

EXHIBIT H

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

801	Introduction	806.05(g)	Apparatus and Product Made — Distinctness
802	Basis for Practice in Statute and Rules	806.05(h)	Product and Process of Using
802.01	Meaning of “Independent” and “Distinct”	806.05(i)	Product, Process of Making, and Process of Using — Product Claim Not Allowable
802.02	Definition of Restriction	807	Patentability Report Practice Has No Effect on Restriction Practice
803	Restriction - When Proper	808	Reasons for Insisting Upon Restriction
803.01	Review by Examiner With at Least Partial Signatory Authority	808.01	Independent Inventions
803.02	Restriction — Markush Claims	808.01(a)	Species
803.03	Restriction — Transitional Applications	808.02	Related Inventions
803.03(a)	Transitional Application — Linking Claim Allowable	809	Claims Linking Distinct Inventions
803.03(b)	Transitional Application — Generic Claim Allowable	809.02	Generic Claim Linking Species
803.04	Restriction - Nucleotide Sequences	809.02(a)	Election Required
804	Definition of Double Patenting	809.02(b)	Election Required — Generic Claim Allowable
804.01	Prohibition of Double Patenting Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 121	809.02(c)	Action Following Election
804.02	Avoiding a Double Patenting Rejection	809.02(d)	No Species Claims
804.03	Treatment of Commonly Owned Cases of Different Inventive Entities	809.02(e)	Generic Claim Allowable in Substance
804.04	Submission to Technology Center Director	809.03	Linking Claims
805	Effect of Improper Joinder in Patent	809.04	Retention of Claims to Nonelected Invention
806	Determination of Distinctness or Independence of Claimed Inventions	810	Action on the Merits
806.01	Compare Claimed Subject Matter	810.01	Not Objectable When Coupled With Requirement
806.02	Patentability Over the Prior Art Not Considered	810.02	Usually Deferred
806.03	Single Embodiment, Claims Defining Same Essential Features	810.03	Given on Elected Invention When Requirement Is Made Final
806.04	Independent Inventions	811	Time for Making Requirement
806.04(a)	Species — Genus	811.02	Even After Compliance With Preceding Requirement
806.04(b)	Species May Be Related Inventions	811.03	Repeating After Withdrawal Proper
806.04(c)	Subcombination Not Generic to Combination	811.04	Proper Even Though Grouped Together in Parent Application
806.04(d)	Definition of a Generic Claim	812	Who Should Make the Requirement
806.04(e)	Claims Restricted to Species	812.01	Telephone Restriction Practice
806.04(f)	Claims Restricted to Species, by Mutually Exclusive Characteristics	814	Indicate Exactly How Application Is To Be Restricted
806.04(h)	Species Must Be Patentably Distinct From Each Other	815	Make Requirement Complete
806.04(i)	Generic Claims Presented for First Time After Issue of Species	816	Give Reasons for Holding of Independence or Distinctness
806.05	Related Inventions	817	Outline of Letter for Restriction Requirement Between Distinct Inventions
806.05(a)	Combination and Subcombination or Element	818	Election and Reply
806.05(b)	Old Combination — Novel Subcombination	818.01	Election Fixed by Action on Claims
806.05(c)	Criteria of Distinctness for Combination, Subcombination, or Element of a Combination	818.02	Election Other Than Express
806.05(d)	Subcombinations Usable Together	818.02(a)	By Originally Presented Claims
806.05(e)	Process and Apparatus for Its Practice — Distinctness	818.02(b)	Generic Claims Only — No Election of Species
806.05(f)	Process of Making and Product Made — Distinctness	818.02(c)	By Optional Cancellation of Claims
		818.03	Express Election and Traverse
		818.03(a)	Reply Must Be Complete
		818.03(b)	Must Elect, Even When Requirement Is Traversed
		818.03(c)	Must Traverse To Preserve Right of Petition

801

MANUAL OF PATENT EXAMINING PROCEDURE

818.03(d) Traverse of Nonallowance of Linking Claims

818.03(e) Applicant Must Make Own Election

819 Office Generally Does Not Permit Shift

819.01 Office May Waive Election and Permit Shift

820 Not an Election; Permissible Shift

820.01 Old Combination Claimed — Not an Election

820.02 Interference Issues — Not an Election

821 Treatment of Claims Held To Be Drawn to Nonelected Inventions

821.01 After Election With Traverse

821.02 After Election Without Traverse

821.03 Claims for Different Invention Added After an Office Action

821.04 Rejoinder

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 refer-

ence 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”

35 U.S.C. 121 quoted in the preceding section states that the Commissioner 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 subjects as between which the Commissioner may require restriction. This, in turn, depends on the construction of the expression “independent and distinct” inventions.

“Independent”, of course, means not dependent. 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 subjects between which the Commissioner may properly require division.

The term “independent” as already pointed out, means not dependent. A large number of subjects between which, prior to the 1952 Act, division had been proper, are dependent subjects, 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 Commissioner never to approve division between dependent inventions, the word “independent” would clearly have been used alone. If the Commissioner 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.

INDEPENDENT

The term “independent” (i.e., not dependent) means that there is no disclosed relationship between the two or more subjects disclosed, that is, they are unconnected in design, operation, or effect, for example: (1) species under a genus which species are not usable together as disclosed; or (2) process and apparatus incapable of being used in practicing the process.

DISTINCT

The term “distinct” means that two or more subjects as disclosed are related, for example, as combination and part (subcombination) thereof, process and apparatus for its practice, process and product made, etc., but are capable of separate manufacture, use, or sale as claimed, AND ARE PATENTABLE (novel and unobvious) OVER EACH OTHER (though they may each be unpatentable because of the prior art). It will be noted that in this definition the term related is used as an alternative for dependent in referring to subjects other than independent subjects.

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

Restriction, a generic term, includes the practice of requiring an election between distinct inventions, for example, election between combination and subcombination inventions, and the practice relating to an election between independent inventions, for example, and election of species.

803 Restriction - When Proper

Under the statute 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

803.01

MANUAL OF PATENT EXAMINING PROCEDURE

(MPEP § 806.04 - § 806.04(i)) or distinct (MPEP § 806.05 - § 806.05(i)).

If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to independent or distinct inventions.

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, § 806.04, § 808.01) or distinct as claimed (see MPEP § 806.05 - § 806.05(i)); and

(B) There must be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction is required (see MPEP § 803.02, § 806.04(a) - § 806.04(i), § 808.01(a), and § 808.02).

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 are 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 if the examiner shows 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(a) - § 806.04(i) and § 808.01(a).

803.01 Review by Examiner with at Least Partial Signatory Authority

Since requirements for restriction under 35 U.S.C. 121 are discretionary with the Commissioner, 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 or temporary full signatory authority may sign final and non-final Office actions containing a final requirement for restriction, except that an examiner with permanent or temporary partial signatory authority may sign non-final Office actions containing a final requirement for restriction.

803.02 Restriction — Markush Claims

PRACTICE RE MARKUSH-TYPE CLAIMS

If the members of the Markush group are sufficiently few in number or so closely related that a search and examination of the entire claim can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine all the members of the Markush group in the claim on the merits, even though they are directed to independent and distinct inventions. In such a case, the examiner will not follow the procedure described below and will not require restriction.

Since the decisions in *In re Weber*, 580 F.2d 455, 198 USPQ 328 (CCPA 1978) and *In re Haas*, 580 F.2d 461, 198 USPQ 334 (CCPA 1978), it is improper for the Office to refuse to examine that which applicants regard as their invention, unless the subject matter in a claim lacks unity of invention. *In re Harnish*, 631 F.2d 716, 206 USPQ 300 (CCPA 1980); and *Ex parte Hozumi*, 3 USPQ2d 1059 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1984). Broadly, unity of invention exists where compounds included within a Markush group (1) share a

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.