CHEMICAL PATENTS AND ALLIED PATENT PROBLEMS

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649437702

Chemical Patents and Allied Patent Problems by Edward Thomas

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd. Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

EDWARD THOMAS

CHEMICAL PATENTS AND ALLIED PATENT PROBLEMS

Trieste

CHEMICAL PATENTS AND ALLIED PATENT PROBLEMS

By

EDWARD THOMAS

Author of Process Digest Member of Appellate Federal Bars of New York and Washington



•

JOHN BYRNE & CO. WASHINGTON, D. C. 1917



1.8

 (\mathbf{f})

Copyright By Edward Thomas 1917

in and Alta the C .

36

1 1

PREFACE.

The present book is more than a revision of my Process Digest, since it is entirely rewritten, all the cases being reread from the point of view of an attorney and expert witness, instead of that of a Patent Office Examiner. For this reason there are specific notes on the kind of evidence needed in chemical and allied cases, and also notes covering the cases on damages, licenses, etc. No attempt has been made to criticize any decision or the findings on which it is based. The book is intended as a statement of the law, with a practically complete "finding list" of the cases on which the law of chemical patents is based, and it also includes the principal cases intimately related in reasoning to such cases.

While errors will undoubtedly be found it is believed that they are only such as are easily recognized. I only regret that, unlike Robinson, I have not the leisure needed to spend two years in rereading and verifying every cited case.

Cases are cited from the reports most likely to be available, and which in general indicate the authority of the decision; viz: reports are given preference in the following order U. S. (including Wallace etc.); F. R.; O. G.; Fish. (Pat. Cases); Fish. Pat. Reports; Robb (Pat. Cases); Ban. and A.; Blatschf., etc. Readers who have only the Official Gazette can rapidly locate the F. Rt and U. S. cases included therein by ascertaining the approximately parallel volumes from the table on page 4.

Since the number of cases cited approaches that in the larger works on patent law, the notes have been condensed by citing in general, only the appeal case, or the last case of a series, if that rules on all the points previously raised, though where the prior cases are cited therein from unusual reports, the O. G. citations are given herein.

It is too much to hope that everyone will be satisfied with the grouping of the cases. An attempt has been made to cite all cases on obscure points, and on leading points to cite all important cases together with those cases which contain many citations. The work covers 242 U. S.; 237 F. R. and 235 O. G.

30 Vesey Street, New York City.

372184

N. N. W.

	100 A	Vols,		App. D. C. Vols.
YEAR.	0. 0. Vola.	Fed. Rep. Vols,	U. S. Vols	0.0
	Ö	Fed	ъ	Apr
	1872	1.2		*14-15 *16
1873	3-4		*17-22	
1874 1875	5-6 7-8		*23	
1876	9-10		91-93	
1877	11-12		93-97	
1878	13-14		97	
1879	15-16		97	
1880	17-18	1-4	100-102	
1881	19-20	5-9	102-103	
1882	21-22	9-14	104-106	
1883	23-25	14-18	106-109	
1884	26-29	18-22	109-112	
1885	30-33	22-25	112-116	
1886	34-37	25-29	116-119	
1887	38-41	29-32	119-123	
1888	42-45	32-36	123-128 129-132	
1890	46-49 50-53	36-40	132-137	
1891	54-57	44-48	138-141	
1892	58-61	48-58	143-145	
1893	62-65	52-58	147-150	2
1894	66-69	58-64	148-155	2, 3
1895	70.73	64-70	155-159	5, 6, 7
1896	74-77	70-76	161-163	7, 8, 9
1897	78-81	77-82	167	9, 10, 11
1898	82-85	83-90	169-170	11, 12, 1
1899	86-89	90-97	- 169	14, 15 15, 16, 1
1900	90-93	97-104	177-179	10, 16, 1
1901 1902	94-97 98-101	104-111	179-180 183-186	17,18
1902	102-107	118-125	183-191	21, 22
1904	108-113	125-132	192	23, 24
1905	114-119	133-140	193-198	24-26
1906	120-125	140-148	198-204	26-28
1907	126-131	148-156	206-207	28-30
1908	132-137	156-164	200-211	30-32
1909	138-149	164-173	213-214	33
1910	150-161	178-182	215-217	34
1911	162-173	182-190	220-221	36-38
1912	174-185	191-199	225-229	37-39
1913	186-197	200-208	226-229	89-41
1914	198-209	208-217	231-233	41
1915 1916	210-221 222-233	218-227 227-236	235-239 239-242	42, 43

TABLE OF PARALLEL VOLUMES.

4

E.

s.

•

. 1

01

18

41₁₂ 63

23 23

\$ \$

TEXT.

The intention of the patent law of the United States is to give a monopoly for seventeen years to the inventor or discoverer of a new art or a new utility in any substance, structure or piece of machinery. The inventor is required to publish a brief, clear description of his invention and to carefully define it (viz: claim it), so that anyone may at any time find out whether he is infringing on the rights of the inventor. Of course in carrying out this law many practical difficulties arise. It is, for example, often difficult to decide how far a definition or claim can be pushed in covering items substantially the same from one point of view though they differ in other ways. Then, too, the definition must cover a distinct step in advance and not something that is simply better but not otherwise new; further, the definition must cover the real invention and not a mere application of it.

It is obviously impossible for the Patent Office or the courts to examine every workshop, laboratory and factory, so in judging whether the improvement is really new it is necessary to take such published data as are available and decide from these whether the applicant for a patent has shown such an improvement as any skilled mechanic or expert in the art might be expected to have extemporized, or whether it is more than that and so deserving of a patent. In facing these difficulties and the analogous ones that arise in determining the scope of an invention, etc., the courts have laid down certain fundamental principles, such as that it is not patentable¹ to put an old machine to a new use; that an abandoned experiment^{\$} cannot defeat a later patent; and that where an improvement goes into extensive use from its own⁵ merits, a patent allowed on it must almost certainly have been justified.

Every patent (except for design patents) is directed either to an "instrument" or to an "operation," the "instrument" being either a machine, a "manufacture" (such as a structure which has some physical utility), or else a composition of matter, (though this last is really only a specific form of manufacture). Every chemical patent properly so called seems to be directed either to an "operation" per se, or else to an "instrument" whose patentability depends on its relationship to an operation in or on material outside itself, e. g., a dye.

1Ames v. Howard, 1 Robb. 689; Bean v. Smallwood, 2 Robb. 133. See also note 82. Falk v. Missouri, 103 F. R. 295.