

TRAINING EXAMPLES

Supplementary Examination Guidelines for Determining Compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112 and for Treatment of Related Issues in Patent Applications, 76 FR 7,162 (Feb. 9, 2011)

I. EXAMPLES OF DEFINITE AND INDEFINITE CLAIM LANGUAGE UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶2	1
A. Functional claim language	1
B. Relative terminology (<i>e.g.</i> , terms of degree, subjective terms)	3
C. Numerical ranges and amounts	10
D. Antecedent basis	11
E. Terms of art	11
F. Breadth is not indefiniteness	12
G. Correspondence between specification and claims	13
II. EXAMPLES OF CLAIM TERMS OTHER THAN “MEANS FOR” THAT MAY INVOKE 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶ 6	13
A. “Mechanism”	13
B. “Member”	16
C. “Element”	18
D. “Circuit”/”Circuitry”	19
E. “Detector”	20
F. “Assembly”	21
III. EXAMPLES OF CLAIM LIMITATIONS THAT INVOKE 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶¶ 6 EVALUATED FOR COMPLIANCE WITH 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶¶ 2	21
A. Examples illustrating when an indefiniteness rejection is appropriate	22
B. Examples illustrating when an indefiniteness rejection is <u>not</u> appropriate	27
IV. EXAMPLES OF RELATED ISSUES UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, ¶¶1	33
A. Lack of written description support for broad claim limitations	33
B. Lack of enablement for full scope of broad claim	37
C. Written description support for claims covering only one of several problems disclosed or covering only one of several solutions disclosed for the same problem	39
D. “Single means”-type claims	41

