

# EXHIBIT J

# Chapter 800 Restriction in Applications Filed Under 35 U.S.C. 111; Double Patenting

<b>801</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	806.05(j)	Related Products; Related Processes
<b>802</b>	<b>Basis for Practice in Statute and Rules</b>	806.06	Independent Inventions
802.01	Meaning of “Independent” and “Distinct”	<b>807</b>	<b>Patentability Report Practice Has No Effect on Restriction Practice</b>
802.02	Definition of Restriction	<b>808</b>	<b>Reasons for Insisting Upon Restriction</b>
<b>803</b>	<b>Restriction — When Proper</b>	808.01	Reasons for Holding of Independence or Distinctness
803.01	Review by Examiner With at Least Partial Signatory Authority	808.01(a)	Species
803.02	Markush Claims	808.02	Establishing Burden
803.03	Transitional Applications	<b>809</b>	<b>Linking Claims</b>
803.03(a)	Transitional Application — Linking Claim Allowable	809.02(a)	Election of Species Required
803.03(b)	Transitional Application — Generic Claim Allowable	809.03	Restriction Between Linked Inventions
803.04	Nucleotide Sequences	<b>810</b>	<b>Action on the Merits</b>
<b>804</b>	<b>Definition of Double Patenting</b>	<b>811</b>	<b>Time for Making Requirement</b>
804.01	Prohibition of Double Patenting Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 121	811.02	New Requirement After Compliance With Preceding Requirement
804.02	Avoiding a Double Patenting Rejection	811.03	Repeating After Withdrawal Proper
804.03	Commonly Owned Inventions of Different Inventive Entities; Non-Commonly Owned Inventions Subject to a Joint Research Agreement	811.04	Proper Even Though Grouped Together in Parent Application
804.04	Submission to Technology Center Director	<b>812</b>	<b>Who Should Make the Requirement</b>
<b>805</b>	<b>Effect of Improper Joinder in Patent</b>	812.01	Telephone Restriction Practice
<b>806</b>	<b>Determination of Distinctness or Independence of Claimed Inventions</b>	<b>814</b>	<b>Indicate Exactly How Application Is To Be Restricted</b>
806.01	Compare Claimed Subject Matter	<b>815</b>	<b>Make Requirement Complete</b>
806.03	Single Embodiment, Claims Defining Same Essential Features	<b>817</b>	<b>Outline of Letter for Restriction Requirement</b>
806.04	Genus and/or Species Inventions	<b>818</b>	<b>Election and Reply</b>
806.04(b)	Species May Be Independent or Related Inventions	818.01	Election Fixed by Action on Claims
806.04(d)	Definition of a Generic Claim	818.02	Election Other Than Express
806.04(e)	Claims Limited to Species	818.02(a)	By Originally Presented Claims
806.04(f)	Restriction Between Mutually Exclusive Species	818.02(b)	Generic Claims Only — No Election of Species
806.04(h)	Species Must Be Patentably Distinct From Each Other	818.02(c)	By Optional Cancellation of Claims
806.04(i)	Generic Claims Presented After Issue of Species	818.03	Express Election and Traverse
806.05	Related Inventions	818.03(a)	Reply Must Be Complete
806.05(a)	Combination and Subcombination	818.03(b)	Must Elect, Even When Requirement Is Traversed
806.05(c)	Criteria of Distinctness Between Combination and Subcombination	818.03(c)	Must Traverse To Preserve Right of Petition
806.05(d)	Subcombinations Usable Together	818.03(d)	Traverse of Restriction Requirement With Linking Claims
806.05(e)	Process and Apparatus for Its Practice	<b>819</b>	<b>Office Generally Does Not Permit Shift</b>
806.05(f)	Process of Making and Product Made	<b>821</b>	<b>Treatment of Claims Held To Be Drawn to Non-elected Inventions</b>
806.05(g)	Apparatus and Product Made	821.01	After Election With Traverse
806.05(h)	Product and Process of Using	821.02	After Election Without Traverse
806.05(i)	Product, Process of Making, and Process of Using	821.03	Claims for Different Invention Added After an Office Action
		821.04	Rejoinder
		821.04(a)	Rejoinder Between Product Inventions; Rejoinder Between Process Inventions
		821.04(b)	Rejoinder of Processes Requiring an Allowable Product

801

## MANUAL OF PATENT EXAMINING PROCEDURE

**822 Claims to Inventions That Are Not Distinct in Plural Applications of Same Inventive Entity**

822.01 Copending Before the Examiner

**823 Unity of Invention Under the Patent Cooperation Treaty****801 Introduction**

This chapter is limited to a discussion of the subject of restriction and double patenting under Title 35 of the United States Code and Title 37 of the Code of Federal Regulations as it relates to national applications filed under 35 U.S.C. 111(a). The discussion of unity of invention under the Patent Cooperation Treaty Articles and Rules as it is applied as an International Searching Authority, International Preliminary Examining Authority, and in applications entering the National Stage under 35 U.S.C. 371 as a Designated or Elected Office in the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is covered in Chapter 1800.

**802 Basis for Practice in Statute and Rules**

The basis for restriction and double patenting practices is found in the following statute and rules:

*35 U.S.C. 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.

*37 CFR 1.141. Different inventions in one national application.*

(a) Two or more independent and distinct inventions may not be claimed in one national application, except that more than one species of an invention, not to exceed a reasonable number, may

be specifically claimed in different claims in one national application, provided the application also includes an allowable claim generic to all the claimed species and all the claims to species in excess of one are written in dependent form (§ 1.75) or otherwise include all the limitations of the generic claim.

(b) Where claims to all three categories, product, process of making, and process of use, are included in a national application, a three way requirement for restriction can only be made where the process of making is distinct from the product. If the process of making and the product are not distinct, the process of using may be joined with the claims directed to the product and the process of making the product even though a showing of distinctness between the product and process of using the product can be made.

*37 CFR 1.142. Requirement for restriction.*

(a) If two or more independent and distinct inventions are claimed in a single application, the examiner in an Office action will require the applicant in the reply to that action to elect an invention to which the claims will be restricted, this official action being called a requirement for restriction (also known as a requirement for division). Such requirement will normally be made before any action on the merits; however, it may be made at any time before final action.

(b) Claims to the invention or inventions not elected, if not canceled, are nevertheless withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner by the election, subject however to reinstatement in the event the requirement for restriction is withdrawn or overruled.

The pertinent Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) Articles and Rules are cited and discussed in Chapter 1800. Sections 1850, 1875, and 1893.03(d) should be consulted for discussions on unity of invention:

- (A) before the International Searching Authority;
- (B) before the International Preliminary Examining Authority; and
- (C) in the National Stage under 35 U.S.C. 371.

**802.01 Meaning of “Independent” and “Distinct” [R-5]**

35 U.S.C. 121 quoted in the preceding section states that the Director may require restriction if two or more “independent and distinct” inventions are claimed in one application. In 37 CFR 1.141, the statement is made that two or more “independent and distinct inventions” may not be claimed in one application.

This raises the question of the inventions as between which the Director may require restriction. This, in turn, depends on the construction of the expression “independent and distinct” inventions.

“Independent”, of course, means not dependent>, or unrelated<. If “distinct” means the same thing, then its use in the statute and in the rule is redundant. If “distinct” means something different, then the question arises as to what the difference in meaning between these two words may be. The hearings before the committees of Congress considering the codification of the patent laws indicate that 35 U.S.C. 121: “enacts as law existing practice with respect to division, at the same time introducing a number of changes.”

The report on the hearings does not mention as a change that is introduced, the inventions between which the Director may properly require division.

The term “independent” as already pointed out, means not dependent>, or unrelated<. A large number of inventions between which, prior to the 1952 Act, division had been proper, are dependent inventions, such as, for example, combination and a subcombination thereof; as process and apparatus used in the practice of the process; as composition and the process in which the composition is used; as process and the product made by such process, etc. If section 121 of the 1952 Act were intended to direct the Director never to approve division between dependent inventions, the word “independent” would clearly have been used alone. If the Director has authority or discretion to restrict independent inventions only, then restriction would be improper as between dependent inventions, e.g., the examples used for purpose of illustration above. Such was clearly not the intent of Congress. Nothing in the language of the statute and nothing in the hearings of the committees indicate any intent to change the substantive law on this subject. On the contrary, joinder of the term “distinct” with the term “independent”, indicates lack of such intent. The law has long been established that dependent inventions (frequently termed related inventions) such as used for illustration above may be properly divided if they are, in fact, “distinct” inventions, even though dependent.

## I. INDEPENDENT

The term “independent” (i.e., \*\*>unrelated<) means that there is no disclosed relationship between the two or more inventions claimed, that is, they are unconnected in design, operation, and effect. For example, a process and an apparatus incapable of

being used in practicing the process are independent inventions. See also MPEP § 806.06 and § 808.01.

## II. >RELATED BUT< DISTINCT

Two or more inventions are related (i.e., not independent) if they are disclosed as connected in at least one of design (e.g., structure or method of manufacture), operation (e.g., function or method of use), or effect. Examples of related inventions include combination and part (subcombination) thereof, process and apparatus for its practice, process and product made, etc. In this definition the term related is used as an alternative for dependent in referring to inventions other than independent inventions.

Related inventions are distinct if the inventions *as claimed* are not connected in at least one of design, operation, or effect (e.g., can be made by, or used in, a materially different process) and wherein at least one invention is PATENTABLE (novel and nonobvious) OVER THE OTHER (though they may each be unpatentable over the prior art). See MPEP § 806.05(c) (combination and subcombination) and § 806.05(j) (related products or related processes) for examples of when a two-way test is required for distinctness.

It is further noted that the terms “independent” and “distinct” are used in decisions with varying meanings. All decisions should be read carefully to determine the meaning intended.

### 802.02 Definition of Restriction [R-3]

Restriction \*\*>is< the practice of requiring an \*\*>applicant to elect a single claimed invention (e.g., a combination or subcombination invention, a product or process invention, a species within a genus) for examination when two or more independent inventions and/or two or more distinct inventions are claimed in an application.<

### 803 Restriction — When Proper [R-3]

Under the statute>, the claims of< an application may properly be required to be restricted to one of two or more claimed inventions only if they are able to support separate patents and they are either independent (MPEP § \*\*>802.01, § 806.06, and § 808.01<) or distinct (MPEP § 806.05 - § \*>806.05(j)<).

803.01

## MANUAL OF PATENT EXAMINING PROCEDURE

If the search and examination of **>all the claims** in an application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine **>them<** on the merits, even though **>they include<** claims to independent or distinct inventions.

&gt;

## I. < CRITERIA FOR RESTRICTION BETWEEN PATENTABLY DISTINCT INVENTIONS

There are two criteria for a proper requirement for restriction between patentably distinct inventions:

(A) The inventions must be independent (see MPEP § 802.01, § **>806.06<**, § 808.01) or distinct as claimed (see MPEP § 806.05 - § **>806.05(j)<**); and

(B) There **>would<** be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is **>not<** required (see MPEP § 803.02, **>§ 808<**, and § 808.02).

&gt;

## II. < GUIDELINES

Examiners must provide reasons and/or examples to support conclusions, but need not cite documents to support the restriction requirement in most cases.

Where plural inventions are capable of being viewed as related in two ways, both applicable criteria for distinctness must be demonstrated to support a restriction requirement.

If there is an express admission that the claimed inventions **>would have been<** obvious over each other within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103, restriction should not be required. *In re Lee*, 199 USPQ 108 (Comm'r Pat. 1978).

For purposes of the initial requirement, a serious burden on the examiner may be *prima facie* shown **>>** by appropriate explanation of separate classification, or separate status in the art, or a different field of search as defined in MPEP § 808.02. That *prima facie* showing may be rebutted by appropriate showings or evidence by the applicant. Insofar as the criteria for restriction practice relating to Markush-type claims is concerned, the criteria is set forth in MPEP § 803.02. Insofar as the criteria for restriction or election practice relating to claims to genus-species, see MPEP § **>806.04<** - § 806.04(i) and § 808.01(a).

## 803.01 Review by Examiner with at Least Partial Signatory Authority [R-3]

Since requirements for restriction under 35 U.S.C. 121 are discretionary with the **>Director<**, it becomes very important that the practice under this section be carefully administered. Notwithstanding the fact that this section of the statute apparently protects the applicant against the dangers that previously might have resulted from compliance with an improper requirement for restriction, IT STILL REMAINS IMPORTANT FROM THE STANDPOINT OF THE PUBLIC INTEREST THAT NO REQUIREMENTS BE MADE WHICH MIGHT RESULT IN THE ISSUANCE OF TWO PATENTS FOR THE SAME INVENTION. Therefore, to guard against this possibility, only an examiner with permanent **>full signatory authority<** or temporary **full signatory authority** may sign final **>>** Office actions containing a final requirement for restriction**>>**. An examiner with permanent **>partial signatory authority<** or temporary **partial signatory authority** may sign non-final Office actions containing a final requirement for restriction.

## 803.02 Markush Claims [R-5]

A Markush-type claim recites alternatives in a format such as "selected from the group consisting of A, B and C." See *Ex parte Markush*, 1925 C.D. 126 (Comm'r Pat. 1925). The members of the Markush group (A, B, and C in the example above) ordinarily must belong to a recognized physical or chemical class or to an art-recognized class. However, when the Markush group occurs in a claim reciting a process or a combination (not a single compound), it is sufficient if the members of the group are disclosed in the specification to possess at least one property in common which is mainly responsible for their function in the claimed relationship, and it is clear from their very nature or from the prior art that all of them possess this property. Inventions in metallurgy, refractories, ceramics, pharmacy, pharmacology and biology are most frequently claimed under the Markush formula but purely mechanical features or process steps may also be claimed by using the Markush style of claiming. See MPEP § 2173.05(h).

# Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

## Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

## Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

## Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

## API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

## LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

## FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

## E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.