

Summary Contents

	<i>Main Volume</i>	<i>Supple- ment</i>
Preface	vii	v
Acknowledgments	xiii	—
About the Authors	xv	—

I. DECIDING WHETHER OR NOT TO SEEK PATENT PROTECTION

1. Electronic and Software Technologies.....	1	3
2. Relationship to Other Intellectual Property Areas ...	31	9
3. Searching Software Inventions.....	61	11
4. Practice Under <i>Alappat</i> (and Its Progeny) and the PTO Guidelines	87	21

II. DRAFTING THE APPLICATION

5. Drafting the Specification	201	35
6. Crafting the Claims	217	49
7. Crafting the Patent Application to Achieve Broad Claim Interpretation.....	245	53
8. An Introduction to Functional Language and Means Expressions	293	63
9. Functional Claim Drafting in the Electronics, Computer, and Software Arts	319	67

III. PROSECUTING THE APPLICATION

10. Prosecution of Electronic and Software Patents	341	85
11. Foreign Patent Prosecution.....	375	103

IV. MANAGING PATENTS IN BUSINESS AND LITIGATION

12. Patent Portfolio Development.....	423	107
13. Noninfringement, Invalidity, and Unenforceability Opinions.....	439	115
14. Design-Around Techniques	557	143
15. Litigation of Patents Involving Software Technology	575	147

V. DEVELOPING AREAS OF LAW

16. Miscellaneous Practice Areas.....	597	171
---------------------------------------	-----	-----

APPENDIXES

Appendix A: Patent Application Checklist.....	615	—
Appendix B: Sample Software Patent	621	—
Appendix C: Sample Electronics Patent	667	—
Appendix D: Sample Business Method Patent.....	—	173
Appendix E: Sample Design Patents.....	—	209
Table of Cases	701	229
Index	721	235

Detailed Table of Contents

	<i>Main Volume</i>	<i>Supple- ment</i>
Preface	vii	v
Acknowledgments	xiii	—
About the Authors	xv	—

I. DECIDING WHETHER OR NOT TO SEEK PATENT PROTECTION

1. Electronic and Software Technologies.....	1	3
§1.01 Introduction	1	—
§1.02 Short History of Electronic Technology	2	—
A. Electron Tubes	3	—
B. Transistors.....	3	—
1. Bipolar Transistors	4	—
2. Four-Layer Devices.....	5	—
3. Field Effect Devices	5	—
C. Integrated Circuits.....	6	—
D. Application Specific Integrated Circuits (ASICs).....	7	—
§1.03 Computer Technologies	8	—
A. History	8	—
B. Basic Computer Technology.....	12	—
C. Von Neumann Computers.....	14	—
D. Non-von Neumann Computers	15	—
E. Supercomputers, Mainframes, Workstations, and Microcomputers.....	16	—
§1.04 Computer Software.....	19	3
A. Compilers and Interpreters.....	19	—
B. Programming Languages	20	—
C. Operating Systems.....	22	—
D. Applications Software.....	26	—

	<i>Main</i>	<i>Supple-</i>
	<i>Volume</i>	<i>ment</i>
E. The Internet	27	3
§1.05 Conclusion	29	—
Main Volume Footnote Updates	—	5
2. Relationship to Other Intellectual Property Areas ...	31	9
§2.01 Introduction	32	—
§2.02 Trade Secret Protection	33	9
A. Overview of Trade Secrets	33	—
1. Trade Secrets Defined	33	—
2. Elements of a Trade Secret.....	33	—
3. Actions for Trade Secret		
Misappropriation.....	36	—
a. Proving the Existence of the Trade		
Secret	36	—
b. Proving the Trade Secret Was		
Improperly Obtained	37	—
4. Remedies for Misappropriation.....	38	—
B. Trade Secrets Compared to Patents.....	39	9
1. Disclosure	39	9
2. Newness: Novelty and Nonobviousness .	40	—
3. Inventorship	41	—
4. Term of Protection	41	—
C. No Preemption by Patent Law	42	—
§2.03 Trademark Protection	43	10
A. Trademarks Defined	43	—
B. Trademark Protection Compared to		
Patent Protection	44	—
1. Creation of Rights.....	44	—
2. Length of Protection	45	—
3. Infringement.....	45	—
C. Trade Dress and Utility Patents		
[New Topic].....	—	10
§2.04 Copyright Protection	47	—
A. Overview of Copyrights	47	—
1. Copyright Defined	47	—
2. Copyright Registration	48	—
3. Copyright Infringement.....	48	—
4. Remedies for Infringement.....	49	—
B. Copyright Protection Compared to Patent		
Protection for Computer Software.....	49	—
1. Scope and Type of Protection.....	50	—
2. Newness Versus Novelty and		
Nonobviousness	51	—
3. Term of Protection	51	—
C. Important Copyright Cases.....	52	—
1. <i>Baker v. Selden</i>	52	—
2. <i>Mazer v. Stein</i>	52	—

	<i>Main</i> Volume	<i>Supple-</i> <i>ment</i>
3. <i>In re Yardley</i>	52	—
D. Computer Software Copyright Cases	53	—
1. <i>Whelan v. Jaslow Dental Lab</i>	53	—
2. <i>Computer Associates v. Altai's</i> Abstraction-Filtration-Comparison Test	53	—
3. <i>Sega v. Accolade's</i> Reverse Engineering as Fair Use	54	—
E. Patent/Copyright Interface.....	54	—
1. <i>Lotus v. Borland</i>	54	—
§2.05 Combining Patent, Copyright, and Trade Secret Protection.....	55	—
A. Patent and Copyright Not Mutually Exclusive.....	55	—
B. Withholding Code as Trade Secret While Patenting Corresponding Method or Apparatus	56	—
C. Use of Copyright Notices in Specification and Drawing.....	57	—
§2.06 Further Studies in Other Intellectual Property Areas.....	58	—
3. Searching Software Inventions	61	11
§3.01 Introduction and Brief History.....	61	11
§3.02 How to Search Software Inventions.....	65	12
A. Timing of Searches	65	—
B. Choosing Search Resources/Databases	65	12
1. U.S. Patent Office and On-Line Patent Databases, U.S. and Foreign	67	12
2. On-Line Literature Databases	70	15
3. In-House CD-ROMs	74	—
4. Internet Databases	75	—
4. Internet Search Engines [Formerly Internet Databases]	—	19
C. Developing a Search Strategy.....	78	—
D. Software Search Example	79	—
§3.03 Summary	84	—
4. Practice Under <i>Alappat</i> (and Its Progeny) and the PTO Guidelines	87	21
§4.01 Introduction: Impact of <i>Allapat</i> and the Examination Guidelines for Computer- Related Inventions on 35 U.S.C. §101	89	—
§4.02 Primary Authorities: Section 101 and the Supreme Court's Trilogy of Statutory Subject Matter Decisions	90	—
A. Section 101: Scant Guidance.....	90	—

		Main Volume	Supple- ment
	B. <i>Benson</i> : Nonstatutory Unapplied Mathematical Process.....	91	—
	C. <i>Flook</i> : Nonstatutory Postsolution Activity.	93	—
	D. <i>Chakrabarty</i> : The Impact of Section 101 on New Technology.....	95	—
	E. <i>Diehr</i> : Statutory Use of a Mathematical Formula.....	96	—
§4.03	Rise and Fall of the <i>Freeman-Walter-Abele</i> Two-Step Test.....	99	—
	A. <i>Freeman</i> : The Initial Statement of the Two-Step Test.....	99	—
	B. <i>Walter</i> : Restriction of the Two-Step Test...	99	—
	C. <i>Abele</i> : Expansion of the Scope of Statutory Inventions.....	101	—
	D. Other Section 101 Tests.....	103	—
	E. <i>Schrader</i> : Extreme Application of <i>Freeman-Walter-Abele</i> Test.....	104	—
§4.04	Federal Circuit Return to the Primary Authorities.....	108	—
	A. <i>Alappat</i> : Demotion of the <i>Freeman-</i> <i>Walter-Abele</i> Test.....	108	—
	B. <i>Warmerdam</i> : Inapplicability of the <i>Freeman-Walter-Abele</i> Test.....	110	—
§4.05	Use of 35 U.S.C. §112, Paragraph 6, in Section 101 Determinations.....	112	—
	A. The <i>Walter Burden</i> (or Test).....	112	—
	B. <i>Iwahashi</i> : Reliance on Disclosed Digital Circuits.....	114	—
	C. <i>Arrhythmia</i> : Statutory Presolution Activity.....	117	—
	D. <i>Donaldson</i> : Obligatory Use by PTO of Paragraph 6 in 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103 Determinations.....	120	—
	E. <i>Alappat</i> : Obligatory Use by PTO of Paragraph 6 in Section 101 Determinations.....	122	—
§4.06	Statutory Data Structures.....	125	—
	A. <i>Warmerdam</i> : Statutory Data Structure.....	125	—
	B. <i>Lowry</i> : Inapplicability of Section 103 Printed Matter Rejection to Data Structures.....	127	—
	C. <i>Beauregard</i> : Applicability of <i>Lowry</i> Rationale to Section 101 Determinations.....	131	—
§4.07	Further Refinement of Use of Paragraph 6 in Section 101 Determinations.....	137	—
	A. <i>Trovato</i> : Software Disclosure.....	137	—

		Main Volume	Supple- ment
	B. <i>Fraenkel</i> : Hardware and Software Disclosure	146	—
§4.08	PTO Guidelines: Expansion of Statutory Computer-Related Inventions Based on <i>Alappat</i> and Its Progeny	152	21
	A. Purpose and Impact of the Guidelines	152	—
	B. Reliance on the Primary Authorities	157	—
	C. Functional and Nonfunctional Descriptive Material	158	21
	D. Apparatus Claims for Specific Machines and Articles of Manufacture	163	—
	E. Practical Application of the Underlying Process	165	22
	1. PTO Claim Example: Sale of Mutual Funds [New Topic]	—	22
	2. PTO Claim Example: Matrix Multiplication [New Topic]	—	24
	3. PTO Claim Example: Training a Neural Network [New Topic]	—	25
	4. PTO Claim Example: Determine Risk of Market Securities [New Topic]	—	27
	F. Examination of All Inventions Under Sections 102, 103, and 112, Paragraphs 1, 2, and 6	169	—
§4.09	<i>State Street</i> : Statutory Financial Construct... ..	170	29
	A. Financial Construct/Investment Structure Protected by the Signature Patent	170	—
	B. Signature's Claims Held Statutory	171	—
	C. <i>Schrader</i> Revisited	175	—
	D. Different Rationales of the Guidelines and the <i>State Street</i> Court	185	—
	E. <i>AT&T</i> Confirms <i>State Street</i> and Questions <i>Schrader</i> [New Topic]	—	29
§4.10	Lessons of <i>Alappat</i> (and Its Progeny) and the Guidelines	195	—
	A. New Touchstones for Defining Statutory Computer-Related Inventions	195	—
	B. Effect of Paragraph 6 on Claim and Specification Preparation	196	—
	C. New Claim Formats	198	—

II. DRAFTING THE APPLICATION

5.	Drafting the Specification	201	35
§5.01	Introduction	201	—
§5.02	Enablement Requirement	202	35

	<i>Main Volume</i>	<i>Supple- ment</i>
§5.03 Best Mode Requirement.....	205	35
§5.04 Written Description Requirement.....	206	36
§5.05 Preparing the Specification.....	207	—
A. Understanding the Invention.....	207	—
B. Describing the Invention.....	209	—
1. Functional Block Diagrams.....	210	—
2. Flowchart Diagrams.....	211	—
3. State Diagrams.....	213	—
C. Alternative Embodiments.....	214	—
§5.06 Conclusion.....	214	—
Main Volume Footnote Updates.....	—	48
6. Crafting the Claims.....	217	49
§6.01 Introduction.....	218	—
§6.02 Preparing to Draft Claims.....	218	49
A. Gathering Information About the Invention.....	218	—
1. Interview Step One.....	219	—
2. Interview Step Two.....	219	—
3. Interview Step Three.....	219	—
B. Planning and Outlining the Claims.....	219	—
C. Outlining the Broadest Independent Claim.....	220	—
D. Outlining the Dependent Claims.....	220	—
E. Outlining Additional Independent Claims.....	221	—
F. Critical Review of Claim Strings.....	222	—
G. Converting Claim Outlines to Claims.....	223	—
H. Patent and Trademark Office Considerations.....	224	—
I. <i>Festo</i> Considerations [New Topic].....	—	49
§6.03 Basic Rules of Claim Drafting.....	225	—
A. Claim Overview.....	226	—
B. Claim Structure.....	227	—
1. Preamble.....	227	—
2. Transitional Phrase.....	228	—
3. Body.....	229	—
C. Basic Claim Types.....	230	—
1. Method Claims.....	230	—
2. Apparatus Claims.....	230	—
3. Article Claims.....	231	—
D. Mathematical Algorithms.....	231	—
E. Claim Differentiation.....	232	—
§6.04 Sample Electronic Circuit and Hardware Claims.....	232	51
A. Sample Electronic Circuit Claims.....	233	—

		<i>Main</i>	<i>Supple-</i>
		<i>Volume</i>	<i>ment</i>
1. Sample Apparatus Claim (Without Means-Plus-Function Language)	234		—
2. Sample Apparatus Claim (With Means-Plus-Function Language)	234		—
3. Sample Method Claim	235		—
A1. Sample Electronic Circuit Claims of Varying Scope [New Topic]	—		51
B. Sample Hardware Claims	236		—
1. Sample Apparatus Claim (Without Means-Plus-Function Language)	236		—
2. Sample Apparatus Claim (With Means-Plus-Function Language)	237		—
3. Sample Method Claims	237		—
§6.05 Sample Software Claims	238		—
A. Method Claims	238		—
1. Sample Method Claim	239		—
B. Apparatus Claims	239		—
1. Sample Apparatus Claims	240		—
C. Computer-Readable Medium Claims	240		—
1. Sample Computer-Readable Medium Claim	241		—
D. Data Structure Claims	241		—
1. Sample Data Structure Claim	242		—
E. API and Protocol Claims	242		—
1. Sample API Claim	242		—
F. User Interface Claims	243		—
1. Sample UI Claim	243		—
7. Crafting the Patent Application to Achieve Broad Claim Interpretation	245		53
§7.01 Introduction	247		—
§7.02 Rules Governing Claim Interpretation by the Courts	248		—
§7.03 Language of the Claims	250		—
A. Ordinary Meaning	250		—
1. Breadth or Scope of Claim Coverage Is the Real Issue Behind Disputes in Court About the Ordinary Meaning of Words in a Claim	251		—
a. Interpretation of the Ordinary Meaning of a Claim Term Can Be Derived From the Totality of the Intrinsic and Extrinsic Evidence	251		—
b. Prosecution History Cannot Change an Interpretation of a Claim Term Unambiguously Defined in the Specification	252		—

c. Therefore, the Specification Is Especially Relevant to a Determination of Whether the Ordinary Meaning of Claim Language Encompasses an Accused Infringing Device	253	—
2. Functional Claim Language Describing Structural Features of an Invention Merits Broad Construction Only if It Suggests a Variety of Particular Structures to One Skilled in the Art.....	254	—
3. The Complexity of the Patented Technology May Influence Application of the Rules of Claim Construction	255	—
a. Example of a Case Involving a More Complex Technology and a Claim Using a More Specialized Term.....	256	—
b. Example of a Case Involving a Less Complex Technology and a Claim Using a Less Specialized Term.....	257	—
c. Therefore, in Complex Technologies, It Is Especially Important That the Specification Support a Broad Claim Interpretation	258	—
B. Patentee as Lexicographer.....	258	—
1. Risk of Adding Additional Ambiguities.....	258	—
2. Need to Explain Desired Broader Meaning in the Specification	260	—
a. Use of a Generalizing Term With an Ordinary Term Does Not Necessarily Broaden the Scope of the Ordinary Term.....	260	—
b. Limited Examples in the Specification May Limit the Construction of a Claim Term	261	—
C. Numerical Ranges.....	262	—
D. Linking Terms.....	264	—
1. Examples of Cases in Which a Linking Term Is Construed Broadly	264	—
a. Functional Versus Mechanical Linking.....	264	—
b. Functional Versus Structural Linking.....	265	—
2. Examples of Cases in Which a Linking Term Is Construed Narrowly.....	266	—
a. Temporal Linking	266	—

		<i>Main</i>	<i>Supple-</i>
		<i>Volume</i>	<i>ment</i>
	b. Explaining a Physical Relationship Among Claim Elements.....	268	—
	3. Therefore, Evaluation of “Linking Terms” to Identify Potential Broad and Narrow Interpretations Is an Important Aspect of Crafting the Claims	269	—
§7.04	The Specification.....	269	—
	A. Implicitly Defining a Word Relative to Its Function in the Context of the Invention	270	—
	1. “Smooth”	270	—
	2. “Conductive”	271	—
	B. Impact of Statements of Purpose or Advantage in the Specification	272	—
	1. Statements of Advantage	272	—
	2. Statement of Purpose	274	—
	3. Need to Qualify Statements of Advantage or Purpose	275	—
	C. Providing a More Complete Understanding of the Invention in the Description of Preferred and Alternative Embodiments.....	276	—
	1. Permissible Claim Scope May Be Limited to the Disclosed Embodiment if the Specification Fails to Suggest Otherwise.....	277	—
	2. Clearly Explaining the Invention Throughout the Specification Promotes Claim Interpretations Consistent With the Invention’s Full Scope.....	278	—
	3. Therefore, Use Language Throughout the Specification That Explains the Full Scope of the Invention	279	—
§7.05	Prosecution History	280	—
	A. Importance of Carefully Circumscribed and Limited Statements Distinguishing Prior Art	280	—
	B. Importance of Precision in Amendments to Avoid Prior Art	281	—
	C. Amendment to and Statements About Claim Language During Prosecution Can Impart a Narrower Meaning Different From Ordinary Meaning	282	—
	D. Patentee’s Statements Affect Interpretation Even if the Examiner Does Not Rely on Them.....	283	—

		Main Volume	Supple- ment
	E. Statements in an Information Disclosure Statement	286	—
§7.06	Extrinsic Evidence.....	286	—
	A. Expert Testimony.....	287	—
	1. Extrinsic Evidence Admissible in Cases of Ambiguity	287	—
	2. Extrinsic Evidence as Supplementing Intrinsic Evidence.....	289	—
	B. Dictionaries and Technical References	290	—
§7.06A	Subjective Aspects of Claim Interpretation: Analysis Informed by an Understanding of the Invention Versus Projection of Disclosed Embodiments [New Topic].....	—	53
	A. A Case in Which Intrinsic Evidence that Revealed the Relationship Between the Words of the Claim, the Problem to Which the Invention Was Addressed, and the Nature of the Inventive Solution Encouraged an Informed Analysis in View of the Invention	—	55
	B. A Case in Which Intrinsic Evidence that Failed to Align the Claim Language with Inventive Concepts Invited a Claim Construction by Projection of the Disclosed Embodiments onto the Claim Language	—	59
§7.07	Conclusion.....	291	62
8.	An Introduction to Functional Language and Means Expressions	293	63
§8.01	Introduction	294	—
§8.02	A Primer on Means-Plus-Function Claims and Their History	295	—
	A. The Patent Act of 1952.....	295	—
	B. Congressional Intent.....	296	—
	1. <i>Halliburton v. Walker</i>	297	—
	2. Congressional Response to <i>Halliburton</i>	297	—
§8.03	Prosecuting Means-Plus-Function Claims: The <i>Donaldson</i> Approach.....	299	63
	A. <i>Donaldson</i>	299	—
	B. <i>In re Lundberg</i>	300	—
	C. <i>In re Iwahashi</i>	301	—
	D. PTO Guidelines.....	301	63
§8.04	Means-Plus-Function Claims in the Special Context of Computer Software Inventions	303	64
	A. <i>In re Alappat</i>	303	—

	Main Volume	Supple- ment
A1. <i>WMS Gaming, Inc. v. International Gaming Technology</i> [New Topic]	—	64
A2. <i>Globetrotter Software, Inc. v. Elan Computer Group, Inc.</i> [New Topic]	—	65
B. Recitation of Hardware Necessary in Software Patents	306	—
§8.05 Litigation of Means-Plus-Function Claims	308	—
A. Claim Differentiation	308	—
B. <i>Laitram v. Rexnord</i>	310	—
C. Measuring Scope of Means-Plus-Function Claims	311	—
D. Properly Drafting Means-Plus-Function Claims	311	—
§8.06 A Claim-Drafting Exercise	313	—
A. The Hypothetical Specification	313	—
B. Hypothetical Claims	315	—
C. Analysis of the Claims	315	—
1. Claim 1	315	—
2. Claim 2	317	—
§8.07 Conclusion	318	—
9. Functional Claim Drafting in the Electronics, Computer, and Software Arts	319	67
§9.01 Introduction	320	—
§9.02 Applicability of Section 112, Paragraph 6, to Determinations of Patentability Under 35 U.S.C. §102 or §103: General Observations	320	67
§9.03 <i>In re Donaldson</i> and Its Impact	322	68
A. Facts and Procedure in <i>Donaldson</i>	323	—
B. Analysis in <i>Donaldson</i>	324	—
C. Effect of <i>Donaldson</i>	326	68
§9.04 PTO and Practitioner Implementation of <i>In re Donaldson</i> Under the PTO Guidelines	328	69
A. When Is a Means or Step for Performing a Specified Function Within Section 112, Paragraph 6?	330	69
B. How Does Equivalency Affect the Scope of the Search and the Prior Art That May Be Cited by an Examiner?	330	—
C. How Is a Prima Facie Case Made (or Rebutted) as to Whether Prior Art Is Equivalent?	331	71
1. Making a Prima Facie Case	331	71
2. Applicant's Response	332	72
§9.05 Developments Subsequent to <i>Donaldson</i> and the PTO Guidelines	334	73

	<i>Main</i>	<i>Supple-</i>
	<i>Volume</i>	<i>ment</i>
A. Importance of Selecting Proper Claim		
Terminology	335	73
1. General Rule	335	73
2. Terminology in Method Claims	336	75
B. Importance of Identifying Corresponding Material, Acts, or Structure in the Specification.....	338	76
C. Determining What is “Equivalent” to the Corresponding Structure, Material, or Acts [New Topic]	—	77
§9.06 Conclusion	339	—
Main Volume Footnote Updates	—	80

III. PROSECUTING THE APPLICATION

10. Prosecution of Electronic and Software Patents	341	85
§10.01 Introduction	342	85
§10.02 Examiner Pressure: Outrage Rolls Downhill	343	87
§10.03 Production Quotas: Guidance From the Hand That Feeds	347	88
§10.04 Prosecution Types.....	349	89
A. Overview	349	—
B. Type 1: Textbook.....	350	89
1. Attributes.....	351	—
2. Frequency	351	—
3. Experience	351	—
4. Prosecution Duration.....	351	—
5. Tips and Traps	352	—
6. Update [New Topic]	—	89
C. Type 2: Dead on Arrival	352	—
1. Attributes.....	352	—
2. Frequency	353	—
3. Experience	353	—
4. Prosecution Duration.....	353	—
5. Tips and Traps	353	—
D. Type 3: White Flag	354	93
1. Attributes.....	354	—
2. Frequency	355	—
3. Experience	355	—
4. Prosecution Duration.....	355	—
5. Tips and Traps	355	—
6. Update [New Topic]	—	93
E. Type 4: Quota Buster	356	—
1. Attributes.....	356	—
2. Frequency	357	—
3. Experience	357	—

	<i>Main</i> Volume	<i>Supple-</i> <i>ment</i>
4. Prosecution Duration.....	357	—
5. Tips and Traps	357	—
F. Type 5: Algorithm Blues	358	93
1. Attributes.....	358	—
2. Frequency	360	—
3. Experience	360	—
4. Prosecution Duration.....	360	—
5. Tips and Traps	360	—
6. Update [New Topic].....	—	93
G. Type 6: Vague and Disabling.....	361	97
1. Attributes.....	361	—
2. Frequency	363	—
3. Experience	363	—
4. Prosecution Duration.....	363	—
5. Tips and Traps	363	—
6. Update [New Topic].....	—	97
H. Type 7: Clueless	364	97
1. Attributes.....	364	—
2. Frequency	365	—
3. Experience	365	—
4. Prosecution Duration.....	365	—
5. Tips and Traps	365	—
6. Update [New Topic].....	—	97
I. Type 8: Rolling 103.....	366	100
1. Attributes.....	366	—
2. Frequency	367	—
3. Experience	367	—
4. Prosecution Duration.....	367	—
5. Tips and Traps	367	—
6. Update [New Topic].....	—	100
J. Type 9: Close Call.....	368	101
1. Attributes.....	368	—
2. Frequency	368	—
3. Experience	369	—
4. Prosecution Duration.....	369	—
5. Tips and Traps	370	—
6. Update [New Topic].....	—	101
K. Type 10: Triple Played	371	101
1. Attributes.....	371	—
2. Frequency	372	—
3. Experience	372	—
4. Prosecution Duration.....	373	—
5. Tips and Traps	373	—
6. Update [New Topic].....	—	101
11. Foreign Patent Prosecution.....	375	103
§11.01 Introduction	380	—

	<i>Main</i>	<i>Supple-</i>
	<i>Volume</i>	<i>ment</i>
§11.02 Basic Global Principles	380	—
A. Patentability of Math or Science	380	—
B. Patentability of Computer Programs Per Se.....	381	—
C. Patentability of Computer Processes	381	—
1. Invention as a Whole Approach.....	381	—
2. Point of Novelty Approach	382	—
3. Otherwise Patentable Approach	382	—
4. Requirement of a Technical Result	382	—
§11.03 Geographic Regions	383	103
A. North America (Excluding the United States).....	383	—
1. Canada.....	383	—
a. Statute	383	—
b. Regulations.....	383	—
c. Case Law	384	—
2. Mexico	386	—
a. Statute	386	—
b. Regulations.....	386	—
c. Case Law	386	—
3. Dominican Republic.....	386	—
a. Statute	386	—
b. Regulations.....	386	—
c. Case Law	387	—
B. South America.....	387	—
1. Argentina.....	387	—
a. Statute	387	—
b. Regulations.....	387	—
c. Case Law	387	—
2. Brazil.....	387	—
a. Statute	387	—
b. Regulations.....	387	—
c. Case Law	388	—
3. Chile.....	388	—
a. Statute	388	—
b. Regulations.....	388	—
c. Case Law	388	—
4. Colombia	388	—
a. Statute	388	—
b. Regulations.....	388	—
c. Case Law	388	—
5. Venezuela	389	—
a. Statute	389	—
b. Regulations.....	389	—
c. Case Law	389	—
C. European Patent Convention.....	389	103
1. The Convention	389	103

	<i>Main</i> Volume	<i>Supple-</i> <i>ment</i>
2. Contracting States	390	—
3. Governing Articles	391	—
4. Guidelines	391	—
5. Case Law	392	—
a. Mathematical Methods	392	—
b. Computer Program as Such	393	—
c. Mere Reproduction of Information	394	—
d. Computer-Generated Software	395	—
e. Method of Doing Business	395	—
D. Individual European Countries	395	—
1. Austria	395	—
a. Statute	395	—
b. Regulations	396	—
c. Case Law	396	—
2. Belgium	396	—
a. Statute	396	—
b. Regulations	396	—
c. Case Law	396	—
3. Czech Republic	396	—
a. Statute	396	—
b. Regulations	396	—
c. Case Law	396	—
4. Denmark	396	—
a. Statute	396	—
b. Regulations	397	—
c. Case Law	397	—
5. Finland	397	—
a. Statute	397	—
b. Regulations	397	—
c. Case Law	397	—
6. France	397	—
a. Statute	397	—
b. Regulations	397	—
c. Case Law	397	—
7. Germany	398	—
a. Statute	398	—
b. Regulations	398	—
c. Case Law	398	—
8. Greece	400	—
a. Statute	400	—
b. Regulations	400	—
c. Case Law	400	—
9. Hungary	400	—
a. Statute	400	—
b. Regulations	401	—
c. Case Law	401	—
10. Ireland	401	—

	<i>Main Volume</i>	<i>Supple- ment</i>
a. Statute	401	—
b. Regulations.....	401	—
c. Case Law	401	—
11. Italy.....	401	—
a. Statute	401	—
b. Regulations.....	401	—
c. Case Law	401	—
12. Luxembourg.....	402	—
a. Statute	402	—
b. Regulations.....	402	—
c. Case Law	402	—
13. Netherlands.....	402	—
a. Statute	402	—
b. Regulations.....	402	—
c. Case Law	402	—
14. Norway.....	403	—
a. Statute	403	—
b. Regulations.....	403	—
c. Case Law	403	—
15. Poland.....	403	—
a. Statute	403	—
b. Regulations.....	403	—
c. Case Law	403	—
16. Slovak Republic.....	403	—
a. Statute	403	—
b. Regulations.....	403	—
c. Case Law	403	—
17. United Kingdom.....	403	—
a. Statute	403	—
b. Regulations.....	404	—
c. Case Law	404	—
i. Software as Such	404	—
ii. Mental Steps.....	405	—
iii. Financial Systems	405	—
18. Spain.....	406	—
a. Statute	406	—
b. Regulations.....	406	—
c. Case Law	406	—
19. Sweden.....	406	—
a. Statute	406	—
b. Regulations.....	406	—
c. Case Law	406	—
20. Switzerland.....	406	—
a. Statute	406	—
b. Regulations.....	406	—
c. Case Law	407	—

	<i>Main</i>	<i>Supple-</i>
	<i>Volume</i>	<i>ment</i>
E. Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS).....	407	—
1. Russia	407	—
a. Statute	407	—
b. Regulations.....	407	—
c. Case Law	407	—
F. Middle East	407	—
1. Israel	407	—
a. Statute	407	—
b. Regulations.....	408	—
c. Case Law	408	—
2. Saudi Arabia	409	—
a. Statute	409	—
b. Regulations.....	409	—
c. Case Law	409	—
3. Turkey.....	409	—
a. Statute	409	—
b. Regulations.....	409	—
c. Case Law	409	—
G. Africa.....	409	—
1. Egypt.....	409	—
a. Statute	409	—
b. Regulations.....	409	—
c. Case Law	409	—
2. South Africa.....	410	—
a. Statute	410	—
b. Regulations.....	410	—
c. Case Law	410	—
H. Indo-Asia.....	410	104
1. China.....	410	—
a. Statute	410	—
b. Regulations.....	410	—
c. Case Law	411	—
2. Hong Kong.....	411	—
a. Statute	411	—
b. Regulations.....	411	—
c. Case Law	411	—
3. India	411	—
a. Statute	411	—
b. Regulations.....	411	—
c. Case Law	411	—
4. Japan	411	—
a. Statute	411	—
b. Regulations.....	412	—
i. Application of a Scientific Principle Requirement	412	—

ii. Industrial Applicability Requirement.....	412	—
iii. Inventiveness Requirement	412	—
iv. Disclosure.....	413	—
c. Case Law	413	—
5. Korea.....	413	—
a. Statute	413	—
b. Regulations.....	413	—
c. Case Law	415	—
6. Malaysia	416	—
a. Statute	416	—
b. Regulations.....	416	—
c. Case Law	416	—
7. Philippines.....	416	—
a. Statute	416	—
a. Regulations.....	416	—
b. Case Law	416	—
8. Singapore.....	416	104
a. Statute	416	104
b. Regulations.....	417	—
c. Case Law	417	—
9. Taiwan	417	—
a. Statute	417	—
b. Regulations.....	417	—
c. Case Law	418	—
10. Thailand.....	418	—
a. Statute	418	—
b. Regulations.....	418	—
c. Case Law	418	—
I. Australia/New Zealand.....	418	—
1. Australia	418	—
a. Statute	418	—
b. Regulations.....	418	—
c. Case Law	419	—
2. New Zealand.....	419	—
a. Statute	419	—
a. Regulations.....	419	—
b. Case Law	419	—
§11.04 Conclusion.....	420	—

IV. MANAGING PATENTS IN BUSINESS AND LITIGATION

12. Patent Portfolio Development.....	423	107
§12.01 Introduction	423	—
§12.02 Establish Strategic Objectives for the Patent Portfolio	424	—

	<i>Main Volume</i>	<i>Supple- ment</i>
§12.03 Organizing, Educating, and Motivating the Team.....	426	—
A. Training of Inventors and Managers	426	—
B. Build an Effective Reward Program	427	—
§12.04 Choosing Among Inventions to Patent	428	—
A. Patent Review Committee.....	428	—
B. Database of Technical Literature and Patents.....	428	—
C. Standards	429	—
D. Quality Versus Volume	429	—
§12.05 Eliciting the Disclosure.....	430	—
A. Streamline the Procedures.....	430	—
B. Software-Based Inventions.....	431	—
C. Hardware-System-Based Inventions.....	432	—
§12.06 Strategic Patent Applications for Start-Ups and Emerging Growth Companies.....	434	—
A. Business Strategies.....	434	—
§12.07 Anticipating Litigation.....	436	—
§12.08 Polishing the Patent Portfolio	437	—
§12.09 Budgets, Cost Control, and Accounting.....	437	—
A. Establish a Corporatewide Patent Budget.....	437	—
B. Costs Versus Accounting Predictability	437	—
C. Forecasts.....	438	—
§12.10 Recent Court Decisions [New Topic].....	—	107
A. Identify the Invention in Terms of the Problem Solved.....	—	110
B. Be Wary of Too Much Reliance Upon Broad Conceptual Claim Language.....	—	110
C. Disclose as Many Alternative Embodiments as Reasonably Possible and Claim Each in a Separate Family of Claims	—	112
D. Use the Prior Art to Measure the Invention But Avoid Comparisons that Can Narrow the Claim.....	—	112
E. If Amendments Must Be Made During Prosecution, Make the Purpose Clear and Limit the Scope of Surrender.....	—	113
F. Vet the Important Patent Applications and Impose a Quality Control Policy for All.....	—	113
13. Noninfringement, Invalidity, and Unenforceability Opinions.....	439	115
§13.01 Introduction	441	—
§13.02 Background	442	—

		<i>Main</i>	<i>Supple-</i>
		<i>Volume</i>	<i>ment</i>
	A. Historical Context.....	442	—
	1. Pre-1982.....	442	—
	2. Enter the Federal Circuit in 1982.....	443	—
	B. Why Obtain an Opinion of Counsel?.....	444	—
	1. Avoid Liability.....	445	—
	2. Willful Infringement.....	447	—
	3. Increased Damages.....	449	—
	4. Effect of an Opinion.....	454	—
§13.03	Preparation of Opinions.....	456	—
	A. When to Obtain the Opinion.....	457	—
	B. Who Should Provide the Opinion?.....	460	—
	C. How Should an Opinion Be Prepared?.....	463	—
	1. Investigation.....	463	—
	a. Facts.....	464	—
	b. Searching.....	465	—
	c. Determining the Status of the Patent.....	466	—
	d. Possible License Defense.....	467	—
	2. Form (Written or Oral).....	467	—
	D. What Should the Opinion Contain?.....	468	—
	1. Overall Tone.....	469	—
	2. Noninfringement or Invalidity or Unenforceability.....	471	—
	3. Practical Suggestions.....	473	—
	a. Issues.....	474	—
	b. Facts.....	474	—
	c. Analysis.....	476	—
	d. Recommendations.....	481	—
	E. Follow-Up.....	482	—
	F. Conclusion.....	483	—
§13.04	Noninfringement Analysis.....	484	115
	A. Overview.....	484	—
	B. General Noninfringement Analysis.....	485	—
	C. Factual Basis.....	485	—
	D. Claim Interpretation.....	486	115
	1. Intrinsic Evidence.....	487	115
	a. Ordinary Meaning of Claim Language.....	487	116
	b. Doctrine of Claim Differentiation.....	488	—
	c. Effect of Preamble as Claim Limitation.....	488	—
	d. Using the Specification.....	490	—
	e. Means-Plus-Function Limitations.....	491	117
	f. Using the Prosecution History.....	493	—
	2. Extrinsic Evidence.....	496	—
	3. <i>Markman v. Westview Instruments</i>	498	118

	<i>Main Volume</i>	<i>Supple- ment</i>
E. Claim Application	500	—
F. Section 112, Paragraph 6, Equivalents	501	119
1. Analysis	502	120
2. Meaning of “Equivalent”	503	—
3. Use of Other Construction Tools	504	—
G. Reverse Doctrine of Equivalents	505	—
H. Doctrine of Equivalents	506	121
1. Overview	506	121
2. The Tripartite Test	508	—
3. The “All Limitations” Rule	509	121
4. Means-Plus-Function Claims	511	—
5. Not a License to Ignore Claim Limitations	512	—
6. Other Factors	513	—
a. Pioneer Inventions	513	—
b. Interchangeability of Ingredients	514	—
c. Copying	514	—
d. Designing Around	515	—
e. Nonobviousness of Accused System	515	—
I. Effect of the Prior Art—Hypothetical Claims	516	—
J. Technological Advances	519	—
K. Prosecution History Estoppel	520	122
§13.05 Invalidity and Unenforceability Analysis	525	125
A. Overview	525	—
B. Validity Analysis	525	125
1. Anticipation	527	126
2. Obviousness	532	127
3. Enabling Disclosure	539	—
4. Best Mode	540	128
5. Written Description	541	128
6. 35 U.S.C. §101	542	—
7. New Matter	543	—
C. Enforceability	547	—
1. Inequitable Conduct	547	—
2. Patent Misuse	548	—
§13.06 Attorney-Client Privilege	549	—
A. Opinion Letters—Relying on the Advice of Counsel	549	—
1. Scope	549	—
a. Subject Matter	550	—
b. Person	552	—
2. Drawing Inferences	553	—
3. Recourses	553	—
4. Work Product Immunity	554	—
Main Volume Footnote Updates	—	130

	<i>Main Volume</i>	<i>Supple- ment</i>
14. Design-Around Techniques	557	143
§14.01 Introduction	557	—
A. Benefits and Challenges of Designing Around	558	—
B. Overview of the Process	562	—
§14.02 Omitting a Claimed Element From the Designed-Around Product.....	564	—
A. Selecting an Element to Omit.....	565	—
B. Omitting the Element.....	565	—
1. Beware of Equivalents of the Omitted Element.....	565	—
2. Omitting Means-Plus-Function Elements.....	566	—
§14.03 Substituting a Component in the Designed- Around Product.....	567	143
A. Structural Elements	568	143
1. Substituting a Nonequivalent.....	568	—
2. Substitute an Equivalent That Is Precluded From Causing Infringement.....	569	143
B. Means-Plus-Function Elements.....	571	144
1. Substitute a Nondisclosed Means That Is Not an Equivalent.....	573	—
§14.04 Conclusion.....	574	145
15. Litigation of Patents Involving Software Technology.....	575	147
§15.01 Introduction	576	—
§15.02 General Comments.....	576	—
A. Software Technology.....	576	—
1. Features of the Industry	576	—
2. Features of Participants.....	577	—
3. Technology.....	577	—
B. Features of Patents Involving Software Technology.....	577	—
§15.03 Specific Issues and Strategies	578	147
A. Infringement.....	578	147
1. How to Determine Infringement	578	—
2. How to Prove Infringement.....	580	147
a. Claim Construction [New Subheading].....	—	147
i. Principles.....	—	147
ii. Examples [New Topic].....	—	149
b. Comparison of Claims and Accused Device or Method [New Subheading] ..	—	161
3. How to Defend Against Infringement Charges.....	581	—

	<i>Main Volume</i>	<i>Supple- ment</i>
B. Validity	582	161
1. Statutory Subject Matter	582	—
2. Prior Art	584	161
a. Where to Find Prior Art.....	584	—
b. Prior Use or Sale.....	585	161
c. Experimental Use	587	—
d. Prior Publication and Knowledge of the Invention	588	—
3. Enabling Disclosure	590	162
4. Best Mode	591	—
5. Omitted Element [New Topic]	—	163
6. Indefinite Claims [New Topic]	—	163
7. Inventorship [New Topic].....	—	165
C. Damages Issues.....	592	—
C. Relief Issues [New Heading].....	—	165
1. How to Prove Damages	592	—
a. Lost Profits	592	—
b. Reasonable Royalty.....	592	—
2. How to Limit Damages.....	593	—
3. Injunctions [New Topic]	—	165
D. Estoppel Issues	593	—
§15.04 Conclusion	595	—
Main Volume Footnote Updates	—	166

V. DEVELOPING AREAS OF LAW

16. Miscellaneous Practice Areas.....	597	171
§16.01 Patenting Software for Implementing Business Systems	597	171
A. Introduction.....	597	—
B. Historical Development	598	—
C. The Federal Circuit	602	171
§16.02 Design Patents for Computer Software	604	—
A. Basic Design Patent Law	604	—
B. Patentability of Designs for Computer- Generated Icons	606	—
C. PTO Guidelines for Computer-Generated Icons	608	—
D. Practical Considerations for Computer- Screen Design Patents.....	610	—
1. Article of Manufacture Consideration....	610	—
a. Software as Article of Manufacture Embodying Ornamental Features	610	—
b. Possible Claim Language	612	—
2. Other General Considerations	613	—

APPENDIXES

Appendix A: Patent Application Checklist.....	615	—
Appendix B: Sample Software Patent	621	—
Appendix C: Sample Electronics Patent	667	—
Appendix D: Sample Business Method Patent [New].....	—	173
Appendix E: Sample Design Patents [New].....	—	209
Table of Cases	701	229
Index	721	235

Preface

The last twenty years have been exciting times for intellectual property attorneys practicing in the computer law area. Most of the jurisprudence we now take for granted evolved extensively, and often tumultuously, during this period. The “look and feel” debates and court cases attracted much attention, while patent protection for software was hotly contested. It is the opinion of the editors that both areas of law, together with trade secrets protection, have emerged in a logical and consistent manner to provide a comprehensive continuum of intellectual property protection for computer software.

Nevertheless, as attorneys practicing in this field, we are faced with a legal corollary of Moore’s Law: change threatens to outpace our capacity even to acknowledge it, much less adapt to it. Keeping pace is all the more difficult without a comprehensive treatise on the practice of electronic and software patent law. What is needed is a resource that not only patent prosecutors and patent litigators can use, but one that general practitioners, corporate executives, and corporate counsel concerned with property in electronic and software technology can refer to. *Electronic and Software Patents* addresses that need.

In many respects, this treatise has its origins in the Electronic and Software Protection Committee of the American Intellectual Property Law Association (AIPLA).

Two contributors to this treatise, Rick Nydegger and Ken Nigon, have been chairs of the committee. A number of other contributors have been active and strong contributors to committee causes for almost twenty years. It was this group that inspired us to embark on the project that developed into *Electronic and Software Patents*. We believed that this group of talented and scholarly individuals was capable of producing a strong, informative, and up-to-date book that would be of great value. It is our belief that this vision has been borne out, and we think you will agree. The treatise is a calculated mix of academically oriented legal analysis and practical advice on how to draft and prosecute winning patents. If you

need a case citation to make your points, an example of how to draft a claim to a data structure, or help in protecting your client's method of doing business, you will find it in *Electronic and Software Patents*.

This treatise is organized to logically follow the steps for obtaining and managing electronic and software patents. First, corporate managers, corporate counsel, and patent attorneys must work together to decide whether or not to seek patent protection for a particular invention. If patent protection is desired for the particular invention, then a patent practitioner begins the process of drafting and filing an application, and then nurturing the application through prosecution into a patent. When this process ends with the issuance of a patent, the process of strategically managing and utilizing the patent has just begun. Whether there is just one patent or a portfolio of hundreds, several parties have a role in its management and use, including patent litigators, general practitioners dealing with intellectual property, and corporate managers and corporate counsel of electronic and software companies.

The opening chapters of this treatise provide a basic understanding of the technology and the law necessary to determine if patent protection is appropriate for a particular invention. With increasing specialization in education, many practitioners have areas of limited competence even within the confines of electronic and software technologies. Chapter 1 is aimed at nonexpert but technically minded readers and surveys the history of key electronic and software technologies. Convenient references are provided to additional in-depth information useful in preparing electronic and computer-related patent applications.

When counseling clients regarding intellectual property protection for a given software program or computer system, practitioners must keep in mind that a combination of patent, copyright, trade secret, and trademark rights is the best cumulative method of protecting the different aspects of computer software. Chapter 2 provides an overview of patent law's relationship to trade secret, trademark, and copyright law. Though each of these subjects merits its own treatise, this chapter will prime new practitioners and refresh seasoned ones.

The rapid evolution of software technology makes searching for prior art in this area potentially difficult and time consuming. In addition to highlighting the early history and problems of PTO computer art searching, Chapter 3 discusses different search strategies and describes numerous prior-art resources.

When drafting computer-related applications, one should be aware of *Alappat* and its case law progeny. Chapter 4 discusses this case law and specifically addresses the impact of the PTO's examination guidelines for computer-related inventions, the rise and fall of the *Freeman-Walter-Abele* test for determining patentable subject matter, and the Federal Circuit's return to primary authorities for

better legal footing. Further, this chapter reduces *Alappat*, its progeny, and the PTO guidelines to several succinct lessons for preparing computer-related patent applications, including insights on drafting claims and specifications in light of 35 U.S.C. Section 112, paragraph 6, and new claim formats for computer-related inventions.

The description of an invention in an electronic or software application must be carefully prepared so that it describes the system or software at a scope appropriate for the invention. The discussion in Chapter 5 centers on the best-mode, enablement, and written-description requirements of Section 112 and focuses on how they relate to software inventions.

Patent applications for electronic and computer-related inventions typically cover inventions that are best claimed using a variety of claim strategies including process claims, means-plus-function claims, or other apparatus claims that include functional or structural language. Chapter 6 presents all of the fundamental electronic and software claiming styles and formats.

Because the nature of infringing devices cannot be known at the time the patent application is prepared, claims should be crafted to achieve the broadest interpretation permitted by the prior art. Chapter 7 explains how to do this, discusses the interplay between the claims and the language of the specification, and addresses the related issues of prosecution history and extrinsic evidence.

Means-plus-function claims provide patent practitioners with a way to construct precisely worded claims using only functional language. Chapter 8 traces the history of 35 U.S.C. Section 112, paragraph 6, and examines current case law relating to prosecution of applications that include means-plus-function claims. This chapter also includes a claim-drafting exercise for a typical computer software invention.

Chapter 9 continues the discussion of means-plus-function claims, examining the impact of *Donaldson* on the interpretation of such claims.

Upon receiving a First Office Action on a filed patent application, practitioners should not only begin thinking how to respond to each rejection, but should also look for clues in the Office Action as to the most effective and efficient manner to respond. Chapter 10 discusses the factors influencing the PTO Examiners responsible for examining software and computer-related patent applications. This chapter then identifies 10 prosecution types that practitioners may encounter and provides tips for dealing with each.

Practitioners must carefully counsel clients so that their inventions remain qualified for international as well as domestic patent protection. Chapter 11 describes major differences between U.S. patent laws and the laws of many other countries. Such differences include the distinction between first-to-invent and first-to-file systems, as well as differing approaches to patentable subject matter. This chapter provides a discussion of statutes, regulations, and case

law for selected individual countries in North America (other than the United States), South America, Europe, the Middle East, Africa, Asia, and Australia/New Zealand.

The next portion of the treatise addresses issues arising after patents issue, beginning with strategically managing a patent portfolio. Building and sustaining a valuable portfolio of domestic and foreign patents is a complex task. Chapter 12 describes how to establish long-term objectives for a patent portfolio and describes methods for advancing these objectives. This chapter also discusses ways to select among invention disclosures to patent, such as using a patent review committee and achieving an optimal balance of quality and quantity. In addition, it sets out procedures for eliciting software- and hardware-based invention disclosures and describes patent portfolio strategies for start-up and emerging-growth companies. Finally, strategies for effectively managing a patent budget are explored.

Practitioners are routinely asked to advise clients on the issues of patent invalidity, unenforceability, and noninfringement. Chapter 13 addresses the principal issues involved in preparing opinions and focuses on the special considerations involved in the context of electronic and software patents. This chapter provides guidance on when an opinion should be prepared, who should prepare the opinion, how to prepare a competent opinion, and what such an opinion should contain. In addition, this chapter discusses the substantive areas of law that a competent opinion should consider as well as confidentiality issues.

Designing around a patent to produce a similar product or process is legitimate competitive behavior. Chapter 14 explains how to identify a patent's broadest valid claim and either omit one of the claim's elements or substitute an appropriate component for it so that infringement can be avoided.

The nature of the software industry, the participants, the technology, and the patents involved make software litigation different in many important respects from other patent litigation and from litigation in general. Chapter 15 describes these differences and discusses specific strategies related to infringement, validity, and damages in software patent litigation.

Two developing areas of law that software patent practitioners need to be aware of are software utility patents for implementing business systems and software design patents. Chapter 16 reviews cases addressing the patentability of software for implementing business systems, concluding that the status of the method-of-doing-business exception remains unsettled but recommending that at least one claim set in a patent application be drafted to a system, including computer components, for performing the desired function. This chapter also addresses design patents for computer software, and more precisely the patenting of ornamental elements of computer software. This chapter surveys design patent law, traces the short history of design patents for computer screen displays, and summarizes the PTO guidelines for examining design patents claiming computer-generated icons shown on a display device. This chapter also explores

case law, arguments, and claim strategies for using design patents to cover ornamental features of stored software and software per se, independent of a display device.

Steven W. Lundberg
Stephen C. Durant
April 2000

**2002 Cumulative Supplement to
Electronic and Software Patents: Law and Practice
Analyzes Festo, Case Law Developments in Means-Plus-Function Claims,
and Written Description Requirement**

Washington, D.C., April 2003-Patent attorneys will find guidance on drafting, prosecuting, and managing a strong patent portfolio in the **2002 Cumulative Supplement to Electronic and Software Patents: Law and Practice**, published by BNA Books, A Division of The Bureau of National Affairs, Inc. (BNA).

Electronic and Software Patents: Law and Practice, written by attorneys with extensive experience in this area of law, offers practical advice on when to seek patent protection; the use of trade secret and copyright law in conjunction with patent strategies; how to prepare computer-related patent applications under the Federal Circuit's rulings in *In re Alappat* and its progeny; PTO examination guidelines; drafting information; "tips and traps" for each step of the patent prosecution process; and more.

The **2002 Cumulative Supplement** updates the main volume with an in-depth look at significant topics such as: the Supreme Court ruling in *TrafFix Devices, Inc. v. Marketing Displays, Inc.*; *ESP@CENET Network* at the European Patent Office; the ramifications of *Gentry Gallery Inc. v. Berkline Corp.* in regard to the written description requirement; and the effects of *Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co.* on claim crafting. The new Supplement also covers case law developments regarding means-plus-function claims; *Budde v. Harley-Davidson Inc.* in regard to interpretation of claim language; the Supreme Court's holding in *Festo* regarding amendments made during prosecution; and the Federal Circuit ruling in *Catalina Marketing International, Inc. v. Coolsavings.com* on the issue of when to give meaning to words in a preamble; and other relevant cases.

The editors-in-chief of **Electronic and Software Patents: Law and Practice** are Steven W. Lundberg (Schwegman, Lundberg, Woessner & Kluth, P.A., Minneapolis) and Stephen C. Durant (Morrison & Foerster, L.L.P., San Francisco). The editors-in-chief of the 2002 Cumulative Supplement are Steven W. Lundberg, Stephen C. Durant, and Ann M. McCrackin (Schwegman, Lundberg, Woessner & Kluth, P.A., Minneapolis, MN).

BNA is a leading private publisher of news and information products for professionals in law and business. In addition to **Electronic and Software Patents: Law and Practice**, BNA's Book Division publishes Legal Protection of Digital Information, Intellectual Property Law in Cyberspace, Patent Litigation Strategies Handbook, Patent Prosecution: Practice and Procedure Before the U.S. Patent Office, Patents and the Federal Circuit, Patent, Trademark, and Copyright Laws, Patent, Trademark, and Copyright Regulations, and other titles in legal specialties.

The **2002 Cumulative Supplement to Electronic and Software Patents: Law and Practice** may be purchased alone (272 pp Softcover/ISBN 1-57018-339-2/Order #1339-PRY3/\$195.00 plus tax, shipping and handling), or with the main volume (787 pp. Hardcover/Order #9339-PRY3/\$415.00 plus tax, shipping and handling) from BNA Books, P.O. Box 7814, Edison, NJ 08818-7814. Telephone orders:1-800-960-1220. Fax orders: 1-732-346-1624. For a free BNA Books catalog, call 1-800-960-1220 or send an e-mail request to books@bna.com. The BNA Books home page, including an online catalog, can be found on the World Wide Web at www.bnabooks.com. A 10 percent discount is available when ordering from the web site (discounts cannot be combined).