

EXHIBIT I

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

801	Introduction	806.05(g)	Apparatus and Product Made *
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 **
802.02	Definition of Restriction	>806.05(j)	Related Products; Related Processes
803	Restriction — When Proper	806.06	Independent Inventions<
803.01	Review by Examiner With at Least Partial Signatory Authority	807	Patentability Report Practice Has No Effect on Restriction Practice
803.02	* Markush Claims	808	Reasons for Insisting Upon Restriction
803.03	* Transitional Applications	808.01	**>Reasons for Holding of Independence or Distinctness<
803.03(a)	Transitional Application — Linking Claim Allowable	808.01(a)	Species
803.03(b)	Transitional Application — Generic Claim Allowable	808.02	**>Establishing Burden<
803.04	* Nucleotide Sequences	809	* Linking **>Claims<
804	Definition of Double Patenting	**	
804.01	Prohibition of Double Patenting Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 121	809.02(a)	Election >of Species< Required
804.02	Avoiding a Double Patenting Rejection	**	
804.03	** Commonly Owned *>Inventions< of Different Inventive Entities>; Non-Commonly Owned *>Inventions< Subject to a Joint Research Agreement<	809.03	**>Restriction Between Linked Inventions<
804.04	Submission to Technology Center Director	**	
805	Effect of Improper Joinder in Patent	810	Action on the Merits
806	Determination of Distinctness or Independence of Claimed Inventions	**	
806.01	Compare Claimed Subject Matter	811	Time for Making Requirement
**		811.02	*>New Requirement< After Compliance With Preceding Requirement
806.03	Single Embodiment, Claims Defining Same Essential Features	811.03	Repeating After Withdrawal Proper
806.04	**>Genus and/or Species< Inventions	811.04	Proper Even Though Grouped Together in Parent Application
**		812	Who Should Make the Requirement
806.04(b)	Species May Be >Independent or< Related Inventions	812.01	Telephone Restriction Practice
**		814	Indicate Exactly How Application Is To Be Restricted
806.04(d)	Definition of a Generic Claim	815	Make Requirement Complete
806.04(e)	Claims * >Limited< to Species	**	
806.04(f)	**>Restriction Between< Mutually Exclusive *>Species<	817	Outline of Letter for Restriction Requirement
806.04(h)	Species Must Be Patentably Distinct From Each Other	**	
806.04(i)	Generic Claims Presented ** After Issue of Species	818	Election and Reply
806.05	Related Inventions	818.01	Election Fixed by Action on Claims
806.05(a)	Combination and Subcombination **	818.02	Election Other Than Express
**		818.02(a)	By Originally Presented Claims
806.05(c)	Criteria of Distinctness *>Between< Combination *>and< Subcombination **	818.02(b)	Generic Claims Only — No Election of Species
806.05(d)	Subcombinations Usable Together	818.02(c)	By Optional Cancellation of Claims
806.05(e)	Process and Apparatus for Its Practice *	818.03	Express Election and Traverse
806.05(f)	Process of Making and Product Made *	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
		818.03(d)	Traverse of **>Restriction Requirement With< Linking Claims
		**	
		819	Office Generally Does Not Permit Shift
		**	

801

MANUAL OF PATENT EXAMINING PROCEDURE

821 Treatment of Claims Held To Be Drawn to Non-elected 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
- >821.04(a) Rejoinder Between Product Inventions; Rejoinder Between Process Inventions
- 821.04(b) Rejoinder of Process Requiring an Allowable Product<

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-3]

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. 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. 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., not dependent) 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. < 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)).

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.

>

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).

>

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-3]

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

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.