



HOW TO EVALUATE WHEN A REISSUE VIOLATES THE RECAPTURE RULE:

Collected Case Law, Rules, and
MPEP Materials

© 2004 Kagan Binder, PLLC





How to Evaluate When a Reissue violates the Recapture Rule:

Collected Case law, rules and MPEP materials

1412.02 Recapture of Canceled Subject Matter - 1400 Correction of Patents

1412.02 Recapture of Canceled Subject Matter

A reissue will not be granted to "recapture" claimed subject matter which was surrendered in an application to obtain the original patent. *Hester Industries, Inc. v. Stein, Inc.*, 142 F.3d 1472, 46 USPQ2d 1641 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Clement*, 131 F.3d 1464, 45 USPQ2d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *Ball Corp. v. United States*, 729 F.2d 1429, 1436, 221 USPQ 289, 295 (Fed. Cir. 1984); *In re Wadlinger*, 496 F.2d 1200, 181 USPQ 826 (CCPA 1974); *In re Richman*, 409 F.2d 269, 276, 161 USPQ


359, 363-364 (CCPA 1969); *In re Willingham*, 282 F.2d 353, 127 USPQ 211 (CCPA 1960).

TWO STEP TEST FOR RECAPTURE:

In *Clement*, 131 F.3d at 1468-69, 45 USPQ2d at 1164, the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit set forth guidance for recapture as follows:

The first step in applying the recapture rule is to determine whether and in what aspect the reissue claims are broader than the patent claims. For example, a reissue claim that deletes a limitation or element from the patent claims is broader in that limitation's aspect.... Under *Mentor [Mentor Corp. v. Coloplast, Inc.]*, 998 F.2d 992, 994, 27 USPQ2d 1521, 1524 (Fed. Cir. 1993)], courts must determine in which aspects the reissue claim is broader, which includes broadening as a result of an omitted limitation....

The second step is to determine whether the broader aspects of the reissue claims relate to surrendered subject matter. To determine whether an applicant surrendered particular subject matter, we look to the prosecution history for arguments and changes to the claims made in an effort to overcome a prior art rejection. *See Mentor*, 998 F.2d at 995-96, 27 USPQ2d at 1524-25; *Ball Corp. v. United States*, 729 F.2d 1429, 1436, 221 USPQ 289, 294-95 (Fed. Cir. 1984).



In every reissue application, the examiner must first review each claim for the presence of broadening, as compared with the scope of the claims of the patent to be reissued. A reissue claim is broadened where some limitation of the patent claims is no longer required in the reissue claim; *see* **MPEP § 1412.03** for guidance as to the nature of a "broadening claim."

Where a claim in a reissue application is in fact broadened, the examiner must next determine whether the broader aspects of that reissue claim relate to subject matter that applicant previously surrendered during the prosecution of the original application (which became the patent to be reissued). Each limitation of the patent claims, which is omitted or broadened in the reissue claim, must be reviewed for this determination.

CRITERIA FOR DETERMINING THAT SUBJECT MATTER HAS BEEN SURRENDERED:


If the limitation now being omitted or broadened in the present reissue was originally presented/argued/stated in the original application to make the claims allowable over a rejection or objection made in the original application, the omitted limitation relates to subject matter previously surrendered by applicant, and impermissible recapture exists. See **MPEP § 706.02(l)(1)** with respect to amendments made to distinguish the claimed invention from 35 U.S.C. **102(e)**/**103** prior art which was commonly owned or assigned at the time the invention was made.

The examiner should review the prosecution history of the original application file (of the patent to be reissued) for recapture. The prosecution history includes the rejections and applicant's arguments made therein. The record of the original application must show that the broadening aspect (the omitted/broadened limitation(s)) relates to subject matter that applicant previously surrendered.

Example

(A) A limitation of the patent claims is omitted in the reissue claims. This omission provides a broadening aspect in the reissue claims, as compared to the claims of the patent. The omitted limitation was originally **argued** in the original application to make the application claims allowable over a rejection or objection made in the application. Thus, the omitted limitation relates to subject matter previously surrendered, in the original application.

Note: The argument that the claim limitation defined over the rejection must have been specific as to the limitation; rather than a general statement regarding the claims as a whole. In other words, a general "boiler plate" sentence will not be sufficient to establish recapture. An example of one such "boiler plate" sentence is:



In closing, it is argued that the limitations of claims 1-7 distinguish the claims from the teachings of the prior art, and claims 1-7 are thus patentable.

This type of general "argument" will not, by itself, be sufficient to establish surrender and recapture.

Example

(B) The limitation omitted in the reissue was added in the original application claims for the purpose of making the claims allowable over a rejection or objection made in the application. Even though applicant made no argument on the record that the limitation was added to obviate the rejection, the nature of the addition to the claim can show that the limitation was added in direct reply to the rejection. This too will establish the omitted limitation as relating to subject matter previously surrendered. To illustrate this, note the following example:

The original application claims recite limitations A+B+C, and the Office action rejection combines two references to show A+B+C. In the amendment replying to the Office action, applicant adds limitation D to A+B+C in the claims, but makes no argument as to that addition. The examiner then allows the claims. Even though there is no argument as to the addition of limitation D, it must be presumed that the D limitation was added to obviate the rejection. The subsequent deletion of (omission of) limitation D in the reissue claims would be


presumed to be a broadening in an aspect of the reissue claims related to surrendered subject matter.

Example

(C) The limitation A omitted in the reissue claims was present in the claims of the original application. The examiner's reasons for allowance in the original application stated that it was that limitation A which distinguished over a potential combination of references X and Y. Applicant did not present on the record a counter statement or comment as to the examiner's reasons for allowance, and permitted the claims to issue. The omitted limitation is thus established as relating to subject matter previously surrendered.

ARGUMENT (WITHOUT AMENDMENT TO THE CLAIMS) IN THE ORIGINAL APPLICATION MAY BE SUFFICIENT TO ESTABLISH RECAPTURE:

In *Clement*, the recapture was directed to subject matter surrendered in the original application by **changes** made to the claims (i.e., amendment of the claims) in an effort to overcome a prior art rejection. The *Clement* Court, however, also stated that "[t]o determine whether an applicant surrendered particular subject matter, we look to the prosecution history for **arguments** and changes to the claims made in an effort to overcome a prior art rejection." [Emphasis added] 131 F.3d at 1469, 45 USPQ2d at 1164. This statement in *Clement* was



subsequently discussed in *Hester Indus., Inc. v. Stein, Inc.*, *supra*, where the Court observed that surrender of claimed subject matter may occur by *arguments* made during the prosecution of the original patent application *even where there was no claim change made*. The Court in *Hester* held that the surrender which forms the basis for impermissible recapture "can occur through arguments alone." 142 F.3d at 1482, 46 USPQ2d at 1649. Accordingly, where claims are broadened in a reissue application, the examiner should review the prosecution history of the original patent file for recapture, even where the claims were never amended during the prosecution of the application which resulted in the patent.

REISSUE CLAIMS HAVE SAME OR BROADER SCOPE IN ALL ASPECTS:

The recapture rule bars the patentee from acquiring through reissue claims that are, in all aspects, of the same scope as, or are broader in scope than, those claims canceled from the original application to obtain a patent. *Ball*, 729 F.2d at 1436, 221 USPQ at 295.

REISSUE CLAIMS ARE NARROWER IN SCOPE IN ALL ASPECTS:


The patentee is free to acquire, through reissue, claims that are narrower in scope in all aspects than claims canceled from the original application to obtain a patent. If the reissue claims are

narrower than the claims canceled from the original application, yet broader than the original patent claims, reissue must be sought within 2 years after the grant of the original patent. *Ball*, 729 F.2d at 1436, 221 USPQ at 295. See **MPEP § 1412.03** as to broadening claims.

REISSUE CLAIMS ARE BROADER IN SCOPE IN SOME ASPECTS, BUT NARROWER IN OTHERS:

Reissue claims that are broader in certain aspects and narrower in others *vis-à-vis* claims canceled from the original application to obtain a patent may avoid the effect of the recapture rule if the claims are broader in a way that does not attempt to reclaim what was surrendered earlier. *Mentor Corp. v. Coloplast, Inc.*, 998 F.2d 992, 994, 27 USPQ2d 1521, 1525 (Fed. Cir. 1993). "[I]f the reissue claim is as broad as or broader in an aspect germane to a prior art rejection, but narrower in another aspect completely unrelated to the rejection, the recapture rule bars the claim; [] if the reissue claim is narrower in an aspect germane to [a] prior art rejection, and broader in an aspect unrelated to the rejection, the recapture rule does not bar the claim, but other rejections are possible." *Clement*, 131 F.3d at 1470, 45 USPQ2d at 1165.

If the broadening aspect of the reissue claim relates to subject matter previously surrendered, the examiner must determine whether the newly added narrowing limitation in the reissue claim modifies the claim such that the scope of the claim no



longer results in a recapture of the surrendered subject matter. If the narrowing limitation modifies the claim in such a manner that the scope of the claim no longer results in a recapture of the surrendered subject matter, then there is no recapture. In this situation, even though a rejection based on recapture is not made, the examiner should make of record the reason(s) why, as a result of the narrowing limitation, there is no recapture.

REISSUE TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF

35 U.S.C. 103(b):

A patentee may file a reissue application to permit consideration of process claims which qualify for **35 U.S.C. 103(b)** treatment if a patent is granted on an application entitled to the benefit of **35 U.S.C. 103(b)**, without an election having been made as a result of error without deceptive intent. See **MPEP § 706.02(n)**. **This is not to be considered a recapture.** The addition of process claims, however, will generally be considered to be a *broadening* of the invention (*Ex parte Wikdahl*, 10 USPQ2d 1546 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989)), and such addition must be applied for within two years of the grant of the original patent. See also **MPEP § 1412.03** as to broadened claims.

REISSUE FOR ARTICLE CLAIMS WHICH ARE FUNCTIONAL DESCRIPTIVE MATERIAL STORED ON A COMPUTER-READABLE MEDIUM:

A patentee may file a reissue application to permit consideration of article of manufacture claims which are functional descriptive material stored on a computer-readable medium, where these article claims correspond to the process or machine claims which have been patented. The error in not presenting claims to this statutory category of invention (the "article" claims) must have been made as a result of error without deceptive intent. The addition of these "article" claims will generally be considered to be a *broadening* of the invention (*Ex parte Wikdahl*, 10 USPQ2d 1546 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1989)), and such addition must be applied for within two years of the grant of the original patent. See also **MPEP § 1412.03** as to broadened claims.


REJECTION BASED UPON RECAPTURE:

Reissue claims which recapture surrendered subject matter should be rejected using form paragraph 14.17.



14.17 Rejection, 35 U.S.C.

251, Recapture



Claim[1] rejected under 35 U.S.C. 251 as being an improper recapture of broadened claimed subject matter surrendered in the application for the patent upon which the present reissue is based. See *Hester Industries, Inc. v. Stein, Inc.*, 142 F.3d 1472, 46 USPQ2d 1641 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Clement*, 131 F.3d 1464, 45 USPQ2d 1161 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *Ball Corp. v. United States*, 729 F.2d 1429, 1436, 221 USPQ 289, 295 (Fed. Cir. 1984). A broadening aspect is present in the reissue which was not present in the application for patent. The record of the application for the patent shows that the broadening aspect (in the reissue) relates to subject matter that applicant previously surrendered during the prosecution of the application.

Accordingly, the narrow scope of the claims in the patent was not an error within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 251, and the broader scope surrendered in the application for the patent cannot be recaptured by the filing of the present reissue application.

[2]


Examiner Note

In bracket 2, the examiner should explain the specifics of why recapture exists, including an identification of the omitted/broadened claim limitations in the reissue which provide the "broadening aspect" to the claim(s), and where in the original application the narrowed claim scope was presented/argued to obviate a rejection/objection. See MPEP § 1412.02.

1414 Content of Reissue Oath/Declaration

37 CFR 1.175 Reissue oath or declaration.

- (a) The reissue oath or declaration in addition to complying with the requirements of § 1.63, must also state that:
- (1) The applicant believes the original patent to be wholly or partly inoperative or invalid by reason of a defective specification or drawing, or by reason of the patentee claiming more or less than the patentee had the right to claim in the patent, stating at least one error being relied upon as the basis for reissue; and
 - (2) All errors being corrected in the reissue application up to the time of filing of the oath or declaration under this paragraph arose without any deceptive intention on the part of the applicant.
- (b) (1) For any error corrected, which is not covered by the oath or declaration submitted under paragraph (a) of this section, applicant must submit a supplemental oath or declaration stating that every such error arose without any deceptive intention on the part of the applicant. Any supplemental oath or declaration required by this paragraph must be submitted before allowance and may be submitted:
- (i) With any amendment prior to allowance; or
 - (ii) In order to overcome a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 251 made by the examiner where it is indicated that the submission of a



supplemental oath or declaration as required by this paragraph will overcome the rejection.

(2) For any error sought to be corrected after allowance, a supplemental oath or declaration must accompany the requested correction stating that the error(s) to be corrected arose without any deceptive intention on the part of the applicant.

(c) Having once stated an error upon which the reissue is based, as set forth in paragraph (a)(1), unless all errors previously stated in the oath or declaration are no longer being corrected, a subsequent oath or declaration under paragraph (b) of this section need not specifically identify any other error or errors being corrected.

(d) The oath or declaration required by paragraph (a) of this section may be submitted under the provisions of § 1.53(f).

The reissue oath/declaration is an essential part of a reissue application and must be filed with the application, or within the time period set under 37 CFR 1.53(f) along with the required surcharge as set forth in 37 CFR 1.16(e) in order to avoid abandonment.

The question of the sufficiency of the reissue oath/declaration filed under 37 CFR 1.175 must in each case be reviewed and decided personally by the primary examiner.

Reissue oaths or declarations must contain the following:

(A) A statement that the applicant believes the original patent to be wholly or partly inoperative or invalid-

(1) by reason of a defective specification or drawing, or
(2) by reason of the patentee claiming more or less than patentee had the right to claim in the patent;

(B) A statement of at least one error which is relied upon to support the reissue application, *i.e.*, as the basis for the reissue;

(C) A statement that all errors which are being corrected in the reissue application up to the time of filing of the oath/declaration arose without any deceptive intention on the part of the applicant; and


(D) The information required by 37 CFR 1.63.

These elements will now be discussed:

A STATEMENT THAT THE APPLICANT BELIEVES THE ORIGINAL PATENT TO BE WHOLLY OR PARTLY INOPERATIVE OR INVALID BY REASON OF A DEFECTIVE SPECIFICATION OR DRAWING, OR BY REASON OF THE PATENTEE CLAIMING MORE OR LESS THAN PATENTEE HAD THE RIGHT TO CLAIM IN THE PATENT.

In order to satisfy this requirement, a declaration can state: "Applicant believes the original patent to be partly inoperative or invalid by reason of a defective specification or drawing." Alternatively, a declaration can state:

Kagan Binder, PLLC
Suite 200, Maple Island Building
221 Main Street North
Stillwater, MN 55082
651-351-2900
www.kaganbinder.com



"Applicant believes the original patent to be partly inoperative or invalid by reason of the patentee claiming more or less than patentee had the right to claim in the patent."

Where the specification or drawing is defective and patentee claimed more or less than patentee had the right to claim in the patent, then *both* statements should be included in the reissue oath/declaration. See **MPEP § 1412.04** for an exemplary declaration statement when the error being corrected is an error in inventorship.

The above examples will be sufficient to satisfy this requirement without any further statement.

Form paragraph 14.01 may be used where the reissue oath/declaration does not provide the required statement as to applicant's belief that the original patent is wholly or partly inoperative or invalid.

The foregoing is intended to provide you with helpful suggestions in protecting your organization from avoidable liability concerns in intellectual property matters. Each matter is different, and the advice of competent counsel in each situation should be obtained.