

multiple inventions that are capable of supporting separate patents.

The Unity of Invention standard is a component of many foreign patent laws and is also used in international search and preliminary examination proceedings conducted pursuant to the PCT.

United States restriction practice is based on 35 U.S.C. 121, which provides that: "[i]f 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." This allows examiners to limit applicants to one set of patentably indistinct inventions per application. The USPTO may "restrict" the application to one set of patentably indistinct inventions: (1) If the application includes multiple independent and patentably distinct sets of inventions, and (2) if there is an undue burden to examine more than one invention in the same application. Restriction practice was designed to balance the interest of granting an applicant reasonable breadth of protection in a single patent against the burden on the USPTO of examining multiple inventions in a single application.

Current USPTO policy allows for restriction between related inventions as well as between independent inventions. However, if the USPTO adopts a Unity of Invention standard, restriction would, as a general rule, no longer be permitted between certain related inventions that currently may be restricted under United States restriction practice. Some examples of related inventions that are often filed together and typically can be restricted under current United States practice before a prior art search is conducted, but do not lack unity under the Unity of Invention standard, include: (1) A process, and the apparatus for carrying out the process; (2) a process for making a product, and the product made; (3) an apparatus, and the product made by the apparatus; (4) a product, and the process of using the product.

A lack of Unity of Invention is different from restriction practice in some major aspects. Unity of Invention is practiced, with slight variations, in PCT applications and in applications examined by the European Patent Office (EPO) and the Japan Patent Office (JPO). The primary consideration for establishing Unity of Invention is that the claims are entitled to be examined in a single application if the claims are so linked together as to form a single general inventive concept, premised on the concept of a common feature (referred to as a "special technical

feature" in the context of PCT Rule 13) that can be present in multiple inventions within a single application. As long as the same or corresponding common feature is found in each claim and that common feature makes a contribution over the prior art, the claims comply with the requirement for Unity of Invention. If the inventions lack a common feature that makes a contribution over the prior art, then a holding of lack of Unity of Invention would be proper. The determination of whether an invention makes a contribution over the prior art can effectively be done only after a prior art search for the common feature has been performed.

Adoption of any of the various styles of Unity of Invention practice will likely have significant impacts on current USPTO examination practices and organization. The degree of the impacts will depend upon the particulars of how the Unity of Invention standard is implemented. A complete study will need to consider, at a minimum, the impacts and changes to: quality, pendency, workload, revenue, fees, patent term adjustment, examination resources, organizational structure of the Patent Examining Corps, and the United States patent classification system.

Issues for Comment

Issue 1: Unity of Invention as practiced in the EPO is interlinked to EPC-style claim drafting and EPO claim treatment practice, including certain limitations on claiming that are not present in current United States patent practice. For example, the EPO (under EPC rule 29(2)) usually allows only one independent claim per category of invention (category of invention is that of product, process or apparatus of use), and emphasizes the search and examination of independent claims. In contrast, the USPTO searches and examines every claim, independent and dependent, and every limitation of every claim. In addition, EPC-style claim drafting is generally termed "central claiming". In central claiming, the inventive concept is essentially claimed in the independent claim. If the independent claim is found allowable, the EPO examination will not be unduly concerned with respect to the dependent claims, according to EPO Guidelines, C-III, 3.6.

Should the USPTO study ways to adopt EPO claim treatment practice, including normally allowing only one independent claim per category of invention, when considering ways to adopt a Unity of Invention standard, and why?

Should the USPTO emphasize the examination of independent claims and modifying the examination of dependent claims in the same fashion as the EPO?

If so, would there be any reason to consider changes to the presumption of validity under 35 U.S.C. 282 of those dependent claims?

Issue 2: In United States restriction practice, the applicant can file a subsequent application that is directed to an invention that was divided out of the parent application. These are called Divisional applications. Divisional applications are typically subsequently filed and are not normally examined concurrently with the parent application. Divisional applications retain the benefit of the filing date of the original application if the conditions set forth in 35 U.S.C. 120 are met. This allows an applicant to continue to pursue protection for the inventions subject to restriction that were in the original application without being affected by double patenting. All member states of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property (1967) (including Japan and all EPC member states), as well as the EPO, also provide for the filing of Divisional applications. However, the PCT does not yet provide for the filing of Divisional international applications. Consequently, the PCT rules provide for applicant to pay for the search and examination of additional inventions that "lack unity" in a single international application. Adoption of a Unity of Invention standard could, in some instances, require examining more inventions during the examination of a single application than occurs presently, thereby possibly causing delay in the examination of other applications if examination resources are limited. This could increase the USPTO's average patent pendency time.

If the USPTO adopts a Unity of Invention standard, should the USPTO provide applicants the option of a PCT-style Unity of Invention practice to pay for additional inventions that lack Unity of Invention in the same application?

If so, should the USPTO consider any changes to patent term adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154(b) for applications which have more inventions examined in a single application under a Unity of Invention standard than are permitted under current practice?

In view of the fact that examining multiple inventions in a single application could cause examination delay in other applications, what other revisions to patent term adjustment provisions under 35 U.S.C. 154(b) should be considered by the USPTO, or