HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

Based on Title 35, U.S.C., 1946 ed., § 36 (R.S. 4893).

The first part is revised in language and amplified. The phrase ''and that the invention is sufficiently useful and important'' is omitted as unnecessary, the requirements for patentability being stated in sections 101, 102 and 103.

AMENDMENTS

2002—Pub. L. 107–273 made technical correction to directory language of Pub. L. 106–113. See 1999 Amendment note below.

1999—Pub. L. 106–113, as amended by Pub. L. 107–273, substituted ''Director'' for ''Commissioner'' in two places.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1999 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 106–113 effective 4 months after Nov. 29, 1999, see section 1000(a)(9) [title IV, § 4731] of Pub. L. 106–113, set out as a note under section 1 of this title.

§ 132. Notice of rejection; reexamination

(a) Whenever, on examination, any claim for a patent is rejected, or any objection or requirement made, the Director shall notify the applicant thereof, stating the reasons for such rejection, or objection or requirement, together with such information and references as may be useful in judging of the propriety of continuing the prosecution of his application; and if after receiving such notice, the applicant persists in his claim for a patent, with or without amendment, the application shall be reexamined. No amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention.

(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.

(July 19, 1952, ch. 950, 66 Stat. 801; Pub. L. 106–113, div. B, § 1000(a)(9) [title IV, §§ 4403, 4732(a)(10)(A)], Nov. 29, 1999, 113 Stat. 1536, 1501A–560, 1501A–582; Pub. L. 107–273, div. C, title III, § 13206(b)(1)(B), Nov. 2, 2002, 116 Stat. 1906.)

HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

Based on Title 35, U.S.C., 1946 ed., § 51 (R.S. 4903, amended Aug. 5, 1939, ch. 452, § 1, 53 Stat. 1213).

The first paragraph of the corresponding section of existing statute is revised in language and amplified to incorporate present practice; the second paragraph of the existing statute is placed in section 135.

The last sentence relating to new matter is added but represents no departure from present practice.

AMENDMENTS

2002—Pub. L. 107–273 made technical correction to directory language of Pub. L. 106–113, § 1000(a)(9) [title IV, § 4732(a)(10)(A)]. See 1999 Amendment note below.

1999—Pub. L. 106–113, § 1000(a)(9) [title IV, § 4732(a)(10)(A)], as amended by Pub. L. 107–273, substituted ''Director'' for ''Commissioner''.

Pub. L. 106–113, § 1000(a)(9) [title IV, § 4403], designated existing provisions as subsec. (a) and added subsec. (b).

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1999 AMENDMENT

Pub. L. 106–113, div. B, § 1000(a)(9) [title IV, § 4405(b)], Nov. 29, 1999, 113 Stat. 1536, 1501A–560, provided that: ''The amendments made by section 4403 [amending this section]—

''(1) shall take effect on the date that is 6 months after the date of the enactment of this Act [Nov. 29, 1999], and shall apply to all applications filed under section 111(a) of title 35, United States Code, on or after June 8, 1995, and all applications complying with section 371 of title 35, United States Code, that resulted from international applications filed on or after June 8, 1995; and

''(2) do not apply to applications for design patents under chapter 16 of title 35, United States Code.''

Amendment by section 1000(a)(9) [title IV, § 4732(a)(10)(A)] of Pub. L. 106–113 effective 4 months after Nov. 29, 1999, see section 1000(a)(9) [title IV, § 4731] of Pub. L. 106–113, set out as a note under section 1 of this title.

§ 133. Time for prosecuting application

Upon failure of the applicant to prosecute the application within six months after any action therein, of which notice has been given or mailed to the applicant, or within such shorter time, not less than thirty days, as fixed by the Director in such action, the application shall be regarded as abandoned by the parties thereto, unless it be shown to the satisfaction of the Director that such delay was unavoidable.

(July 19, 1952, ch. 950, 66 Stat. 801; Pub. L. 106–113, div. B, § 1000(a)(9) [title IV, § 4732(a)(10)(A)], Nov. 29, 1999, 113 Stat. 1536, 1501A–582; Pub. L. 107–273, div. C, title III, § 13206(b)(1)(B), Nov. 2, 2002, 116 Stat. 1906.)

HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

Based on Title 35, U.S.C., 1946 ed., § 37 (R.S. 4894, amended (1) Mar. 3, 1897, ch. 391, § 4, 29 Stat. 692, 693, (2) July 6, 1916, ch. 225, § 1, 39 Stat. 345, 347–8, (3) Mar. 2, 1927, ch. 273, § 1, 44 Stat. 1335, (4) Aug. 7, 1939, ch. 568, 53 Stat. 1264).

The opening clause of the corresponding section of existing statute is omitted as having no present day meaning or value and the last two sentences are omitted for inclusion in section 267. The notice is stated as given or mailed. Language is revised.

AMENDMENTS

2002—Pub. L. 107–273 made technical correction to directory language of Pub. L. 106–113. See 1999 Amendment note below.

1999—Pub. L. 106–113, as amended by Pub. L. 107–273, substituted ''Director'' for ''Commissioner'' in two places.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1999 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 106–113 effective 4 months after Nov. 29, 1999, see section 1000(a)(9) [title IV, § 4731] of Pub. L. 106–113, set out as a note under section 1 of this title.

§ 134. Appeal to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences

(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, having once paid the fee for such appeal.

(b) PATENT OWNER.—A patent owner in any reexamination proceeding may appeal from the final rejection of any claim by the primary examiner to the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences, having once paid the fee for such appeal.

(c) THIRD-PARTY.—A third-party requester in an inter partes proceeding may appeal to the

Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences 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.

(July 19, 1952, ch. 950, 66 Stat. 801; Pub. L. 98–622, title II, §204(b)(1), Nov. 8, 1984, 98 Stat. 3388; Pub. L. 106–113, div. B, §1000(a)(9) [title IV, §4605(b)], Nov. 29, 1999, 113 Stat. 1536, 1501A–570; Pub. L. 107–273, div. C, title III, §§13106(b), 13202(b)(1), Nov. 2, 2002, 116 Stat. 1901.)

HISTORICAL AND REVISION NOTES

Based on Title 35, U.S.C., 1946 ed., §57 (R.S. 4909 amended (1) Mar. 2, 1927, ch. 273, §5, 44 Stat. 1335, 1336, (2) Aug. 5, 1939, ch. 451, §2, 53 Stat. 1212).

Reference to reissues is omitted in view of the general provision in section 251. Minor changes in language are made.

AMENDMENTS

2002—Subsecs. (a), (b). Pub. L. 107–273, §13202(b)(1), substituted ''primary examiner'' for ''administrative patent judge''.

Subsec. (c). Pub. L. 107–273, §13202(b)(1), substituted ''primary examiner'' for ''administrative patent judge''.

Pub. L. 107–273, §13106(b), struck out at end ''The third-party requester may not appeal the decision of the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences.''

1999—Pub. L. 106–113 reenacted section catchline without change and amended text generally. Prior to amendment, text read as follows: ''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, having once paid the fee for such appeal.''

1984—Pub. L. 98–622 substituted ''Patent Appeals and Interferences'' for ''Appeals'' in section catchline and text.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 2002 AMENDMENT

Pub. L. 107–273, div. C, title III, §13106(d), Nov. 2, 2002, 116 Stat. 1901, provided that: ''The amendments made by this section [amending this section and sections 141 and 315 of this title] apply with respect to any reexamination proceeding commenced on or after the date of enactment of this Act [Nov. 2, 2002].''

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1999 AMENDMENT

Pub. L. 107–273, div. C, title III, §13202(d), Nov. 2, 2002, 116 Stat. 1902, provided that: ''The amendments made by section 4605(b), (c), and (e) of the Intellectual Property and Communications Omnibus Reform Act, as enacted by section 1000(a)(9) of Public Law 106–113 [amending this section and sections 141 and 145 of this title], shall apply to any reexamination filed in the United States Patent and Trademark Office on or after the date of enactment of Public Law 106–113 [Nov. 29, 1999].''

Amendment by Pub. L. 106–113 effective Nov. 29, 1999, and applicable to any patent issuing from an original application filed in the United States on or after that date, see section 1000(a)(9) [title IV, §4608(a)] of Pub. L. 106–113, set out as a note under section 41 of this title.

EFFECTIVE DATE OF 1984 AMENDMENT

Amendment by Pub. L. 98–622 effective three months after Nov. 8, 1984, see section 207 of Pub. L. 98–622, set out as a note under section 41 of this title.

§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 application 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