

# Comments On The Patent Application Drafting Assignment

## I. General Comments

- A. Great job on the patent applications. Everyone is really trying hard and making good progress.
- B. It seems like a few people are still being held back by poor word choices that were made early on and/or some structural faults in the application. These will get better with time, but are often difficult to correct because your brain “locks in” on the first thing that was created.
- C. In several instances, the newly added sections were markedly better than the previous sections.
- D. In order to maximize your gain from this exercise, take 20 minutes or so and really think about how you could have done it differently. What worked? What did not work out so well? What choices were you not happy with – and why did you make them – and how can you avoid making them in the future? It may be helpful to write out these insights and then refer to them before you start drafting your next patent application.
- E. In a larger sense, consciously thinking about how you could have made your product better is really one of the only ways you will improve because your feedback in the law firm will likely be pretty infrequent.

## II. Background

- A. Most people may have found it more difficult to write the background than the DD because ICOA gives you a structure/outline and a starting point for your efforts. It’s much more difficult to get started when you have no structure, right? Feedback with regard to the experience?
- B. Especially post *KSR*, the Background can be taken as admitted prior art. Remember that we no longer want to recite “long-felt needs” or other

“motivational” statements in the Background because Examiners are using them against us.

- C. Additionally, think about what you are writing and whether it would give the Examiner something that they can say is a “motivation” for combination. For example, describing the prior art as being directed towards a problem – and a similar one that you are directed towards might be a problem. Additionally, if you get too specific about what the prior art fails to do, you start disclosing your invention.
- D. Also, avoid giving the Examiner easy admissions phrases that the Examiner can use in the Office Action. For example, “The X reference teaches a supplement dispensing system.” This may be true, but describing it in terms that are similar to your claim language just makes it easier for the Examiner to hit you with it in a rejection. Instead, talk about the limiting parts of the reference rather than trying to describe it totally.
- E. Do not recite your invention in the background. Outside of the Field of the Invention (first paragraph) no mention of “the present invention” or the “present system. Additionally, the Field of the Invention is just the Field – NOT the point of novelty. Just think about “What field would the PTO classify this invention as?” Maybe something like “drink dispensers/automated, wireless drink dispensers” is fine.
- F. Most people need better descriptions of the prior art’s limitations in order to make their advocacy more effective – DISCLOSE THE PRIOR ART IN TERMS OF ITS LIMITATIONS.  
Good words to start limiting phrases for describing the prior art: only, limited to, requires
- G. Don’t use terminology from your specification when discussing the prior art – if the prior art uses different terminology, then use that – or else it can be used by the Examiner as an admission.
- H. When discussing prior art, use the “X reference” not the “X method” avoid admissions that similar devices “have been under development” or that “prior tracking methods have been suboptimal” coupled with “one

prior art was of improving tracking metrics”. This can be used by the Examiner as providing motivation to combine references “to improve tracking metrics”

- I. In many cases, recognition of disadvantages is itself an important part of the invention – or at least a motivation for one. Thus, don’t put it in the Background.
- 
- III. Detailed Description
    - A. Validation – This is your last opportunity to point out the differences between your invention and the prior art that you will have before the Examiner looks at your claims. Make it powerfully persuasive. Link back to the Background. Be specific about limitations that are in your embodiments, but not in the prior art. Don’t skip the validation section. You can include more exciting, “marketing-type” language and link it back to the description of the Figures. It is also your opportunity to review the invention disclosure and include all of the “sales” language that the inventor wrote.
    - B. We need a positive recitation of the structure or function, not just a blanket statement that “thus the invention satisfies need X”
    - C. Sometimes this is hard for people to write because they feel like they just described everything in the previous 30 pages, why should they summarize it here?- Pretend that the Examiner did not read the spec (or did not read it thoroughly) and is just skipping to the end. Not that they would ever do that, right? No, of course not. (Sarcastic) Convince the Examiner of how great the invention is and he will likely be more helpful.
    - D. It is also helpful because you can clearly point out distinct elements of the system or method that you regard as novel over the prior art. Otherwise, the Examiner may have just glossed over it during the previous 30 pages. This is something that you can point to in a later 102 or 103 rejection.
    - E. Additionally, this can serve as a good “check” in that you can review the benefits of the invention claimed by the inventor and make sure all of

them are disclosed.

- F. Only one student included a validation paragraph – and it was pretty small.
- G. Why include a validation paragraph?
  1. As a check to make sure you include all commercially valuable features.
  2. Explicitly point out to the Examiner all commercially valuable features.
  3. Emphasize improvements over the prior art / pre-argue obviousness rejection.
  4. Discuss fundamental improvement to computer-related technology to help combat 101 rejection.
- H. “to server 300” vs. “to the server 300” – read it as if the numbers are not there. Bad habit to get into
- I. “auction” vs. “automated data selection and transmission process”

#### IV. Summary

- A. You don’t have to summarize each of your independent claims. You want a clear, understandable Summary of your invention. It will often be similar to your independent claims, but some independent claims use language that is so vague/broad that you can’t really tell what is going on.
- B. The summary can be quite short. One page is plenty.

#### V. Abstract

- A. Generally pretty good. Remember that “said” only belongs in the claims, so re-word the claims slightly.
- B. Remember 150 word limit.

VI. Figures

- A. Remember, lead lines must be curved (not straight) in the figures.
- B. Remember 1 inch margin requirements
- C. Text and Numbers 1/8 inch high (12-point maybe, 14-point OK)
- D. Remember not to put numbers on top of other structural elements.
- E. Many Examiners will only let you use the underlined numbering elements for structural elements rather than for flowchart boxes.

VII. General Issues

- A. Did you include all of the disclosure? Was it enabled? Several people did not include the “route maximization” and “alert” aspects of the invention. For those who mentioned it, it was often not well disclosed.
  - You would want to recognize earlier in the process that you desired more information and then ask the inventor. If you don't have it, then try to walk through the system step-by-step so that at least you are enabling something.
  - If the Examiner signs the Declaration, then she/he is alleging under penalty of perjury that what is in the spec is her invention. If they did not read it and later try to blame it on you, you can point to the signed declaration. However, if whatever you added is not enabled, then they will try to put it back on you.
  - Potential malpractice to leave out “push” and “route optimization”