§ 41.201
(c) Patent interferences shall be administered such that pendency before the Board is normally no more than two years.


§ 41.201 Definitions.

In addition to the definitions in §§ 41.2 and 41.100, the following definitions apply to proceedings under this subpart:

Accord benefit means Board recognition that a patent application provides a proper constructive reduction to practice under 35 U.S.C. 102(g)(1).

Constructive reduction to practice means a described and enabled anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102(g)(1) in a patent application of the subject matter of a count. Earliest constructive reduction to practice means the first constructive reduction to practice that has been continuously disclosed through a chain of patent applications including in the involved application or patent. For the chain to be continuous, each subsequent application must have been co-pending under 35 U.S.C. 120 or 121 or timely filed under 35 U.S.C. 119 or 365(a).

Count means the Board’s description of the interfering subject matter that sets the scope of admissible proofs on priority. Where there is more than one count, each count must be patentably distinct invention.

Involved claim means, for the purposes of 35 U.S.C. 135(a), a claim that has been designated as corresponding to the count.

Senior party means the party entitled to the presumption under §41.207(a)(1) that it is the prior inventor. Any other party is a junior party.

Threshold issue means an issue that, if resolved in favor of the movant, would deprive the opponent of standing in the interference. Threshold issues may include:

(1) No interference-in-fact, and
(2) In the case of an involved application claim first made after the publication of the movant’s application or issuance of the movant’s patent:
   (i) Repose under 35 U.S.C. 135(b) in view of the movant’s patent or published application, or
   (ii) Unpatentability for lack of written description under 35 U.S.C. 112(1) of an involved application claim where the applicant suggested, or could have suggested, an interference under §41.202(a).

§ 41.202 Suggesting an interference.

(a) Applicant. An applicant, including a reissue applicant, may suggest an interference with another application or a patent. The suggestion must:

(1) Provide sufficient information to identify the application or patent with which the applicant seeks an interference,
(2) Identify all claims the applicant believes interfere, propose one or more counts, and show how the claims correspond to one or more counts,
(3) For each count, provide a claim chart comparing at least one claim of each party corresponding to the count and show why the claims interfere within the meaning of §41.203(a),
(4) Explain in detail why the applicant will prevail on priority,
(5) If a claim has been added or amended to provoke an interference, provide a claim chart showing the written description for each claim in the applicant’s specification, and
(6) For each constructive reduction to practice for which the applicant wishes to be accorded benefit, provide a chart showing where the disclosure provides a constructive reduction to practice within the scope of the interfering subject matter.

(b) Patentee. A patentee cannot suggest an interference under this section but may, to the extent permitted under §1.99 and §1.291 of this title, alert the examiner of an application claiming interfering subject matter to the possibility of an interference.

(c) Examiner. An examiner may require an applicant to add a claim to provoke an interference. Failure to satisfy the requirement within a period (not less than one month) the examiner sets will operate as a concession of priority for the subject matter of the claim. If the interference would be with a patent, the applicant must also comply with paragraphs (a)(2) through (a)(6) of this section. The claim the examiner proposes to have added must,
apart from the question of priority under 35 U.S.C. 102(g):
(1) Be patentable to the applicant, and
(2) Be drawn to patentable subject matter claimed by another applicant or patentee.

(d) Requirement to show priority under 35 U.S.C. 102(g). (1) When an applicant has an earliest constructive reduction to practice that is later than the apparent earliest constructive reduction to practice for a patent or published application claiming interfering subject matter, the applicant must show why it would prevail on priority.
(2) If an applicant fails to show priority under paragraph (d)(1) of this section, an administrative patent judge may nevertheless declare an interference to place the applicant under an order to show cause why judgment should not be entered against the applicant on priority. New evidence in support of priority will not be admitted except on a showing of good cause. The Board may authorize the filing of motions to redefine the interfering subject matter or to change the benefit accorded to the parties.

(e) Sufficiency of showing. (1) A showing of priority under this section is not sufficient unless it would, if unrebutted, support a determination of priority in favor of the party making the showing.
(2) When testimony or production necessary to show priority is not available without authorization under §41.150(c) or §41.156(a), the showing shall include:
(i) Any necessary interrogatory, request for admission, request for production, or deposition request, and
(ii) A detailed proffer of what the response to the interrogatory or request would be expected to be and an explanation of the relevance of the response to the question of priority.

§41.203 Declaration.
(a) Interfering subject matter. An interference exists if the subject matter of a claim of one party would, if prior art, have anticipated or rendered obvious the subject matter of a claim of the opposing party and vice versa.
(b) Notice of declaration. An administrative patent judge declares the patent interference on behalf of the Director. A notice declaring an interference identifies:
(1) The interfering subject matter;
(2) The involved applications, patents, and claims;
(3) The accorded benefit for each count; and
(4) The claims corresponding to each count.

(c) Redeclaration. An administrative patent judge may redeclare a patent interference on behalf of the Director to change the declaration made under paragraph (b) of this section.
(d) A party may suggest the addition of a patent or application to the interference or the declaration of an additional interference. The suggestion should make the showings required under §41.202(a) of this part.

§41.204 Notice of basis for relief.
(a) Priority statement. (1) A party may not submit evidence of its priority in addition to its accorded benefit unless it files a statement setting forth all bases on which the party intends to establish its entitlement to judgment on priority.
(2) The priority statement must:
(i) State the date and location of the party’s earliest corroborated conception,
(ii) State the date and location of the party’s earliest corroborated actual reduction to practice,
(iii) State the earliest corroborated date on which the party’s diligence began, and
(iv) Provide a copy of the earliest document upon which the party will rely to show conception.
(3) If a junior party fails to file a priority statement overcoming a senior party’s accorded benefit, judgment shall be entered against the junior party absent a showing of good cause.
(b) Other substantive motions. The Board may require a party to list the motions it intends to file, including sufficient detail to place the Board and the opponent on notice of the precise relief sought.
(c) Filing and service. The Board will set the times for filing and serving statements required under this section.