director of the USPTO to have the application accepted without every inventor’s signature in limited circumstances, e.g., when the inventor cannot be found or refuses to participate in the application.

²⁶ See *Perspectives on Patents: Harmonization and Other Matters: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Intellectual Prop. of the Senate Comm. on the Judiciary*, 109th Cong. (2005) (statement of David Beier, Senior Vice President of Global Government Affairs, Amgen).

provides similar flexibility for a person to whom the inventor is obligated to assign, but has not assigned, rights to the invention (the “obligated assignee”).

Section 115 of title 35 is amended to allow a substitute statement to be submitted in lieu of an inventor’s oath when either the inventor (i) is unable to submit an oath, or (ii) is both unwilling to do so and under an obligation to assign the invention. If an error is discovered, the statement may later be corrected. A savings clause is included to prevent an invalidity or unenforceability challenge to the patent based on failure to comply with these requirements, provided that any error has been remedied. Willful false statements remain punishable, however, under Federal criminal laws.²⁷

Section 118 of title 35 is also amended to make it easier for an assignee to file a patent application. The amendment now allows obligated assignees—entities to which the inventor is obligated to assign the application—to file applications, as well. It also allows a person who has a sufficient proprietary interest in the invention to file an application to preserve that person’s rights and those of the inventor.

Defense to infringement based on earlier inventor

Under current law, “prior user rights” may offer a defense to patent infringement when the patent in question is a “business method patent”²⁸ and its inventor uses the invention, but never files a patent application for it.²⁹ If the same invention is later patented by another party, the prior user may not be liable for infringement to the new patent holder, although all others may be.

Many counties include a more expansive prior-user rights regime within their first-to-file system. In the United States, this is particularly important to high-tech businesses that prefer not to patent every process or method that is part of their commercial operations. The Act responds to this point by revising US law as follows: First, the prior-use defense may be asserted against any patent (not just method patents), provided the person asserting the defense reduced the subject matter of the patent to practice and commercially used the subject matter at least 1 year before the effective filing date of the patent. Second, the defense cannot be asserted if the subject matter was derived from the patent holder or persons in privity with the patent holder. And third, the defense cannot be asserted unless the prior user both reduced the subject matter of the patent to practice and commercially used it at least 1 year before the effective filing date of the patent or the date that the patentee publicly disclosed the invention and invoked the § 102(b) grace period, whichever is earlier.

This narrow expansion of prior-user rights balances the interests of patent holders, including universities, against the legitimate concerns of businesses that want to avoid infringement suits relating to processes that they developed and used prior to another party acquiring related patents.

²⁷ See 18 U.S.C. § 1001.

²⁸ 35 U.S.C. § 273(a)(3) states: “The term ‘method’ means a method of doing or conducting business.”

²⁹ See 35 U.S.C. § 273.

Post-grant review proceedings

The Act amends *ex parte* and *inter partes* reexamination and establishes a new post-grant review procedure. Under current law, there are two ways to challenge the validity and enforceability of a patent that has issued. The patent may be challenged in district court litigation or in a reexamination at the USPTO.

Nearly 30 years ago, Congress created the administrative “reexamination” process, through which the USPTO could review the validity of already-issued patents on the request of either the patent holder or a third party,³⁰ in the expectation that it would serve as an effective and efficient alternative to often costly and protracted district court litigation.³¹ Reexamination requires the USPTO to review the patent in light of a substantial new question of patentability not presented during the original examination.³² The initial reexamination statute had several limitations that later proved to make it a less viable alternative to litigation for evaluating patent validity than Congress intended. First, a reexamination request could only be based on prior art, and could not be based on prior public use or prior sales. Moreover, the requestor could not raise any challenge based on § 101 (utility, eligibility) or § 112 (indefiniteness, enablement, written description, best mode). A third party alleging a patent is invalid, therefore, had fewer challenges it could raise in the proceeding and, therefore, may instead opt to risk infringement and litigate the validity of the patent in court. Second, in the original reexamination system, the third-party challenger had no role once the proceeding was initiated, while the patent holder had significant input throughout the entire process. Third, a challenger that lost at the USPTO under reexamination had no right to appeal an examiner’s, or the Patent Board’s, decision either administratively or in court. Restrictions such as these made reexamination a much less favored avenue to challenge questionable patents than litigation. Reexamination proceedings are also often costly, taking several years to complete,³³ and are first conducted by examiners and, if the patent is rejected, then by Patent Board judges. Thus, many patents must go through two rounds of administrative review (one by the examiner, and a second by the Patent Board) adding to the length of the proceeding.³⁴

³⁰See 35 U.S.C. §§ 301–307. A patent holder will typically request reexamination to bolster the patent in view of new prior art. A third party may request reexamination to challenge, and ultimately invalidate, the patent.

³¹“Reexamination will permit efficient resolution of questions about the validity of issued patents without recourse to expensive and lengthy infringement litigation. . . . The reexamination of issued patents could be conducted with a fraction of the time and cost of formal legal proceedings and would help restore confidence in the effectiveness of our patent system. . . . It is anticipated that these measures provide a useful and necessary alternative for challengers and for patent owners to test the validity of united states patents in an efficient and relatively inexpensive manner.” See H.R. Rep. No. 96–1307(I) at 3 (1980), reprinted in 1980 U.S.C.A.N. 6460, 6462–63.

³²See 35 U.S.C. § 303.

³³See *Perspectives on Patents: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Intellectual Prop. of the Senate Comm. on the Judiciary*, 109th Cong. (2005) (statement of Jon W. Dudas, Undersecretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property, Director of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office), explaining that “a large number of reexamination proceedings have been pending before the USPTO for more than 4 years,” and questioning whether this amount of time is consistent with the statutory requirement that “[a]ll reexamination proceedings . . . will be conducted with special dispatch within the Office.” See also 35 U.S.C. § 305.

³⁴For several years, the standard practice at the USPTO was to assign the reexamination to the patent examiner who had originally examined that patent. In addition, the same third-party requester could file multiple, serial reexaminations based on the same “substantial new question of patentability,” so long as the initial reexamination was not complete. More recently, the

Continued

Congress has responded several times to criticisms of the reexamination system by making amendments to the process.³⁵ In 1999, Congress created a second reexamination procedure—called inter partes reexamination—that gave third-party challengers greater input throughout the proceeding by permitting them to respond to every pleading submitted by the patent holder.³⁶ Congress also eventually gave third-party challengers the right to appeal adverse decisions.³⁷

As part of the 1999 improvements to reexamination, Congress directed the USPTO to submit a report to Congress evaluating the inter partes reexamination process and making any recommendations for changes.³⁸ Initially, the USPTO projected that in the first year after the creation of inter partes reexamination, it would receive 400 such requests and it projected that by 2004 it would receive nearly 600.³⁹ No inter partes reexamination requests were actually filed in 2000 and only 27 such requests had been filed by 2004.⁴⁰ Over the 5-year period studied by the USPTO, it issued 900,000 patents and received only 53 requests for inter partes reexamination.⁴¹

The Act expands the category of documents that may be cited in a reexamination proceeding to include written statements of the patent owner that have been filed in a proceeding before a Federal court or the USPTO regarding the scope of claims. This addition will counteract the ability of patent owners to offer differing interpretations of prior art in different proceedings. These written statements, which include documents, pleadings or evidence from proceedings that address the patent owner’s statements, shall not be considered for any purpose other than to determine the proper meaning of the claims that are the subject of the request in a proceeding. Specifically, the Committee does not intend these statements to be a basis for the institution of a reexamination proceeding. Reexaminations will continue to be available only on the basis of “patents or printed publications.”⁴²

The Act also amends the ex parte reexamination procedure to allow the Director to institute a reexamination on the Director’s own initiative if a substantial new question of patentability is raised by patents or publications.

The Act converts inter partes reexamination from an examinational to an adjudicative proceeding, and renames the pro-

USPTO ended some of these procedures, and now reexaminations are handled by a Central Reexamination Unit (CRU), and subsequent serial reexamination, based on the same “substantial new question of patentability,” is no longer permitted. See, e.g., Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) §§ 2236 and 2240 (August 2006).

³⁵ See e.g., 21st Century Dep’t of Justice Appropriations Authorization Act, Pub. L. No. 107–273, §§ 13105–06, 13202, 116 Stat. 1758, 1761 (2002) (effective Nov. 2, 2002); American Inventors Protection Act, Pub.L. 106–113, 113 Stat. 1536, § 1501A et seq. (1999) (creating inter partes reexamination) (hereafter referred to as the “AIPA”).

³⁶ See 35 U.S.C. §§ 311–318.

³⁷ See 35 U.S.C. § 315(b).

³⁸ AIPA, Pub. L. 106–113, § 4606.

³⁹ See *United States Patent and Trademark Office, Report to Congress on Inter Partes Reexamination* (2004) (hereinafter referred to as “*Report on Inter Partes Reexamination*”), at 4.

⁴⁰ *Id.* at 5.

⁴¹ *Id.*

⁴² The scope of “patent and printed publication” prior art in the amended section 301 is intended to be coextensive with these terms in current section 102 of the title 35. Further, amendments made by Section 2 of the Act, which expand and contract the definition of certain other forms of prior art, are not intended to change the particular “patent or printed publication” prior art, which will continue to be the sole basis for initiating reexamination proceedings.

ceeding “inter partes review.” The Act also makes the following improvements to this proceeding:

- **“Reasonable likelihood of success” for instituting inter partes review.** The threshold for initiating an inter partes review is elevated from “significant new question of patentability”—a standard that currently allows 95% of all requests to be granted—to a standard requiring petitioners to present information showing that their challenge has a reasonable likelihood of success. Satisfaction of the new threshold will be assessed based on the information presented both in the petition for the proceeding and in the patent owner’s response to the petition.
- **“Reasonably could have raised” estoppel applied to subsequent administrative proceedings.** A party that uses inter partes review is estopped from raising in a subsequent PTO proceeding (such as an ex parte reexam or inter partes review) any issue that it raised or reasonably could have raised in the inter partes review.
- **Repeal of the 1999 limit.** The limit on challenging patents issued before 1999 in inter partes reexamination is eliminated; all patents can be challenged in inter partes review.
- **Preponderance burden.** Petitioners bear the burden of proving that a patent is invalid by a preponderance of the evidence in inter partes review.
- **Time limits during litigation.** Parties who want to use inter partes review during litigation are required to seek a proceeding within 12 months of being served with a complaint alleging infringement of the patent, and are barred from seeking or maintaining an inter partes review if they file an action for a declaratory judgment that the patent is invalid.
- **Discovery.** Parties may depose witnesses submitting affidavits or declarations and seek such discovery as the Patent Office determines is otherwise necessary in the interest of justice.
- **12- to 18-month deadline.** Inter partes review must be completed within 1 year of when the proceeding is instituted, except that the Office can extend this deadline by 6 months for good cause.
- **Oral hearing.** Each party has the right to request an oral hearing as part of an inter partes review.
- **Three-judge panels.** Inter partes reviews will be conducted before a panel of three APJs. Decisions will be appealed directly to the Federal Circuit.

The Act also creates a new post-grant opposition procedure that can be utilized during the first 12 months after the grant of a patent or issue of a reissue patent. Unlike reexamination proceedings, which provide only a limited basis on which to consider whether a patent should have issued, the post-grant review proceeding permits a challenge on any ground related to invalidity under section 282. The intent of the post-grant review process is to enable early

challenges to patents, while still protecting the rights of inventors and patent owners against new patent challenges unbounded in time and scope. The Committee believes that this new, early-stage process for challenging patent validity and its clear procedures for submission of art will make the patent system more efficient and improve the quality of patents and the patent system. This new, but time-limited, post-grant review procedure will provide a meaningful opportunity to improve patent quality and restore confidence in the presumption of validity that comes with issued patents in court.

In utilizing the post-grant review process, petitioners, real parties in interest, and their privies are precluded from improperly mounting multiple challenges to a patent or initiating challenges after filing a civil action challenging the validity a claim in the patent. Further, a final decision in a post-grant review process will prevent the petitioner, a real party in interest, or its privy from challenging any patent claim on a ground that was raised in the post-grant review process. The post-grant review procedure is not intended, however, to inhibit patent owners from pursuing the various avenues of enforcement of their rights under a patent, and the amendment makes clear that the filing or institution of a post-grant review proceeding does not limit a patent owner from commencing such actions.

The Committee recognizes the importance of quiet title to patent owners to ensure continued investment resources. While this amendment is intended to remove current disincentives to current administrative processes, the changes made by it are not to be used as tools for harassment or a means to prevent market entry through repeated litigation and administrative attacks on the validity of a patent. Doing so would frustrate the purpose of the section as providing quick and cost effective alternatives to litigation. Further, such activity would divert resources from the research and development of inventions. As such, the Committee intends for the USPTO to address potential abuses and current inefficiencies under its expanded procedural authority.

Patent Trial and Appeal Board.

The Act renames the Patent Board the “Patent Trial and Appeal Board” and sets forth its duties, which are expanded to include jurisdiction over the new post-grant review and derivation proceedings. This section strikes references to proceedings eliminated by the Act, including interference proceedings, and updates the various appeals statutes.

Preissuance submissions by third parties

After an application is published, members of the public—most likely, a competitor or someone else familiar with the patented invention’s field—may realize they have information relevant to a pending application. The relevant information may include prior art that would prohibit the pending application from issuing as a patent. Current USPTO rules permit the submission of such prior art by third parties only if it is in the form of a patent or publication,⁴³ but the submitter is precluded from explaining why the

⁴³ See 35 C.F.R. § 1.99.

prior art was submitted or what its relevancy to the application might be.⁴⁴ Such restrictions decrease the value of the information to the examiner and may, as a result, deter such submissions.⁴⁵

The Act improves the process by which third parties submit relevant information to the USPTO by permitting those third parties to make statements concerning the relevance of the patents, patent applications, and other printed publications that they bring to the USPTO's attention.

Venue

In 1999, as part of the American Inventors Protection Act (AIPA), Congress established that as a general matter the venue of the USPTO is the district where it resides.⁴⁶ The USPTO currently resides in the Eastern District of Virginia. However, Congress inadvertently failed to make this change uniformly throughout the entire patent statute. As a result, certain sections of the patent statute (and one section of the trademark statute) continue to allow challenges to USPTO decisions to be brought in the District of Columbia, a place where the USPTO has not resided in decades.

Because the USPTO no longer resides in the District of Columbia, the sections that authorize venue for litigation against the USPTO are consistently changed to reflect the venue where the USPTO currently resides.

Fee-setting authority

a) Agency fee setting authority

Although the USPTO has had the ability to set certain fees by regulation, most fees (*e.g.*, filing fee, issuance fee, maintenance fees) are set by Congress.⁴⁷ History has shown that such a scheme does not allow the USPTO to respond promptly to the challenges that confront it. The USPTO has argued for years that it must have fee-setting authority to administer properly the agency and its growing workload.

The Act allows the USPTO to set or adjust all of its fees, including those related to patents and trademarks, so long as they do no more than reasonably compensate the USPTO for the services performed. Prior to setting such fees, the Director must give notice to, and receive input from, the Patent or Trademark Public Advisory Committee (PPAC or TPAC). The Director may also reduce fees for any given fiscal year, but only after consultation with the PPAC or TPAC. The Act details the procedures for how the Director shall consult with the PPAC and TPAC, including providing for public hearings and the dissemination to the public of any recommendations made by either Committee. Fees shall be prescribed by rule. Any proposed fee change shall be published in the Federal Register and include the specific rationale and purpose for the proposed change. The Director must seek public comments for no less than 45 days. The Director must also notify Congress of any final deci-

⁴⁴ See 35 C.F.R. § 1.99(d) (“A submission under this section shall not include any explanation of the patents or publications, or any other information.”).

⁴⁵ See *Perspectives on Patents: Hearing Before the Subcomm. on Intellectual Prop. of the Senate Comm. on the Judiciary*, 109th Cong. (2005) (statement of David Simon, Chief Patent Counsel, Intel Corporation).

⁴⁶ See 35 U.S.C. § 1(b).

⁴⁷ See, *e.g.*, 35 U.S.C. § 41.

sion regarding proposed fees. Congress shall have no more than 45 days to consider and comment on any proposed fee, but no proposed fee shall be effective prior to the expiration of this 45-day period.

b) “Micro entity” defined

As part of the ongoing effort to nurture U.S. innovation, Congress has long recognized that certain groups, including independent inventors, small business concerns, and non-profit organizations (collectively referred to as “small business entities”) should not bear the same financial burden for filing patent applications as larger corporate interests. The current statute provides for a significant reduction in certain fees for small business entities.⁴⁸ The Committee was made aware, however, that there is likely a benefit to describing—and then accommodating—a group of inventors who are even smaller, in order to ensure that the USPTO can tailor its requirements, and its assistance, to the people with very little capital, and just a few inventions, as they are starting out.

This section of the Act defines this even smaller group—the micro-entity—that includes only truly independent inventors. The Committee expects that the USPTO will make accommodations under its authority in recognition of the special status of micro-entities.

Supplemental examination

Patents are unenforceable and invalid if they are obtained through fraud. This concept is addressed in the “inequitable conduct” defense, which allows a defendant in an infringement suit to plead that the plaintiff patent-holder would not have received a patent but for misrepresentations made to the USPTO. Inequitable conduct requires proof of materiality as well as intent to deceive. These standards require courts and litigants to invest time and resources in determining the patent-holder’s state of mind or intent when developing the invention and submitting the application. Critics of the inequitable conduct defense, including the National Academies and the Federal Trade Commission, argue that our patent system is hampered by provisions that require courts to divine the difficult-to-prove subjective intent of individuals in patent disputes. And most defendants reflexively plead inequitable conduct as a defense to infringement, prompting the Federal Circuit to label the practice a “plague” on the patent system.

The Act addresses the inequitable conduct doctrine by authorizing supplemental examination of a patent to correct errors or omissions in proceedings before the Office. Under this new procedure, information that was not considered or was inadequately considered or was incorrect can be presented to the Office. If the Office determines that the information does not present a substantial new question of patentability or that the patent is still valid, that information cannot later be used to hold the patent unenforceable or invalid on the basis for an inequitable-conduct attack in civil litigation.

⁴⁸ See 35 U.S.C. § 41(h).

Funding agreements

The Patent and Trademark Amendments Act of 1980 (commonly referred to as the Bayh-Dole Act)⁴⁹ granted universities, other non-profit organizations, and small businesses the right to title to inventions developed using Federal funds. In 1984, Congress amended the law to ensure that universities and small businesses operating at Government facilities (GOCOs) reaped the benefits of Bayh-Dole by giving them the right to elect title to a subject invention.⁵⁰ The 1984 Act permitted GOCOs to retain the balance of any royalties or income earned from licensing inventions, up to 5 percent of the annual budget of the facility, for further research, development, and related activities. If the balance exceeds 5 percent of the facility's annual budget, however, 75 percent of the excess is recouped by the Government, with the remaining 25 percent of the excess also retained by the GOCO for further research, development, and related activities.⁵¹

The Senate Judiciary Committee considered testimony that the requirement to repay the government 75 percent of the excess on royalty payments may be causing a disincentive for universities and small business operating under the GOCO provisions to commercialize products.⁵² Based on these concerns, the Act maintains the essence of the agreement GOCOs made with the taxpayers when they received funding that they would reimburse the taxpayer if they are sufficiently successful in commercializing a product invented with taxpayer dollars, but which reduces the burden on universities and small businesses, thereby encouraging commercialization. Pursuant to the Act, instead of reimbursing 75% of the excess to the Government, the GOCO will retain 85 percent for further research, development, and related activities and reimburse the Government 15 percent.

Tax strategies deemed within the prior art

In recent years, the numbers of patents on tax-strategies have increased. Critics assert that it is not fair to permit patents on techniques used to satisfy a government mandate, such as compliance with the Internal Revenue Code.

Tax preparers, lawyers, and planners have a long history of sharing their knowledge regarding how to file returns, plan estates, and advise clients. The ability to interpret the tax law and implement such interpretations should remain in the public domain, available to all taxpayers and their advisors.

The Act mandates that tax strategies are deemed “insufficient to differentiate a claimed invention from the prior art.” In other words, any future tax strategy will be considered indistinguishable from all other publicly available information that is relevant to a patent's claim of originality. Under the Act, however, protection (an exclusion) is made available for software that enables individuals to file their income tax returns or that assists them with managing

⁴⁹ P.L. 96-517.

⁵⁰ P.L. 98-620, § 501.

⁵¹ 35 U.S.C. § 202(c)(7).

⁵² See *The Role of Federally-Funded University Research in the Patent System: Hearing Before the Senate Comm. on the Judiciary*, 110th Cong. (2008) (statement of Dr. Elizabeth Hoffman, Executive Vice President and Provost, Iowa State University).

their finances. The exclusion does not apply to that part of the software related to a tax strategy.

Best mode requirement

The Act amends § 282(b) to eliminate as a defense to patent infringement the patentee's failure to comply with the best mode requirement of § 112. An applicant for a patent must disclose: (1) a written description of the invention; (2) a written description of the manner of making and using the invention, sufficient to enable one skilled in the art to make and use it (known as the "enablement requirement"); and (3) the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out the invention.⁵³ The disclosures required of an applicant are part of the important tradeoff that underlies the patent laws: the grant of a limited-term monopoly in exchange for disclosure of the invention.

Under current law, the defense of patent invalidity is available for failure to comply with any requirement of § 112 (specification) or § 251 (reissued patents). Further, a defendant in patent litigation may also allege an intentional nondisclosure of the best mode, with intent to deceive the Office, as a basis for an unenforceability defense. Many have argued in recent years that the best mode requirement, which is unique to American patent law, is counterproductive.⁵⁴ They argue that challenges to patents based on best mode are inherently subjective and not relevant by the time the patent is in litigation, because the best mode contemplated at the time of the invention may not be the best mode for practicing or using the invention years later.

In response to these concerns, the Act includes a provision that eliminates best mode as a basis for both invalidity and unenforceability defenses under § 282; other defenses are unaffected.

Marking

a) Virtual Marking

In general, for patented "articles," a patent holder must give an alleged infringer notice of the claimed infringement, and the infringer must continue to infringe, before the patent holder may succeed in a suit for damages.⁵⁵ Actual notice requires the affirmative communication of infringement to the defendant, which may include the filing of a lawsuit. Constructive notice is possible by "marking" any patented article that the patent holder (or its licensee) makes, uses, sells or imports.⁵⁶ Failure to appropriately mark an article can preclude the recovery of damages until notice is effective.

The Act permits patent holders to "virtually mark" a product by providing the address of a publicly available website that associates the patented article with the number of the patent. The burden will remain on the patent holder to demonstrate that the marking was effective. This amendment will save costs for pro-

⁵³ 35 U.S.C. § 112. Section 112 also requires an applicant to disclose a written description of the invention and a written description of the manner of making and using the invention, sufficient to enable one skilled in the art to make and use it.

⁵⁴ Among those who have so argued are the National Academy of Sciences, the Biotechnology Industry Organization, the American Intellectual Property Law Association, the Intellectual Property Owners Association, and Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America.

⁵⁵ See 35 U.S.C. § 287.

⁵⁶ See *id.*

ducers of products that include technology on which a patent issues after the product is on the market, and will facilitate effective marking on smaller products.

b) False marking

The Federal Circuit's recent decision in *Forest Group, Inc. v. Bon Tool Co.*, 590 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2009), which held that section 292's \$500 fine is assessed for each product that is falsely marked, has created a surge in false-marking qui tam litigation. Though one might assume that section 292 actions are targeted at parties that assert fictitious patents in order to deter competitors, such a scenario is almost wholly unknown to false-marking litigation. False-marking suits are almost always based on allegations that a valid patent that did cover the product has expired, but the manufacturer continued to sell products stamped with the patent; or that an existing patent used to mark products is invalid or unenforceable; or that an existing and valid patent's claims should not be construed to cover the product in question.

Indeed, a recent survey of such suits found that a large majority involved valid patents that covered the products in question but had simply expired. For many products, it is difficult and expensive to change a mold or other means by which a product is marked as patented, and marked products continue to circulate in commerce for some period after the patent expires. It is doubtful that the Congress that originally enacted this section anticipated that it would force manufacturers to immediately remove marked products from commerce once the patent expired, given that the expense to manufacturers of doing so will generally greatly outweigh any conceivable harm of allowing such products to continue to circulate in commerce.

To address the recent surge in litigation, the bill replaces the qui tam remedy for false marking with a new action that allows a party that has suffered a competitive injury as a result of such marking to seek compensatory damages. The United States would be allowed to seek the \$500-per-article fine, and competitors may recover in relation to actual injuries that they have suffered as a result of false marking, but the bill would eliminate litigation brought by unrelated, private third parties.

Advice of Counsel

The Act includes a new provision that bars courts and juries from drawing an adverse inference from an accused infringer's failure to obtain opinion of counsel as to infringement or his failure to waive privilege and disclose such an opinion. Section 298 of title 35 is designed to protect attorney-client privilege and to reduce pressure on accused infringers to obtain opinions of counsel for litigation purposes. It reflects a policy choice that the probative value of this type of evidence is outweighed by the harm that coercing a waiver of attorney-client privilege inflicts on the attorney-client relationship. Section 298 applies to findings of both willfulness and intent to induce infringement—and thus legislatively abrogates the Federal Circuit's decision in *Broadcom Corp. v. Qualcomm Inc.*, 543 F.3d 683, 699 (Fed. Cir. 2008).

Transitional program for covered business method patents

A number of patent observers believe the issuance of poor business-method patents during the late 1990's through the early 2000's led to the patent "troll" lawsuits that compelled the Committee to launch the patent reform project 6 years ago. At the time, the USPTO lacked a sufficient number of examiners with expertise in the relevant art area. Compounding this problem, there was a dearth of available prior art to assist examiners as they reviewed business method applications. Critics also note that most countries do not grant patents for business methods.

The Act responds to the problem by creating a transitional program 1 year after enactment of the bill to implement a provisional post-grant proceeding for review of the validity of any business method patent. In contrast to the era of the late 1990's-early 2000's, examiners will review the best prior art available. A petition to initiate a review will not be granted unless the petitioner is first sued for infringement or is accused of infringement. The program otherwise generally functions on the same terms as other post-grant proceedings initiated pursuant to the bill. Any party may request a stay of a civil action if a related post-grant proceeding is granted. The program sunsets after 10 years, which ensures that patent holders cannot delay filing a lawsuit over a shorter time period to avoid reevaluation under the transitional program.

*Jurisdictional and procedural matters***a) State court jurisdiction and the US Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit**

The US district courts area given original jurisdiction to hear patent cases,⁵⁷ while the US Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit adjudicates all patent appeals.⁵⁸ The Supreme Court ruled in 2002,⁵⁹ however, that patent counterclaims do not give the Federal Circuit appellate jurisdiction over a case.

The Act clarifies the jurisdiction of the US district courts and stipulates that the US Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit has jurisdiction over appeals involving *compulsory* patent counterclaims. The legislative history of this provision, which we reaffirm and adopt as our own, appears in the Committee Report accompanying H.R. 2955 from the 109th Congress,⁶⁰ which the Committee reported favorably to the House on April 5, 2006.

b) Joinder

The Act also addresses problems occasioned by the joinder of defendants (sometimes numbering in the dozens) who have tenuous connections to the underlying disputes in patent infringement suits.

The Act amends chapter 29 of the Patent Act by creating a new § 299 that addresses joinder under Rule 20 and consolidation of trials under Rule 42. Pursuant to the provision, parties who are accused infringers in most patent suits may be joined as defendants

⁵⁷ 28 USC § 1338.

⁵⁸ 28 USC § 1295.

⁵⁹ *Holmes Group, Inc., v. Vornado Air Circulation Systems, Inc.* 535 U.S. 826 (2002).

⁶⁰ H. Rep. 109-405.

or counterclaim defendants only if: (1) relief is asserted against the parties, jointly, severally, or in the alternative, arising out of the same transaction regarding the manufacture, use, or importation of the accused product or process; and (2) questions of fact common to all of the defendants will arise in the action. New § 299 also clarifies that joinder will not be available if it based solely on allegations that a defendant has infringed the patent(s) in question.⁶¹

Technical amendments

The Act contains technical amendments to improve the organization of the patent statute.

Travel expenses and payment of administrative judges

The USPTO Director is authorized to conduct programs or exchanges pertaining to intellectual property law and protection “domestically and throughout the world.” The House bill clarifies that this authority includes expending funds to cover the subsistence and travel expenses of non-Federal employees who attend these programs.

The House bill also clarifies that the Director may fix the pay for administrative patent judges and administrative trademark judges under the new Patent Trial and Appeal Board set forth in Section 6 of the bill.

Patent and Trademark Office funding

The USPTO is a fee-funded agency. The revenue it collects from fees imposed on inventors and trademark filers is deposited in a special USPTO appropriations account in the Treasury. To obtain funding for its operations, the agency must request the revenue back from congressional appropriators. Since the early 1990’s, however, more than \$800 million has been diverted from the agency and spent on non-USPTO initiatives.

The Committee believes the USPTO could operate more efficiently and productively if the agency had full access to all of its fee-generated revenue. The House bill therefore creates a USPTO revolving fund within the Treasury that allows the agency to keep all of the funds it raises until expended.

The provision also requires the Director to submit an annual spending plan as well as an annual year-end report to the House and Senate Appropriations and Judiciary Committees.

Satellite offices

The USPTO is conducting a pilot to create and operate a new satellite office located in Detroit. The bill requires the Director to establish three other satellite offices within a 3-year window, subject to available resources. The legislation includes criteria that must be invoked when selecting the new sites.

⁶¹ Section 299 legislatively abrogates the construction of Rule 20(a) adopted in *MyMail, Ltd. v. America Online, Inc.*, 223 F.R.D. 455 (E.D. Tex. 2004); *Sprint Communications Co. v. TheGlobe.com, Inc.*, 233 F.R.D. 615 (D. Kan. 2006); *Adrain v. Genetec Inc.*, 2009 WL3063414 (E.D. Tex. September 22, 2009); *Better Educ. Inc. v. Einstruction Corp.*, 2010 WL 918307 (E.D. Tex. March 10, 2010); *Mannatech, Inc. v. Country Life, LLC*, 2010 WL 2944574 (N.D. Tex. July 26, 2010); *Alford Safety Services, Inc., v. Hot-Hed, Inc.*, 2010 WL 3418233 (E.D. La. August 24, 2010); and *Eolas Technologies, Inc. v. Adobe Systems, Inc.*, 2010 WL 3835762 (E.D. Tex. September 28, 2010)—effectively conforming these courts’ jurisprudence to that followed by a majority of jurisdictions. See generally *Rudd v. Lux Products Corp.*, 2011 WL 148052 (N.D. Ill. January 12, 2011).

Designation of Detroit satellite office

The House and Senate bills contain a provision that designates the PTO satellite office in Detroit as the “Elijah J. McCoy United States Patent and Trademark Office.” Elijah McCoy was an African-Canadian inventor who spent much of his life in Michigan and earned 57 US patents. His work on an automatic lubricator to oil railroad steam engines gave rise to the expression, “the real McCoy.”

Patent Ombudsman Program for small business concerns

The Act requires the USPTO Director to establish a Patent Ombudsman Program to provide support and services regarding patent filings to small business concerns. The authorization is subject to available resources.

Priority examination for technologies important to American competitiveness

The Act stipulates that the USPTO may promulgate regulations, not inconsistent with law, that prioritize examination of applications for products, processes, or technologies that are important to the national economy or national competitiveness. This may be done without recovering the aggregate extra cost of providing the prioritization.

Calculation of 60-day period for application of patent term extension

The USPTO has inconsistently applied “counting” rules that are imposed on patent holders who must submit documents to the agency within statutory time periods for consideration of additional patent term under § 156 of the Patent Act. The Act clarifies that the agency should impose a “business-day” construction for application to § 156, consistent with recent case law on the matter⁶².

Study on implementation

The Act requires the USPTO Director to conduct a study regarding the implementation of the legislation and on such other aspects of Federal patent policies and practices with respect to patent rights, innovation in the United States, competitiveness of US markets, access by small business to capital and investment, and such other issues as the Director deems appropriate. The study must be completed within 4 years and the results submitted to the House and Senate Committees on the Judiciary.

Pro bono program

The Committee acknowledges the importance of individuals and small businesses to the patent system and our national culture of innovation. Consistent with this sentiment, the Act requires the USPTO Director to support intellectual property law associations across the United States to establish pro bono programs to assist under-resourced independent inventors and businesses.

⁶²*The Medicines Co. v. Kappos, et. al.*, 10–CV–286 (E.D. Va. August 3, 2010).

Effective date

Except as otherwise provided, the provisions of the bill take effect 1 year following the date of enactment and shall apply to any patent issued on or after that date.

Budgetary effects

The House bill retains a Senate provision that references a CBO PAYGO score in *The Congressional Record*.

Hearings

The Committee's Subcommittee on Intellectual Property, Competition, and the Internet held 1 day of hearings on H.R. 1249. The hearing took place on March 30, 2011. Testimony was received from the Honorable David Kappos, Under Secretary of Commerce for Intellectual Property and Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office; Steve Bartlett, President and CEO of The Financial Services Roundtable; Steven Miller, President and General Counsel (Intellectual Property) for Procter & Gamble; Mark Chandler, Senior Vice President, General Counsel, and Secretary for Cisco; and John Vaughn, Executive Vice President of the Association of American Universities.

The Subcommittee also conducted three separate but related hearings on January 25, 2011 ("How an Improved US Patent and Trademark Office Can Create Jobs," Serial No. 112-6), February 11, 2011 ("Crossing the Finish Line on Patent Reform—What Can and Should be Done," Serial No. 112-8), and March 10, 2011 ("Review of Recent Judicial Decisions on Patent Law," Serial No. 112-20).

Given that the bill is a 6-year work in progress, the legislative record should also reflect that the Subcommittee conducted related hearings on patent reform in the 109th through 111th Congresses. These hearings include the following: "H.R. 2795, the 'Patent Reform Act of 2005'" (June 19, 2005); "Committee Print Regarding Patent Quality Improvement (Part I)" (April 20, 2005, Serial No. 109-11); "Committee Print Regarding Patent Quality Improvement (Part II)" (April 28, 2005, Serial No. 109-11); "Review of US Patent and Trademark Office Operations" (September 8, 2005, Serial No. 109-48); "Patent Quality Enhancement in the Information-Based Economy" (April 5, 2006, Serial No. 109-99); "Patent Harmonization" (April 26, 2006, Serial No. 109-100); "Patent Trolls: Fact or Fiction?" (June 15, 2006, Serial No. 109-104); "Oversight Hearing on the US Patent and Trademark Office" (February 27, 2008, Serial No. 110-115); "The 'Patent Reform Act of 2007'" (April 26, 2007, Serial No. 110-65); "H.R. 1260, The 'Patent Reform Act of 2009'" (April 30, 2009, Serial No. 111-92); and "The US Patent and Trademark Office" (May 5, 2010, Serial No. 111-135).

Finally, the United States Senate Committee on the Judiciary devoted substantial process to patent reform over the same time period. Beginning in 2005, the Senate Judiciary Committee conducted eight hearings on the subject and reported separate bills in the 110th (S. 1145), 111th (S. 515), and 112th (S. 23) Congresses. The full Senate passed S. 23 on March 8, 2011, by a vote of 95-5. H.R. 1249 is substantially similar to S. 23.

Committee Consideration

On April 14, 2011, the Committee met in open session and ordered the bill H.R. 1249 favorably reported with an amendment, by a rollcall vote of 32 to 3, a quorum being present.

Committee Votes

In compliance with clause 3(b) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee advises that the following rollcall votes occurred during the Committee's consideration of H.R. 1249.

1. Amendment #7 to the Manager's Amendment, offered by Ms. Lofgren. The amendment ties the commencement of an inter partes proceeding to a claims-construction order following a "Markman" hearing. Failed by a rollcall of 14–17.

ROLLCALL NO. 1

	Ayes	Nays	Present
Mr. Smith, Chairman		X	
Mr. Sensenbrenner, Jr.	X		
Mr. Coble			
Mr. Gallegly		X	
Mr. Goodlatte		X	
Mr. Lungren	X		
Mr. Chabot		X	
Mr. Issa		X	
Mr. Pence		X	
Mr. Forbes		X	
Mr. King		X	
Mr. Franks		X	
Mr. Gohmert		X	
Mr. Jordan			
Mr. Poe			
Mr. Chaffetz		X	
Mr. Griffin		X	
Mr. Marino		X	
Mr. Gowdy		X	
Mr. Ross		X	
Ms. Adams			
Mr. Quayle		X	
Mr. Conyers, Jr., Ranking Member	X		
Mr. Berman	X		
Mr. Nadler	X		
Mr. Scott	X		
Mr. Watt	X		
Ms. Lofgren	X		
Ms. Jackson Lee	X		
Ms. Waters	X		
Mr. Cohen	X		
Mr. Johnson	X		
Mr. Pierluisi		X	
Mr. Quigley			
Ms. Chu	X		
Mr. Deutch	X		
Ms. Sánchez			
Ms. Wasserman Schultz			
Total	14	17	

2. Amendment #11 to the Manager's amendment, offered by Ms. Chu. The amendment strikes the inter partes review threshold and

retains the lower threshold of a “substantial new questions of patentability.” Failed by a rollcall of 7–21.

ROLLCALL NO. 2

	Ayes	Nays	Present
Mr. Smith, Chairman		X	
Mr. Sensenbrenner, Jr.		X	
Mr. Coble		X	
Mr. Gallegly		X	
Mr. Goodlatte		X	
Mr. Lungren		X	
Mr. Chabot		X	
Mr. Issa		X	
Mr. Pence		X	
Mr. Forbes		X	
Mr. King		X	
Mr. Franks		X	
Mr. Gohmert			
Mr. Jordan			
Mr. Poe			
Mr. Chaffetz		X	
Mr. Griffin			
Mr. Marino		X	
Mr. Gowdy		X	
Mr. Ross		X	
Ms. Adams		X	
Mr. Quayle		X	
Mr. Conyers, Jr., Ranking Member	X		
Mr. Berman	X		
Mr. Nadler	X		
Mr. Scott			
Mr. Watt	X		
Ms. Lofgren	X		
Ms. Jackson Lee			
Ms. Waters	X		
Mr. Cohen			
Mr. Johnson		X	
Mr. Pierluisi		X	
Mr. Quigley			
Ms. Chu	X		
Mr. Deutch		X	
Ms. Sánchez			
Ms. Wasserman Schultz			
Total	7	21	

3. Manager’s amendment as amended to H.R. 1249. The manager’s amendment revises the inter partes review proceeding, clarifies the application of the prior-user defense, and makes other improvements to H.R. 1249. Adopted by a rollcall of 29–2.

ROLLCALL NO. 3

	Ayes	Nays	Present
Mr. Smith, Chairman	X		
Mr. Sensenbrenner, Jr.		X	
Mr. Coble	X		
Mr. Gallegly	X		
Mr. Goodlatte	X		
Mr. Lungren	X		
Mr. Chabot	X		
Mr. Issa			
Mr. Pence	X		
Mr. Forbes	X		

ROLLCALL NO. 3—Continued

	Ayes	Nays	Present
Mr. King	X		
Mr. Franks	X		
Mr. Gohmert			
Mr. Jordan			
Mr. Poe	X		
Mr. Chaffetz	X		
Mr. Griffin			
Mr. Marino	X		
Mr. Gowdy	X		
Mr. Ross	X		
Ms. Adams	X		
Mr. Quayle	X		
Mr. Conyers, Jr., Ranking Member		X	
Mr. Berman	X		
Mr. Nadler	X		
Mr. Scott			
Mr. Watt	X		
Ms. Lofgren	X		
Ms. Jackson Lee			
Ms. Waters	X		
Mr. Cohen	X		
Mr. Johnson	X		
Mr. Pierluisi	X		
Mr. Quigley	X		
Ms. Chu	X		
Mr. Deutch	X		
Ms. Sánchez	X		
Ms. Wasserman Schultz			
Total	29	2	

4. Amendment #8 to H.R. 1249, offered by Mr. Goodlatte. The amendment precludes the use of supplemental examination by any patent holder who attempts to practice or practices fraud on the USPTO. The amendment passed by a rollcall of 21–9, with one vote recorded as “present” and one vote recorded as “pass.”

ROLLCALL NO. 4

	Ayes	Nays	Present
Mr. Smith, Chairman			X
Mr. Sensenbrenner, Jr.		X	
Mr. Coble		X	
Mr. Gallegly		X	
Mr. Goodlatte	X		
Mr. Lungren	X		
Mr. Chabot		X	
Mr. Issa	X		
Mr. Pence		X	
Mr. Forbes	X		
Mr. King	X		
Mr. Franks	X		
Mr. Gohmert			
Mr. Jordan			
Mr. Poe			
Mr. Chaffetz	X		
Mr. Griffin	X		
Mr. Marino	X		
Mr. Gowdy	X		
Mr. Ross	X		
Ms. Adams	X		
Mr. Quayle	X		

ROLLCALL NO. 4—Continued

	Ayes	Nays	Present
Mr. Conyers, Jr., Ranking Member	X		
Mr. Berman	X		
Mr. Nadler	X		
Mr. Scott	X		
Mr. Watt	X		
Ms. Lofgren	X		
Ms. Jackson Lee		X	
Ms. Waters	X		
Mr. Cohen			Pass
Mr. Johnson		X	
Mr. Pierluisi		X	
Mr. Quigley			
Ms. Chu		X	
Mr. Deutch	X		
Ms. Sánchez			
Ms. Wasserman Schultz			
Total	21	9	

5. Amendment #15 to H.R. 1249, offered by Ms. Lofgren. The amendment strikes the supplemental examination provision from the bill. Failed by a rollcall of 8–21.

ROLLCALL NO. 5

	Ayes	Nays	Present
Mr. Smith, Chairman		X	
Mr. Sensenbrenner, Jr.			
Mr. Coble		X	
Mr. Gallegly		X	
Mr. Goodlatte		X	
Mr. Lungren		X	
Mr. Chabot		X	
Mr. Issa		X	
Mr. Pence			
Mr. Forbes			
Mr. King			
Mr. Franks		X	
Mr. Gohmert			
Mr. Jordan			
Mr. Poe			
Mr. Chaffetz		X	
Mr. Griffin		X	
Mr. Marino		X	
Mr. Gowdy		X	
Mr. Ross			
Ms. Adams		X	
Mr. Quayle		X	
Mr. Conyers, Jr., Ranking Member	X		
Mr. Berman	X		
Mr. Nadler	X		
Mr. Scott	X		
Mr. Watt	X		
Ms. Lofgren	X		
Ms. Jackson Lee		X	
Ms. Waters			
Mr. Cohen	X		
Mr. Johnson		X	
Mr. Pierluisi		X	
Mr. Quigley		X	
Ms. Chu		X	
Mr. Deutch		X	
Ms. Sánchez		X	

ROLLCALL NO. 5—Continued

	Ayes	Nays	Present
Ms. Wasserman Schultz	X		
Total	8	21	

6. Amendment #1 to H.R. 1249, offered by Mr. Conyers. The amendment limits the application of the business method patent program. Failed by a rollcall of 11–24.

ROLLCALL NO. 6

	Ayes	Nays	Present
Mr. Smith, Chairman		X	
Mr. Sensenbrenner, Jr.	X		
Mr. Coble		X	
Mr. Gallegly		X	
Mr. Goodlatte		X	
Mr. Lungren	X		
Mr. Chabot		X	
Mr. Issa		X	
Mr. Pence		X	
Mr. Forbes		X	
Mr. King		X	
Mr. Franks	X		
Mr. Gohmert		X	
Mr. Jordan		X	
Mr. Poe		X	
Mr. Chaffetz		X	
Mr. Griffin		X	
Mr. Marino		X	
Mr. Gowdy		X	
Mr. Ross		X	
Ms. Adams		X	
Mr. Quayle		X	
Mr. Conyers, Jr., Ranking Member	X		
Mr. Berman	X		
Mr. Nadler		X	
Mr. Scott		X	
Mr. Watt		X	
Ms. Lofgren	X		
Ms. Jackson Lee	X		
Ms. Waters			
Mr. Cohen	X		
Mr. Johnson			
Mr. Pierluisi		X	
Mr. Quigley	X		
Ms. Chu	X		
Mr. Deutch		X	
Ms. Sánchez	X		
Ms. Wasserman Schultz			
Total	11	24	

7. Reporting H.R. 1249 as amended. The bill bolsters funding for the USPTO, switches the United States to a first-to-file patent system, and makes further improvements to the Patent Act. Reported by a rollcall of 32–3.

ROLLCALL NO. 7

	Ayes	Nays	Present
Mr. Smith, Chairman	X		

ROLLCALL NO. 7—Continued

	Ayes	Nays	Present
Mr. Sensenbrenner, Jr.		X	
Mr. Coble	X		
Mr. Gallegly	X		
Mr. Goodlatte	X		
Mr. Lungren	X		
Mr. Chabot	X		
Mr. Issa	X		
Mr. Pence	X		
Mr. Forbes	X		
Mr. King		X	
Mr. Franks	X		
Mr. Gohmert	X		
Mr. Jordan	X		
Mr. Poe	X		
Mr. Chaffetz	X		
Mr. Griffin	X		
Mr. Marino	X		
Mr. Gowdy	X		
Mr. Ross	X		
Ms. Adams	X		
Mr. Quayle	X		
Mr. Conyers, Jr., Ranking Member		X	
Mr. Berman	X		
Mr. Nadler	X		
Mr. Scott	X		
Mr. Watt	X		
Ms. Lofgren	X		
Ms. Jackson Lee	X		
Ms. Waters			
Mr. Cohen	X		
Mr. Johnson			
Mr. Pierluisi	X		
Mr. Quigley	X		
Ms. Chu	X		
Mr. Deutch	X		
Ms. Sánchez	X		
Ms. Wasserman Schultz			
Total	32	3	

Committee Oversight Findings

In compliance with clause 3(c)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee advises that the findings and recommendations of the Committee, based on oversight activities under clause 2(b)(1) of rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, are incorporated in the descriptive portions of this report.

New Budget Authority and Tax Expenditures

Clause 3(c)(2) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives is inapplicable because this legislation does not provide new budgetary authority or increased tax expenditures.

Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate

In compliance with clause 3(c)(3) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee sets forth, with respect to the bill, H.R. 1249, the following estimate and comparison prepared

by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, May 26, 2011.

Hon. LAMAR SMITH, CHAIRMAN,
Committee on the Judiciary,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 1249, the “America Invents Act.”

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Susan Willie.

Sincerely,

DOUGLAS W. ELMENDORF,
DIRECTOR.

Enclosure.

cc: Honorable John Conyers, Jr.
Ranking Member

H.R. 1249—America Invents Act.

SUMMARY

H.R. 1249 would amend the law that governs how the Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) awards patents. Among other things, the bill would alter the rule that prioritizes the award of a patent from the “first to invent” to the “first inventor to file.” As a result, PTO would change certain procedures it follows in awarding patents. The bill also would establish new review procedures that would allow individuals to challenge the validity of a patent and would modify PTO’s authority to collect and spend fees.

CBO estimates that enacting the bill would reduce net direct spending by \$725 million and revenues by \$8 million over the 2011–2021 period. Most of the change in direct spending would result from providing PTO with permanent authority to collect and spend certain fees. In total, the changes would decrease budget deficits by \$717 million over the 2011–2021 period. Because enacting the legislation would affect direct spending and revenues, pay-as-you-go procedures apply. CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 1249 would have a discretionary cost of \$446 million over the 2011–2016 period, assuming appropriation of the necessary amounts.

H.R. 1249 would impose both intergovernmental and private-sector mandates, as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA), on certain patent applicants and other entities. The bill also would preempt the authority of state courts to hear certain patent cases. Based on information from PTO, CBO estimates that the costs of complying with those mandates would exceed the annual threshold for private-sector mandates established in UMRA (\$142 million in 2011, adjusted annually for inflation) in each of the first 5 years the mandate is in effect. CBO estimates that the cost to state, local, and tribal governments would fall below the annual threshold established in UMRA (\$71 million in 2011, adjusted annually for inflation).

ESTIMATED COST TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The estimated budgetary impact of H.R. 1249 is shown in the following table. The costs of this legislation fall within budget function 370 (commerce and housing credit).

By Fiscal Year, in Millions of Dollars

	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2011-2016	2011-2021
CHANGES IN DIRECT SPENDING													
Reclassification of PTO Spending	0	2,266	2,573	2,784	2,907	3,017	3,143	3,262	3,375	3,472	3,593	13,547	30,392
Estimated Budget Authority	0	1,869	2,486	2,743	2,883	2,995	3,119	3,238	3,353	3,453	3,571	12,976	29,710
Estimated Outlays	0	43	92	99	113	123	129	134	141	149	157	470	1,180
New and Amended PTO Processes	0	35	83	97	110	121	127	134	140	147	155	446	1,149
Estimated Budget Authority	0	8	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	18
Estimated Outlays	0	8	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	18
PTO Administrative Costs	0	-2,318	-2,672	-2,886	-3,019	-3,140	-3,272	-3,396	-3,516	-3,620	-3,750	-14,035	-31,589
Estimated Budget Authority	0	-2,318	-2,672	-2,886	-3,019	-3,140	-3,272	-3,396	-3,516	-3,620	-3,750	-14,035	-31,589
Estimated Outlays	0	-3	3	-2	-2	-2	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-12	-17
Electronic Filing Incentive	0	-3	-3	-2	-2	-2	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-12	-17
Estimated Budget Authority	0	-3	-3	-2	-2	-2	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-12	-17
Estimated Outlays	0	-3	-3	-2	-2	-2	-1	-1	-1	-1	-1	-12	-17
Funding Agreements	*	1	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2	4
Estimated Budget Authority	*	1	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2	4
Estimated Outlays	*	1	1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	2	4
Total Changes in Direct Spending	*	-3	-2	-2	-1	-2	-1	-1	-1	0	0	-10	-12
Estimated Budget Authority	*	-408	-98	-45	-28	-26	-27	-25	-24	-21	-25	-605	-725
Estimated Outlays													
Estimated Revenues	-1	-3	-2	-1	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-7	-8
Impact on Deficit	1	-405	-96	-44	-28	-26	-27	-25	-24	-21	-25	-598	-717
CHANGES IN SPENDING SUBJECT TO APPROPRIATION													
Estimated Authorization Level	0	-76	-37	5	44	76	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	13	n.a.
Estimated Outlays	0	294	-8	16	55	88	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	446	n.a.

Notes:
 Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.
 Negative numbers denote reductions in spending, revenues, and the deficit.
 PTO = Patent and Trademark Office; * = between -\$500,000 and \$500,000; n.a. = not applicable.

BASIS OF ESTIMATE

For this estimate, CBO assumes that the bill will be enacted near the end of fiscal year 2011, the necessary amounts will be appropriated each year, and spending will follow historical patterns for the PTO. Further, CBO assumes that most of the bill's provisions would be effective 1 year after the date of enactment.

H.R. 1249 would change the basis that PTO uses to award patents. Under current law, where two or more persons independently develop identical or similar inventions at approximately the same time, the patent is awarded to the inventor PTO established to be first through PTO's examination process. H.R. 1249 would direct PTO, under the same circumstances, to award the patent to the inventor whose application to PTO had the earliest filing date.

H.R. 1249 also would provide PTO with permanent authority to collect and spend certain fees, shifting collections and spending out of the PTO appropriation account and into a revolving fund. Further, H.R. 1249 would direct PTO's collections to be recorded in the budget as offsetting receipts, that is, offsets to direct spending. Under current law, PTO is authorized to collect fees from the public for specific activities related to processing applications for patents and trademarks. The agency assesses and collects fees for a number of different activities, and the rate for each is set in law. Currently, authority to collect and spend those fees is provided in annual appropriation acts, and the fees are classified as offsets to the agency's discretionary spending levels. For 2011, PTO received a gross appropriation of \$2,016 million, and CBO estimates the agency will collect fees of \$2,198 million that year to more than offset that appropriation.

Direct Spending

Based on information from PTO and other agencies, CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 1249 would reduce net direct spending by about \$0.7 billion over the 2012–2021 period. Provisions of the bill that would reclassify PTO spending and broaden the agency's workload would increase spending by \$30.9 billion over the 2012–2021 period. Other provisions of the bill would decrease direct spending (by changing the amount of collections classified as offsets to direct spending) by \$31.6 billion over the same period.

Reclassification of PTO Spending. Because PTO's spending would no longer be controlled by the availability of appropriated funds, H.R. 1249 would make all of the agency's fee collections permanently available for spending. Based on historical growth in the number of applications filed for patents and trademarks and historical spending patterns, we estimate that enacting those provisions of H.R. 1249 would increase gross direct spending by about \$29.7 billion over the 2012–2021 period.

New and Amended PTO Processes. H.R. 1249 would establish two new procedures to review or update patents and amend one process already available under current law to review existing patents. PTO would be authorized to collect fees to offset much of the costs associated with those activities. Based on information from PTO, CBO estimates that those new and amended processes, taken together, would increase direct spending by \$1.1 billion over the 2012–2021 period.

Specifically, the bill would:

- Establish a new procedure, known as post-grant review, to review the validity of a patent. This option generally would be available within 12 months of the date the patent was issued and would take place in a court-like proceeding in which both the challenger and the owner of the patent present information regarding the validity of a patent. CBO estimates that implementing this new process would increase direct spending by \$140 million over the 2012–2021 period.
- Establish a new procedure that would allow patent holders to request that PTO review an existing patent to consider, reconsider, or correct information believed to be relevant to the patent. Should this supplemental review raise a new question of patentability, PTO would then reexamine the patent. CBO estimates that the supplemental reviews and the additional reexaminations that would result under the bill would increase direct spending by \$758 million over the 2012–2021 period.
- Amend a process already existing under current law, inter partes reexamination, to expand the universe of patents that could be challenged through this proceeding but also limit the time period during which such a challenge could be raised. CBO estimates that implementing the changes to inter partes reexamination procedures would increase direct spending by \$251 million over the 2012–2021 period.

PTO Administrative Costs. As a result of the switch to a “first-to-file” principle for granting patents, PTO would incur additional administrative costs, including updating its information technology systems, training staff, and preparing several reports for the Congress. Further, the bill would require PTO to establish at least three additional satellite offices in different regions throughout the country. CBO estimates that those changes would cost \$18 million over the 2012–2021 period.

Reclassification of PTO Fees. As noted above, the bill would permanently authorize PTO to set and collect fees and would direct those collections to be recorded in the budget as offsetting receipts (credits against direct spending). Further, the bill would amend current law to permanently increase fee rates that have been temporarily authorized in annual appropriation acts since 2005 and authorize PTO, after specified public notice and comment periods, to set fee rates at levels sufficient to cover the agency’s operating costs.

Based on information from PTO and historical patterns of collections, CBO estimates that enacting H.R. 1249 would result in collections of \$31.6 billion over the 2012–2021 period. Most of that amount, about \$30.5 billion, would stem from the reclassification of the fees from offsets to discretionary spending to offsetting receipts and from PTO’s new authority to set fees to recover costs; the balance, about \$1.1 billion, would result from increases in fee collections related to the increases in the agency’s workload.

Electronic Filing Incentive. In addition to fees PTO collects under current law, H.R. 1249 would establish a new fee that would

be charged to patent applicants that do not use electronic means to file an application. Based on information from PTO, CBO estimates that about 5,000 paper applications, on average, would be filed per year, generating collections of about \$17 million over the 2012–2021 period. The bill would direct those collections to be recorded as offsets to direct spending and would make them unavailable for spending by PTO.

Funding Agreements. H.R. 1249 would change the amount of royalties or income earned by certain contractors that is required to be remitted to the federal government. Under current law, funding agreements between the federal government and contractors operating government-owned, contractor-operated (GOCO) laboratories allow contractors to retain, up to a certain threshold, all royalty and other income earned from patents received as a result of work performed under the contract. Beyond that, 75 percent of royalties or income earned above the threshold must be returned to the U.S. Treasury. The royalties returned to the Treasury are recorded as offsetting receipts. H.R. 1249 would reduce the amount deposited into the Treasury to 15 percent.

Currently, only one entity operating a GOCO laboratory returns royalties and license fees to the federal government. Over the past several years, the Ames Laboratory, operated by Iowa State University, has returned to the Treasury approximately \$1 million a year in license fees earned from patents awarded under its contract with the federal government. CBO estimates that reducing the percentage of income that is returned to the Treasury would reduce offsetting receipts (and thus increase direct spending) by about \$4 million over the 2011–2021 period.

REVENUES

H.R. 1249 would change how certain patent cases, known as false marking cases, are handled by the court system. False marking cases are brought when a defendant is accused of incorrectly claiming a product's right to certain patent protection. Under current law, such cases can be brought by any person on behalf of the government; the government receives half of the value of any fines or amount paid as part of a court-mediated settlement, with the person bringing the case receiving the other. H.R. 1249 would permit competitors to recover damages for the competitive harm caused by a defendant's false marking but would eliminate the option for individuals to seek fines on behalf of the government by stating that only the United States can sue for a civil penalty. H.R. 1249 would further specify that a defendant would not be liable for a false marking suit if the patent involved either expired within 3 years of the alleged false marking or if the word 'expired' were added to the claim of patent protection.

Information from the Department of Justice (DOJ) indicates that in 2010, the government collected fines (recorded as revenues) of about \$3 million from false marking cases. Under current law, CBO expects that a diminishing number of new cases will be filed through 2011 and beyond, as courts define stricter standards for proving 'intent to deceive' on the part of the defendant, and as companies rectify their patent marking procedures in response to the risk of litigation. Based on information from DOJ, CBO estimates that about a third of currently pending cases will eventually be set-

tled in court; we expect the rest to be dismissed with no monetary settlement. Thus, CBO estimates that under current law, by 2014, federal revenues from those cases will drop to less than \$500,000 a year.

By changing both who can litigate and their incentives for doing so, H.R. 1249 would significantly reduce both the pending caseload and the number of future cases filed. Therefore, CBO estimates that enacting the bill would reduce federal revenues by \$7 million over the 2011–2016 period and by \$8 million over the 2011–2021 period.

Spending Subject to Appropriation

H.R. 1249 would provide PTO with permanent authority to collect fees and spend those collections thus changing the budgetary classification of those fees and spending. Under that permanent authority, PTO fees would be recorded as offsetting receipts rather than as offsets to discretionary spending. As a result of the reclassification, CBO estimates that this provision would decrease discretionary spending by \$10.4 billion and offsetting collections by about \$10.8 billion over the 2012–2016 period. On net, CBO estimates that implementing this provision would increase net discretionary spending by \$445 million over the 5-year period, assuming that appropriation actions consistent with H.R. 1249 are enacted.

H.R. 1249 also would require the Small Business Administration to prepare a study of the effects on small businesses of eliminating the use of dates of invention for determining entitlement to a patent. The results of the study would be included in a report to the Congress due 1 year after enactment of the bill. In addition, H.R. 1249 would require the Government Accountability Office to conduct a study on the implementation of the bill's provisions by PTO; a report on the results of the study would be due 4 years after enactment of the bill. Based on information from the affected agencies, CBO estimates that those reporting requirements would cost \$1 million over the 2012–2016 period, assuming availability of appropriated funds.

PAY-AS-YOU-GO CONSIDERATIONS

The Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 establishes budget-reporting and enforcement procedures for legislation affecting direct spending or revenues. The net changes in outlays and revenues that are subject to those pay-as-you-go procedures are shown in the following table.

CBO Estimate of Pay-As-You-Go Effects for H.R. 1249 as ordered reported by the House Committee on the Judiciary on April 14, 2011

By Fiscal Year, in Millions of Dollars													
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2011– 2016	2011– 2021
NET INCREASE OR DECREASE (–) IN THE DEFICIT													
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Impact	1	–405	–96	–44	–28	–26	–27	–25	–24	–21	–25	–598	–717
Memorandum:													
Changes in Outlays	0	–408	–98	–45	–28	–26	–27	–25	–24	–21	–25	–605	–725
Changes in Revenues	–1	–3	–2	–1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	–7	–8

Note: Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL AND PRIVATE-SECTOR IMPACT

H.R. 1249 would impose both intergovernmental and private-sector mandates, as defined in UMRA, on certain patent applicants and other entities. The bill also would preempt the authority of state courts to hear certain patent cases. Based on information from PTO, CBO estimates that the costs of complying with those mandates would exceed the annual threshold for private-sector mandates established in UMRA (\$142 million in 2011, adjusted annually for inflation) in each of the first 5 years the mandate is in effect. CBO estimates that the costs to state, local, and tribal governments would fall below the annual threshold established in UMRA (\$71 million in 2011, adjusted annually for inflation).

Mandates That Apply to Both Public and Private Entities

PTO fees. H.R. 1249 would impose a mandate on both public and private entities by allowing PTO to set or adjust certain fees and by permanently extending other fee increases that are set to expire at the end of fiscal year 2011. The requirement to pay those fees is a mandate because the federal government controls the patent and trademark systems, and no reasonable alternatives to the systems exist.

Based on information from PTO, CBO estimates that the total cost to comply with the mandate would range from about \$220 million in 2013 to about \$350 million in 2017, with less than \$1 million of those costs accruing to public entities and the rest accruing to private entities.

Restricting Prior-Use Defense. H.R. 1249 would prohibit public and private entities from using the prior-use defense to patent infringement claims for business processes brought by a university or technology-transfer organization. Consequently, public and private entities that have been using business processes which are later patented by a university or technology-transfer organization would no longer be eligible to use those processes without permission from the patent holder. That restriction would be an intergovernmental and private-sector mandate. The cost of the mandate would be the cost to purchase a license from the patent holder, or the amount of net income the entity would lose as a result of no longer being able to use that patent commercially. Based on the small number of public entities that use business methods, CBO es-

estimates that the cost to comply with the mandate would be small for public entities. According to information from industry experts, the prior-use defense has never been asserted in a recorded case and therefore it is likely that the use of such a defense would be uncommon. Consequently, CBO estimates that the cost to comply with the mandate for private entities would probably be small.

Mandate That Applies to Public Entities Only

H.R. 1249 would preempt the authority of state courts to hear certain patent cases. That provision would be an intergovernmental mandate as defined in UMRA. While it would limit the authority of state courts, CBO estimates that it would impose no duty on states that would result in additional spending.

Mandate That Applies to Private Entities Only

The bill also would impose a mandate on patent applicants by prohibiting certain tax strategies from being patented. The prohibition would apply to any application pending on the date of enactment and any application submitted for such a patent after that date. CBO has no basis for estimating the net income that would be forgone by a patent applicant for not receiving such a patent. Therefore, the cost to private entities to comply with this mandate is uncertain.

PREVIOUS CBO ESTIMATE

On March 8, 2011, CBO transmitted a pay-as-you-go estimate for S. 23, the America Invents Act, reflecting a number of amendments adopted prior to Senate passage of the bill. One amendment would provide permanent authority to PTO to collect and spend fees. CBO estimated that enacting S. 23 would reduce budget deficits by \$750 million over the 2011–2021 period.

On March 1, 2011, CBO transmitted a cost estimate for S. 23, the Patent Reform Act of 2011, as ordered reported by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on February 3, 2011. That version of the legislation would not provide permanent authority to PTO to collect and spend fees. CBO's estimates of the House and Senate bills reflect those differences. The mandates contained in both the House and Senate bills are the same, except for the mandate regarding prior-use defense, which is only in H.R. 1249.

ESTIMATE PREPARED BY:

Federal Spending: Susan Willie
 Federal Revenue: Kalyani Parthasarathy
 Impact on State, Local, and Tribal Governments: Elizabeth Cove
 Delisle
 Impact on the Private Sector: Paige Piper/Bach

ESTIMATE APPROVED BY:

Theresa Gullo
 Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis
 Frank Sammartino
 Assistant Director for Tax Analysis

Performance Goals and Objectives

The Committee states that pursuant to clause 3(c)(4) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, H.R. 1249 modernizes US patent law to improve the operations of the US Patent and Trademark Office, inhibit frivolous patent lawsuits, protect the rights of all inventors, and spur innovation as a means to create American jobs and raise standards of living.

Advisory on Earmarks

In accordance with clause 9 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, H.R. 1249 does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9(e), 9(f), or 9(g) of Rule XXI.

Section-by-Section

Section 1. Short title; table of contents.

This Act may be cited as the “America Invents Act.”

Section 2. Definitions.

Section 2 defines the following terms: “Director,” “Office,” “Patent Public Advisory Committee,” “Trademark Act of 1946,” and “Trademark Public Advisory Committee”.

Section 3. First inventor to file.

Subsection (a)—§ 100 is amended to include definitions for additional terms, including “effective filing date.”

Subsection (b)—§ 102 is amended to make an invention’s priority date its effective filing date. This change moves the United States to the first-to-file system. New section 102(b) preserves the grace period, ensuring that during the year prior to filing, an invention will not be rendered unpatentable based on any of the inventor’s own disclosures, or any disclosure made by any party after the inventor has disclosed his invention to the public. Section 102(c) recodifies the CREATE Act, and section 102(d) defines the effective filing date of a patent or application that is cited as prior art to a claimed invention.

Subsection (c)—§ 103 is amended consistent with moving to a first-to-file system. Existing subsection (a) is amended slightly; subsection (b) is deleted because it is no longer needed; subsection (c), which is the CREATE Act, has been moved to § 102.

Subsection (d)—Repeals § 104 (Inventions Made Abroad).

Subsection (e)—Repeals § 157 (Statutory Invention Registration).

Subsection (f)—Amends § 120 related to filing dates to conform with the CREATE Act.

Subsection (g)—Makes various conforming amendments.

Subsections (h), (i) & (j)—Repeals interference proceeding and makes conforming changes to § 291. Amends § 135(a) and provides for a “derivation proceeding,” designed to determine the inventor with the right to file an application on a claimed invention. An applicant requesting a derivation proceeding must set forth the basis for finding that an earlier applicant derived the claimed invention and without authorization filed an application claiming such invention. The request must be filed within 1 year of the date of first

publication of an application for a claim that is substantially the same as the claimed invention. The Patent Trial and Appeal Board (the “Board”) shall determine the right to patent and issue a final decision thereon. Decisions of the Board may be appealed to the Federal Circuit, or to district court pursuant to § 146.

Subsection (k)—Paragraph (1) amends § 32 of the Patent Act (“suspension or exclusion from practice”) by placing time limitations on the commencement of a proceeding. Paragraph (2) imposes a reporting requirement on the Director regarding instances of misconduct before the agency and how they were addressed.

Subsection (l)—Contains a provision for a study regarding first-to-file to be conducted by the Small Business Administration and the USPTO.

Subsection (m)—Requires a study of prior user rights.

Subsection (n)—Contains an effective date provision.

Subsection (o)—Contains a study of patent litigation and its effect on the patent system.

Subsection (p)—Sets forth the sense of Congress that the first-to-file system promotes the purposes of Article I, section 8, clause 8, of the US Constitution.

Subsection (q)—Sets forth the sense of Congress that the first-to-file system promotes harmonization of the US and other patent systems.

Section 4. Inventor’s oath or declaration.

The section streamlines the requirement that the inventor submit an oath as part of a patent application, and makes it easier for patent owners to file applications.

Subsection (a)—Section 115 is amended to permit an applicant to submit a substitute statement in lieu of the inventor’s oath or declaration in certain circumstances, including if the inventor is (i) unable to do so, or (ii) unwilling to do so and is under an obligation to assign the invention. A savings clause provides that failure to comply with the requirements of this section will not be a basis for invalidity or unenforceability of the patent if the failure is remedied by a supplemental and corrected statement. False substitute statements are subject to the same penalties as false oaths and declarations.

Subsection (b)—Section 118 is amended to allow the person to whom the inventor has assigned (or is under an obligation to assign) the invention to file a patent application. A person who otherwise shows sufficient proprietary interest in the invention may file a patent application as an agent of the inventor to preserve the rights of the parties.

Section 5. Defense to infringement based on earlier inventor.

Section 5 amends § 273 of the Patent Act, which addresses prior-user rights, as follows:

The prior-use defense may be asserted against any patent (not just methods), provided the person asserting the defense reduced the subject matter of the patent to practice and commercially used the subject matter at least 1 year before the effective filing date of the patent. However, the defense cannot be asserted if the subject matter was derived from the patent holder or persons in privity with the patent holder. Nor can the defense be asserted unless the

prior user both reduced the subject matter of the patent to practice and commercially used it at least 1 year before the effective filing date of the patent or the date that the patentee publicly disclosed the invention and invoked the § 102(b) grace period, whichever is earlier.

Section 5 also clarifies that a person may not assert the defense if the subject matter of the patent on which the defense is based was developed pursuant to a funding agreement under Chapter 18 of the Patent Act (patent rights in inventions made with Federal assistance) or by a university or a technology transfer organization affiliated with a university that did not receive private business funding in support of the patent's development.

Finally, Section 5 states that the defense may only be asserted by the person who performed or caused the performance of the acts necessary to establish the defense, as well as any other entity that controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with such person; and except for any transfer to the patent owner, the right to assert the defense cannot be licensed or assigned or transferred to another person except as an ancillary and subordinate part of a good faith assignment or transfer for other reasons of the entire enterprise or line of business to which the defense relates.

Section 6. Post-grant review proceedings.

Subsections (a) and (d) enact new chapters 31 and 32, which create adjudicative systems of post-grant and inter partes review. The parallel sections of these new chapters are as follows:

§§ 311 and 321. Inter partes review may be sought on the basis of patents and printed publications any time after a post-grant review is concluded or, if no such review is instituted, after the time for seeking such review has expired. Post-grant review may be sought on any invalidity ground during the first 12 months after a patent is issue or reissued.

§§ 312 and 322. Petitions for review shall explain the basis for seeking review, shall identify the petitioner's real parties in interest and privies, and shall be made publicly available as soon as is practicable.

§§ 313 and 323. Patent owners may file a response to a petition for reviewing explaining why a review should not be instituted.

§§ 314 and 324. Inter partes review shall not be instituted unless the information in the petition and response shows that there is a reasonable likelihood that a claim would be found invalid. Post-grant review shall not be instituted unless the information presented in the petition, if not rebutted, shows that it is more likely than not that a claim would be found invalid, or the petition raises a novel or unsettled legal question that is important to other patents or applications.

§§ 315 and 325. (a) Review may not be instituted if the petitioner has previously filed a civil action challenging the validity of the patent. The petitioner may, however, file a declaratory-judgment action challenging the validity of one or more claims in the patent on or after the day that he files the review petition, but such action is automatically stayed until the patent owner countersues for infringement.

(b) Inter partes review must be sought by a party within 12 months of the date when the party is served with a complaint for infringement. If a patent owner sues for infringement within 3 months of the patent's issue, a pending petition for post-grant review or the institution of such a proceeding may not serve as a basis for staying the court's consideration of the patent owner's motion for a preliminary injunction.

(c) The Director may allow other petitioners to join an inter partes or post-grant review.

(d) The Director may consolidate multiple proceedings or matters concerning the same patent and decline requests for repeated proceedings on the same question.

(e) Inter partes and post-grant petitioners are estopped from raising in a subsequent Office proceeding any issue that they raised or reasonably could have raised in the inter partes or post grant review, and inter partes petitioners are also estopped from raising in civil litigation or an ITC proceeding any issue that they raised or could have raised in the inter partes review. Post-grant petitioners are only estopped from raising in civil litigation or ITC proceedings those issues that they actually raised in the post-grant review.

(f) Post-grant review may not be used to challenge claims in a reissue patent that are the same as or narrower than claims in the original patent if the time for seeking review of the original patent has lapsed.

§§ 316 and 326. (a) The Director shall prescribe regulations that make the file in proceedings public; define standards for instituting reviews; allow submission of additional information; establish and govern review and its relationship to other proceedings; set a time limit for requesting joinder in inter partes review; set standards for discovery; prescribe sanctions for abuse of the proceedings; provide for protective orders for confidential information; allow the patent owner to file a response after an inter partes review has been instituted; allow the patent owner to amend the patent; provide either party with the right to an oral hearing; and set a 1-year time limit for completion of the proceeding, with a 6-month extension for good cause; and provide the petitioner with at least one opportunity to file written comments after the proceeding is instituted.

(b) In prescribing regulations, the Director shall consider the integrity of the patent system and the efficient operation of the Office.

(c) The Patent Trial and Appeal Board shall conduct review proceedings.

(d) The patent owner may submit one amendment with a reasonable number of substitute claims, and additional amendments either as agreed to by the parties for settlement, for good cause shown in post-grant review, or as prescribed in regulations by the Director in inter partes review.

(e) The challenger shall have the burden of providing unpatentability by a preponderance of the evidence.

§§ 317 and 327. Parties may agree to settle review proceedings, in which case estoppel shall not apply and a copy of the settlement agreement shall be filed in the Office.

§§ 318 and 328. The Patent Trial and Appeal Board shall issue a final written decision and a certificate cancelling, confirming, or incorporating claims.

§§ 319 and 329. A party dissatisfied with a final written decision may appeal to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

Subsections (b) and (e) of section 5 make technical and conforming amendments.

Subsections (c) and (f) require the Director to issue regulations implementing the new reviews within 1 year, and create transition provisions for proceedings pending between the enactment of the Act and the full implementation of the new reviews.

Subsection (g) amends § 301 to include written statements of the patent owner filed in a proceedings before a Federal court or the Office as citable prior art. The section is further amended to provide rules for submitting such statements and the limitations on their use.

Subsection (h) amends § 303 to provide that the Director may determine whether to initiate reexamination on the Director's own initiative based on citations by any person other than the owner of the patent under section 301 or 302. Also, § 306 is amended to conform to the changes made by § 4605 of the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999, Public Law 106–113, to §§ 134 and 141 of title 35.

Section 7. Patent Trial and Appeal Board.

The Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences is replaced with the new Patent Trial and Appeal Board (“Board”). The Board is charged with (i) reviewing adverse decisions of examiners on applications and reexamination proceedings, (ii) conducting derivation proceedings, and (iii) conducting the post-grant review proceedings. This section also updates the various appeals statutes.

Section 8. Preissuance submissions by third parties.

This section amends § 122 to create a mechanism for third parties to submit timely pre-issuance information relevant to the examination of the application, including a concise statement of the relevance of the submission.

Section 9. Venue.

The venue for certain district court challenges of USPTO decisions is changed from the District of Columbia to the Eastern District of Virginia, the district where the USPTO resides.

Section 10. Fee-setting authority.

This section gives the Director rulemaking authority to set or adjust any fee under §§ 41 and 376, and section 1113 of title 15, provided that such fee amounts are set to reasonably compensate the USPTO for the services performed. The Director may also reduce such fees. The Director shall consult with the patent and trademark advisory committees as provided for in this section. Any proposal for a change in fees (including the rationale, purpose, and

possible expectations or benefits that will result) shall be published in the *Federal Register* and shall seek public comment for a period of not less than 45 days. The Director shall notify Congress of any final proposed fee change and Congress shall have up to 45 days to consider and comment before any proposed fee change becomes effective.

Rules of construction are provided.

Section 11. Fees for patent services.

The Act includes the current patent fee schedule in the text. This schedule represents a reference point for any future adjustments to the fee schedule by the Director.

Section 12. Supplemental examination.

This section authorizes a new § 257 of the Patent Act that addresses the “supplemental examination” of a patent to correct errors or omissions in proceedings before the Office. Information that was not considered or was inadequately considered or was incorrect can be presented to the Office.

Under new subsection (a) of § 257, the Director must initially determine whether a petitioner’s request for supplemental examination of one or more items in the request raises a new question of patentability. The Director must make this determination within 3 months of receiving a request for supplemental examination.

Under new subsection (b), if the Director issues a certificate affirming that this threshold is met, a reexamination shall be ordered and will be conducted according to the procedures under Chapter 30 of the Patent Act (ex parte reexamination).

New Subsection (c) of § 257 stipulates that a patent cannot be held unenforceable on the basis of conduct relating to information that had not been considered, was inadequately considered, or was incorrect in a prior examination if the information was considered, reconsidered, or corrected during the supplemental examination. Challengers may still argue in court that the Office’s conclusion in supplemental examination was erroneous and that the information renders the patent invalid, but the information cannot be used to render the patent invalid or unenforceable on the basis of inequitable conduct.

New subsection (c) also enumerates three exceptions to these terms: (1) prior allegations involving certain new drug applications (21 USC § 355(j)); (2) patent enforcement actions before the International Trade Commission or a US district court, unless the supplemental examination was concluded before the date on which the action is brought; and (3) instances in which fraud on the USPTO was practiced or attempted.

New subsection (d) of § 257 authorizes the Director to establish fees, by regulation, to help defray the cost of a supplemental examination, in addition to those charged pursuant to Chapter 30.

Finally, new subsection (e) clarifies that nothing in Section 12 limits the application of criminal or antitrust laws or the ability of the USPTO Director to investigate and sanction persons or their representatives for misconduct before the Office.

Section 13. Funding agreements.

Clause (i) of § 202(c)(7)(E) is amended to permit a nonprofit organization that has a funding agreement for the operation of a Government-owned-contractor-operated facility to retain 85%, rather than 25% under current law, of licensing royalties in excess of the amount equal to 5% of the annual budget of the facility.

Section 14. Tax strategies deemed within the prior art.

This section provides that strategies for reducing, avoiding, or deferring tax liability shall be deemed insufficient to differentiate an invention from the prior art. In other words, applicants will no longer be able to rely on the novelty or non-obviousness of a tax strategy embodied in their claims in order to distinguish their claims from the prior art under the statutory novelty and non-obviousness requirements of those provisions.

Under the provision, the term “tax liability” refers to any liability for a tax under any Federal, State, or local law, or law of any foreign jurisdiction, including any statute, rule, regulation, or ordinance that levies, imposes, or assesses such tax liability.

The provision is directed to tax strategies, which are a subset of business methods, and is not intended to deny patent protection for an invention that consists of tax preparation software or other tools used solely to enter data on tax or information returns or any other filing required by a tax authority. Thus, a software program that is novel and non-obvious as software would not be affected by this section even though the software is used for a tax purpose. A prior-art software program, however, could not overcome the section 102 and 103 hurdles by implementing a novel and non-obvious strategy for reducing, avoiding, or deferring taxes.

There may be situations in which some aspects of an invention are separable from the tax strategy. In this case, any claim that encompasses a tax strategy will be subject to the provision and the novelty or non-obviousness of the tax strategy will be deemed insufficient to differentiate that claim from the prior art. However, any claim that does not involve a tax strategy would not be within the scope of the provision. In such a case, if the invention includes claims that are separable from the tax strategy, such claims could, if otherwise enforceable, be enforced.

Inventions that fall within the scope of the provision include those especially suitable for use with tax-favored structures that must meet certain requirements, such as employee benefit plans, tax-exempt organizations, or any other entities that must be structured or operated in a particular manner to obtain certain tax consequences. Thus, the provision applies if the effect of an invention is to aid in satisfying the qualification requirements for the desired tax-favored entity status, to take advantage of the specific tax benefits offered in a tax-favored structure, or to allow for tax reduction, avoidance, or deferral not otherwise automatically available in such entity or structure.

In general, the USPTO may seek advice and assistance from Treasury and the IRS to better recognize tax strategies. Such consultations should help ensure that patents do not infringe on the ability of others to interpret the tax law and that implementing such interpretations remains in the public domain, available to all taxpayers and their advisors.

Section 15. Best Mode Requirement.

This section amends § 282(b) by removing the failure to disclose the best mode under section 112 as a basis for canceling or holding either invalid or unenforceable a patent claim.

Section 16. Marking.

Subsection (a) addresses virtual marking. The provision allows a patent holder to satisfy the requirements of § 287 of the Patent Act by affixing to a patented article the word “patent” or the abbreviation “pat.” together with an Internet address that the public can access free of charge to determine the status of the patent. The USPTO is also instructed to submit a report to Congress on the effectiveness of virtual marking that is due no later than 3 years after the date of enactment.

Subsection (b) addresses false marking in the following ways: (1) Only the United States may sue for the qui tam penalty under the subsection. (2) A person who has suffered a competitive injury as a result of a violation may still bring a civil action in US district court for compensatory damages. (3) Persons or companies otherwise liable under § 292 (the false marking statute) are protected during a 3-year window beginning on the date the patent at issue expires. Beyond the 3-year window, persons or companies are also protected if they place the word “patent” or “patented”, the abbreviation “pat.”, or the patent number either on the article or through an Internet posting, consistent with the amendments in subsection (a).

Section 17. Advice of Counsel.

Section 17 creates a new § 298 of the Patent Act that states that the failure of an infringer to obtain the advice of counsel regarding any allegedly infringed patent, or the failure of the infringer to present such advice to the court or jury, may not be used to prove that the accused infringer willfully infringed the patent or that the infringer intended to induce infringement of the patent.

Section 18. Transitional program for covered business method patents.

Section 18 creates a transitional program to allow post-grant review of the validity of business method patents.

Under subsection (a), the Director is authorized to establish regulations governing the use of the new proceeding, which will be modeled after post-grant review as set forth in Section 6 (new Chapter 32 of the Patent Act). The proceeding is limited in certain respects. A petition cannot be accepted unless the petitioner or his real party in interest has been sued for infringement of the patent or has been charged with infringement. Nor can the petitioner or his real party in interest later assert invalidity before the ITC or a Federal court on a ground that was considered and resulted in a written decision by the agency in the course of a transitional proceeding.

The program takes effect 1 year following the date of enactment and applies to any covered business method patent issued before, on, or after the effective date, with the exception of a patent that satisfies the requirements of § 321(c) of the Patent Act as set forth in Section 6 of the bill. The program sunsets after 10 years.

Subsection (b) addresses requests for a stay of a civil action alleging infringement under § 281 of the Patent Act. A US district court shall decide to grant a stay based on prescribed criteria: (A) whether a stay (or denial thereof) will simplify the issues in question and streamline the trial; (B) whether discovery is complete and whether a trial date has been set; (C) whether a stay (or a denial thereof) would unduly prejudice the non-moving party or present a clear tactical advantage for the moving party; and (D) whether a stay (or the denial thereof) will reduce the burden of litigation on the parties and on the court. A party may seek an interlocutory appeal of the US district court’s decision, which the Federal Circuit shall review to ensure consistent application of established precedent, and such review may be de novo.

Subsection (c) deems that in an action for infringement under § 281 of a covered business method patent, an automated teller machine (“ATM”) shall not be considered a regular and established place of business for purposes of the patent venue statute.⁶³

Subsection (d) defines “covered business method patent” as one that claims a method or corresponding apparatus for performing data processing or other operations used in the practice, administration, or management of a financial product or service, except that it does not include patents for technological inventions.

Finally, subsection (e) clarifies that nothing in Section 18 shall be construed as amending or interpreting categories of patent-eligible subject matter under § 101 of the Patent Act.

Section 19. Jurisdiction and procedural matters.

Subsection (a) through (d) enact the so-called *Holmes Group* fix (H.R. 2955, 109th Congress), which the House Judiciary Committee reported favorably in 2006. The Committee Report accompanying H.R. 2955 (House Rep. 109–407), which we reaffirm, explains the bill’s reasons for abrogating *Holmes Group, Inc. v. Vornado Air Circulation Systems, Inc.*, 535 U.S. 826 (2002), and more fully precluding state court jurisdiction over patent legal claims.

Subsection (e) creates a new § 299 of the Patent Act that addresses joinder of accused infringers in patent actions or trials not involving certain drugs and biologics. Parties accused as defendants may be joined in one action as defendants or counterclaim defendants only if: (1) any right to relief is asserted against the parties jointly, severally, or in the alternative with respect to or arising out of the same transaction, occurrence, or series of transactions or occurrences relating to the making, using, importing into the United States, offering for sale, or selling of the same accused product or process; and (2) questions of fact common to all defendants or counterclaim defendants will arise in the action.

For purposes of subsection (e), accused infringers may not be joined based solely on allegations that they each have infringed the patent or patents in suit.

The changes set forth in Section 19 shall apply to any civil action commenced on or after the date of enactment of the Act.

⁶³ 28 USC § 1400(b).

Section 20. Technical amendments.

This section sets forth technical amendments consistent with this Act.

Section 21. Travel expenses and payment of administrative judges.

Subsection (a) authorizes the USPTO to expend funds to cover the subsistence and travel-related expenses of non-Federal employees attending intellectual property programs hosted by the agency.

Subsection (b) authorizes the Director to fix the rate of basic pay for administrative patent and trademark judges at a rate not greater than that payable for level III of the Executive Pay Schedule under 5 USC § 5314.

Section 22. Patent and Trademark Office funding.

Subsections (a) defines the “United State Patent and Trademark Office Public Enterprise Fund” (“the Fund”) that replaces the existing “Patent and Trademark Office Appropriation Account.”

Subsection (b) clarifies the USPTO Director’s authority under the new Fund to collect all patent and trademark user fee revenue, which shall be available to the agency until expended. This change shall take effect on the later of October 1, 2011, or the first day of the first fiscal year that begins after the date of the enactment of the Act.

Subsection (c) establishes the Fund as a revolving fund in the US Treasury. Any amounts in the Fund shall be available for use by the Director without fiscal year limitation. Patent and trademark fees deposited in the Fund shall be recorded as offsetting receipts. Amounts deposited in the Fund shall be available, without fiscal year limitation, to cover all expenses determined in the discretion of the Director to be ordinary and reasonable.

Subsection (d) requires the Director, not later than 60 days after the end of each fiscal year, to submit a report to Congress that summarizes the USPTO operations for the preceding fiscal year, details the operating plan of the agency, describes its long-term modernization plans as well as any progress made toward modernization efforts in the previous fiscal year, and includes the results of the most recent audit as carried out by subsection (f).

Not later than 30 days after the beginning of each fiscal year, subsection (e) instructs the Director to notify the Committees on Appropriations of both houses of Congress of the plan for the obligation and expenditure of the total amount of the funds for that fiscal year under Public Law 109–108.

Subsection (f) mandates that the Director annually shall provide for an independent audit of the financial statement of the USPTO.

Subsection (g) requires the Director to prepare and submit to the President an annual “business-type” budget for the Fund as the President prescribes by regulation for the Federal Budget.

Section 23. Satellite offices.

Pursuant to subsection (a), and subject to available resources, the Director shall establish three or more satellite offices in the United States to carry out the responsibilities of the USPTO. The Director has 3 years after the date of enactment of the Act to complete the task.

Subject (b) enumerates the purposes of the satellite offices, including efforts to increase outreach activities, enhance patent examiner retention, and improve the quality of patent examination.

Subsection (c) details the required considerations the Director must invoke in selecting each location. Among the criteria are geographic diversity among the offices and reliance upon previous evaluations.

Not later than three fiscal years after the date of enactment of the Act, Subsection (d) requires the Director to submit a report to Congress on the rationale of the Director in selecting the location of any satellite office, the progress in establishing any satellite offices so selected, and whether the operation of any existing satellite office is achieving the purposes set forth in subsection (b).

Section 24. Designation of the Detroit satellite office.

Section 24 designates the USPTO satellite office to be located in Detroit, Michigan, as the “Elijah J. McCoy United States Patent and Trademark Office.”

Section 25. Patent Ombudsman Program for small business concerns.

Section 25 states that, using available resources, the Director shall establish and maintain in the USPTO a Patent Ombudsman Program, whose staff shall provide support and services relating to patent filings to small business concerns.

Section 26. Priority examination for technologies important to American competitiveness.

Section 26 amends § 2(b)(2) of the Patent Act by permitting the USPTO to prioritize the examination of applications for products, processes, or technologies that are important to the national economy or national competitiveness without recovering the aggregate extra cost of providing such prioritization.

Section 27. Calculation of 60-day period for application of patent term extension.

Subsection (a) clarifies USPTO “counting” rules that are used to determine whether an applicant has submitted an application to the agency in a timely manner under § 156(d)(1) of the Patent Act. If the application is transmitted after 4:30 pm, EST, on a business day, or is transmitted on a day that is not a business day, the product addressed by the application shall be deemed to receive “permission” on the next business day. “Business day” means any Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday, excluding any legal holiday under 5 USC § 6103.

Subsection (b) states that subsection (a) shall apply to any application for extension of term under § 156 of the Patent Act that is pending on, filed after, or as to which a decision regarding the application is subject judicial review on, the date of enactment of the Act.

Section 28. Study on implementation.

Subsection (a) requires the Director to conduct a study on the manner in which the Act is being implemented by the USPTO, along with a review of patent policies and practices of the Federal

Government with respect to patent rights, US innovation, access by small business to capital, and other issues as the Director deems appropriate.

Subsection (b) stipulates that the Director shall submit the results of the study along with his recommendations for any changes to the Senate and House Judiciary Committees not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of the Act.

Section 29. Pro bono program.

Section 29 requires the Director to work with and support intellectual law associations across the country to establish pro bono programs to assist financially under-resourced independent inventors and small businesses.

Section 30. Effective date.

Except as otherwise provided, this Act takes effect 12 months after the date of enactment and applies to any patent issued on or after that effective date.

Section 31. Budgetary effects.

Section 31 references text from S. 23 regarding the budgetary effects of the Act as it pertains to PAYGO compliance.

Agency Views

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
The Secretary of Commerce
Washington, D.C. 20230

May 31, 2011

The Honorable Lamar Smith
Chairman
Committee on the Judiciary
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I am pleased to provide the views of the U.S. Department of Commerce on the "America Invents Act," H.R. 1249 as reported by the House Committee on the Judiciary on April 14, 2011. As the Chairman and Ranking Member and I have discussed on several occasions, passage of needed reforms to our patent laws has been a high priority for me during my time as Secretary of Commerce because of its importance to America's competitiveness and our economic growth.

The Administration continues to strongly support the bipartisan efforts of Congress to enact patent reform legislation that will accelerate innovation, and create new jobs, new industries and new economic opportunities for Americans. Enactment of a balanced bill is an important part of the Administration's goal of "out-innovating" our economic competitors and winning the future – and it can be done with no cost to taxpayers and no addition to the deficit.

Accordingly, we supported passage of the Senate's recent patent reform legislation, S. 23, and welcome the House Judiciary Committee's timely consideration and approval of an amended version of H.R. 1249. These two bills are identical in many respects, and we are confident that the variations between the two can be resolved and that enactment of a bipartisan consensus bill is within reach. We look forward to working with Congress toward prompt passage of legislation that will enable more timely and quality-focused examination of patent applications, establish a secure funding mechanism for the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), and reduce litigation uncertainties and costs.

Our views on certain key provisions of H.R. 1249, as reported, that are important to our goals of an appropriately funded and well-functioning USPTO and successful passage of a balanced bill are as follows.

The Honorable Lamar Smith
Page 2

First Inventor to File

We strongly support the proposed transition of the United States to a first-inventor-to file system. It is an essential feature of any final bill that will simplify the process of acquiring rights while protecting innovators. The first-inventor-to-file provision is consistent with the practices of our economic competitors, and would benefit U.S. businesses by providing a more transparent and cost-effective process that puts them on a level playing field with the rest of the world. The proposed legislation provides a more transparent and certain grace period (a key feature of U.S. law) and a definite filing date that enables inventors to promote, fund and market their technology while making them less vulnerable to costly patent challenges, which disadvantage small entity inventors. These changes, as outlined in H.R. 1249, will benefit all stakeholders, both small and large, regardless of the field of innovation.

USPTO Fee Setting and Funding

We are pleased that H.R. 1249 includes fee-setting authority for the USPTO, an essential provision that will allow the agency to establish and adjust its fees – subject to oversight – to reflect changes in costs, demand, and workload and thereby ensure full cost recovery at no expense to America’s taxpayers. Moreover, it will allow the USPTO to process applications more quickly and produce higher-quality patents that are less likely to be subject to a court challenge.

This bill includes strong oversight of the USPTO in addition to that which the agency currently receives from the U.S. Department of Commerce and the Office of Management and Budget under existing law. The legislation incorporates a deliberative and transparent review process, input and oversight by the Patent and Trademark Public Advisory Committees, by stakeholders through public hearings and *Federal Register* notices with comment periods, and by Congress in a 45-day comment period. We support this package as a comprehensive and appropriate set of mechanisms to ensure all fee changes are well-considered and well-calibrated.

Fee-setting authority, coupled with the right to use all fees paid by patent applicants without fiscal year limitation, will permit the USPTO to engage in multi-year budget planning and achieve a stable funding model that supports future investments and improvements in operations. This structure is critical to enable the USPTO to better meet the needs of America’s innovators. We would like to work with the Committee to provide technical changes to the legislation needed to ensure that the USPTO can make interim fee adjustments so it can best use this new authority on day one, as it transitions to a thoughtful and transparent process to adjust its fees.

The Honorable Lamar Smith
Page 3

Post-Grant Review Proceedings

The Administration supports establishing a new post-grant review proceeding and retooling the existing post-grant *inter partes* reexamination procedure. These proceedings will serve to minimize costs and increase certainty by offering efficient and timely alternatives to litigation as a means of reviewing questions of patent validity. Such proceedings also will provide a check on patent examination, ultimately resulting in higher quality patents. It is important that post-grant review proceedings be designed to prevent delay and abusive challenges, but still enable valid challenges based on meritorious grounds.

We believe that the provisions contained in H.R. 1249 – including those covering regulatory authority, threshold and estoppel issues – will adequately address these concerns. Various safeguards and flexibilities are included in the proposed proceedings to enable USPTO to effectively implement and manage them. The bill also establishes a time-limited transitional post-grant review proceeding, which would enable the USPTO, upon petition, to review the validity of a limited range of business method patents to address particular challenges faced in this technology area as a result of case law developments.

Pre-issuance Submissions

Further measures to increase the quality of patents include the provision in H.R. 1249 that increases the opportunity for third parties to submit potentially relevant prior art to the USPTO after publication of an application and before examination. This provision will help to ensure that USPTO's examiners have before them the best available prior art for consideration.

Prior User Defense


H.R. 1249 includes provisions to expand the current prior user defense to all areas of technology. As a matter of fairness, we believe that innovators who independently create and commercialize technology should not be penalized for, or deprived of, their investment. As a result, we believe that the availability of a prior user defense is, on balance, good policy. We recognize, however, that some in the university community have raised concerns about the provision, and we stand ready to work with the Committee on any proposed revisions.

The Honorable Lamar Smith
Page 4

Again, we are grateful for the Committee's timely consideration of H.R. 1249, and we look forward to working with you toward final enactment of historic patent reform legislation in support of America's innovators, job creation and economic growth across the United States.

The Office of Management and Budget has advised that there is no objection to the transmittal of these views from the standpoint of the Administration's program. If you have any questions, please contact me or April Boyd, Assistant Secretary for Legislative and Intergovernmental Affairs, at 202-482-3663.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Gary Locke". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Gary Locke

Changes in Existing Law Made by the Bill, as Reported

In compliance with clause 3(e) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italics, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

TITLE 35, UNITED STATES CODE

PART I—UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CHAPTER 1—ESTABLISHMENT, OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES, FUNCTIONS

Sec.

1. Establishment.

* * * * *

[6. Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences.]

6. Patent Trial and Appeal Board.

* * * * *

§ 2. Powers and duties

(a) * * *

(b) **SPECIFIC POWERS.—**The Office—

(1) * * *

(2) may establish regulations, not inconsistent with law, which—

(A) * * *

* * * * *

(E) shall recognize the public interest in continuing to safeguard broad access to the United States patent system through the reduced fee structure for small entities under section 41(h)(1) **[of this title; and]**;

(F) provide for the development of a performance-based process that includes quantitative and qualitative measures and standards for evaluating cost-effectiveness and is consistent with the principles of impartiality and competitiveness; *and*

(G) *may, subject to any conditions prescribed by the Director and at the request of the patent applicant, provide for prioritization of examination of applications for products, processes, or technologies that are important to the national economy or national competitiveness without recovering the aggregate extra cost of providing such prioritization, notwithstanding section 41 or any other provision of law;*

* * * * *

(11) may conduct programs, studies, or exchanges of items or services regarding domestic and international intellectual property law and the effectiveness of intellectual property protection domestically and throughout the world, *and the Office*

is authorized to expend funds to cover the subsistence expenses and travel-related expenses, including per diem, lodging costs, and transportation costs, of persons attending such programs who are not Federal employees;

* * * * *

§ 3. Officers and employees

(a) * * *

(b) OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE OFFICE.—

(1) * * *

* * * * *

(6) ADMINISTRATIVE PATENT JUDGES AND ADMINISTRATIVE TRADEMARK JUDGES.—*The Director may fix the rate of basic pay for the administrative patent judges appointed pursuant to section 6 and the administrative trademark judges appointed pursuant to section 17 of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1067) at not greater than the rate of basic pay payable for level III of the Executive Schedule under section 5314 of title 5. The payment of a rate of basic pay under this paragraph shall not be subject to the pay limitation under section 5306(e) or 5373 of title 5.*

* * * * *

(e) CARRYOVER OF PERSONNEL.—

(1) * * *

(2) OTHER PERSONNEL.—Any individual who, on the day before the effective date of the Patent and Trademark Office Efficiency Act, is an officer or employee of the Department of Commerce (other than an officer or employee under paragraph (1)) shall be transferred to the Office, as necessary to carry out the purposes of **[this Act,]** *that Act*, if—

(A) * * *

* * * * *

【§ 6. Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences

【(a) ESTABLISHMENT AND COMPOSITION.—There shall be in the United States Patent and Trademark Office a Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences. The Director, the Commissioner for Patents, the Commissioner for Trademarks, and the administrative patent judges shall constitute the Board. The administrative patent judges shall be persons of competent legal knowledge and scientific ability who are appointed by the Secretary of Commerce, in consultation with the Director.

【(b) DUTIES.—The Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences shall, on written appeal of an applicant, review adverse decisions of examiners upon applications for patents and shall determine priority and patentability of invention in interferences declared under section 135(a). Each appeal and interference shall be heard by at least three members of the Board, who shall be designated by the Director. Only the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences may grant rehearings.

【(c) AUTHORITY OF THE SECRETARY.—The Secretary of Commerce may, in his or her discretion, deem the appointment of an administrative patent judge who, before the date of the enactment

of this subsection, held office pursuant to an appointment by the Director to take effect on the date on which the Director initially appointed the administrative patent judge.

[(d) DEFENSE TO CHALLENGE OF APPOINTMENT.—It shall be a defense to a challenge to the appointment of an administrative patent judge on the basis of the judge's having been originally appointed by the Director that the administrative patent judge so appointed was acting as a de facto officer.]

§ 6. Patent Trial and Appeal Board

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—*There shall be in the Office a Patent Trial and Appeal Board. The Director, the Deputy Director, the Commissioner for Patents, the Commissioner for Trademarks, and the administrative patent judges shall constitute the Patent Trial and Appeal Board. The administrative patent judges shall be persons of competent legal knowledge and scientific ability who are appointed by the Secretary, in consultation with the Director. Any reference in any Federal law, Executive order, rule, regulation, or delegation of authority, or any document of or pertaining to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences is deemed to refer to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board.*

(b) *DUTIES.*—*The Patent Trial and Appeal Board shall—*

(1) *on written appeal of an applicant, review adverse decisions of examiners upon applications for patents pursuant to section 134(a);*

(2) *review appeals of reexaminations pursuant to section 134(b);*

(3) *conduct derivation proceedings pursuant to section 135; and*

(4) *conduct inter partes reviews and post-grant reviews pursuant to chapters 31 and 32.*

(c) *3-MEMBER PANELS.*—*Each appeal, derivation proceeding, post-grant review, and inter partes review shall be heard by at least 3 members of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board, who shall be designated by the Director. Only the Patent Trial and Appeal Board may grant rehearings.*

(d) *TREATMENT OF PRIOR APPOINTMENTS.*—*The Secretary of Commerce may, in the Secretary's discretion, deem the appointment of an administrative patent judge who, before the date of the enactment of this subsection, held office pursuant to an appointment by the Director to take effect on the date on which the Director initially appointed the administrative patent judge. It shall be a defense to a challenge to the appointment of an administrative patent judge on the basis of the judge's having been originally appointed by the Director that the administrative patent judge so appointed was acting as a de facto officer.*

* * * * *

§ 12. Copies of patents and applications for public libraries

The Director may supply copies of specifications and drawings of patents in printed or electronic form and published applications for patents to public libraries in the United States which shall maintain such copies for the use of the public, at the rate for each

year's issue established for this purpose in section 41(d) [of this title].

* * * * *

CHAPTER 3—PRACTICE BEFORE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

§ 32. Suspension or exclusion from practice

The Director may, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, suspend or exclude, either generally or in any particular case, from further practice before the Patent and Trademark Office, any person, agent, or attorney shown to be incompetent or disreputable, or guilty of gross misconduct, or who does not comply with the regulations established under section 2(b)(2)(D) [of this title], or who shall, by word, circular, letter, or advertising, with intent to defraud in any manner, deceive, mislead, or threaten any applicant or prospective applicant, or other person having immediate or prospective business before the Office. The reasons for any such suspension or exclusion shall be duly recorded. The Director shall have the discretion to designate any attorney who is an officer or employee of the United States Patent and Trademark Office to conduct the hearing required by this section. *A proceeding under this section shall be commenced not later than the earlier of either the date that is 10 years after the date on which the misconduct forming the basis for the proceeding occurred, or 1 year after the date on which the misconduct forming the basis for the proceeding is made known to an officer or employee of the Office as prescribed in the regulations established under section 2(b)(2)(D).* The [United States District Court for the District of Columbia] *United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia*, under such conditions and upon such proceedings as it by its rules determines, may review the action of the Director upon the petition of the person so refused recognition or so suspended or excluded.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 4—PATENT FEES; FUNDING; SEARCH SYSTEMS

§ 41. Patent fees; patent and trademark search systems

[(a) The Director shall charge the following fees:

[(1)(A) On filing each application for an original patent, except in design or plant cases, \$690.

[(B) In addition, on filing or on presentation at any other time, \$78 for each claim in independent form which is in excess of 3, \$18 for each claim (whether independent or dependent) which is in excess of 20, and \$260 for each application containing a multiple dependent claim.

[(C) On filing each provisional application for an original patent, \$150.

[(2) For issuing each original or reissue patent, except in design or plant cases, \$1,210.

[(3) In design and plant cases—

[(A) on filing each design application, \$310;

[(B) on filing each plant application, \$480;

[(C) on issuing each design patent, \$430; and

[(D) on issuing each plant patent, \$580.

[(4)(A) On filing each application for the reissue of a patent, \$690.

[(B) In addition, on filing or on presentation at any other time, \$78 for each claim in independent form which is in excess of the number of independent claims of the original patent, and \$18 for each claim (whether independent or dependent) which is in excess of 20 and also in excess of the number of claims of the original patent.

[(5) On filing each disclaimer, \$110.

[(6)(A) On filing an appeal from the examiner to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, \$300.

[(B) In addition, on filing a brief in support of the appeal, \$300, and on requesting an oral hearing in the appeal before the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, \$260.

[(7) On filing each petition for the revival of an unintentionally abandoned application for a patent, for the unintentionally delayed payment of the fee for issuing each patent, or for an unintentionally delayed response by the patent owner in any reexamination proceeding, \$1,210, unless the petition is filed under section 133 or 151 of this title, in which case the fee shall be \$110.

[(8) For petitions for 1-month extensions of time to take actions required by the Director in an application—

[(A) on filing a first petition, \$110;

[(B) on filing a second petition, \$270; and

[(C) on filing a third petition or subsequent petition, \$490.

[(9) Basic national fee for an international application where the Patent and Trademark Office was the International Preliminary Examining Authority and the International Searching Authority, \$670.

[(10) Basic national fee for an international application where the Patent and Trademark Office was the International Searching Authority but not the International Preliminary Examining Authority, \$690.

[(11) Basic national fee for an international application where the Patent and Trademark Office was neither the International Searching Authority nor the International Preliminary Examining Authority, \$970.

[(12) Basic national fee for an international application where the international preliminary examination fee has been paid to the Patent and Trademark Office, and the international preliminary examination report states that the provisions of Article 33(2), (3), and (4) of the Patent Cooperation Treaty have been satisfied for all claims in the application entering the national stage, \$96.

[(13) For filing or later presentation of each independent claim in the national stage of an international application in excess of 3, \$78.

[(14) For filing or later presentation of each claim (whether independent or dependent) in a national stage of an international application in excess of 20, \$18.

[(15) For each national stage of an international application containing a multiple dependent claim, \$260.

For the purpose of computing fees, a multiple dependent claim referred to in section 112 of this title or any claim depending therefrom shall be considered as separate dependent claims in accordance with the number of claims to which reference is made. Errors in payment of the additional fees may be rectified in accordance with regulations of the Director.

[(b) The Director shall charge the following fees for maintaining in force all patents based on applications filed on or after December 12, 1980:

[(1) 3 years and 6 months after grant, \$830.

[(2) 7 years and 6 months after grant, \$1,900.

[(3) 11 years and 6 months after grant, \$2,910.

Unless payment of the applicable maintenance fee is received in the Patent and Trademark Office on or before the date the fee is due or within a grace period of 6 months thereafter, the patent will expire as of the end of such grace period. The Director may require the payment of a surcharge as a condition of accepting within such 6-month grace period the payment of an applicable maintenance fee. No fee may be established for maintaining a design or plant patent in force.]

(a) *GENERAL FEES.*—*The Director shall charge the following fees:*

(1) *FILING AND BASIC NATIONAL FEES.*—

(A) *On filing each application for an original patent, except for design, plant, or provisional applications, \$330.*

(B) *On filing each application for an original design patent, \$220.*

(C) *On filing each application for an original plant patent, \$220.*

(D) *On filing each provisional application for an original patent, \$220.*

(E) *On filing each application for the reissue of a patent, \$330.*

(F) *The basic national fee for each international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) entering the national stage under section 371, \$330.*

(G) *In addition, excluding any sequence listing or computer program listing filed in an electronic medium as prescribed by the Director, for any application the specification and drawings of which exceed 100 sheets of paper (or equivalent as prescribed by the Director if filed in an electronic medium), \$270 for each additional 50 sheets of paper (or equivalent as prescribed by the Director if filed in an electronic medium) or fraction thereof.*

(2) *EXCESS CLAIMS FEES.*—

(A) *IN GENERAL.*—*In addition to the fee specified in paragraph (1)—*

(i) *on filing or on presentation at any other time, \$220 for each claim in independent form in excess of 3;*

(ii) *on filing or on presentation at any other time, \$52 for each claim (whether dependent or independent) in excess of 20; and*

(iii) for each application containing a multiple dependent claim, \$390.

(B) *MULTIPLE DEPENDENT CLAIMS.*—For the purpose of computing fees under subparagraph (A), a multiple dependent claim referred to in section 112 or any claim depending therefrom shall be considered as separate dependent claims in accordance with the number of claims to which reference is made.

(C) *REFUNDS; ERRORS IN PAYMENT.*—The Director may by regulation provide for a refund of any part of the fee specified in subparagraph (A) for any claim that is canceled before an examination on the merits, as prescribed by the Director, has been made of the application under section 131. Errors in payment of the additional fees under this paragraph may be rectified in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Director.

(3) *EXAMINATION FEES.*—

(A) *IN GENERAL.*—

(i) For examination of each application for an original patent, except for design, plant, provisional, or international applications, \$220.

(ii) For examination of each application for an original design patent, \$140.

(iii) For examination of each application for an original plant patent, \$170.

(iv) For examination of the national stage of each international application, \$220.

(v) For examination of each application for the reissue of a patent, \$650.

(B) *APPLICABILITY OF OTHER FEE PROVISIONS.*—The provisions of paragraphs (3) and (4) of section 111(a) relating to the payment of the fee for filing the application shall apply to the payment of the fee specified in subparagraph (A) with respect to an application filed under section 111(a). The provisions of section 371(d) relating to the payment of the national fee shall apply to the payment of the fee specified in subparagraph (A) with respect to an international application.

(4) *ISSUE FEES.*—

(A) For issuing each original patent, except for design or plant patents, \$1,510.

(B) For issuing each original design patent, \$860.

(C) For issuing each original plant patent, \$1,190.

(D) For issuing each reissue patent, \$1,510.

(5) *DISCLAIMER FEE.*—On filing each disclaimer, \$140.

(6) *APPEAL FEES.*—

(A) On filing an appeal from the examiner to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board, \$540.

(B) In addition, on filing a brief in support of the appeal, \$540, and on requesting an oral hearing in the appeal before the Patent Trial and Appeal Board, \$1,080.

(7) *REVIVAL FEES.*—On filing each petition for the revival of an unintentionally abandoned application for a patent, for the unintentionally delayed payment of the fee for issuing each patent, or for an unintentionally delayed response by the patent

owner in any reexamination proceeding, \$1,620, unless the petition is filed under section 133 or 151, in which case the fee shall be \$540.

(8) *EXTENSION FEES.*—For petitions for 1-month extensions of time to take actions required by the Director in an application—

- (A) on filing a first petition, \$130;
- (B) on filing a second petition, \$360; and
- (C) on filing a third or subsequent petition, \$620.

(b) *MAINTENANCE FEES.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—The Director shall charge the following fees for maintaining in force all patents based on applications filed on or after December 12, 1980:

- (A) Three years and 6 months after grant, \$980.
- (B) Seven years and 6 months after grant, \$2,480.
- (C) Eleven years and 6 months after grant, \$4,110.

(2) *GRACE PERIOD; SURCHARGE.*—Unless payment of the applicable maintenance fee under paragraph (1) is received in the Office on or before the date the fee is due or within a grace period of 6 months thereafter, the patent shall expire as of the end of such grace period. The Director may require the payment of a surcharge as a condition of accepting within such 6-month grace period the payment of an applicable maintenance fee.

(3) *NO MAINTENANCE FEE FOR DESIGN OR PLANT PATENT.*—No fee may be established for maintaining a design or plant patent in force.

【(c)(1) The Director】

(c) *DELAYS IN PAYMENT OF MAINTENANCE FEES.*—

(1) *ACCEPTANCE.*—The Director may accept the payment of any maintenance fee required by subsection (b) of this section which is made within twenty-four months after the six-month grace period if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Director to have been unintentional, or at any time after the six-month grace period if the delay is shown to the satisfaction of the Director to have been unavoidable. The Director may require the payment of a surcharge as a condition of accepting payment of any maintenance fee after the six-month grace period. If the Director accepts payment of a maintenance fee after the six-month grace period, the patent shall be considered as not having expired at the end of the grace period.

【(2) A patent】

(2) *EFFECT ON RIGHTS OF OTHERS.*—A patent, the term of which has been maintained as a result of the acceptance of a payment of a maintenance fee under this subsection, shall not abridge or affect the right of any person or that person's successors in business who made, purchased, offered to sell, or used anything protected by the patent within the United States, or imported anything protected by the patent into the United States after the 6-month grace period but prior to the acceptance of a maintenance fee under this subsection, to continue the use of, to offer for sale, or to sell to others to be used, offered for sale, or sold, the specific thing so made, purchased, offered for sale, used, or imported. The court before which such matter is in question may provide for the continued manufacture, use, offer for sale, or sale of the thing made, purchased,

offered for sale, or used within the United States, or imported into the United States, as specified, or for the manufacture, use, offer for sale, or sale in the United States of which substantial preparation was made after the 6-month grace period but before the acceptance of a maintenance fee under this subsection, and the court may also provide for the continued practice of any process that is practiced, or for the practice of which substantial preparation was made, after the 6-month grace period but before the acceptance of a maintenance fee under this subsection, to the extent and under such terms as the court deems equitable for the protection of investments made or business commenced after the 6-month grace period but before the acceptance of a maintenance fee under this subsection.

[(d) The Director shall establish fees for all other processing, services, or materials relating to patents not specified in this section to recover the estimated average cost to the Office of such processing, services, or materials, except that the Director shall charge the following fees for the following services:

[(1) For recording a document affecting title, \$40 per property.

[(2) For each photocopy, \$.25 per page.

[(3) For each black and white copy of a patent, \$3.

The yearly fee for providing a library specified in section 13 of this title with uncertified printed copies of the specifications and drawings for all patents in that year shall be \$50.]

(d) *PATENT SEARCH AND OTHER FEES.*—

(1) *PATENT SEARCH FEES.*—

(A) *IN GENERAL.*—*The Director shall charge the fees specified under subparagraph (B) for the search of each application for a patent, except for provisional applications. The Director shall adjust the fees charged under this paragraph to ensure that the fees recover an amount not to exceed the estimated average cost to the Office of searching applications for patent either by acquiring a search report from a qualified search authority, or by causing a search by Office personnel to be made, of each application for patent.*

(B) *SPECIFIC FEES.*—*The fees referred to in subparagraph (A) are—*

(i) \$540 for each application for an original patent, except for design, plant, provisional, or international applications;

(ii) \$100 for each application for an original design patent;

(iii) \$330 for each application for an original plant patent;

(iv) \$540 for the national stage of each international application; and

(v) \$540 for each application for the reissue of a patent.

(C) *APPLICABILITY OF OTHER PROVISIONS.*—*The provisions of paragraphs (3) and (4) of section 111(a) relating to the payment of the fee for filing the application shall apply to the payment of the fee specified in this paragraph with respect to an application filed under section 111(a). The*

provisions of section 371(d) relating to the payment of the national fee shall apply to the payment of the fee specified in this paragraph with respect to an international application.

(D) *REFUNDS.*—The Director may by regulation provide for a refund of any part of the fee specified in this paragraph for any applicant who files a written declaration of express abandonment as prescribed by the Director before an examination has been made of the application under section 131.

(E) *APPLICATIONS SUBJECT TO SECRECY ORDER.*—A search of an application that is the subject of a secrecy order under section 181 or otherwise involves classified information may be conducted only by Office personnel.

(F) *CONFLICTS OF INTEREST.*—A qualified search authority that is a commercial entity may not conduct a search of a patent application if the entity has any direct or indirect financial interest in any patent or in any pending or imminent application for patent filed or to be filed in the Office.

(2) *OTHER FEES.*—

(A) *IN GENERAL.*—The Director shall establish fees for all other processing, services, or materials relating to patents not specified in this section to recover the estimated average cost to the Office of such processing, services, or materials, except that the Director shall charge the following fees for the following services:

(i) For recording a document affecting title, \$40 per property.

(ii) For each photocopy, \$.25 per page.

(iii) For each black and white copy of a patent, \$3.

(B) *COPIES FOR LIBRARIES.*—The yearly fee for providing a library specified in section 12 with uncertified printed copies of the specifications and drawings for all patents in that year shall be \$50.

(e) **【The Director】** *WAIVER OF FEES; COPIES REGARDING NOTICE.*—The Director may waive the payment of any fee for any service or material related to patents in connection with an occasional or incidental request made by a department or agency of the Government, or any officer thereof. The Director may provide any applicant issued a notice under section 132 **【of this title】** with a copy of the specifications and drawings for all patents referred to in that notice without charge.

(f) **【The fees】** *ADJUSTMENT OF FEES.*—The fees established in subsections (a) and (b) of this section may be adjusted by the Director on October 1, 1992, and every year thereafter, to reflect any fluctuations occurring during the previous 12 months in the Consumer Price Index, as determined by the Secretary of Labor. Changes of less than 1 per centum may be ignored.

【(g)】 No fee established by the Director under this section shall take effect until at least 30 days after notice of the fee has been published in the Federal Register and in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark Office.

【(h)(1)】 Fees charged under subsection (a) or (b) shall be reduced by 50 percent with respect to their application to any small

business concern as defined under section 3 of the Small Business Act, and to any independent inventor or nonprofit organization as defined in regulations issued by the Director.

【(2) With respect to its application to any entity described in paragraph (1), any surcharge or fee charged under subsection (c) or (d) shall not be higher than the surcharge or fee required of any other entity under the same or substantially similar circumstances.】

(h) *FEES FOR SMALL ENTITIES.*—

(1) *REDUCTIONS IN FEES.*—Subject to paragraph (3), fees charged under subsections (a), (b), and (d)(1) shall be reduced by 50 percent with respect to their application to any small business concern as defined under section 3 of the Small Business Act, and to any independent inventor or nonprofit organization as defined in regulations issued by the Director.

(2) *SURCHARGES AND OTHER FEES.*—With respect to its application to any entity described in paragraph (1), any surcharge or fee charged under subsection (c) or (d) shall not be higher than the surcharge or fee required of any other entity under the same or substantially similar circumstances.

(3) *REDUCTION FOR ELECTRONIC FILING.*—The fee charged under subsection (a)(1)(A) shall be reduced by 75 percent with respect to its application to any entity to which paragraph (1) applies, if the application is filed by electronic means as prescribed by the Director.

【(i)(1) The Director】

(i) *ELECTRONIC PATENT AND TRADEMARK DATA.*—

(1) *MAINTENANCE OF COLLECTIONS.*—The Director shall maintain, for use by the public, paper, microform, or electronic collections of United States patents, foreign patent documents, and United States trademark registrations arranged to permit search for and retrieval of information. The Director may not impose fees directly for the use of such collections, or for the use of the public patent or trademark search rooms or libraries.

【(2) The Director】

(2) *AVAILABILITY OF AUTOMATED SEARCH SYSTEMS.*—The Director shall provide for the full deployment of the automated search systems of the Patent and Trademark Office so that such systems are available for use by the public, and shall assure full access by the public to, and dissemination of, patent and trademark information, using a variety of automated methods, including electronic bulletin boards and remote access by users to mass storage and retrieval systems.

【(3) The Director】

(3) *ACCESS FEES.*—The Director may establish reasonable fees for access by the public to the automated search systems of the Patent and Trademark Office. If such fees are established, a limited amount of free access shall be made available to users of the systems for purposes of education and training. The Director may waive the payment by an individual of fees authorized by this subsection upon a showing of need or hardship, and if such a waiver is in the public interest.

【(4) The Director】

(4) *ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS.*—*The Director shall submit to the Congress an annual report on the automated search systems of the Patent and Trademark Office and the access by the public to such systems. The Director shall also publish such report in the Federal Register. The Director shall provide an opportunity for the submission of comments by interested persons on each such report.*

§ 42. Patent and Trademark Office funding

(a) * * *

(b) All fees paid to the Director and all appropriations for defraying the costs of the activities of the Patent and Trademark Office will be credited to the **Patent and Trademark Office Appropriation Account** *United States Patent and Trademark Office Public Enterprise Fund* in the Treasury of the United States.

(c) **To the extent and in the amounts provided in advance in appropriations Acts, fees** *Fees* authorized in this title or any other Act to be charged or established by the Director **shall be collected by and shall be available to the Director** *shall be collected by the Director and shall be available until expended* to carry out the activities of the Patent and Trademark Office. All fees available to the Director under section 31 of the Trademark Act of 1946 shall be used only for the processing of trademark registrations and for other activities, services, and materials relating to trademarks and to cover a proportionate share of the administrative costs of the Patent and Trademark Office.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 10—PATENTABILITY OF INVENTIONS

Sec.

100. Definitions.

* * * * *

102. Conditions for patentability; novelty and loss of right to patent.

102. Conditions for patentability; novelty.

* * * * *

104. Invention made abroad.

* * * * *

§ 100. Definitions

When used in this title unless the context otherwise indicates—

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(e) The term “third-party requester” means a person requesting ex parte reexamination under section 302 **or inter partes reexamination under section 311** who is not the patent owner.

(f) *The term “inventor” means the individual or, if a joint invention, the individuals collectively who invented or discovered the subject matter of the invention.*

(g) *The terms “joint inventor” and “coinventor” mean any 1 of the individuals who invented or discovered the subject matter of a joint invention.*

(h) *The term “joint research agreement” means a written contract, grant, or cooperative agreement entered into by 2 or more per-*

sons or entities for the performance of experimental, developmental, or research work in the field of the claimed invention.

(i)(1) The term “effective filing date” for a claimed invention in a patent or application for patent means—

(A) if subparagraph (B) does not apply, the actual filing date of the patent or the application for the patent containing a claim to the invention; or

(B) the filing date of the earliest application for which the patent or application is entitled, as to such invention, to a right of priority under section 119, 365(a), or 365(b) or to the benefit of an earlier filing date under section 120, 121, or 365(c).

(2) The effective filing date for a claimed invention in an application for reissue or reissued patent shall be determined by deeming the claim to the invention to have been contained in the patent for which reissue was sought.

(j) The term “claimed invention” means the subject matter defined by a claim in a patent or an application for a patent.

* * * * *

【§ 102. Conditions for patentability; novelty and loss of right to patent

【A person shall be entitled to a patent unless—

【(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or

【(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of the application for patent in the United States, or

【(c) he has abandoned the invention, or

【(d) the invention was first patented or caused to be patented, or was the subject of an inventor’s certificate, by the applicant or his legal representatives or assigns in a foreign country prior to the date of the application for patent in this country on an application for patent or inventor’s certificate filed more than twelve months before the filing of the application in the United States, or

【(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for the purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language; or

【(f) he did not himself invent the subject matter sought to be patented, or

【(g)(1) during the course of an interference conducted under section 135 or section 291, another inventor involved therein establishes, to the extent permitted in section 104, that before such person’s invention thereof the invention was made by such other inventor and not abandoned, suppressed, or concealed, or (2) before

such person's invention thereof, the invention was made in this country by another inventor who had not abandoned, suppressed, or concealed it. In determining priority of invention under this subsection, there shall be considered not only the respective dates of conception and reduction to practice of the invention, but also the reasonable diligence of one who was first to conceive and last to reduce to practice, from a time prior to conception by the other.

【§ 103. Conditions for patentability; non-obvious subject matter

【(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

【(b)(1) Notwithstanding subsection (a), and upon timely election by the applicant for patent to proceed under this subsection, a biotechnological process using or resulting in a composition of matter that is novel under section 102 and nonobvious under subsection (a) of this section shall be considered nonobvious if—

【(A) claims to the process and the composition of matter are contained in either the same application for patent or in separate applications having the same effective filing date; and

【(B) the composition of matter, and the process at the time it was invented, were owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

【(2) A patent issued on a process under paragraph (1)—

【(A) shall also contain the claims to the composition of matter used in or made by that process, or

【(B) shall, if such composition of matter is claimed in another patent, be set to expire on the same date as such other patent, notwithstanding section 154.

【(3) For purposes of paragraph (1), the term “biotechnological process” means—

【(A) a process of genetically altering or otherwise inducing a single- or multi-celled organism to—

【(i) express an exogenous nucleotide sequence,

【(ii) inhibit, eliminate, augment, or alter expression of an endogenous nucleotide sequence, or

【(iii) express a specific physiological characteristic not naturally associated with said organism;

【(B) cell fusion procedures yielding a cell line that expresses a specific protein, such as a monoclonal antibody; and

【(C) a method of using a product produced by a process defined by subparagraph (A) or (B), or a combination of subparagraphs (A) and (B).

【(c)(1) Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under one or more of subsections (e), (f), and (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the claimed invention was made, owned by

the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

[(2) For purposes of this subsection, subject matter developed by another person and a claimed invention shall be deemed to have been owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person if—

[(A) the claimed invention was made by or on behalf of parties to a joint research agreement that was in effect on or before the date the claimed invention was made;

[(B) the claimed invention was made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of the joint research agreement; and

[(C) the application for patent for the claimed invention discloses or is amended to disclose the names of the parties to the joint research agreement.

[(3) For purposes of paragraph (2), the term “joint research agreement” means a written contract, grant, or cooperative agreement entered into by two or more persons or entities for the performance of experimental, developmental, or research work in the field of the claimed invention.

[§ 104. Invention made abroad

[(a) IN GENERAL.—

[(1) PROCEEDINGS.—In proceedings in the Patent and Trademark Office, in the courts, and before any other competent authority, an applicant for a patent, or a patentee, may not establish a date of invention by reference to knowledge or use thereof, or other activity with respect thereto, in a foreign country other than a NAFTA country or a WTO member country, except as provided in sections 119 and 365 of this title.

[(2) RIGHTS.—If an invention was made by a person, civil or military—

[(A) while domiciled in the United States, and serving in any other country in connection with operations by or on behalf of the United States,

[(B) while domiciled in a NAFTA country and serving in another country in connection with operations by or on behalf of that NAFTA country, or

[(C) while domiciled in a WTO member country and serving in another country in connection with operations by or on behalf of that WTO member country,

that person shall be entitled to the same rights of priority in the United States with respect to such invention as if such invention had been made in the United States, that NAFTA country, or that WTO member country, as the case may be.

[(3) USE OF INFORMATION.—To the extent that any information in a NAFTA country or a WTO member country concerning knowledge, use, or other activity relevant to proving or disproving a date of invention has not been made available for use in a proceeding in the Patent and Trademark Office, a court, or any other competent authority to the same extent as such information could be made available in the United States, the Director, court, or such other authority shall draw appropriate inferences, or take other action permitted by statute,

rule, or regulation, in favor of the party that requested the information in the proceeding.

[(b) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

[(1) the term “NAFTA country” has the meaning given that term in section 2(4) of the North American Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act; and

[(2) the term “WTO member country” has the meaning given that term in section 2(10) of the Uruguay Round Agreements Act.]

§ 102. Conditions for patentability; novelty

(a) *NOVELTY; PRIOR ART.*—A person shall be entitled to a patent unless—

(1) the claimed invention was patented, described in a printed publication, or in public use, on sale, or otherwise available to the public before the effective filing date of the claimed invention; or

(2) the claimed invention was described in a patent issued under section 151, or in an application for patent published or deemed published under section 122(b), in which the patent or application, as the case may be, names another inventor and was effectively filed before the effective filing date of the claimed invention.

(b) *EXCEPTIONS.*—

(1) *DISCLOSURES MADE 1 YEAR OR LESS BEFORE THE EFFECTIVE FILING DATE OF THE CLAIMED INVENTION.*—A disclosure made 1 year or less before the effective filing date of a claimed invention shall not be prior art to the claimed invention under subsection (a)(1) if—

(A) the disclosure was made by the inventor or joint inventor or by another who obtained the subject matter disclosed directly or indirectly from the inventor or a joint inventor; or

(B) the subject matter disclosed had, before such disclosure, been publicly disclosed by the inventor or a joint inventor or another who obtained the subject matter disclosed directly or indirectly from the inventor or a joint inventor.

(2) *DISCLOSURES APPEARING IN APPLICATIONS AND PATENTS.*—A disclosure shall not be prior art to a claimed invention under subsection (a)(2) if—

(A) the subject matter disclosed was obtained directly or indirectly from the inventor or a joint inventor;

(B) the subject matter disclosed had, before such subject matter was effectively filed under subsection (a)(2), been publicly disclosed by the inventor or a joint inventor or another who obtained the subject matter disclosed directly or indirectly from the inventor or a joint inventor; or

(C) the subject matter disclosed and the claimed invention, not later than the effective filing date of the claimed invention, were owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

(c) *COMMON OWNERSHIP UNDER JOINT RESEARCH AGREEMENTS.*—Subject matter disclosed and a claimed invention shall be deemed to have been owned by the same person or subject to an obli-

gation of assignment to the same person in applying the provisions of subsection (b)(2)(C) if—

(1) the subject matter disclosed was developed and the claimed invention was made by, or on behalf of, 1 or more parties to a joint research agreement that was in effect on or before the effective filing date of the claimed invention;

(2) the claimed invention was made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of the joint research agreement; and

(3) the application for patent for the claimed invention discloses or is amended to disclose the names of the parties to the joint research agreement.

(d) PATENTS AND PUBLISHED APPLICATIONS EFFECTIVE AS PRIOR ART.—For purposes of determining whether a patent or application for patent is prior art to a claimed invention under subsection (a)(2), such patent or application shall be considered to have been effectively filed, with respect to any subject matter described in the patent or application—

(1) if paragraph (2) does not apply, as of the actual filing date of the patent or the application for patent; or

(2) if the patent or application for patent is entitled to claim a right of priority under section 119, 365(a), or 365(b), or to claim the benefit of an earlier filing date under section 120, 121, or 365(c), based upon 1 or more prior filed applications for patent, as of the filing date of the earliest such application that describes the subject matter.

§ 103. Conditions for patentability; non-obvious subject matter

A patent for a claimed invention may not be obtained, notwithstanding that the claimed invention is not identically disclosed as set forth in section 102, if the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art are such that the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious before the effective filing date of the claimed invention to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the claimed invention pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

CHAPTER 11—APPLICATION FOR PATENT

Sec.

111. Application.

* * * * *

115. Oath of applicant.

115. Inventor's oath or declaration.

* * * * *

123. Micro entity defined.

§ 111. Application

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—

(1) * * *

(2) **CONTENTS.**—Such application shall include—

(A) a specification as prescribed by section 112 **[of this title]**;

(B) a drawing as prescribed by section 113 **[of this title]**; and

(C) an oath [by the applicant] *or declaration* as prescribed by section 115 [of this title].

(3) FEE AND OATH *OR DECLARATION*.—The application must be accompanied by the fee required by law. The fee and oath *or declaration* may be submitted after the specification and any required drawing are submitted, within such period and under such conditions, including the payment of a surcharge, as may be prescribed by the Director.

(4) FAILURE TO SUBMIT.—Upon failure to submit the fee and oath *or declaration* within such prescribed period, the application shall be regarded as abandoned, unless it is shown to the satisfaction of the Director that the delay in submitting the fee and oath *or declaration* was unavoidable or unintentional. The filing date of an application shall be the date on which the specification and any required drawing are received in the Patent and Trademark Office.

(b) PROVISIONAL APPLICATION.—

(1) AUTHORIZATION.—A provisional application for patent shall be made or authorized to be made by the inventor, except as otherwise provided in this title, in writing to the Director. Such application shall include—

(A) a specification as prescribed by [the first paragraph of section 112 of this title] *section 112(a)*; and

(B) a drawing as prescribed by section 113 [of this title].

(2) CLAIM.—A claim, as required by [the second through fifth paragraphs of section 112,] *subsections (b) through (e) of section 112*, shall not be required in a provisional application.

* * * * *

(5) ABANDONMENT.—Notwithstanding the absence of a claim, upon timely request and as prescribed by the Director, a provisional application may be treated as an application filed under subsection (a). Subject to section 119(e)(3) [of this title], if no such request is made, the provisional application shall be regarded as abandoned 12 months after the filing date of such application and shall not be subject to revival after such 12-month period.

(6) OTHER BASIS FOR PROVISIONAL APPLICATION.—Subject to all the conditions in this subsection and section 119(e) [of this title], and as prescribed by the Director, an application for patent filed under subsection (a) may be treated as a provisional application for patent.

(7) NO RIGHT OF PRIORITY OR BENEFIT OF EARLIEST FILING DATE.—A provisional application shall not be entitled to the right of priority of any other application under section 119 or 365(a) [of this title] or to the benefit of an earlier filing date in the United States under section 120, 121, or 365(c) [of this title].

(8) APPLICABLE PROVISIONS.—The provisions of this title relating to applications for patent shall apply to provisional applications for patent, except as otherwise provided, and except that provisional applications for patent shall not be subject to [sections 115, 131, 135, and 157 of this title] *sections 131 and 135*.

§ 112. Specification

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same, and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor [of carrying out his invention] or joint inventor of carrying out the invention.

(b) *CONCLUSION.*—The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the [applicant regards as his invention] inventor or a joint inventor regards as the invention.

(c) *FORM.*—A claim may be written in independent or, if the nature of the case admits, in dependent or multiple dependent form.

[Subject to the following paragraph,] (d) *REFERENCE IN DEPENDENT FORMS.*—Subject to subsection (e), a claim in dependent form shall contain a reference to a claim previously set forth and then specify a further limitation of the subject matter claimed. A claim in dependent form shall be construed to incorporate by reference all the limitations of the claim to which it refers.

(e) *REFERENCE IN MULTIPLE DEPENDENT FORM.*—A claim in multiple dependent form shall contain a reference, in the alternative only, to more than one claim previously set forth and then specify a further limitation of the subject matter claimed. A multiple dependent claim shall not serve as a basis for any other multiple dependent claim. A multiple dependent claim shall be construed to incorporate by reference all the limitations of the particular claim in relation to which it is being considered.

(f) *ELEMENT IN CLAIM FOR A COMBINATION.*—An element in a claim for a combination may be expressed as a means or step for performing a specified function without the recital of structure, material, or acts in support thereof, and such claim shall be construed to cover the corresponding structure, material, or acts described in the specification and equivalents thereof.

* * * * *

§ 115. Oath of applicant

[The applicant shall make oath that he believes himself to be the original and first inventor of the process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or improvement thereof, for which he solicits a patent; and shall state of what country he is a citizen. Such oath may be made before any person within the United States authorized by law to administer oaths, or, when, made in a foreign country, before any diplomatic or consular officer of the United States authorized to administer oaths, or before any officer having an official seal and authorized to administer oaths in the foreign country in which the applicant may be, whose authority is proved by certificate of a diplomatic or consular officer of the United States, or apostille of an official designated by a foreign country which, by treaty or convention, accords like effect to apostilles of designated officials in the United States, and such oath shall be valid if it complies with the laws of the state or coun-

try where made. When the application is made as provided in this title by a person other than the inventor, the oath may be so varied in form that it can be made by him. For purposes of this section, a consular officer shall include any United States citizen serving overseas, authorized to perform notarial functions pursuant to section 1750 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (22 U.S.C. 4221).】

§ 115. Inventor's oath or declaration

(a) *NAMING THE INVENTOR; INVENTOR'S OATH OR DECLARATION.*—An application for patent that is filed under section 111(a) or commences the national stage under section 371 shall include, or be amended to include, the name of the inventor for any invention claimed in the application. Except as otherwise provided in this section, each individual who is the inventor or a joint inventor of a claimed invention in an application for patent shall execute an oath or declaration in connection with the application.

(b) *REQUIRED STATEMENTS.*—An oath or declaration under subsection (a) shall contain statements that—

(1) the application was made or was authorized to be made by the affiant or declarant; and

(2) such individual believes himself or herself to be the original inventor or an original joint inventor of a claimed invention in the application.

(c) *ADDITIONAL REQUIREMENTS.*—The Director may specify additional information relating to the inventor and the invention that is required to be included in an oath or declaration under subsection (a).

(d) *SUBSTITUTE STATEMENT.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—In lieu of executing an oath or declaration under subsection (a), the applicant for patent may provide a substitute statement under the circumstances described in paragraph (2) and such additional circumstances that the Director may specify by regulation.

(2) *PERMITTED CIRCUMSTANCES.*—A substitute statement under paragraph (1) is permitted with respect to any individual who—

(A) is unable to file the oath or declaration under subsection (a) because the individual—

(i) is deceased;

(ii) is under legal incapacity; or

(iii) cannot be found or reached after diligent effort; or

(B) is under an obligation to assign the invention but has refused to make the oath or declaration required under subsection (a).

(3) *CONTENTS.*—A substitute statement under this subsection shall—

(A) identify the individual with respect to whom the statement applies;

(B) set forth the circumstances representing the permitted basis for the filing of the substitute statement in lieu of the oath or declaration under subsection (a); and

(C) contain any additional information, including any showing, required by the Director.

(e) *MAKING REQUIRED STATEMENTS IN ASSIGNMENT OF RECORD.*—An individual who is under an obligation of assignment of an application for patent may include the required statements under subsections (b) and (c) in the assignment executed by the individual, in lieu of filing such statements separately.

(f) *TIME FOR FILING.*—A notice of allowance under section 151 may be provided to an applicant for patent only if the applicant for patent has filed each required oath or declaration under subsection (a) or has filed a substitute statement under subsection (d) or recorded an assignment meeting the requirements of subsection (e).

(g) *EARLIER-FILED APPLICATION CONTAINING REQUIRED STATEMENTS OR SUBSTITUTE STATEMENT.*—

(1) *EXCEPTION.*—The requirements under this section shall not apply to an individual with respect to an application for patent in which the individual is named as the inventor or a joint inventor and who claims the benefit under section 120, 121, or 365(c) of the filing of an earlier-filed application, if—

(A) an oath or declaration meeting the requirements of subsection (a) was executed by the individual and was filed in connection with the earlier-filed application;

(B) a substitute statement meeting the requirements of subsection (d) was filed in connection with the earlier filed application with respect to the individual; or

(C) an assignment meeting the requirements of subsection (e) was executed with respect to the earlier-filed application by the individual and was recorded in connection with the earlier-filed application.

(2) *COPIES OF OATHS, DECLARATIONS, STATEMENTS, OR ASSIGNMENTS.*—Notwithstanding paragraph (1), the Director may require that a copy of the executed oath or declaration, the substitute statement, or the assignment filed in connection with the earlier-filed application be included in the later-filed application.

(h) *SUPPLEMENTAL AND CORRECTED STATEMENTS; FILING ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—Any person making a statement required under this section may withdraw, replace, or otherwise correct the statement at any time. If a change is made in the naming of the inventor requiring the filing of 1 or more additional statements under this section, the Director shall establish regulations under which such additional statements may be filed.

(2) *SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENTS NOT REQUIRED.*—If an individual has executed an oath or declaration meeting the requirements of subsection (a) or an assignment meeting the requirements of subsection (e) with respect to an application for patent, the Director may not thereafter require that individual to make any additional oath, declaration, or other statement equivalent to those required by this section in connection with the application for patent or any patent issuing thereon.

(3) *SAVINGS CLAUSE.*—A patent shall not be invalid or unenforceable based upon the failure to comply with a requirement under this section if the failure is remedied as provided under paragraph (1).

(i) *ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF PENALTIES.*—Any declaration or statement filed pursuant to this section shall contain an acknowledg-

ment that any willful false statement made in such declaration or statement is punishable under section 1001 of title 18 by fine or imprisonment of not more than 5 years, or both.

§ 116. Inventors

(a) *JOINT INVENTIONS.*—When an invention is made by two or more persons jointly, they shall apply for patent jointly and each make the required oath, except as otherwise provided in this title. Inventors may apply for a patent jointly even though (1) they did not physically work together or at the same time, (2) each did not make the same type or amount of contribution, or (3) each did not make a contribution to the subject matter of every claim of the patent.

(b) *OMITTED INVENTOR.*—If a joint inventor refuses to join in an application for patent or cannot be found or reached after diligent effort, the application may be made by the other inventor on behalf of himself and the omitted inventor. The Director, on proof of the pertinent facts and after such notice to the omitted inventor as he prescribes, may grant a patent to the inventor making the application, subject to the same rights which the omitted inventor would have had if he had been joined. The omitted inventor may subsequently join in the application.

(c) *CORRECTION OF ERRORS IN APPLICATION.*—Whenever through error a person is named in an application for patent as the inventor, or through error an inventor is not named in an application, [and such error arose without any deceptive intention on his part,] the Director may permit the application to be amended accordingly, under such terms as he prescribes.

* * * * *

§ 118. Filing by other than inventor

【Whenever an inventor refuses to execute an application for patent, or cannot be found or reached after diligent effort, a person to whom the inventor has assigned or agreed in writing to assign the invention or who otherwise shows sufficient proprietary interest in the matter justifying such action, may make application for patent on behalf of and as agent for the inventor on proof of the pertinent facts and a showing that such action is necessary to preserve the rights of the parties or to prevent irreparable damage; and the Director may grant a patent to such inventor upon such notice to him as the Director deems sufficient, and on compliance with such regulations as he prescribes.】

§ 118. Filing by other than inventor

A person to whom the inventor has assigned or is under an obligation to assign the invention may make an application for patent. A person who otherwise shows sufficient proprietary interest in the matter may make an application for patent on behalf of and as agent for the inventor on proof of the pertinent facts and a showing that such action is appropriate to preserve the rights of the parties. If the Director grants a patent on an application filed under this section by a person other than the inventor, the patent shall be granted to the real party in interest and upon such notice to the inventor as the Director considers to be sufficient.

§ 119. Benefit of earlier filing date; right of priority

(a) 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, or in a WTO member country, 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].

* * * * *

(e)(1) An application for patent filed under section 111(a) or section 363 [of this title] for an invention disclosed in the manner provided by [the first paragraph of section 112 of this title] *section 112(a) (other than the requirement to disclose the best mode)* in a provisional application filed under section 111(b) [of this title], by an inventor or inventors named in the provisional application, shall have the same effect, as to such invention, as though filed on the date of the provisional application filed under section 111(b) [of this title], if the application for patent filed under section 111(a) or section 363 [of this title] is filed not later than 12 months after the date on which the provisional application was filed and if it contains or is amended to contain a specific reference to the provisional application. No application shall be entitled to the benefit of an earlier filed provisional application under this subsection unless an amendment containing the specific reference to the earlier filed provisional application is submitted at such time during the pendency of the application as required by the Director. The Director may consider the failure to submit such an amendment within that time period as a waiver of any benefit under this subsection. The Director may establish procedures, including the payment of a surcharge, to accept an unintentionally delayed submission of an amendment under this subsection during the pendency of the application.

(2) A provisional application filed under section 111(b) [of this title] may not be relied upon in any proceeding in the Patent and Trademark Office unless the fee set forth in subparagraph (A) or (C) of section 41(a)(1) [of this title] has been paid.

* * * * *

(g) As used in this section—

(1) the term “WTO member country” has the same meaning as the term is defined in section 104(b)(2) [of this title]; and

* * * * *

§ 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] *section 112(a) (other than the requirement to disclose the best mode)* in an application previously filed in the United States, or as provided by section 363 [of this title], [which is filed by an inventor or inventors named] *which names an inventor or joint inventor* in the previously filed application 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. No application shall be entitled to the benefit of an earlier filed application under this section unless an amendment containing the specific reference to the earlier filed application is submitted at such time during the pendency of the application as required by the Director. The Director may consider the failure to submit such an amendment within that time period as a waiver of any benefit under this section. The Director may establish procedures, including the payment of a surcharge, to accept an unintentionally delayed submission of an amendment under this section.

§ 121. Divisional applications

If two or more independent and distinct inventions are claimed in one application, the Director may require the application to be restricted to one of the inventions. If the other invention is made the subject of a divisional application which complies with the requirements of section 120 [of this title] it shall be entitled to the benefit of the filing date of the original application. A patent issuing on an application with respect to which a requirement for restriction under this section has been made, or on an application filed as a result of such a requirement, shall not be used as a reference either in the Patent and Trademark Office or in the courts against a divisional application or against the original application or any patent issued on either of them, if the divisional application is filed before the issuance of the patent on the other application. [If a divisional application is directed solely to subject matter described and claimed in the original application as filed, the Director may dispense with signing and execution by the inventor.] The validity of a patent shall not be questioned for failure of the Director to require the application to be restricted to one invention.

§ 122. Confidential status of applications; publication of patent applications

(a) * * *

(b) PUBLICATION.—

(1) * * *

(2) EXCEPTIONS.—(A) An application shall not be published if that application is—

(i) * * *

(ii) subject to a secrecy order under section 181 [of this title];

- (iii) a provisional application filed under section 111(b) [of this title]; or
- (iv) an application for a design patent filed under chapter 16 [of this title].

* * * * *

(d) NATIONAL SECURITY.—No application for patent shall be published under subsection (b)(1) if the publication or disclosure of such invention would be detrimental to the national security. The Director shall establish appropriate procedures to ensure that such applications are promptly identified and the secrecy of such inventions is maintained in accordance with chapter 17 [of this title].

(e) PREISSUANCE SUBMISSIONS BY THIRD PARTIES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any third party may submit for consideration and inclusion in the record of a patent application, any patent, published patent application, or other printed publication of potential relevance to the examination of the application, if such submission is made in writing before the earlier of—

(A) the date a notice of allowance under section 151 is given or mailed in the application for patent; or

(B) the later of—

(i) 6 months after the date on which the application for patent is first published under section 122 by the Office, or

(ii) the date of the first rejection under section 132 of any claim by the examiner during the examination of the application for patent.

(2) OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—Any submission under paragraph (1) shall—

(A) set forth a concise description of the asserted relevance of each submitted document;

(B) be accompanied by such fee as the Director may prescribe; and

(C) include a statement by the person making such submission affirming that the submission was made in compliance with this section.

§ 123. Micro entity defined

(a) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this title, the term “micro entity” means an applicant who makes a certification that the applicant—

(1) qualifies as a small entity, as defined in regulations issued by the Director;

(2) has not been named as an inventor on more than 4 previously filed patent applications, other than applications filed in another country, provisional applications under section 111(b), or international applications filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) for which the basic national fee under section 41(a) was not paid;

(3) did not, in the calendar year preceding the calendar year in which the examination fee for the application is being paid, have a gross income, as defined in section 61(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, exceeding 3 times the median household income for that preceding calendar year, as reported by the Bureau of the Census; and

(4) has not assigned, granted, or conveyed, and is not under an obligation by contract or law to assign, grant, or convey, a license or other ownership interest in the application concerned to an entity that, in the calendar year preceding the calendar year in which the examination fee for the application is being paid, had a gross income, as defined in section 61(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, exceeding 3 times the median household income for that preceding calendar year, as reported by the Bureau of the Census.

(b) **APPLICATIONS RESULTING FROM PRIOR EMPLOYMENT.**—An applicant is not considered to be named on a previously filed application for purposes of subsection (a)(2) if the applicant has assigned, or is under an obligation by contract or law to assign, all ownership rights in the application as the result of the applicant’s previous employment.

(c) **FOREIGN CURRENCY EXCHANGE RATE.**—If an applicant’s or entity’s gross income in the preceding calendar year is not in United States dollars, the average currency exchange rate, as reported by the Internal Revenue Service, during that calendar year shall be used to determine whether the applicant’s or entity’s gross income exceeds the threshold specified in paragraphs (3) or (4) of subsection (a).

(d) **PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of this section, a micro entity shall include an applicant who certifies that—

(A) the applicant’s employer, from which the applicant obtains the majority of the applicant’s income, is an institution of higher education, as defined in section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001), that is a public institution; or

(B) the applicant has assigned, granted, conveyed, or is under an obligation by contract or law to assign, grant, or convey, a license or other ownership interest in the particular application to such public institution.

(2) **DIRECTOR’S AUTHORITY.**—The Director may, in the Director’s discretion, impose income limits, annual filing limits, or other limits on who may qualify as a micro entity pursuant to this subsection if the Director determines that such additional limits are reasonably necessary to avoid an undue impact on other patent applicants or owners or are otherwise reasonably necessary and appropriate. At least 3 months before any limits proposed to be imposed pursuant to this paragraph take effect, the Director shall inform the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate of any such proposed limits.

CHAPTER 12—EXAMINATION OF APPLICATION

Sec.

131. Examination of application.

* * * * *

【134. Appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences.

【135. Interferences.】

134. Appeal to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board.

135. Derivation proceedings.

* * * * *

§ 132. Notice of rejection; reexamination

(a) * * *

(b) The Director shall prescribe regulations to provide for the continued examination of applications for patent at the request of the applicant. The Director may establish appropriate fees for such continued examination and shall provide a 50 percent reduction in such fees for small entities that qualify for reduced fees under section 41(h)(1) [of this title].

* * * * *

[§ 134. Appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences]***§ 134. Appeal to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board***

(a) PATENT APPLICANT.—An applicant for a patent, any of whose claims has been twice rejected, may appeal from the decision of the primary examiner to the [Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences] *Patent Trial and Appeal Board*, having once paid the fee for such appeal.

(b) PATENT OWNER.—A patent owner in [any reexamination proceeding] *a reexamination* may appeal from the final rejection of any claim by the a primary examiner to the [Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences] *Patent Trial and Appeal Board*, having once paid the fee for such appeal.

[(c) THIRD-PARTY.—A third-party requester in an inter partes proceeding may appeal to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board from the final decision of the primary examiner favorable to the patentability of any original or proposed amended or new claim of a patent, having once paid the fee for such appeal.]

[§ 135. Interferences]

[(a) Whenever an application is made for a patent which, in the opinion of the Director, would interfere with any pending application, or with any unexpired patent, an interference may be declared and the Director shall give notice of such declaration to the applicants, or applicant and patentee, as the case may be. The Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences shall determine questions of priority of the inventions and may determine questions of patentability. Any final decision, if adverse to the claim of an applicant, shall constitute the final refusal by the Patent and Trademark Office of the claims involved, and the Director may issue a patent to the applicant who is adjudged the prior inventor. A final judgment adverse to a patentee from which no appeal or other review has been or can be taken or had shall constitute cancellation of the claims involved in the patent, and notice of such cancellation shall be endorsed on copies of the patent distributed after such cancellation by the Patent and Trademark Office.

[(b)(1) A claim which is the same as, or for the same or substantially the same subject matter as, a claim of an issued patent may not be made in any application unless such a claim is made prior to one year from the date on which the patent was granted.

[(2) A claim which is the same as, or for the same or substantially the same subject matter as, a claim of an application published under section 122(b) of this title may be made in an applica-

tion filed after the application is published only if the claim is made before 1 year after the date on which the application is published.

[(c) Any agreement or understanding between parties to an interference, including any collateral agreements referred to therein, made in connection with or in contemplation of the termination of the interference, shall be in writing and a true copy thereof filed in the Patent and Trademark Office before the termination of the interference as between the said parties to the agreement or understanding. If any party filing the same so requests, the copy shall be kept separate from the file of the interference, and made available only to Government agencies on written request, or to any person on a showing of good cause. Failure to file the copy of such agreement or understanding shall render permanently unenforceable such agreement or understanding and any patent of such parties involved in the interference or any patent subsequently issued on any application of such parties so involved. The Director may, however, on a showing of good cause for failure to file within the time prescribed, permit the filing of the agreement or understanding during the six-month period subsequent to the termination of the interference as between the parties to the agreement or understanding. The Director shall give notice to the parties or their attorneys of record, a reasonable time prior to said termination, of the filing requirement of this section. If the Director gives such notice at a later time, irrespective of the right to file such agreement or understanding within the six-month period on a showing of good cause, the parties may file such agreement or understanding within sixty days of the receipt of such notice. Any discretionary action of the Director under this subsection shall be reviewable under section 10 of the Administrative Procedure Act.]

[(d) Parties to a patent interference, within such time as may be specified by the Director by regulation, may determine such contest or any aspect thereof by arbitration. Such arbitration shall be governed by the provisions of title 9 to the extent such title is not inconsistent with this section. The parties shall give notice of any arbitration award to the Director, and such award shall, as between the parties to the arbitration, be dispositive of the issues to which it relates. The arbitration award shall be unenforceable until such notice is given. Nothing in this subsection shall preclude the Director from determining patentability of the invention involved in the interference.]

§ 135. Derivation proceedings

(a) *INSTITUTION OF PROCEEDING.*—*An applicant for patent may file a petition to institute a derivation proceeding in the Office. The petition shall set forth with particularity the basis for finding that an inventor named in an earlier application derived the claimed invention from an inventor named in the petitioner's application and, without authorization, the earlier application claiming such invention was filed. Any such petition may be filed only within the 1-year period beginning on the date of the first publication of a claim to an invention that is the same or substantially the same as the earlier application's claim to the invention, shall be made under oath, and shall be supported by substantial evidence. Whenever the Director determines that a petition filed under this subsection dem-*

onstrates that the standards for instituting a derivation proceeding are met, the Director may institute a derivation proceeding. The determination by the Director whether to institute a derivation proceeding shall be final and nonappealable.

(b) *DETERMINATION BY PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD.*—In a derivation proceeding instituted under subsection (a), the Patent Trial and Appeal Board shall determine whether an inventor named in the earlier application derived the claimed invention from an inventor named in the petitioner’s application and, without authorization, the earlier application claiming such invention was filed. The Director shall prescribe regulations setting forth standards for the conduct of derivation proceedings.

(c) *DEFERRAL OF DECISION.*—The Patent Trial and Appeal Board may defer action on a petition for a derivation proceeding until the expiration of the 3-month period beginning on the date on which the Director issues a patent that includes the claimed invention that is the subject of the petition. The Patent Trial and Appeal Board also may defer action on a petition for a derivation proceeding, or stay the proceeding after it has been instituted, until the termination of a proceeding under chapter 30, 31, or 32 involving the patent of the earlier applicant.

(d) *EFFECT OF FINAL DECISION.*—The final decision of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board, if adverse to claims in an application for patent, shall constitute the final refusal by the Office on those claims. The final decision of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board, if adverse to claims in a patent, shall, if no appeal or other review of the decision has been or can be taken or had, constitute cancellation of those claims, and notice of such cancellation shall be endorsed on copies of the patent distributed after such cancellation.

(e) *SETTLEMENT.*—Parties to a proceeding instituted under subsection (a) may terminate the proceeding by filing a written statement reflecting the agreement of the parties as to the correct inventors of the claimed invention in dispute. Unless the Patent Trial and Appeal Board finds the agreement to be inconsistent with the evidence of record, if any, it shall take action consistent with the agreement. Any written settlement or understanding of the parties shall be filed with the Director. At the request of a party to the proceeding, the agreement or understanding shall be treated as business confidential information, shall be kept separate from the file of the involved patents or applications, and shall be made available only to Government agencies on written request, or to any person on a showing of good cause.

(f) *ARBITRATION.*—Parties to a proceeding instituted under subsection (a) may, within such time as may be specified by the Director by regulation, determine such contest or any aspect thereof by arbitration. Such arbitration shall be governed by the provisions of title 9, to the extent such title is not inconsistent with this section. The parties shall give notice of any arbitration award to the Director, and such award shall, as between the parties to the arbitration, be dispositive of the issues to which it relates. The arbitration award shall be unenforceable until such notice is given. Nothing in this subsection shall preclude the Director from determining the patentability of the claimed inventions involved in the proceeding.

* * * * *

**CHAPTER 13—REVIEW OF PATENT AND TRADEMARK
OFFICE DECISIONS**

Sec.

141. Appeal to Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

* * * * *

[146. Civil action in case of interference.]

146. Civil action in case of derivation proceeding.

[§ 141. Appeal to Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

[An applicant dissatisfied with the decision in an appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences under section 134 of this title may appeal the decision to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. By filing such an appeal the applicant waives his or her right to proceed under section 145 of this title. A patent owner, or a third-party requester in an inter partes reexamination proceeding, who is in any reexamination proceeding dissatisfied with the final decision in an appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences under section 134 may appeal the decision only to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. A party to an interference dissatisfied with the decision of the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences on the interference may appeal the decision to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, but such appeal shall be dismissed if any adverse party to such interference, within twenty days after the appellant has filed notice of appeal in accordance with section 142 of this title, files notice with the Director that the party elects to have all further proceedings conducted as provided in section 146 of this title. If the appellant does not, within thirty days after the filing of such notice by the adverse party, file a civil action under section 146, the decision appealed from shall govern the further proceedings in the case.]

§ 141. Appeal to Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

(a) EXAMINATIONS.—An applicant who is dissatisfied with the final decision in an appeal to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board under section 134(a) may appeal the Board's decision to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit. By filing such an appeal, the applicant waives his or her right to proceed under section 145.

(b) REEXAMINATIONS.—A patent owner who is dissatisfied with the final decision in an appeal of a reexamination to the Patent Trial and Appeal Board under section 134(b) may appeal the Board's decision only to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

(c) POST-GRANT AND INTER PARTES REVIEWS.—A party to an inter partes review or a post-grant review who is dissatisfied with the final written decision of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board under section 318(a) or 328(a) (as the case may be) may appeal the Board's decision only to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

(d) DERIVATION PROCEEDINGS.—A party to a derivation proceeding who is dissatisfied with the final decision of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board in the proceeding may appeal the decision to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, but such appeal shall be dismissed if any adverse party to such deriva-

tion proceeding, within 20 days after the appellant has filed notice of appeal in accordance with section 142, files notice with the Director that the party elects to have all further proceedings conducted as provided in section 146. If the appellant does not, within 30 days after the filing of such notice by the adverse party, file a civil action under section 146, the Board's decision shall govern the further proceedings in the case.

* * * * *

§ 143. Proceedings on appeal

With respect to an appeal described in section 142 [of this title], the Director shall transmit to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit a certified list of the documents comprising the record in the Patent and Trademark Office. The court may request that the Director forward the original or certified copies of such documents during pendency of the appeal. In an ex parte case or any reexamination case, the Director shall submit to the court in writing the grounds for the decision of the Patent and Trademark Office, addressing all the issues involved in the appeal. [The court shall, before hearing an appeal, give notice of the time and place of the hearing to the Director and the parties in the appeal. The court shall, before hearing an appeal, give notice of the time and place of the hearing to the Director and the parties in the appeal] *In an ex parte case, the Director shall submit to the court in writing the grounds for the decision of the Patent and Trademark Office, addressing all of the issues raised in the appeal. The Director shall have the right to intervene in an appeal from a decision entered by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board in a derivation proceeding under section 135 or in an inter partes or post-grant review under chapter 31 or 32.*

* * * * *

§ 145. Civil action to obtain patent

An applicant dissatisfied with the decision of the [Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences] *Patent Trial and Appeal Board* in an appeal under section 134(a) [of this title] may, unless appeal has been taken to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, have remedy by civil action against the Director in the [United States District Court for the District of Columbia] *United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia* if commenced within such time after such decision, not less than sixty days, as the Director appoints. The court may adjudge that such applicant is entitled to receive a patent for his invention, as specified in any of his claims involved in the decision of the [Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences] *Patent Trial and Appeal Board*, as the facts in the case may appear and such adjudication shall authorize the Director to issue such patent on compliance with the requirements of law. All the expenses of the proceedings shall be paid by the applicant.

【§ 146. Civil action in case of interference】

§ 146. Civil action in case of derivation proceeding

Any party to [an interference] *a derivation proceeding* dissatisfied with the decision of the [Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences] *Patent Trial and Appeal Board* on [the interference] *the derivation proceeding*, may have remedy by civil action, if commenced within such time after such decision, not less than sixty days, as the Director appoints or as provided in section 141 [of this title], unless he has appealed to the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, and such appeal is pending or has been decided. In such suits the record in the Patent and Trademark Office shall be admitted on motion of either party upon the terms and conditions as to costs, expenses, and the further cross-examination of the witnesses as the court imposes, without prejudice to the right of the parties to take further testimony. The testimony and exhibits of the record in the Patent and Trademark Office when admitted shall have the same effect as if originally taken and produced in the suit.

Such suit may be instituted against the party in interest as shown by the records of the Patent and Trademark Office at the time of the decision complained of, but any party in interest may become a party to the action. If there be adverse parties residing in a plurality of districts not embraced within the same state, or an adverse party residing in a foreign country, the [United States District Court for the District of Columbia] *United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia* shall have jurisdiction and may issue summons against the adverse parties directed to the marshal of any district in which any adverse party resides. Summons against adverse parties residing in foreign countries may be served by publication or otherwise as the court directs. The Director shall not be a necessary party but he shall be notified of the filing of the suit by the clerk of the court in which it is filed and shall have the right to intervene. Judgment of the court in favor of the right of an applicant to a patent shall authorize the Director to issue such patent on the filing in the Patent and Trademark Office of a certified copy of the judgment and on compliance with the requirements of law.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 14—ISSUE OF PATENT

Sec.

151. Issue of patent.

* * * * *

【157. Statutory invention registration.】

* * * * *

§ 154. Contents and term of patent; provisional rights

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) * * *

(2) TERM.—Subject to the payment of fees under this title, such grant shall be for a term beginning on the date on which the patent issues and ending 20 years from the date on which the application for the patent was filed in the United States or,

if the application contains a specific reference to an earlier filed application or applications under section 120, 121, or 365(c) [of this title], from the date on which the earliest such application was filed.

(3) PRIORITY.—Priority under section 119, 365(a), or 365(b) [of this title] shall not be taken into account in determining the term of a patent.

* * * * *

(b) ADJUSTMENT OF PATENT TERM.—

(1) PATENT TERM GUARANTEES.—

(A) GUARANTEE OF PROMPT PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE RESPONSES.—Subject to the limitations under paragraph (2), if the issue of an original patent is delayed due to the failure of the Patent and Trademark Office to—

(i) provide at least one of the notifications under section 132 [of this title] or a notice of allowance under section 151 [of this title] not later than 14 months after—

(I) the date on which an application was filed under section 111(a) [of this title]; or

(II) the date on which an international application fulfilled the requirements of section 371 [of this title];

* * * * *

(iii) act on an application within 4 months after the date of a decision by the [Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences] *Patent Trial and Appeal Board* under section 134 or 135 or a decision by a Federal court under section 141, 145, or 146 in a case in which allowable claims remain in the application; or

* * * * *

the term of the patent shall be extended 1 day for each day after the end of the period specified in clause (i), (ii), (iii), or (iv), as the case may be, until the action described in such clause is taken.

(B) GUARANTEE OF NO MORE THAN 3-YEAR APPLICATION PENDENCY.—Subject to the limitations under paragraph (2), if the issue of an original patent is delayed due to the failure of the United States Patent and Trademark Office to issue a patent within 3 years after the actual filing date of the application in the United States, not including—

(i) * * *

(ii) any time consumed by a proceeding under section 135(a), any time consumed by the imposition of an order under section 181, or any time consumed by appellate review by the [Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences] *Patent Trial and Appeal Board* or by a Federal court; or

* * * * *

the term of the patent shall be extended 1 day for each day after the end of that 3-year period until the patent is issued.

【(C) GUARANTEE OR ADJUSTMENTS FOR DELAYS DUE TO INTERFERENCES, SECRECY ORDERS, AND APPEALS.—】

(C) *GUARANTEE OF ADJUSTMENTS FOR DELAYS DUE TO DERIVATION PROCEEDINGS, SECRECY ORDERS, AND APPEALS.*—Subject to the limitations under paragraph (2), if the issue of an original patent is delayed due to—

(i) * * *

* * * * *

(iii) appellate review by the [Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences] *Patent Trial and Appeal Board* or by a Federal court in a case in which the patent was issued under a decision in the review reversing an adverse determination of patentability, the term of the patent shall be extended 1 day for each day of the pendency of the proceeding, order, or review, as the case may be.

* * * * *

(4) APPEAL OF PATENT TERM ADJUSTMENT DETERMINATION.—

(A) An applicant dissatisfied with a determination made by the Director under paragraph (3) shall have remedy by a civil action against the Director filed in the [United States District Court for the District of Columbia] *United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia* within 180 days after the grant of the patent. Chapter 7 of title 5 shall apply to such action. Any final judgment resulting in a change to the period of adjustment of the patent term shall be served on the Director, and the Director shall thereafter alter the term of the patent to reflect such change.

* * * * *

(c) CONTINUATION.—

(1) * * *

(2) REMEDIES.—The remedies of sections 283, 284, and 285 [of this title] shall not apply to acts which—

(A) * * *

* * * * *

(3) REMUNERATION.—The acts referred to in paragraph (2) may be continued only upon the payment of an equitable remuneration to the patentee that is determined in an action brought under chapter 28 and chapter 29 (other than those provisions excluded by paragraph (2)) [of this title].

* * * * *

§ 155A. Patent term restoration

(a) Notwithstanding section 154 [of this title], the term of each of the following patents shall be extended in accordance with this section:

(1) * * *

* * * * *

§ 156. Extension of patent term

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(d)(1) To obtain an extension of the term of a patent under this section, the owner of record of the patent or its agent shall submit an application to the Director. Except as provided in paragraph (5), such an application may only be submitted within the sixty-day period beginning on the date the product received permission under the provision of law under which the applicable regulatory review period occurred for commercial marketing or use. The application shall contain—

(A) * * *

* * * * *

For purposes of determining the date on which a product receives permission under the second sentence of this paragraph, if such permission is transmitted after 4:30 P.M., Eastern Time, on a business day, or is transmitted on a day that is not a business day, the product shall be deemed to receive such permission on the next business day. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term “business day” means any Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, or Friday, excluding any legal holiday under section 6103 of title 5.

* * * * *

§ 157. Statutory invention registration

[(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, the Director is authorized to publish a statutory invention registration containing the specification and drawings of a regularly filed application for a patent without examination if the applicant—

[(1) meets the requirements of section 112 of this title;

[(2) has complied with the requirements for printing, as set forth in regulations of the Director;

[(3) waives the right to receive a patent on the invention within such period as may be prescribed by the Director; and

[(4) pays application, publication, and other processing fees established by the Director.

If an interference is declared with respect to such an application, a statutory invention registration may not be published unless the issue of priority of invention is finally determined in favor of the applicant.

[(b) The waiver under subsection (a)(3) of this section by an applicant shall take effect upon publication of the statutory invention registration.

[(c) A statutory invention registration published pursuant to this section shall have all of the attributes specified for patents in this title except those specified in section 183 and sections 271 through 289 of this title. A statutory invention registration shall not have any of the attributes specified for patents in any other provision of law other than this title. A statutory invention registration published pursuant to this section shall give appropriate notice to the public, pursuant to regulations which the Director shall issue, of the preceding provisions of this subsection. The invention with respect to which a statutory invention certificate is

published is not a patented invention for purposes of section 292 of this title.

[(d) The Director shall report to the Congress annually on the use of statutory invention registrations. Such report shall include an assessment of the degree to which agencies of the Federal Government are making use of the statutory invention registration system, the degree to which it aids the management of federally developed technology, and an assessment of the cost savings to the Federal Government of the use of such procedures.]

* * * * *

CHAPTER 15—PLANT PATENTS

* * * * *

§ 162. Description, claim

No plant patent shall be declared invalid for noncompliance with section 112 [of this title] if the description is as complete as is reasonably possible.

The claim in the specification shall be in formal terms to the plant shown and described.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 16—DESIGNS

* * * * *

§ 172. Right of priority

The right of priority provided for by subsections (a) through (d) of section 119 [of this title and the time specified in section 102(d)] shall be six months in the case of designs. The right of priority provided for by section 119(e) [of this title] shall not apply to designs.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 17—SECURITY OF CERTAIN INVENTIONS AND FILING APPLICATIONS IN FOREIGN COUNTRY

* * * * *

§ 182. Abandonment of invention for unauthorized disclosure

The invention disclosed in an application for patent subject to an order made pursuant to section 181 [of this title] may be held abandoned upon its being established by the Commissioner of Patents that in violation of said order the invention has been published or disclosed or that an application for a patent therefor has been filed in a foreign country by the inventor, his successors, assigns, or legal representatives, or anyone in privity with him or them, without the consent of the Commissioner of Patents. The abandonment shall be held to have occurred as of the time of violation. The consent of the Commissioner of Patents shall not be given without the concurrence of the heads of the departments and the chief officers of the agencies who caused the order to be issued. A holding of abandonment shall constitute forfeiture by the applicant, his successors, assigns, or legal representatives, or anyone in priv-

ity with him or them, of all claims against the United States based upon such invention.

§ 183. Right to compensation

An applicant, his successors, assigns, or legal representatives, whose patent is withheld as herein provided, shall have the right, beginning at the date the applicant is notified that, except for such order, his application is otherwise in condition for allowance, or February 1, 1952, whichever is later, and ending six years after a patent is issued thereon, to apply to the head of any department or agency who caused the order to be issued for compensation for the damage caused by the order of secrecy and/or for the use of the invention by the Government, resulting from his disclosure. The right to compensation for use shall begin on the date of the first use of the invention by the Government. The head of the department or agency is authorized, upon the presentation of a claim, to enter into an agreement with the applicant, his successors, assigns, or legal representatives, in full settlement for the damage and/or use. This settlement agreement shall be conclusive for all purposes notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary. If full settlement of the claim cannot be effected, the head of the department or agency may award and pay to such applicant, his successors, assigns, or legal representatives, a sum not exceeding 75 per centum of the sum which the head of the department or agency considers just compensation for the damage and/or use. A claimant may bring suit against the United States in the United States Court of Federal Claims or in the District Court of the United States for the district in which such claimant is a resident for an amount which when added to the award shall constitute just compensation for the damage and/or use of the invention by the Government. The owner of any patent issued upon an application that was subject to a secrecy order issued pursuant to section 181 [of this title], who did not apply for compensation as above provided, shall have the right, after the date of issuance of such patent, to bring suit in the United States Court of Federal Claims for just compensation for the damage caused by reason of the order of secrecy and/or use by the Government of the invention resulting from his disclosure. The right to compensation for use shall begin on the date of the first use of the invention by the Government. In a suit under the provisions of this section the United States may avail itself of all defenses it may plead in an action under section 1498 of title 28. This section shall not confer a right of action on anyone or his successors, assigns, or legal representatives who, while in the full-time employment or service of the United States, discovered, invented, or developed the invention on which the claim is based.

§ 184. Filing of application in foreign country

(a) *FILING IN FOREIGN COUNTRY.*—Except when authorized by a license obtained from the Commissioner of Patents a person shall not file or cause or authorize to be filed in any foreign country prior to six months after filing in the United States an application for patent or for the registration of a utility model, industrial design, or model in respect of an invention made in this country. A license shall not be granted with respect to an invention subject to an

order issued by the Commissioner of Patents pursuant to section 181 [of this title] without the concurrence of the head of the departments and the chief officers of the agencies who caused the order to be issued. The license may be granted retroactively where an application has been filed abroad through error [and without deceptive intent] and the application does not disclose an invention within the scope of section 181 [of this title].

(b) *APPLICATION*.—The term “application” when used in this chapter includes applications and any modifications, amendments, or supplements thereto, or divisions thereof.

(c) *SUBSEQUENT MODIFICATIONS, AMENDMENTS, AND SUPPLEMENTS*.—The scope of a license shall permit subsequent modifications, amendments, and supplements containing additional subject matter if the application upon which the request for the license is based is not, or was not, required to be made available for inspection under section 181 [of this title] and if such modifications, amendments, and supplements do not change the general nature of the invention in a manner which would require such application to be made available for inspection under such section 181. In any case in which a license is not, or was not, required in order to file an application in any foreign country, such subsequent modifications, amendments, and supplements may be made, without a license, to the application filed in the foreign country if the United States application was not required to be made available for inspection under section 181 and if such modifications, amendments, and supplements do not, or did not, change the general nature of the invention in a manner which would require the United States application to have been made available for inspection under such section 181.

§ 185. Patent barred for filing without license

Notwithstanding any other provisions of law any person, and his successors, assigns, or legal representatives, shall not receive a United States patent for an invention if that person, or his successors, assigns, or legal representatives shall, without procuring the license prescribed in section 184 [of this title], have made, or consented to or assisted another’s making, application in a foreign country for a patent or for the registration of a utility model, industrial design, or model in respect of the invention. A United States patent issued to such person, his successors, assigns, or legal representatives shall be invalid, unless the failure to procure such license was through error [and without deceptive intent], and the patent does not disclose subject matter within the scope of section 181 [of this title].

§ 186. Penalty

Whoever, during the period or periods of time an invention has been ordered to be kept secret and the grant of a patent thereon withheld pursuant to section 181 [of this title], shall, with knowledge of such order and without due authorization, willfully publish or disclose or authorize or cause to be published or disclosed the invention, or material information with respect thereto, or whoever willfully, in violation of the provisions of section 184 [of this title], shall file or cause or authorize to be filed in any foreign country an application for patent or for the registration of a utility model,

industrial design, or model in respect of any invention made in the United States, shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 18—PATENT RIGHTS IN INVENTIONS MADE WITH FEDERAL ASSISTANCE

* * * * *

§ 202. Disposition of rights

(a) * * *

(b)(1) * * *

* * * * *

(3) If the contractor believes that a determination is contrary to the policies and objectives of this chapter or constitutes an abuse of discretion by the agency, the determination shall be subject to [the section 203(b)] *section 203(b)*.

(c) Each funding agreement with a small business firm or non-profit organization shall contain appropriate provisions to effectuate the following:

(1) * * *

(2) That the contractor make a written election within two years after disclosure to the Federal agency (or such additional time as may be approved by the Federal agency) whether the contractor will retain title to a subject invention: *Provided*, That in any case where [publication, on sale, or public use, has initiated the one year statutory period in which valid patent protection can still be obtained in the United States] *the 1-year period referred to in section 102(b) would end before the end of that 2-year period*, the period for election may be shortened by the Federal agency to a date that is not more than sixty days [prior to the end of the statutory] *before the end of that 1-year period: And provided further*, That the Federal Government may receive title to any subject invention in which the contractor does not elect to retain rights or fails to elect rights within such times.

(3) That a contractor electing rights in a subject invention agrees to file a patent application prior to [any statutory bar date that may occur under this title due to publication, on sale, or public use] *the expiration of the 1-year period referred to in section 102(b)*, and shall thereafter file corresponding patent applications in other countries in which it wishes to retain title within reasonable times, and that the Federal Government may receive title to any subject inventions in the United States or other countries in which the contractor has not filed patent applications on the subject invention within such times.

* * * * *

(7) In the case of a nonprofit organization, (A) a prohibition upon the assignment of rights to a subject invention in the United States without the approval of the Federal agency, except where such assignment is made to an organization which has as one of its primary functions the management of inventions (provided that such assignee shall be subject to the same

provisions as the contractor); (B) a requirement that the contractor share royalties with the inventor; (C) except with respect to a funding agreement for the operation of a Government-owned-contractor-operated facility, a requirement that the balance of any royalties or income earned by the contractor with respect to subject inventions, after payment of expenses (including payments to inventors) incidental to the administration of subject inventions, be utilized for the support of scientific research or education; (D) a requirement that, [except where it proves infeasible after a reasonable inquiry, in the licensing of subject inventions shall be given to small business firms; and] *except where it is determined to be infeasible following a reasonable inquiry, a preference in the licensing of subject inventions shall be given to small business firms; and* (E) with respect to a funding agreement for the operation of a Government-owned-contractor-operated facility, requirements (i) that after payment of patenting costs, licensing costs, payments to inventors, and other expenses incidental to the administration of subject inventions, 100 percent of the balance of any royalties or income earned and retained by the contractor during any fiscal year up to an amount equal to 5 percent of the annual budget of the facility, shall be used by the contractor for scientific research, development, and education consistent with the research and development mission and objectives of the facility, including activities that increase the licensing potential of other inventions of the facility; provided that if said balance exceeds 5 percent of the annual budget of the facility, that [75] 15 percent of such excess shall be paid to the Treasury of the United States and the remaining [25] 85 percent shall be used for the same purposes [as described above in this clause (D);] *described above in this clause;* and (ii) that, to the extent it provides the most effective technology transfer, the licensing of subject inventions shall be administered by contractor employees on location at the facility.

* * * * *

§ 207. Domestic and foreign protection of federally owned inventions

- (a) Each Federal agency is authorized to—
 - (1) * * *
 - (2) grant nonexclusive, exclusive, or partially exclusive licenses under federally owned inventions, royalty-free or for royalties or other consideration, and on such terms and conditions, including the grant to the licensee of the right of enforcement pursuant to the provisions of chapter 29 [of this title] as determined appropriate in the public interest;

* * * * *

§ 209. Licensing federally owned inventions

- (a) * * *
- * * * * *

(d) TERMS AND CONDITIONS.—Any licenses granted under section 207(a)(2) shall contain such terms and conditions as the granting agency considers appropriate, and shall include provisions—

(1) retaining a **[nontransferable]** *nontransferable*, irrevocable, paid-up license for any Federal agency to practice the invention or have the invention practiced throughout the world by or on behalf of the Government of the United States;

* * * * *

§ 210. Precedence of chapter

(a) * * *

* * * * *

(c) Nothing in this chapter is intended to limit the authority of agencies to agree to the disposition of rights in inventions made in the performance of work under funding agreements with persons other than nonprofit organizations or small business firms in accordance with the Statement of Government Patent Policy issued on February 18, 1983, agency regulations, or other applicable regulations or to otherwise limit the authority of agencies to allow such persons to retain ownership of inventions except that all funding agreements, including those with other than small business firms and nonprofit organizations, shall include the requirements established in section 202(c)(4) and section 203 **[of this title]**. Any disposition of rights in inventions made in accordance with the Statement or implementing regulations, including any disposition occurring before enactment of this section, are hereby authorized.

* * * * *

PART III—PATENTS AND PROTECTION OF PATENT RIGHTS

Chap.		Sec.
	[31. Optional Inter Partes Reexamination of Patents	311]
	31. <i>Inter Partes Review</i>	311
	32. <i>Post-Grant Review</i>	321
	* * * * *	

CHAPTER 25—AMENDMENT AND CORRECTION OF PATENTS

Sec.	
251. Reissue of defective patents.	* * * * *
257. <i>Supplemental examinations to consider, reconsider, or correct information.</i>	

§ 251. Reissue of defective patents

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Whenever any patent is, through error **[without any deceptive intention]**, deemed wholly or partly inoperative or invalid, by reason of a defective specification or drawing, or by reason of the patentee claiming more or less than he had a right to claim in the patent, the Director shall, on the surrender of such patent and the payment of the fee required by law, reissue the patent for the invention disclosed in the original patent, and

in accordance with a new and amended application, for the unexpired part of the term of the original patent. No new matter shall be introduced into the application for reissue.

(b) *MULTIPLE REISSUED PATENTS*.—The Director may issue several reissued patents for distinct and separate parts of the thing patented, upon demand of the applicant, and upon payment of the required fee for a reissue for each of such reissued patents.

(c) *APPLICABILITY OF THIS TITLE*.—The provisions of this title relating to applications for patent shall be applicable to applications for reissue of a patent, except that application for reissue may be made and sworn to by the assignee of the entire interest if the application does not seek to enlarge the scope of the claims of the original patent *or the application for the original patent was filed by the assignee of the entire interest*.

(d) *REISSUE PATENT ENLARGING SCOPE OF CLAIMS*.—No reissued patent shall be granted enlarging the scope of the claims of the original patent unless applied for within two years from the grant of the original patent.

* * * * *

§ 253. Disclaimer

【Whenever, without any deceptive intention,】 (a) *IN GENERAL*.—Whenever a claim of a patent is invalid the remaining claims shall not thereby be rendered invalid. A patentee, whether of the whole or any sectional interest therein, may, on payment of the fee required by law, make disclaimer of any complete claim, stating therein the extent of his interest in such patent. Such disclaimer shall be in writing, and recorded in the Patent and Trademark Office; and it shall thereafter be considered as part of the original patent to the extent of the interest possessed by the disclaimant and by those claiming under him.

【In like manner】 (b) *ADDITIONAL DISCLAIMER OR DEDICATION*.—In the manner set forth in subsection (a), any patentee or applicant may disclaim or dedicate to the public the entire term, or any terminal part of the term, of the patent granted or to be granted.

* * * * *

§ 256. Correction of named inventor

(a) *CORRECTION*.—Whenever through error a person is named in an issued patent as the inventor, or through error an inventor is not named in an issued patent 【and such error arose without any deceptive intention on his part】, the Director may, on application of all the parties and assignees, with proof of the facts and such other requirements as may be imposed, issued a certificate correcting such error.

(b) *PATENT VALID IF ERROR CORRECTED*.—The error of omitting inventors or naming persons who are not inventors shall not invalidate the patent in which such error occurred if it can be corrected as provided in this section. The court before which such matter is called in question may order correction of the patent on notice and hearing of all parties concerned and the Director shall issue a certificate accordingly.

§257. Supplemental examinations to consider, reconsider, or correct information

(a) *REQUEST FOR SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINATION.*—A patent owner may request supplemental examination of a patent in the Office to consider, reconsider, or correct information believed to be relevant to the patent, in accordance with such requirements as the Director may establish. Within 3 months after the date a request for supplemental examination meeting the requirements of this section is received, the Director shall conduct the supplemental examination and shall conclude such examination by issuing a certificate indicating whether the information presented in the request raises a substantial new question of patentability.

(b) *REEXAMINATION ORDERED.*—If the certificate issued under subsection (a) indicates that a substantial new question of patentability is raised by 1 or more items of information in the request, the Director shall order reexamination of the patent. The reexamination shall be conducted according to procedures established by chapter 30, except that the patent owner shall not have the right to file a statement pursuant to section 304. During the reexamination, the Director shall address each substantial new question of patentability identified during the supplemental examination, notwithstanding the limitations in chapter 30 relating to patents and printed publication or any other provision of such chapter.

(c) *EFFECT.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—A patent shall not be held unenforceable on the basis of conduct relating to information that had not been considered, was inadequately considered, or was incorrect in a prior examination of the patent if the information was considered, reconsidered, or corrected during a supplemental examination of the patent. The making of a request under subsection (a), or the absence thereof, shall not be relevant to enforceability of the patent under section 282.

(2) *EXCEPTIONS.*—

(A) *PRIOR ALLEGATIONS.*—Paragraph (1) shall not apply to an allegation pled with particularity in a civil action, or set forth with particularity in a notice received by the patent owner under section 505(j)(2)(B)(iv)(II) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 355(j)(2)(B)(iv)(II)), before the date of a supplemental examination request under subsection (a) to consider, reconsider, or correct information forming the basis for the allegation.

(B) *PATENT ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS.*—In an action brought under section 337(a) of the Tariff Act of 1930 (19 U.S.C. 1337(a)), or section 281 of this title, paragraph (1) shall not apply to any defense raised in the action that is based upon information that was considered, reconsidered, or corrected pursuant to a supplemental examination request under subsection (a), unless the supplemental examination, and any reexamination ordered pursuant to the request, are concluded before the date on which the action is brought.

(C) *FRAUD.*—No supplemental examination may be commenced by the Director on, and any pending supplemental examination shall be immediately terminated regarding, an application or patent in connection with which

fraud on the Office was practiced or attempted. If the Director determines that such a fraud on the Office was practiced or attempted, the Director shall also refer the matter to the Attorney General for such action as the Attorney General may deem appropriate.

(d) FEES AND REGULATIONS.—

(1) FEES.—The Director shall, by regulation, establish fees for the submission of a request for supplemental examination of a patent, and to consider each item of information submitted in the request. If reexamination is ordered under subsection (b), fees established and applicable to ex parte reexamination proceedings under chapter 30 shall be paid, in addition to fees applicable to supplemental examination.

(2) REGULATIONS.—The Director shall issue regulations governing the form, content, and other requirements of requests for supplemental examination, and establishing procedures for reviewing information submitted in such requests.

(e) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed—

(1) to preclude the imposition of sanctions based upon criminal or antitrust laws (including section 1001(a) of title 18, the first section of the Clayton Act, and section 5 of the Federal Trade Commission Act to the extent that section relates to unfair methods of competition);

(2) to limit the authority of the Director to investigate issues of possible misconduct and impose sanctions for misconduct in connection with matters or proceedings before the Office; or

(3) to limit the authority of the Director to issue regulations under chapter 3 relating to sanctions for misconduct by representatives practicing before the Office.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 27—GOVERNMENT INTERESTS IN PATENTS

§ 267. Time for taking action in Government applications

Notwithstanding the provisions of sections 133 and 151 [of this title], the Director may extend the time for taking any action to three years, when an application has become the property of the United States and the head of the appropriate department or agency of the Government has certified to the Director that the invention disclosed therein is important to the armament or defense of the United States.

CHAPTER 28—INFRINGEMENT OF PATENTS

* * * * *

§ 273. Defense to infringement based on earlier inventor

(a) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) the terms “commercially used” and “commercial use” mean [use of a method in] *use of the subject matter of a patent* in the United States, so long as such use is in connection with an internal commercial use or an actual arm’s-length sale or other arm’s-length commercial transfer of a useful end result, whether or not the subject matter at issue is accessible to or

otherwise known to the public, except that the subject matter for which commercial marketing or use is subject to a premarketing regulatory review period during which the safety or efficacy of the subject matter is established, including any period specified in section 156(g), shall be deemed “commercially used” and in “commercial use” during such regulatory review period; *and*

(2) in the case of activities performed by a nonprofit research laboratory, or nonprofit entity such as a university, research center, or hospital, a use for which the public is the intended beneficiary shall be considered to be a use described in paragraph (1), except that the use—

(A) * * *

(B) may not be asserted as a defense with respect to any subsequent commercialization or use outside such laboratory or nonprofit entity[;].

[(3) the term “method” means a method of doing or conducting business; and

[(4) the “effective filing date” of a patent is the earlier of the actual filing date of the application for the patent or the filing date of any earlier United States, foreign, or international application to which the subject matter at issue is entitled under section 119, 120, or 365 of this title.]

(b) DEFENSE TO INFRINGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall be a defense to an action for infringement under section 271 [of this title] with respect to any subject matter that would otherwise infringe one or more claims [for a method] in the patent being asserted against a person, if such person had, acting in good faith, actually reduced the subject matter to practice [at least 1 year before the effective filing date of such patent, and commercially used the subject matter before the effective filing date of such patent.] *and commercially used the subject matter at least 1 year before the effective filing date of the claimed invention that is the subject matter of the patent.*

(2) EXHAUSTION OF RIGHT.—The sale or other disposition of a useful end product produced by a [patented method] *patented process*, by a person entitled to assert a defense under this section with respect to that useful end result shall exhaust the patent owner’s rights under the patent to the extent such rights would have been exhausted had such sale or other disposition been made by the patent owner.

(3) LIMITATIONS AND QUALIFICATIONS OF DEFENSE.—The defense to infringement under this section is subject to the following:

[(A) PATENT.—A person may not assert the defense under this section unless the invention for which the defense is asserted is for a method.

[(B) DERIVATION.—A person may not assert the defense under this section if the subject matter on which the defense is based was derived from the patentee or persons in privity with the patentee.]

(A) DERIVATION AND PRIOR DISCLOSURE TO THE PUBLIC.—A person may not assert the defense under this section if—

(i) *the subject matter on which the defense is based was derived from the patentee or persons in privity with the patentee; or*

(ii) *the claimed invention that is the subject of the defense was disclosed to the public in a manner that qualified for the exception from the prior art under section 102(b) and the commercialization date relied upon under paragraph (1) of this subsection for establishing entitlement to the defense is less than 1 year before the date of such disclosure to the public;*

[(C)] (B) NOT A GENERAL LICENSE.—The defense asserted by a person under this section is not a general license under all claims of the patent at issue, but extends only to the specific subject matter claimed in the patent with respect to which the person can assert a defense under this chapter, except that the defense shall also extend to variations in the quantity or volume of use of the claimed subject matter, and to improvements in the claimed subject matter that do not infringe additional specifically claimed subject matter of the patent.

(C) **FUNDING.**—

(i) **DEFENSE NOT AVAILABLE IN CERTAIN CASES.**—A person may not assert the defense under this section if the subject matter of the patent on which the defense is based was developed pursuant to a funding agreement under chapter 18 or by a nonprofit institution of higher education, or a technology transfer organization affiliated with such an institution, that did not receive funding from a private business enterprise in support of that development.

(ii) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this subparagraph—

(I) *the term “institution of higher education” has the meaning given that term in section 101(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001(a)); and*

(II) *the term “technology transfer organization” means an organization the primary purpose of which is to facilitate the commercialization of technologies developed by one or more institutions of higher education.*

* * * * *

[(6) PERSONAL DEFENSE.—The defense under this section may be asserted only by the person who performed the acts necessary to establish the defense and, except for any transfer to the patent owner, the right to assert the defense shall not be licensed or assigned or transferred to another person except as an ancillary and subordinate part of a good faith assignment or transfer for other reasons of the entire enterprise or line of business to which the defense relates.]

(6) **PERSONAL DEFENSE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—*The defense under this section may be asserted only by the person who performed or caused the performance of the acts necessary to establish the defense, as well as any other entity that controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with such person, and, except*

for any transfer to the patent owner, the right to assert the defense shall not be licensed or assigned or transferred to another person except as an ancillary and subordinate part of a good faith assignment or transfer for other reasons of the entire enterprise or line of business to which the defense relates.

(B) *EXCEPTION.*—Notwithstanding subparagraph (A), any person may, on the person’s own behalf, assert a defense based on the exhaustion of rights provided under paragraph (2), including any necessary elements thereof.

* * * * *

(8) **UNSUCCESSFUL ASSERTION OF DEFENSE.**—If the defense under this section is pleaded by a person who is found to infringe the patent and who subsequently fails to demonstrate a reasonable basis for asserting the defense, the court shall find the case exceptional for the purpose of awarding attorney fees under section 285 [of this title].

(9) **INVALIDITY.**—A patent shall not be deemed to be invalid under section 102 or 103 [of this title] solely because a defense is raised or established under this section.

CHAPTER 29—REMEDIES FOR INFRINGEMENT OF PATENT, AND OTHER ACTIONS

Sec.						
281. Remedy for infringement of patent.	*	*	*	*	*	*
[291. Interfering patents.]						
291. <i>Derived patents.</i>	*	*	*	*	*	*
298. <i>Advice of counsel.</i>						
299. <i>Joinder of parties.</i>	*	*	*	*	*	*

§ 282. Presumption of validity; defenses

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—A patent shall be presumed valid. Each claim of a patent (whether in independent, dependent, or multiple dependent form) shall be presumed valid independently of the validity of other claims; dependent or multiple dependent claims shall be presumed valid even though dependent upon an invalid claim. **[Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, if a claim to a composition of matter is held invalid and that claim was the basis of a determination of nonobviousness under section 103(b)(1), the process shall no longer be considered nonobvious solely on the basis of section 103(b)(1).]** The burden of establishing invalidity of a patent or any claim thereof shall rest on the party asserting such invalidity.

(b) *DEFENSES.*—The following shall be defenses in any action involving the validity or infringement of a patent and shall be pleaded:

- (1) Noninfringement, absence of liability for infringement or **[unenforceability,]** *unenforceability*.
- (2) Invalidity of the patent or any claim in suit on any ground specified in part II **[of this title]** as a condition for **[patentability,]** *patentability*.

[(3) Invalidity of the patent or any claim in suit for failure to comply with any requirement of sections 112 or 251 of this title.]

(3) *Invalidity of the patent or any claim in suit for failure to comply with—*

(A) *any requirement of section 112, except that the failure to disclose the best mode shall not be a basis on which any claim of a patent may be canceled or held invalid or otherwise unenforceable; or*

(B) *any requirement of section 251.*

(4) Any other fact or act made a defense by this title.

[In actions involving the validity or infringement of a patent]

(c) *NOTICE OF ACTIONS; ACTIONS DURING EXTENSION OF PATENT TERM.—In an action involving the validity or infringement of patent, the party asserting infringement shall identify, in the pleadings or otherwise in writing to the adverse party, all of its real parties in interest, and the party asserting invalidity or noninfringement shall give notice in the pleadings or otherwise in writing to the adverse party at least thirty days before the trial, of the country, number, date, and name of the patentee of any patent, the title, date, and page numbers of any publication to be relied upon as anticipation of the patent in suit or, except in actions in the United States [Claims Court] Court of Federal Claims, as showing the state of the art, and the name and address of any person who may be relied upon as the prior inventor or as having prior knowledge of or as having previously used or offered for sale the invention of the patent in suit. In the absence of such notice proof of the said matters may not be made at the trial except on such terms as the court requires. Invalidity of the extension of a patent term or any portion thereof under section 154(b) or 156 [of this title] because of the material failure—*

(1) * * *

* * * * *

§ 284. Damages

Upon finding for the claimant the court shall award the claimant damages adequate to compensate for the infringement, but in no event less than a reasonable royalty for the use made of the invention by the infringer, together with interest and costs as fixed by the court.

When the damages are not found by a jury, the court shall assess them. In either event the court may increase the damages up to three times the amount found or assessed. Increased damages under this paragraph shall not apply to provisional rights under section 154(d) [of this title].

The court may receive expert testimony as an aid to the determination of damages or of what royalty would be reasonable under the circumstances.

* * * * *

§ 287. Limitation on damages and other remedies; marking and notice

(a) Patentees, and persons making, offering for sale, or selling within the United States any patented article for or under them,

or importing any patented article into the United States, may give notice to the public that the same is patented, either by fixing thereon the word "patent" or the abbreviation "pat.", together with the number of the patent, [or when,] *or by fixing thereon the word "patent" or the abbreviation "pat." together with an address of a posting on the Internet, accessible to the public without charge for accessing the address, that associates the patented article with the number of the patent, or when,* from the character of the article, this can not be done, by fixing to it, or to the package wherein one or more of them is contained, a label containing a like notice. In the event of failure so to mark, no damages shall be recovered by the patentee in any action for infringement, except on proof that the infringer was notified of the infringement and continued to infringe thereafter, in which event damages may be recovered only for infringement occurring after such notice. Filing of an action for infringement shall constitute such notice.

(b)(1) * * *

(2) No remedies for infringement under section 271(g) [of this title] shall be available with respect to any product in the possession of, or in transit to, the person subject to liability under such section before that person had notice of infringement with respect to that product. The person subject to liability shall bear the burden of proving any such possession or transit.

* * * * *

(c)(1) With respect to a medical practitioner's performance of a medical activity that constitutes an infringement under section 271 (a) or (b) [of this title], the provisions of sections 281, 283, 284, and 285 [of this title] shall not apply against the medical practitioner or against a related health care entity with respect to such medical activity.

(2) For the purposes of this subsection:

(A) * * *

* * * * *

(G) the term "State" shall mean [any state] *any State* or territory of the United States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

* * * * *

(4) This subsection shall not apply to any patent issued based on an application [the earliest effective filing date of which is prior to] *which has an effective filing date before September 30, 1996.*

§ 288. Action for infringement of a patent containing an invalid claim

Whenever[, without deceptive intention,] a claim of a patent is invalid, an action may be maintained for the infringement of a claim of the patent which may be valid. The patentee shall recover no costs unless a disclaimer of the invalid claim has been entered at the Patent and Trademark Office before the commencement of the suit.

* * * * *

【§ 291. Interfering patents

【The owner of an interfering patent may have relief against the owner of another by civil action, and the court may adjudge the question of the validity of any of the interfering patents, in whole or in part. The provisions of the second paragraph of section 146 of this title shall apply to actions brought under this section.】

§ 291. Derived Patents

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—*The owner of a patent may have relief by civil action against the owner of another patent that claims the same invention and has an earlier effective filing date, if the invention claimed in such other patent was derived from the inventor of the invention claimed in the patent owned by the person seeking relief under this section.*

(b) *FILING LIMITATION.*—*An action under this section may be filed only before the end of the 1-year period beginning on the date of the issuance of the first patent containing a claim to the allegedly derived invention and naming an individual alleged to have derived such invention as the inventor or joint inventor.*

§ 292. False marking

(a) Whoever, without the consent of the patentee, marks upon, or affixes to, or uses in advertising in connection with anything made, used, offered for sale, or sold by such person within the United States, or imported by the person into the United States, the name or any imitation of the name of the patentee, the patent number, or the words “patent,” “patentee,” or the like, with the intent of counterfeiting or imitating the mark of the patentee, or of deceiving the public and inducing them to believe that the thing was made, offered for sale, sold, or imported into the United States by or with the consent of the patentee; or

Whoever marks upon, or affixes to, or uses in advertising in connection with any unpatented article, the word “patent” or any word or number importing that the same is patented for the purpose of deceiving the public; or

Whoever marks upon, or affixes to, or uses in advertising in connection with any article, the words “patent applied for,” “patent pending,” or any word importing that an application for patent has been made, when no application for patent has been made, or if made, is not pending, for the purpose of deceiving the public—

Shall be fined not more than \$500 for every such offense. *Only the United States may sue for the penalty authorized by this subsection.*

【(b) Any person may sue for the penalty, in which event one-half shall go to the person suing and the other to the use of the United States.】

(b) *A person who has suffered a competitive injury as a result of a violation of this section may file a civil action in a district court of the United States for recovery of damages adequate to compensate for the injury.*

(c) *Whoever engages in an activity under subsection (a) for which liability would otherwise be imposed shall not be liable for such activity—*

(1) that is engaged in during the 3-year period beginning on the date on which the patent at issue expires; or

(2) that is engaged in after the end of that 3-year period if the word “expired” is placed before the word “patent”, “patented”, the abbreviation “pat”, or the patent number, either on the article or through a posting on the Internet, as provided in section 287(a).

§ 293. Nonresident patentee; service and notice

Every patentee not residing in the United States may file in the Patent and Trademark Office a written designation stating the name and address of a person residing within the United States on whom may be served process or notice of proceedings affecting the patent or rights thereunder. If the person designated cannot be found at the address given in the last designation, or if no person has been designated, the [United States District Court for the District of Columbia] *United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia* shall have jurisdiction and summons shall be served by publication or otherwise as the court directs. The court shall have the same jurisdiction to take any action respecting the patent or rights thereunder that it would have if the patentee were personally within the jurisdiction of the court.

§ 294. Voluntary arbitration

(a) * * *

(b) Arbitration of such disputes, awards by arbitrators and confirmation of awards shall be governed by title 9, to the extent such title is not inconsistent with this section. In any such arbitration proceeding, the defenses provided for under section 282 [of this title] shall be considered by the arbitrator if raised by any party to the proceeding.

* * * * *

§ 298. Advice of counsel

The failure of an infringer to obtain the advice of counsel with respect to any allegedly infringed patent, or the failure of the infringer to present such advice to the court or jury, may not be used to prove that the accused infringer willfully infringed the patent or that the infringer intended to induce infringement of the patent.

§ 299. Joinder of parties

(a) *JOINDER OF ACCUSED INFRINGERS.—In any civil action arising under any Act of Congress relating to patents, other than an action or trial in which an act of infringement under section 271(e)(2) has been pled, parties that are accused infringers may be joined in one action as defendants or counterclaim defendants only if—*

(1) any right to relief is asserted against the parties jointly, severally, or in the alternative with respect to or arising out of the same transaction, occurrence, or series of transactions or occurrences relating to the making, using, importing into the United States, offering for sale, or selling of the same accused product or process; and

(2) questions of fact common to all defendants or counterclaim defendants will arise in the action.

(b) *ALLEGATIONS INSUFFICIENT FOR JOINDER.—For purposes of this subsection, accused infringers may not be joined in one action*

or trial as defendants or counterclaim defendants based solely on allegations that they each have infringed the patent or patents in suit.

CHAPTER 30—PRIOR ART CITATIONS TO OFFICE AND EX PARTE REEXAMINATION OF PATENTS

Sec.

[301. Citation of prior art.]

301. Citation of prior art and written statements.

* * * * *

[§ 301. Citation of prior art

[Any person at any time may cite to the Office in writing prior art consisting of patents or printed publications which that person believes to have a bearing on the patentability of any claim of a particular patent. If the person explains in writing the pertinency and manner of applying such prior art to at least one claim of the patent, the citation of such prior art and the explanation thereof will become a part of the official file of the patent. At the written request of the person citing the prior art, his or her identity will be excluded from the patent file and kept confidential.]

§ 301. Citation of prior art and written statements

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Any person at any time may cite to the Office in writing—

(1) *prior art consisting of patents or printed publications which that person believes to have a bearing on the patentability of any claim of a particular patent; or*

(2) *statements of the patent owner filed in a proceeding before a Federal court or the Office in which the patent owner took a position on the scope of any claim of a particular patent.*

(b) *OFFICIAL FILE.*—If the person citing prior art or written statements pursuant to subsection (a) explains in writing the pertinence and manner of applying the prior art or written statements to at least 1 claim of the patent, the citation of the prior art or written statements and the explanation thereof shall become a part of the official file of the patent.

(c) *ADDITIONAL INFORMATION.*—A party that submits a written statement pursuant to subsection (a)(2) shall include any other documents, pleadings, or evidence from the proceeding in which the statement was filed that addresses the written statement.

(d) *LIMITATIONS.*—A written statement submitted pursuant to subsection (a)(2), and additional information submitted pursuant to subsection (c), shall not be considered by the Office for any purpose other than to determine the proper meaning of a patent claim in a proceeding that is ordered or instituted pursuant to section 304, 314, or 324. If any such written statement or additional information is subject to an applicable protective order, such statement or information shall be redacted to exclude information that is subject to that order.

(e) *CONFIDENTIALITY.*—Upon the written request of the person citing prior art or written statements pursuant to subsection (a), that person's identity shall be excluded from the patent file and kept confidential.

§ 302. Request for reexamination

Any person at any time may file a request for reexamination by the Office of any claim of a patent on the basis of any prior art cited under the provisions of section 301 [of this title]. The request must be in writing and must be accompanied by payment of a reexamination fee established by the Director pursuant to the provisions of section 41 [of this title]. The request must set forth the pertinency and manner of applying cited prior art to every claim for which reexamination is requested. Unless the requesting person is the owner of the patent, the Director promptly will send a copy of the request to the owner of record of the patent.

§ 303. Determination of issue by Director

(a) Within three months following the filing of a request for reexamination under the provisions of section 302 [of this title], the Director will determine whether a substantial new question of patentability affecting any claim of the patent concerned is raised by the request, with or without consideration of other patents or printed publications. On his own initiative, and any time, the Director may determine whether a substantial new question of patentability is raised by patents and publications discovered by him or cited under the provisions of [section 301 of this title] *section 301 or 302*. The existence of a substantial new question of patentability is not precluded by the fact that a patent or printed publication was previously cited by or to the Office or considered by the Office.

* * * * *

(c) A determination by the Director pursuant to subsection (a) of this section that no substantial new question of patentability has been raised will be final and nonappealable. Upon such a determination, the Director may refund a portion of the reexamination fee required under section 302 [of this title].

§ 304. Reexamination order by Director

If, in a determination made under the provisions of subsection 303(a) [of this title], the Director finds that a substantial new question of patentability affecting any claim of a patent is raised, the determination will include an order for reexamination of the patent for resolution of the question. The patent owner will be given a reasonable period, not less than two months from the date a copy of the determination is given or mailed to him, within which he may file a statement on such question, including any amendment to his patent and new claim or claims he may wish to propose, for consideration in the reexamination. If the patent owner files such a statement, he promptly will serve a copy of it on the person who has requested reexamination under the provisions of section 302 [of this title]. Within a period of two months from the date of service, that person may file and have considered in the reexamination a reply to any statement filed by the patent owner. That person promptly will serve on the patent owner a copy of any reply filed.

§ 305. Conduct of reexamination proceedings

After the times for filing the statement and reply provided for by section 304 [of this title] have expired, reexamination will be

conducted according to the procedures established for initial examination under the provisions of sections 132 and 133 [of this title]. In any reexamination proceeding under this chapter, the patent owner will be permitted to propose any amendment to his patent and a new claim or claims thereto, in order to distinguish the invention as claimed from the prior art cited under the provisions of section 301 [of this title], or in response to a decision adverse to the patentability of a claim of a patent. No proposed amended or new claim enlarging the scope of a claim of the patent will be permitted in a reexamination proceeding under this chapter. All reexamination proceedings under this section, including any appeal to the [Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences] *Patent Trial and Appeal Board*, will be conducted with special dispatch within the Office.

§ 306. Appeal

The patent owner involved in a reexamination proceeding under this chapter may appeal under the provisions of section 134 [of this title], and may seek court review under the provisions of sections 141 to [145 of this title] 144, with respect to any decision adverse to the patentability of any original or proposed amended or new claim of the patent.

§ 307. Certificate of patentability, unpatentability, and claim cancellation

(a) * * *

(b) Any proposed amended or new claim determined to be patentable and incorporated into a patent following a reexamination proceeding will have the same effect as that specified in section 252 [of this title] for reissued patents on the right of any person who made, purchased, or used within the United States, or imported into the United States, anything patented by such proposed amended or new claim, or who made substantial preparation for the same, prior to issuance of a certificate under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

[CHAPTER 31—OPTIONAL INTER PARTES REEXAMINATION PROCEDURES

§ 311. Request for inter partes reexamination

[(a) IN GENERAL.—Any third-party requester at any time may file a request for inter partes reexamination by the Office of a patent on the basis of any prior art cited under the provisions of section 301.

[(b) REQUIREMENTS.—The request shall—

[(1) be in writing, include the identity of the real party in interest, and be accompanied by payment of an inter partes reexamination fee established by the Director under section 41; and

[(2) set forth the pertinency and manner of applying cited prior art to every claim for which reexamination is requested.

[(c) COPY.—The Director promptly shall send a copy of the request to the owner of record of the patent.

【§ 312. Determination of issue by Director

【(a) REEXAMINATION.—Not later than 3 months after the filing of a request for inter partes reexamination under section 311, the Director shall determine whether a substantial new question of patentability affecting any claim of the patent concerned is raised by the request, with or without consideration of other patents or printed publications. The existence of a substantial new question of patentability is not precluded by the fact that a patent or printed publication was previously cited by or to the Office or considered by the Office.

【(b) RECORD.—A record of the Director's determination under subsection (a) shall be placed in the official file of the patent, and a copy shall be promptly given or mailed to the owner of record of the patent and to the third-party requester.

【(c) FINAL DECISION.—A determination by the Director under subsection (a) shall be final and non-appealable. Upon a determination that no substantial new question of patentability has been raised, the Director may refund a portion of the inter partes reexamination fee required under section 311.

【§ 313. Inter partes reexamination order by Director

【If, in a determination made under section 312(a), the Director finds that a substantial new question of patentability affecting a claim of a patent is raised, the determination shall include an order for inter partes reexamination of the patent for resolution of the question. The order may be accompanied by the initial action of the Patent and Trademark Office on the merits of the inter partes reexamination conducted in accordance with section 314.

【§ 314. Conduct of inter partes reexamination proceedings

【(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided in this section, reexamination shall be conducted according to the procedures established for initial examination under the provisions of sections 132 and 133. In any inter partes reexamination proceeding under this chapter, the patent owner shall be permitted to propose any amendment to the patent and a new claim or claims, except that no proposed amended or new claim enlarging the scope of the claims of the patent shall be permitted.

【(b) RESPONSE.—(1) With the exception of the inter partes reexamination request, any document filed by either the patent owner or the third-party requester shall be served on the other party. In addition, the Office shall send to the third-party requester a copy of any communication sent by the Office to the patent owner concerning the patent subject to the inter partes reexamination proceeding.

【(2) Each time that the patent owner files a response to an action on the merits from the Patent and Trademark Office, the third-party requester shall have one opportunity to file written comments addressing issues raised by the action of the Office or the patent owner's response thereto, if those written comments are received by the Office within 30 days after the date of service of the patent owner's response.

【(c) SPECIAL DISPATCH.—Unless otherwise provided by the Director for good cause, all inter partes reexamination proceedings under this section, including any appeal to the Board of Patent Ap-

peals and Interferences, shall be conducted with special dispatch within the Office.

【§ 315. Appeal

【(a) PATENT OWNER.—The patent owner involved in an inter partes reexamination proceeding under this chapter—

【(1) may appeal under the provisions of section 134 and may appeal under the provisions of sections 141 through 144, with respect to any decision adverse to the patentability of any original or proposed amended or new claim of the patent; and

【(2) may be a party to any appeal taken by a third-party requester under subsection (b).

【(b) THIRD-PARTY REQUESTER.—A third-party requester—

【(1) may appeal under the provisions of section 134, and may appeal under the provisions of sections 141 through 144, with respect to any final decision favorable to the patentability of any original or proposed amended or new claim of the patent; and

【(2) may, subject to subsection (c), be a party to any appeal taken by the patent owner under the provisions of section 134 or sections 141 through 144.

【(c) CIVIL ACTION.—A third-party requester whose request for an inter partes reexamination results in an order under section 313 is estopped from asserting at a later time, in any civil action arising in whole or in part under section 1338 of title 28, the invalidity of any claim finally determined to be valid and patentable on any ground which the third-party requester raised or could have raised during the inter partes reexamination proceedings. This subsection does not prevent the assertion of invalidity based on newly discovered prior art unavailable to the third-party requester and the Patent and Trademark Office at the time of the inter partes reexamination proceedings.

【§ 316. Certificate of patentability, unpatentability, and claim cancellation

【(a) IN GENERAL.—In an inter partes reexamination proceeding under this chapter, when the time for appeal has expired or any appeal proceeding has terminated, the Director shall issue and publish a certificate canceling any claim of the patent finally determined to be unpatentable, confirming any claim of the patent determined to be patentable, and incorporating in the patent any proposed amended or new claim determined to be patentable.

【(b) AMENDED OR NEW CLAIM.—Any proposed amended or new claim determined to be patentable and incorporated into a patent following an inter partes reexamination proceeding shall have the same effect as that specified in section 252 of this title for reissued patents on the right of any person who made, purchased, or used within the United States, or imported into the United States, anything patented by such proposed amended or new claim, or who made substantial preparation therefor, prior to issuance of a certificate under the provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

【§ 317. Inter partes reexamination prohibited

【(a) ORDER FOR REEXAMINATION.—Notwithstanding any provision of this chapter, once an order for inter partes reexamination

of a patent has been issued under section 313, neither the third-party requester nor its privies, may file a subsequent request for inter partes reexamination of the patent until an inter partes reexamination certificate is issued and published under section 316, unless authorized by the Director.

[(b) FINAL DECISION.—Once a final decision has been entered against a party in a civil action arising in whole or in part under section 1338 of title 28, that the party has not sustained its burden of proving the invalidity of any patent claim in suit or if a final decision in an inter partes reexamination proceeding instituted by a third-party requester is favorable to the patentability of any original or proposed amended or new claim of the patent, then neither that party nor its privies may thereafter request an inter partes reexamination of any such patent claim on the basis of issues which that party or its privies raised or could have raised in such civil action or inter partes reexamination proceeding, and an inter partes reexamination requested by that party or its privies on the basis of such issues may not thereafter be maintained by the Office, notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter. This subsection does not prevent the assertion of invalidity based on newly discovered prior art unavailable to the third-party requester and the Patent and Trademark Office at the time of the inter partes reexamination proceedings.]

[§ 318. Stay of litigation

[Once an order for inter partes reexamination of a patent has been issued under section 313, the patent owner may obtain a stay of any pending litigation which involves an issue of patentability of any claims of the patent which are the subject of the inter partes reexamination order, unless the court before which such litigation is pending determines that a stay would not serve the interests of justice.]

CHAPTER 31—INTER PARTES REVIEW

Sec.

311. *Inter partes review.*

312. *Petitions.*

313. *Preliminary response to petition.*

314. *Institution of inter partes review.*

315. *Relation to other proceedings or actions.*

316. *Conduct of inter partes review.*

317. *Settlement.*

318. *Decision of the Board.*

319. *Appeal.*

§ 311. Inter partes review

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Subject to the provisions of this chapter, a person who is not the owner of a patent may file with the Office a petition to institute an inter partes review of the patent. The Director shall establish, by regulation, fees to be paid by the person requesting the review, in such amounts as the Director determines to be reasonable, considering the aggregate costs of the review.

(b) *SCOPE.*—A petitioner in an inter partes review may request to cancel as unpatentable 1 or more claims of a patent only on a ground that could be raised under section 102 or 103 and only on the basis of prior art consisting of patents or printed publications.

(c) *FILING DEADLINE.*—A petition for inter partes review shall be filed after the later of either—

- (1) the date that is 1 year after the grant of a patent or issuance of a reissue of a patent; or
- (2) if a post-grant review is instituted under chapter 32, the date of the termination of such post-grant review.

§ 312. Petitions

(a) *REQUIREMENTS OF PETITION.*—A petition filed under section 311 may be considered only if—

- (1) the petition is accompanied by payment of the fee established by the Director under section 311;
- (2) the petition identifies all real parties in interest;
- (3) the petition identifies, in writing and with particularity, each claim challenged, the grounds on which the challenge to each claim is based, and the evidence that supports the grounds for the challenge to each claim, including—

(A) copies of patents and printed publications that the petitioner relies upon in support of the petition; and

(B) affidavits or declarations of supporting evidence and opinions, if the petitioner relies on expert opinions;

(4) the petition provides such other information as the Director may require by regulation; and

(5) the petitioner provides copies of any of the documents required under paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) to the patent owner or, if applicable, the designated representative of the patent owner.

(b) *PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.*—As soon as practicable after the receipt of a petition under section 311, the Director shall make the petition available to the public.

§ 313. Preliminary response to petition

If an inter partes review petition is filed under section 311, the patent owner shall have the right to file a preliminary response to the petition, within a time period set by the Director, that sets forth reasons why no inter partes review should be instituted based upon the failure of the petition to meet any requirement of this chapter.

§ 314. Institution of inter partes review

(a) *THRESHOLD.*—The Director may not authorize an inter partes review to commence unless the Director determines that the information presented in the petition filed under section 311 and any response filed under section 313 shows that there is a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition.

(b) *TIMING.*—The Director shall determine whether to institute an inter partes review under this chapter pursuant to a petition filed under section 311 within 3 months after—

(1) receiving a preliminary response to the petition under section 313; or

(2) if no such preliminary response is filed, the last date on which such response may be filed.

(c) *NOTICE.*—The Director shall notify the petitioner and patent owner, in writing, of the Director's determination under subsection (a), and shall make such notice available to the public as soon as

is practicable. Such notice shall include the date on which the review shall commence.

(d) **NO APPEAL.**—The determination by the Director whether to institute an inter partes review under this section shall be final and nonappealable.

§ 315. Relation to other proceedings or actions

(a) **INFRINGEMENT'S CIVIL ACTION.**—

(1) **INTER PARTES REVIEW BARRED BY CIVIL ACTION.**—An inter partes review may not be instituted if, before the date on which the petition for such a review is filed, the petitioner, real party in interest, or privy of the petitioner filed a civil action challenging the validity of a claim of the patent.

(2) **STAY OF CIVIL ACTION.**—If the petitioner, real party in interest, or privy of the petitioner files a civil action challenging the validity of a claim of the patent on or after the date on which the petitioner files a petition for inter partes review of the patent, that civil action shall be automatically stayed until either—

(A) the patent owner moves the court to lift the stay;

(B) the patent owner files a civil action or counterclaim alleging that the petitioner, real party in interest, or privy of the petitioner has infringed the patent; or

(C) the petitioner, real party in interest, or privy of the petitioner moves the court to dismiss the civil action.

(3) **TREATMENT OF COUNTERCLAIM.**—A counterclaim challenging the validity of a claim of a patent does not constitute a civil action challenging the validity of a claim of a patent for purposes of this subsection.

(b) **PATENT OWNER'S ACTION.**—An inter partes review may not be instituted if the petition requesting the proceeding is filed more than 1 year after the date on which the petitioner, real party in interest, or privy of the petitioner is served with a complaint alleging infringement of the patent. The time limitation set forth in the preceding sentence shall not apply to a request for joinder under subsection (c).

(c) **JOINER.**—If the Director institutes an inter partes review, the Director, in his or her discretion, may join as a party to that inter partes review any person who properly files a petition under section 311 that the Director, after receiving a preliminary response under section 313 or the expiration of the time for filing such a response, determines warrants the institution of an inter partes review under section 314.

(d) **MULTIPLE PROCEEDINGS.**—Notwithstanding sections 135(a), 251, and 252, and chapter 30, during the pendency of an inter partes review, if another proceeding or matter involving the patent is before the Office, the Director may determine the manner in which the inter partes review or other proceeding or matter may proceed, including providing for stay, transfer, consolidation, or termination of any such matter or proceeding.

(e) **ESTOPPEL.**—

(1) **PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE OFFICE.**—The petitioner in an inter partes review of a claim in a patent under this chapter that results in a final written decision under section 318(a), or the real party in interest or privy of the petitioner, may not re-

quest or maintain a proceeding before the Office with respect to that claim on any ground that the petitioner raised or reasonably could have raised during that inter partes review.

(2) *CIVIL ACTIONS AND OTHER PROCEEDINGS.*—The petitioner in an inter partes review of a claim in a patent under this chapter that results in a final written decision under section 318(a), or the real party in interest or privy of the petitioner, may not assert either in a civil action arising in whole or in part under section 1338 of title 28 or in a proceeding before the International Trade Commission under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 that the claim is invalid on any ground that the petitioner raised or reasonably could have raised during that inter partes review.

§ 316. Conduct of inter partes review

(a) *REGULATIONS.*—The Director shall prescribe regulations—

(1) providing that the file of any proceeding under this chapter shall be made available to the public, except that any petition or document filed with the intent that it be sealed shall, if accompanied by a motion to seal, be treated as sealed pending the outcome of the ruling on the motion;

(2) setting forth the standards for the showing of sufficient grounds to institute a review under section 314(a);

(3) establishing procedures for the submission of supplemental information after the petition is filed;

(4) establishing and governing inter partes review under this chapter and the relationship of such review to other proceedings under this title;

(5) setting forth standards and procedures for discovery of relevant evidence, including that such discovery shall be limited to—

(A) the deposition of witnesses submitting affidavits or declarations; and

(B) what is otherwise necessary in the interest of justice;

(6) prescribing sanctions for abuse of discovery, abuse of process, or any other improper use of the proceeding, such as to harass or to cause unnecessary delay or an unnecessary increase in the cost of the proceeding;

(7) providing for protective orders governing the exchange and submission of confidential information;

(8) providing for the filing by the patent owner of a response to the petition under section 313 after an inter partes review has been instituted, and requiring that the patent owner file with such response, through affidavits or declarations, any additional factual evidence and expert opinions on which the patent owner relies in support of the response;

(9) setting forth standards and procedures for allowing the patent owner to move to amend the patent under subsection (d) to cancel a challenged claim or propose a reasonable number of substitute claims, and ensuring that any information submitted by the patent owner in support of any amendment entered under subsection (d) is made available to the public as part of the prosecution history of the patent;

(10) providing either party with the right to an oral hearing as part of the proceeding;

(11) requiring that the final determination in an inter partes review be issued not later than 1 year after the date on which the Director notices the institution of a review under this chapter, except that the Director may, for good cause shown, extend the 1-year period by not more than 6 months, and may adjust the time periods in this paragraph in the case of joinder under section 315(c);

(12) setting a time period for requesting joinder under section 315(c); and

(13) providing the petitioner with at least 1 opportunity to file written comments within a time period established by the Director.

(b) *CONSIDERATIONS.*—In prescribing regulations under this section, the Director shall consider the effect of any such regulation on the economy, the integrity of the patent system, the efficient administration of the Office, and the ability of the Office to timely complete proceedings instituted under this chapter.

(c) *PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD.*—The Patent Trial and Appeal Board shall, in accordance with section 6, conduct each inter partes review instituted under this chapter.

(d) *AMENDMENT OF THE PATENT.*—

(1) *IN GENERAL.*—During an inter partes review instituted under this chapter, the patent owner may file 1 motion to amend the patent in 1 or more of the following ways:

(A) Cancel any challenged patent claim.

(B) For each challenged claim, propose a reasonable number of substitute claims.

(2) *ADDITIONAL MOTIONS.*—Additional motions to amend may be permitted upon the joint request of the petitioner and the patent owner to materially advance the settlement of a proceeding under section 317, or as permitted by regulations prescribed by the Director.

(3) *SCOPE OF CLAIMS.*—An amendment under this subsection may not enlarge the scope of the claims of the patent or introduce new matter.

(e) *EVIDENTIARY STANDARDS.*—In an inter partes review instituted under this chapter, the petitioner shall have the burden of proving a proposition of unpatentability by a preponderance of the evidence.

§ 317. Settlement

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—An inter partes review instituted under this chapter shall be terminated with respect to any petitioner upon the joint request of the petitioner and the patent owner, unless the Office has decided the merits of the proceeding before the request for termination is filed. If the inter partes review is terminated with respect to a petitioner under this section, no estoppel under section 315(e) shall attach to the petitioner, or to the real party in interest or privy of the petitioner, on the basis of that petitioner's institution of that inter partes review. If no petitioner remains in the inter partes review, the Office may terminate the review or proceed to a final written decision under section 318(a).

(b) *AGREEMENTS IN WRITING.*—Any agreement or understanding between the patent owner and a petitioner, including any collateral agreements referred to in such agreement or understanding, made in connection with, or in contemplation of, the termination of an inter partes review under this section shall be in writing and a true copy of such agreement or understanding shall be filed in the Office before the termination of the inter partes review as between the parties. At the request of a party to the proceeding, the agreement or understanding shall be treated as business confidential information, shall be kept separate from the file of the involved patents, and shall be made available only to Federal Government agencies on written request, or to any person on a showing of good cause.

§ 318. Decision of the Board

(a) *FINAL WRITTEN DECISION.*—If an inter partes review is instituted and not dismissed under this chapter, the Patent Trial and Appeal Board shall issue a final written decision with respect to the patentability of any patent claim challenged by the petitioner and any new claim added under section 316(d).

(b) *CERTIFICATE.*—If the Patent Trial and Appeal Board issues a final written decision under subsection (a) and the time for appeal has expired or any appeal has terminated, the Director shall issue and publish a certificate canceling any claim of the patent finally determined to be unpatentable, confirming any claim of the patent determined to be patentable, and incorporating in the patent by operation of the certificate any new or amended claim determined to be patentable.

(c) *AMENDED OR NEW CLAIM.*—Any proposed amended or new claim determined to be patentable and incorporated into a patent following an inter partes review under this chapter shall have the same effect as that specified in section 252 for reissued patents on the right of any person who made, purchased, or used within the United States, or imported into the United States, anything patented by such proposed amended or new claim, or who made substantial preparation therefor, before the issuance of a certificate under subsection (b).

(d) *DATA ON LENGTH OF REVIEW.*—The Office shall make available to the public data describing the length of time between the institution of, and the issuance of a final written decision under subsection (a) for, each inter partes review.

§ 319. Appeal

A party dissatisfied with the final written decision of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board under section 318(a) may appeal the decision pursuant to sections 141 through 144. Any party to the inter partes review shall have the right to be a party to the appeal.

CHAPTER 32—POST-GRANT REVIEW

Sec.

321. Post-grant review.

322. Petitions.

323. Preliminary response to petition.

324. Institution of post-grant review.

325. Relation to other proceedings or actions.

326. Conduct of post-grant review.

327. Settlement.
 328. Decision of the Board.
 329. Appeal.

§ 321. Post-grant review

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Subject to the provisions of this chapter, a person who is not the patent owner may file with the Office a petition to institute a post-grant review of a patent. The Director shall establish, by regulation, fees to be paid by the person requesting the review, in such amounts as the Director determines to be reasonable, considering the aggregate costs of the post-grant review.

(b) *SCOPE.*—A petitioner in a post-grant review may request to cancel as unpatentable 1 or more claims of a patent on any ground that could be raised under paragraph (2) or (3) of section 282(b) (relating to invalidity of the patent or any claim).

(c) *FILING DEADLINE.*—A petition for a post-grant review may only be filed not later than the date that is 1 year after the date of the grant of the patent or of the issuance of a reissue patent (as the case may be).

§ 322. Petitions

(a) *REQUIREMENTS OF PETITION.*—A petition filed under section 321 may be considered only if—

(1) the petition is accompanied by payment of the fee established by the Director under section 321;

(2) the petition identifies all real parties in interest;

(3) the petition identifies, in writing and with particularity, each claim challenged, the grounds on which the challenge to each claim is based, and the evidence that supports the grounds for the challenge to each claim, including—

(A) copies of patents and printed publications that the petitioner relies upon in support of the petition; and

(B) affidavits or declarations of supporting evidence and opinions, if the petitioner relies on other factual evidence or on expert opinions;

(4) the petition provides such other information as the Director may require by regulation; and

(5) the petitioner provides copies of any of the documents required under paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) to the patent owner or, if applicable, the designated representative of the patent owner.

(b) *PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.*—As soon as practicable after the receipt of a petition under section 321, the Director shall make the petition available to the public.

§ 323. Preliminary response to petition

If a post-grant review petition is filed under section 321, the patent owner shall have the right to file a preliminary response to the petition, within a time period set by the Director, that sets forth reasons why no post-grant review should be instituted based upon the failure of the petition to meet any requirement of this chapter.

§ 324. Institution of post-grant review

(a) *THRESHOLD.*—The Director may not authorize a post-grant review to commence unless the Director determines that the information presented in the petition filed under section 321, if such in-

formation is not rebutted, would demonstrate that it is more likely than not that at least 1 of the claims challenged in the petition is unpatentable.

(b) *ADDITIONAL GROUNDS.*—The determination required under subsection (a) may also be satisfied by a showing that the petition raises a novel or unsettled legal question that is important to other patents or patent applications.

(c) *TIMING.*—The Director shall determine whether to institute a post-grant review under this chapter pursuant to a petition filed under section 321 within 3 months after—

(1) receiving a preliminary response to the petition under section 323; or

(2) if no such preliminary response is filed, the last date on which such response may be filed.

(d) *NOTICE.*—The Director shall notify the petitioner and patent owner, in writing, of the Director's determination under subsection (a) or (b), and shall make such notice available to the public as soon as is practicable. The Director shall make each notice of the institution of a post-grant review available to the public. Such notice shall include the date on which the review shall commence.

(e) *NO APPEAL.*—The determination by the Director whether to institute a post-grant review under this section shall be final and nonappealable.

§ 325. Relation to other proceedings or actions

(a) *INFRINGEMENT'S CIVIL ACTION.*—

(1) *POST-GRANT REVIEW BARRED BY CIVIL ACTION.*—A post-grant review may not be instituted under this chapter if, before the date on which the petition for such a review is filed, the petitioner, real party in interest, or privy of the petitioner filed a civil action challenging the validity of a claim of the patent.

(2) *STAY OF CIVIL ACTION.*—If the petitioner, real party in interest, or privy of the petitioner files a civil action challenging the validity of a claim of the patent on or after the date on which the petitioner files a petition for post-grant review of the patent, that civil action shall be automatically stayed until either—

(A) the patent owner moves the court to lift the stay;

(B) the patent owner files a civil action or counterclaim alleging that the petitioner, real party in interest, or privy of the petitioner has infringed the patent; or

(C) the petitioner, real party in interest, or privy of the petitioner moves the court to dismiss the civil action.

(3) *TREATMENT OF COUNTERCLAIM.*—A counterclaim challenging the validity of a claim of a patent does not constitute a civil action challenging the validity of a claim of a patent for purposes of this subsection.

(b) *PRELIMINARY INJUNCTIONS.*—If a civil action alleging infringement of a patent is filed within 3 months after the date on which the patent is granted, the court may not stay its consideration of the patent owner's motion for a preliminary injunction against infringement of the patent on the basis that a petition for post-grant review has been filed under this chapter or that such a post-grant review has been instituted under this chapter.

(c) *JOINDER.*—If more than 1 petition for a post-grant review under this chapter is properly filed against the same patent and the Director determines that more than 1 of these petitions warrants the institution of a post-grant review under section 324, the Director may consolidate such reviews into a single post-grant review.

(d) *MULTIPLE PROCEEDINGS.*—Notwithstanding sections 135(a), 251, and 252, and chapter 30, during the pendency of any post-grant review under this chapter, if another proceeding or matter involving the patent is before the Office, the Director may determine the manner in which the post-grant review or other proceeding or matter may proceed, including providing for the stay, transfer, consolidation, or termination of any such matter or proceeding. In determining whether to institute or order a proceeding under this chapter, chapter 30, or chapter 31, the Director may take into account whether, and reject the petition or request because, the same or substantially the same prior art or arguments previously were presented to the Office.

(e) *ESTOPPEL.*—

(1) *PROCEEDINGS BEFORE THE OFFICE.*—The petitioner in a post-grant review of a claim in a patent under this chapter that results in a final written decision under section 328(a), or the real party in interest or privy of the petitioner, may not request or maintain a proceeding before the Office with respect to that claim on any ground that the petitioner raised or reasonably could have raised during that post-grant review.

(2) *CIVIL ACTIONS AND OTHER PROCEEDINGS.*—The petitioner in a post-grant review of a claim in a patent under this chapter that results in a final written decision under section 328(a), or the real party in interest or privy of the petitioner, may not assert either in a civil action arising in whole or in part under section 1338 of title 28 or in a proceeding before the International Trade Commission under section 337 of the Tariff Act of 1930 that the claim is invalid on any ground that the petitioner raised or reasonably could have raised during that post-grant review.

(f) *REISSUE PATENTS.*—A post-grant review may not be instituted under this chapter if the petition requests cancellation of a claim in a reissue patent that is identical to or narrower than a claim in the original patent from which the reissue patent was issued, and the time limitations in section 321(c) would bar filing a petition for a post-grant review for such original patent.

§ 326. Conduct of post-grant review

(a) *REGULATIONS.*—The Director shall prescribe regulations—

(1) providing that the file of any proceeding under this chapter shall be made available to the public, except that any petition or document filed with the intent that it be sealed shall, if accompanied by a motion to seal, be treated as sealed pending the outcome of the ruling on the motion;

(2) setting forth the standards for the showing of sufficient grounds to institute a review under subsections (a) and (b) of section 324;

(3) establishing procedures for the submission of supplemental information after the petition is filed;

(4) *establishing and governing a post-grant review under this chapter and the relationship of such review to other proceedings under this title;*

(5) *setting forth standards and procedures for discovery of relevant evidence, including that such discovery shall be limited to evidence directly related to factual assertions advanced by either party in the proceeding;*

(6) *prescribing sanctions for abuse of discovery, abuse of process, or any other improper use of the proceeding, such as to harass or to cause unnecessary delay or an unnecessary increase in the cost of the proceeding;*

(7) *providing for protective orders governing the exchange and submission of confidential information;*

(8) *providing for the filing by the patent owner of a response to the petition under section 323 after a post-grant review has been instituted, and requiring that the patent owner file with such response, through affidavits or declarations, any additional factual evidence and expert opinions on which the patent owner relies in support of the response;*

(9) *setting forth standards and procedures for allowing the patent owner to move to amend the patent under subsection (d) to cancel a challenged claim or propose a reasonable number of substitute claims, and ensuring that any information submitted by the patent owner in support of any amendment entered under subsection (d) is made available to the public as part of the prosecution history of the patent;*

(10) *providing either party with the right to an oral hearing as part of the proceeding; and*

(11) *requiring that the final determination in any post-grant review be issued not later than 1 year after the date on which the Director notices the institution of a proceeding under this chapter, except that the Director may, for good cause shown, extend the 1-year period by not more than 6 months, and may adjust the time periods in this paragraph in the case of joinder under section 325(c).*

(b) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—*In prescribing regulations under this section, the Director shall consider the effect of any such regulation on the economy, the integrity of the patent system, the efficient administration of the Office, and the ability of the Office to timely complete proceedings instituted under this chapter.*

(c) **PATENT TRIAL AND APPEAL BOARD.**—*The Patent Trial and Appeal Board shall, in accordance with section 6, conduct each post-grant review instituted under this chapter.*

(d) **AMENDMENT OF THE PATENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—*During a post-grant review instituted under this chapter, the patent owner may file 1 motion to amend the patent in 1 or more of the following ways:*

(A) *Cancel any challenged patent claim.*

(B) *For each challenged claim, propose a reasonable number of substitute claims.*

(2) **ADDITIONAL MOTIONS.**—*Additional motions to amend may be permitted upon the joint request of the petitioner and the patent owner to materially advance the settlement of a proceeding under section 327, or upon the request of the patent owner for good cause shown.*

(3) *SCOPE OF CLAIMS.*—An amendment under this subsection may not enlarge the scope of the claims of the patent or introduce new matter.

(e) *EVIDENTIARY STANDARDS.*—In a post-grant review instituted under this chapter, the petitioner shall have the burden of proving a proposition of unpatentability by a preponderance of the evidence.

§ 327. Settlement

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—A post-grant review instituted under this chapter shall be terminated with respect to any petitioner upon the joint request of the petitioner and the patent owner, unless the Office has decided the merits of the proceeding before the request for termination is filed. If the post-grant review is terminated with respect to a petitioner under this section, no estoppel under section 325(e) shall attach to the petitioner, or to the real party in interest or privy of the petitioner, on the basis of that petitioner's institution of that post-grant review. If no petitioner remains in the post-grant review, the Office may terminate the post-grant review or proceed to a final written decision under section 328(a).

(b) *AGREEMENTS IN WRITING.*—Any agreement or understanding between the patent owner and a petitioner, including any collateral agreements referred to in such agreement or understanding, made in connection with, or in contemplation of, the termination of a post-grant review under this section shall be in writing, and a true copy of such agreement or understanding shall be filed in the Office before the termination of the post-grant review as between the parties. At the request of a party to the proceeding, the agreement or understanding shall be treated as business confidential information, shall be kept separate from the file of the involved patents, and shall be made available only to Federal Government agencies on written request, or to any person on a showing of good cause.

§ 328. Decision of the Board

(a) *FINAL WRITTEN DECISION.*—If a post-grant review is instituted and not dismissed under this chapter, the Patent Trial and Appeal Board shall issue a final written decision with respect to the patentability of any patent claim challenged by the petitioner and any new claim added under section 326(d).

(b) *CERTIFICATE.*—If the Patent Trial and Appeal Board issues a final written decision under subsection (a) and the time for appeal has expired or any appeal has terminated, the Director shall issue and publish a certificate canceling any claim of the patent finally determined to be unpatentable, confirming any claim of the patent determined to be patentable, and incorporating in the patent by operation of the certificate any new or amended claim determined to be patentable.

(c) *AMENDED OR NEW CLAIM.*—Any proposed amended or new claim determined to be patentable and incorporated into a patent following a post-grant review under this chapter shall have the same effect as that specified in section 252 of this title for reissued patents on the right of any person who made, purchased, or used within the United States, or imported into the United States, anything patented by such proposed amended or new claim, or who

made substantial preparation therefor, before the issuance of a certificate under subsection (b).

(d) DATA ON LENGTH OF REVIEW.—The Office shall make available to the public data describing the length of time between the institution of, and the issuance of a final written decision under subsection (a) for, each post-grant review.

§ 329. Appeal

A party dissatisfied with the final written decision of the Patent Trial and Appeal Board under section 328(a) may appeal the decision pursuant to sections 141 through 144. Any party to the post-grant review shall have the right to be a party to the appeal.

PART IV—PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

* * * * *

CHAPTER 36—INTERNATIONAL STAGE

§ 363. International application designating the United States: Effect

An international application designating the United States shall have the effect, from its international filing date under article 11 of the treaty, of a national application for patent regularly filed in the Patent and Trademark Office [except as otherwise provided in section 102(e) of this title].

§ 365. Right of priority; benefit of the filing date of a prior application

(a) In accordance with the conditions and requirements of subsections (a) through (d) of section 119 [of this title], a national application shall be entitled to the right of priority based on a prior filed international application which designated at least one country other than the United States.

(b) In accordance with the conditions and requirement of section 119(a) [of this title] and the treaty and the Regulations, an international application designating the United States shall be entitled to the right of priority based on a prior foreign application, or a prior international application designating at least one country other than the United States.

(c) In accordance with the conditions and requirements of section 120 [of this title], an international application designating the United States shall be entitled to the benefit of the filing date of a prior national application or a prior international application designating the United States, and a national application shall be entitled to the benefit of the filing date of a prior international application designating the United States. If any claim for the benefit of an earlier filing date is based on a prior international application which designated but did not originate in the United States, the Director may require the filing in the Patent and Trademark Office of a certified copy of such application together with a translation thereof into the English language, if it was filed in another language.

* * * * *

§ 368. Secrecy of certain inventions; filing international applications in foreign countries

(a) International applications filed in the Patent and Trademark Office shall be subject to the provisions of chapter 17 [of this title].

(b) In accordance with article 27(8) of the treaty, the filing of an international application in a country other than the United States on the invention made in this country shall be considered to constitute the filing of an application in a foreign country within the meaning of chapter 17 [of this title], whether or not the United States is designated in that international application.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 37—NATIONAL STAGE

§ 371. National stage: Commencement

(a) * * *

(b) Subject to subsection (f) of this section, the national stage shall commence with the expiration of the applicable time limit under article 22(1) or (2), or under article 39(1)(a) [of the treaty] of the treaty.

(c) The applicant shall file in the Patent and Trademark Office—

(1) the national fee provided in section 41(a) [of this title];

* * * * *

(4) an oath or declaration of the inventor (or other person authorized under chapter 11 [of this title]) complying with the requirements of section 115 [of this title] and with regulations prescribed for oaths or declarations of applicants;

* * * * *

§ 372. National stage: Requirements and procedure

(a) * * *

(b) In case of international applications designating but not originating in, the United States—

(1) * * *

(2) the Director may cause the question of unity of invention to be reexamined under section 121 [of this title], within the scope of the requirements of the treaty and the Regulations; and

* * * * *

§ 373. Improper applicant

An international application designating the United States, shall not be accepted by the Patent and Trademark Office for the national stage if it was filed by anyone not qualified under chapter 11 [of this title] to be an applicant for the purpose of filing a national application in the United States. Such international applications shall not serve as the basis for the benefit of an earlier filing date under section 120 [of this title] in a subsequently filed application, but may serve as the basis for a claim of the right of priority under subsections (a) through (d) of section 119 [of this title],

if the United States was not the sole country designated in such international application.

§ 374. Publication of international application

The publication under the treaty defined in section 351(a) [of this title], of an international application designating the United States shall be deemed a publication under section 122(b), except as provided in [sections 102(e) and 154(d) of this title] *section 154(d)*.

The publication under the treaty of an international application shall confer no rights and shall have no effect under this title other than that of a printed publication.

§ 375. Patent issued on international application: Effect

(a) A patent may be issued by the Director based on an international application designating the United States, in accordance with the provisions of this title. [Subject to section 102(e) of this title, such] *Such* patent shall have the force and effect of a patent issued on a national application filed under the provisions of chapter 11 [of this title].

* * * * *

TITLE 28, UNITED STATES CODE

* * * * *

PART IV—JURISDICTION AND VENUE

* * * * *

CHAPTER 83—COURTS OF APPEALS

* * * * *

§ 1295. Jurisdiction of the united states court of appeals for the federal circuit

(a) The United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit shall have exclusive jurisdiction-

[(1) of an appeal from a final decision of a district court of the United States, the United States District Court for the District of the Canal Zone, the District Court of Guam, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, or the District Court for the Northern Mariana Islands, if the jurisdiction of that court was based, in whole or in part, on section 1338 of this title, except that a case involving a claim arising under any Act of Congress relating to copyrights, exclusive rights in mask works, or trademarks and no other claims under section 1338(a) shall be governed by sections 1291, 1292, and 1294 of this title;]

(1) of an appeal from a final decision of a district court of the United States, the District Court of Guam, the District Court of the Virgin Islands, or the District Court of the Northern Mariana Islands, in any civil action arising under, or in any civil action in which a party has asserted a compulsory

counterclaim arising under, any Act of Congress relating to patents or plant variety protection;

* * * * *

(4) of an appeal from a decision of-

[(A) the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences of the United States Patent and Trademark Office with respect to patent applications and interferences, at the instance of an applicant for a patent or any party to a patent interference, and any such appeal shall waive the right of such applicant or party to proceed under section 145 or 146 of title 35;]

(A) the Patent Trial and Appeal Board of the United States Patent and Trademark Office with respect to a patent application, derivation proceeding, reexamination, post-grant review, or inter partes review under title 35, at the instance of a party who exercised that party's right to participate in the applicable proceeding before or appeal to the Board, except that an applicant or a party to a derivation proceeding may also have remedy by civil action pursuant to section 145 or 146 of title 35; an appeal under this subparagraph of a decision of the Board with respect to an application or derivation proceeding shall waive the right of such applicant or party to proceed under section 145 or 146 of title 35;

* * * * *

CHAPTER 85—COURTS OF APPEALS

* * * * *

§ 1338. Patents, plant variety protection, copyrights, mask works, designs, trademarks, and unfair competition

(a) The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action arising under any Act of Congress relating to patents, plant variety protection, copyrights and trademarks. [Such jurisdiction shall be exclusive of the courts of the states in patent, plant variety protection and copyright cases.] *No State court shall have jurisdiction over any claim for relief arising under any Act of Congress relating to patents, plant variety protection, or copyrights. For purposes of this subsection, the term "State" includes any State of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Northern Mariana Islands.*

* * * * *

CHAPTER 89—DISTRICT COURTS; REMOVAL OF CASES FROM STATE COURTS

Sec.
1441. Actions removable generally.

* * * * *

1454. *Patent, plant variety protection, and copyright cases.*

* * * * *

§ 1454. Patent, plant variety protection, and copyright cases

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—A civil action in which any party asserts a claim for relief arising under any Act of Congress relating to patents, plant variety protection, or copyrights may be removed to the district court of the United States for the district and division embracing the place where the action is pending.

(b) *SPECIAL RULES.*—The removal of an action under this section shall be made in accordance with section 1446, except that if the removal is based solely on this section—

(1) the action may be removed by any party; and

(2) the time limitations contained in section 1446(b) may be extended at any time for cause shown.

(c) *CLARIFICATION OF JURISDICTION IN CERTAIN CASES.*—The court to which a civil action is removed under this section is not precluded from hearing and determining any claim in the civil action because the State court from which the civil action is removed did not have jurisdiction over that claim.

(d) *REMAND.*—If a civil action is removed solely under this section, the district court—

(1) shall remand all claims that are neither a basis for removal under subsection (a) nor within the original or supplemental jurisdiction of the district court under any Act of Congress; and

(2) may, under the circumstances specified in section 1367(c), remand any claims within the supplemental jurisdiction of the district court under section 1367.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 99—GENERAL PROVISIONS

Sec.

1631. Transfer to cure want of jurisdiction.

1632. Transfer by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit.

* * * * *

§ 1632. Transfer by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit

When a case is appealed to the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit under section 1295(a)(1), and no claim for relief arising under any Act of Congress relating to patents or plant variety protection is the subject of the appeal by any party, the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit shall transfer the appeal to the court of appeals for the regional circuit embracing the district from which the appeal has been taken.

* * * * *

TRADEMARK ACT OF 1946

TITLE I—THE PRINCIPAL REGISTER

* * * * *

SEC. 21. (a) * * *

(b)(1) * * *

* * * * *

(4) Where there is an adverse party, such suit may be instituted against the party in interest as shown by the records of the United States Patent and Trademark Office at the time of the decision complained of, but any party in interest may become a party to the action. If there are adverse parties residing in a plurality of districts not embraced within the same State, or an adverse party residing in a foreign country, the [United States District Court for the District of Columbia] *United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia* shall have jurisdiction and may issue summons against the adverse parties directed to the marshal of any district in which any adverse party resides. Summons against adverse parties residing in foreign countries may be served by publication or otherwise as the court directs.

* * * * *

CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

* * * * *

DIVISION B—DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

* * * * *

TITLE VIII—PATENT AND TRADEMARK FEES

* * * * *

SEC. 802. ADJUSTMENT OF TRADEMARK FEES.

(a) FEE FOR FILING APPLICATION.—[During fiscal years 2005, 2006, and 2007,] *Until such time as the Director sets or adjusts the fees otherwise,* under such conditions as may be prescribed by the Director, the fee under section 31(a) of the Trademark Act of 1946 (15 U.S.C. 1113(a)) for: (1) the filing of a paper application for the registration of a trademark shall be \$375; (2) the filing of an electronic application shall be \$325; and (3) the filing of an electronic application meeting certain additional requirements prescribed by the Director shall be \$275. [During fiscal years 2005, 2006, and 2007, the] *The provisions of the second and third sentences of section 31(a) of the Trademark Act of 1946 shall apply to the fees established under this section.*

* * * * *

SEC. 803. EFFECTIVE DATE, APPLICABILITY, AND TRANSITIONAL PROVISION.

(a) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—Except as otherwise provided in this title (including this section), the provisions of this title shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act [and shall apply only with respect to the remaining portion of fiscal year 2005 and fiscal year 2006].

* * * * *

Dissenting Views

Patent reform is one of the most important issues facing Congress and the Nation. Increasingly our nation has an information based economy, and the key to such an economy is intellectual property such as patents, copyrights and trademarks. Studies establish that intellectual property drives this economy to the tune of \$5 trillion dollars, accounting for half of all U.S. exports and employing nearly 18 million workers. This is why the House Judiciary Committee has been working on patent reform for over 6 years, under both parties.

Unfortunately, the legislation does not represent an overall improvement over the status quo and, as presently drafted is not one that I can support. Among other things, I object to provisions in the bill that apply retroactively with regard to business method patents¹ and false markings cases.² Most of the proposed reforms in both the House and Senate patent reform bills such as the other post-grant provisions are applicable going forward, not retroactively. If we are seeking to craft a bipartisan bill with consensus, stripping the legal rights of private parties involved in pending litigation is a non-starter.

Section 18 in the bill is purportedly designed to create an administrative mechanism to review so-called business method patents whose validity has been questioned. However, Section 18 is both too broad and too narrow to serve its purported goal, and works an injustice on legitimate patent holders as a result. Section 18 is overly broad because it is retroactive, applying to patents granted more than a decade ago. It is also overly broad because it could affect patents that have been upheld as valid through additional review at the USPTO, such as *ex parte* re-examination, or that have been held valid by a federal court. It applies not only to business methods but also to apparatus inventions. On the other hand, Section 18 is too narrow because instead of applying to all kinds of business methods, it only applies to financially-related business methods. Further, it is unfair and inappropriate to force specific patent holders that have been through reexamination, or that have survived years of legal challenge, to defend their patents under an entirely new set of rules at the USPTO. It is also contrary to patent law norms and establishes a bad precedent for our trade partners to force a small subset of patent holders—those who have invented financially-related business methods and associated apparatus—to defend themselves in a new, retroactive procedure that does not apply to any other patent holders.

¹America Invents Act, H.R. 1249, 112th Cong. § 18.

²*Id.* § 15(b).

I am also opposed to the section dealing with false markings cases. I say this as a member who has expressed concerns in the past with the Federal Circuit decision in *Forest Group Inc. v. Bon Tool Co.*³ The legislation, in essence, would change the rules of the game for cases that are currently being litigated. To the extent legislation is needed, I support applying the new rules going forward because these rules would be implemented and cases would be adjudicated in conjunction with the new broader reforms of the entire patent system the bill proposes, creating balance and fairness for all parties. Moreover, based on recent court decisions that have already imposed more restrictive standards concerning present claims, there is absolutely no reason for Congress to interfere in these claims which are before the courts.⁴

I am also concerned about the creation of a 3-year safe harbor for companies accused of false marking their products. Providing a safe harbor for expiring patents only compounds the retroactivity problem by ensuring that almost all ongoing litigation will be eliminated.

I would also like to express my support for the Additional Views being filed by other Democratic Members noting improvements that should be made in the bill regarding *inter partes* reexamination.

It is my hope that these and other problems can be alleviated and the bill modified so that it can become a true bipartisan consensus product.

JOHN CONYERS, JR.

Additional Views

Congressional efforts to enact comprehensive patent reform began in the 107th Congress. Since that time, various iterations of patent reform bills have fallen short of the elusive finish-line. Today, however, we are closer than we have ever been to crafting legislation that will strengthen the patent system and afford the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (PTO) the resources it requires to clear the still sizeable backlog of patent applications and move forward to deliver to all American inventors the first rate service they deserve. We are not there yet and the process has not been perfect. But Committee Democrats are encouraged that some of the core provisions we sought, for example, the expansion of prior user rights and the end to fee diversion, are in H.R. 1249. We write separately to highlight our concerns with modifications to the post-grant review procedures designed to provide controls on the quality of issued patents.

A longstanding goal of patent reform has been to improve the PTO's administrative procedures for challenging dubious patents through reexamination. H.R. 1249 creates a new post-grant review procedure to provide an additional check on poor-quality patents than currently available under current law. However, this new procedure is limited to challenges filed within 12 months of the date that a patent is granted. This 12-month deadline will limit the util-

³ *Forest Group, Inc. v. Bon Tool Co.*, 590 F.3d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 2009).

⁴ *Unique Product Solutions, Ltd. v. Hy-Grade Valve, Inc.*, No. 10-1912, 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS (N.D. Ohio Feb. 23, 2011); *In re BP Lubricants USA Inc.*, Misc. Docket No. 960, 2011 U.S. App. LEXIS 5015 (Fed. Cir. March 15, 2011).

ity of the post-grant review as an efficient, low-cost alternative to litigation. The lack of clear notice of the precise scope of a given patent is well documented.¹ In several industries, patents are often multitudinous, vague, and highly abstract. This prevents practitioners from being able to identify and assess relevant patents before they receive some specific warning of liability, which often comes many years after a patent has been issued. For this reason, the National Research Council of the National Academies recommended, at a minimum, the creation of a “second window” for post-grant review challenges triggered by litigation or a threat of enforcement by a patent owner.²

In the absence of a second window, patent reform legislation should maintain the existing system for reexaminations by the PTO, through *ex parte* and *inter partes* procedures. *Inter partes* reexamination in particular provides important ongoing opportunities for expert review of patent validity in some cases. H.R. 1249 maintains this procedure with some changes. We support the continued existence of *inter partes* reexamination³ as well as the creation of the new post-grant review procedure. However, we have significant concerns about the limitations that H.R. 1249 imposes on *inter partes* review.

Use of *inter partes* reexamination is already exceedingly rare in the status quo. In Fiscal Year 2010, 281 reexamination petitions were filed,⁴ while 219,614 utility patents were granted.⁵ The limitations imposed by H.R. 1249 and the managers amendment are motivated by assertions that the *inter partes* procedure may be abused to harass patent owners and interfere with the enforcement of valid patents. However, no empirical evidence, even anecdotally, was proffered to the Committee to demonstrate such abuses occur in the current reexamination system. On the contrary, of the 253 *inter partes* reexaminations decided since the procedure was created in 1999,⁶ 224 (89%) resulted in the modification or nullification of at least one patent claim, which means that the challenges were ultimately found meritorious.⁷ This suggests that further limitations and deterrents against *inter partes* petitions, beyond those already in place in current law, are unnecessary and counter-productive.

Patent reform legislation should seek to expand opportunities for low-cost, efficient alternatives to litigation as a way of resolving disputes about the validity of issued patents. In the context of *inter partes* reexamination, H.R. 1249 does the opposite, by placing unnecessary constraints on a procedure that is already under-utilized. We are particularly concerned about two specific provisions.

First, H.R. 1249 as amended sets a 12-month deadline for a defendant in litigation to file a petition for *inter partes* review, start-

¹ See Federal Trade Commission, *The Evolving IP Marketplace: Aligning Patent Notice and Remedies with Competition* (Mar. 2011), available at <http://www.ftc.gov/os/2011/03/110307patentreport.pdf>.

² National Research Council of the National Academies, *A Patent System for the 21st Century* (2004) at 101.

³ Under Sec. 5 of H.R. 1249, *inter partes* reexamination is renamed as “inter partes review.”

⁴ United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO), *Inter Partes Reexamination Filing Data* (Mar. 31, 2011), available at http://www.uspto.gov/patents/IP_quarterly_report_March_2011.pdf.

⁵ United States Patent and Trademark Office, *U.S. Patent Activity, Calendar Years 1790 to the Present*, available at http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/ac/ido/oeip/taf/h_counts.htm.

⁶ The Optional Inter Partes Reexamination Act, Pub. L. No. 106-113.

⁷ See *Inter Partes Reexamination Filing Data*, *supra* note 4.

ing from the date on which the party is served with a complaint for infringement. The length of this deadline is completely arbitrary, and does not account for the complexity of many patent cases that can encompass dozens of patents and defendants and hundreds of separate patent claims. In such complex cases, the 12-month period imposes an extremely compressed schedule that will not provide enough time for the defendants to prepare and file an *inter partes* petition. Instead, the deadline should be tied to substantive progress in patent litigation, such as the entry of an order by the district court construing the relevant patent claims. This would ensure that defendants have an opportunity to prepare legitimate petitions for *inter partes* review based upon the core issues in a patent case.

Second, H.R. 1249 as amended raises the threshold for initiating an *inter partes* review procedure. In order to initiate a review, the Director must find “a reasonable likelihood that the petitioner would prevail with respect to at least one of the claims challenged in the petition.” The existing threshold—whether a petition raises a “substantial new question of patentability”—should be maintained instead. As noted above, the overwhelming majority of *inter partes* reexaminations that have been initiated under the current standard have been ultimately deemed meritorious. A stricter threshold is therefore unjustified. Moreover, the practical meaning of the new standard in H.R. 1249 is not clear and creates a risk that the PTO will reject legitimate petitions at the outset of the procedure, without further inquiry.

Because of these provisions, we do not support Sec. 5(a) of H.R. 1249. Several Democratic amendments designed to address these provisions were offered but defeated during the markup of the bill. We believe that, at minimum, in order to preserve the existing utility of *inter partes* reexaminations, current law should be maintained. Ensuring the high caliber of patents circulating in the marketplace inures to the benefit of all Americans by stimulating innovation, encouraging investment and creating jobs. We hope that as H.R. 1249 moves closer to the floor, needed revisions will be made to ensure that *inter partes* reexamination remains a viable, efficient alternative to litigation for weeding out bad patents.

HOWARD L. BERMAN.
MELVIN L. WATT.
ZOE LOFGREN.

