



SEP 5 2001

In re

:
: DECISION ON
: PETITION FOR REGRADE
: UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 10.7(c)
:

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

(petitioner) petitions for regrading her answers to questions 3, 8, 38 and 50 of the morning section and questions 21, 29, 33, 37 and 40 of the afternoon section of the Registration Examination held on October 18, 2000. The petition is denied to the extent petitioner seeks a passing grade on the Registration Examination.

BACKGROUND

An applicant for registration to practice before the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) in patent cases must achieve a passing grade of 70 in both the morning and afternoon sections of the Registration Examination. Petitioner scored 65. On January 30, 2001, petitioner requested regrading, arguing that the model answers were incorrect.

As indicated in the instructions for requesting regrading of the Examination, in order to expedite a petitioner's appeal rights, a single final agency decision will be made regarding each request for regrade. The decision will be reviewable under

35 U.S.C. § 32. The Director of the USPTO, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 2(b)(2)(D) and 37 CFR 10.2 and 10.7, has delegated the authority to decide requests for regrade to the Director of Patent Legal Administration.

OPINION

Under 37 C.F.R. § 10.7(c), petitioner must establish any errors that occurred in the grading of the Examination. The directions state: " No points will be awarded for incorrect answers or unanswered questions." The burden is on petitioners to show that their chosen answers are the most correct answers.

The directions to the morning and afternoon sections state in part:

Do not assume any additional facts not presented in the questions. When answering each question, unless otherwise stated, assume that you are a registered patent practitioner. Any reference to a practitioner is a reference to a registered patent practitioner. The most correct answer is the policy, practice, and procedure which must, shall, or should be followed in accordance with the U.S. patent statutes, the PTO rules of practice and procedure, the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), and the Patent Cooperation Treaty (PCT) articles and rules, unless modified by a subsequent court decision or a notice in the Official Gazette. There is only one most correct answer for each question. Where choices (A) through (D) are correct and choice (E) is "All of the above," the last choice (E) will be the most correct answer and the only answer which will be accepted. Where two or more choices are correct, the most correct answer is the

answer which refers to each and every one of the correct choices. Where a question includes a statement with one or more blanks or ends with a colon, select the answer from the choices given to complete the statement which would make the statement true. Unless otherwise explicitly stated, all references to patents or applications are to be understood as being U.S. patents or regular (non-provisional) utility applications for utility inventions only, as opposed to plant or design applications for plant and design inventions.

Where the terms "USPTO" or "Office" are used in this examination, they mean the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

Petitioner has presented various arguments attacking the validity of the model answers. All of petitioner's arguments have been fully considered. Each question in the Examination is worth one point.

Petitioner has been awarded an additional point for morning question 50. Accordingly, petitioner has been granted an additional point on the Examination. No credit has been awarded for morning questions 3, 8 and 38 and afternoon questions 21, 29, 33, 37 and 40. Petitioner's arguments for these questions are addressed individually below.

Morning question 3 reads as follows:

3. You are a registered practitioner and filed a new application on behalf of John. All claims were drawn to a single invention. With the application, you submitted an offer to elect without traverse if the Office deems the application to be drawn to more than one invention, a search made by a foreign patent office, one copy each of the references deemed most closely related to the claimed subject matter, and a detailed discussion of the references pointing out with the particularity required by 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(b) and (c), how the claimed subject matter is patentable over the references. You also submitted a petition to make John's application special. John was 75 years of age at the time of filing, and in such poor health that his doctor had issued a certificate stating that John is unable to assist in the prosecution of his application. Which of the following, singularly or in combination, submitted with the petition, is not sufficient to result in the petition being granted?

I. The fee set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(i).

II. John's birth certificate showing his date of birth.

III. The doctor's certificate stating that John's health is such that he is unable to assist in the prosecution of his application.

(A) I

(B) II

(C) III

(D) II and III

(E) None of the above.

The model answer is selection E.

MPEP § 708.02. I is sufficient to result in the petition being granted. MPEP § 708.02, subpart (VIII). II is sufficient. MPEP § 708.02, subpart (IV). III is sufficient. MPEP § 708.02, subpart (III). Therefore, (A) through (D) are incorrect.

Petitioner argues that answer (A) is correct. Petitioner contends that no showing as required by 37 CFR 1.102(a) is given in the fact pattern.

Petitioner's arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Contrary to petitioner's statement that no showing as required by 37 CFR 1.102(a) is given in the fact pattern, the fact pattern lists all of the requirements for accelerated examination as shown in MPEP 708.02 (VIII). This MPEP section states that a new application may be granted special status provided that applicant complies with each of

an enumerated list, which the above fact pattern indicates is complied with. Accordingly, model answer (E) is correct and petitioner's answer (A) is incorrect.

No error in grading has been shown. Petitioner's request for credit on this question is denied.

Morning question 8 reads as follows:

8. Which of the following is true?

(A) If after the filing of a reissue application no errors in the original patent are found, a reissue patent will be granted on the reissue application noting no change, and the original patent will be returned to the applicant.

(B) In order to add matter not previously found in the patent, a continuation-in-part reissue application must be filed.

(C) In a reissue application, additions and deletions to the original patent should be made by underlining and bracketing, respectively, except for changes made in prior Certificates of Correction and disclaimer(s) of claims under 37 C.F.R. §1.321(a).

(D) A dependent claim may be broadened in a reissue application only in the first two years of the enforceable life of the patent.

(E) (A), (B), and (C).

The model answer is selection C.

See MPEP § 1411.01. As to (A) see MPEP § 1402. A reissue patent is not granted. As to (B), new matter may not be entered in a reissue. As to (D) see MPEP § 1412.03, p.1400-13. Since (A), and (B) are incorrect, (E) is incorrect.

Petitioner argues that answer (D) is correct. Petitioner contends that if a dependent claim is broadened by virtue of its precedent independent claim being broadened, then (D) is true. Petitioner provides no reason for considering model answer (C) to be in error.

Petitioner's arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Contrary to petitioner's statement that if a dependent claim is broadened by virtue of its precedent independent claim being broadened, then (D) is true, the instructions specifically state "Do not assume any additional facts not presented in the questions." There is no reason to assume that an independent claim has been broadened and absent

such an assumption, (D) is not true. Accordingly, model answer (C) is correct and petitioner's answer (D) is incorrect.

No error in grading has been shown. Petitioner's request for credit on this question is denied.

Please answer questions 38 and 39 based on the following information.

Ace Equipment Corp., approaches you with information concerning a pending original U.S. patent application of its chief competitor. A copy of the patent application, which was filed July 9, 1999, and its entire prosecution history was provided to Ace during negotiations concerning the competitor's trade secret technology. The application stands rejected by the examiner on the basis of a prior art patent. A foreign patent application corresponding to the competitor's U.S. patent application had previously published, and Ace was not required to maintain its knowledge of the U.S. application in confidence. Ace is virtually certain that the competitor had used the claimed invention publicly more than one year before the filing date of the patent application and would like to take whatever steps are available to prevent the application from issuing as a patent. However, Ace does not want the competitor to know they oppose issuance of the patent. The competitor does not know that you represent Ace.

Morning question 38 reads as follows:

38. Which of the following would be the best advice from you to Ace?

(A) Recommend initiating a public use proceeding by filing a petition signed by you and serving a copy of the petition on the competitor. The petition would assert that a statutory bar exists that prohibits the patenting of the subject matter of the application, would be supported by appropriate affidavits or declarations, and would describe the subject matter that was in public use sufficiently to enable the examiner to compare the claimed subject matter to the subject matter in public use. The petition would indicate that a copy of the petition was served on the applicant and would specifically identify the application by serial number and filing date, but would not identify Ace. Any required fee would also be submitted with the petition.

(B) Recommend filing a copy of the competitor's application as a new patent application naming an Ace employee as the inventor. You then submit a statement that the claims have been copied from the competitor's application, and request that an interference proceeding be declared. During the interference

proceeding, you can file a preliminary motion under 37 C.F.R. § 1.633(a) in an effort to obtain a ruling that the subject matter is not patentable to the competitor due to the earlier public use.

(C) Inform Ace that because patent applications are maintained in confidence under 35 U.S.C. § 122 and because patent prosecution is conducted *ex parte*, there is nothing that can be done until the patent issues. Once the patent issues, you can file an anonymous request for re-examination based on the competitor's public use of the invention more than one year before the filing date.

(D) For strategic reasons, recommend waiting to see if the competitor is able to overcome the examiner's rejection. If the patent issues, you can then file an anonymous request for re-examination on Ace's behalf based on the competitor's public use of the invention more than one year before the filing date.

(E) Recommend initiating an inter partes protest by submitting a written protest signed by you. The protest would not provide any information other than identifying the application.

The model answer is selection A.

See 37 C.F.R. § 1.292; MPEP § 720. (B) is unreasonable at least because no employee at Ace can legitimately be identified as an inventor. (C) and (D) are unreasonable at least because re-examination may not be based on public use. (C) is also unreasonable in suggesting that nothing can be done because the application is maintained in confidence by the Patent Office. (E) is incorrect at least because a protest is not conducted as an inter partes proceeding. 37 C.F.R. § 1.291(c); MPEP § 1901.07.

Petitioner argues that answer (C) is correct. Petitioner contends that answer (A) is incorrect because it relies on affidavits and declarations which would be improper to present. Petitioner presents no argument supporting the correctness of answer (C).

Petitioner's arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Contrary to petitioner's statement that answer (A) is incorrect because it relies on affidavits and declarations which would be improper to present, MPEP 720 supports the use of affidavits and declarations in public use proceedings. To the extent petitioner's argument are based on conclusions from the facts that there is insufficient evidence to support affidavits because facts are only virtually certain and that affidavits would disclose Aces' identity, there is no reason to necessarily assume either of these conclusions from the fact pattern. A prima facie case may be made from facts that are virtually certain. Affidavits may be introduced by parties other than Ace. Accordingly, model answer (A) is correct and petitioner's answer (C) is incorrect.

No error in grading has been shown. Petitioner's request for credit on this question is denied.

Afternoon question 21 reads as follows:

21. You are prosecuting a patent application wherein an Office action has been issued rejecting the claims as being obvious over the prior art and objecting to the drawings as failing to illustrate an item that is fully described in the specification and included in a dependent claim. The examiner has required an amendment to Figure 1 to illustrate the item. In preparing a reply to the Office action, you identify several errors in Figure 2 that should also be corrected. Assuming that you make an amendment to the claims and develop persuasive arguments to overcome the obviousness rejection and that the examiner will not object to your desired changes to Figure 2, which of the following actions is likely to lead to the most favorable result?

(A) Submit a reply amending the claims and setting forth your arguments to overcome the obviousness rejection. Submit a separate cover letter for replacement Figures 1 and 2 that incorporate the amendments to the drawings.

(B) Submit a reply amending the claims and setting forth your arguments to overcome the obviousness rejection. In the Remarks portion of the reply, explain the proposed drawing changes and attach copies of Figures 1 and 2 with the changes marked in red for the examiner's review and approval.

(C) Submit a reply amending the claims and setting forth your arguments to overcome the obviousness rejection. In a separate paper, explain the proposed drawing changes and attach copies of Figures 1 and 2 with the changes marked in red for the examiner's review and approval.

(D) Options (A), (B) and (C) are equally likely to lead to the most favorable result.

(E) Options (B) and (C) are equally likely to lead to the most favorable result.

The model answer is selection C.

(A) is not the best answer because drawing changes normally must be approved by the examiner before the application will be allowed. The examiner must give written approval for alterations or corrections before the drawing is corrected. MPEP § 608.02(q). (B) is not the best answer because any proposal by an applicant for amendment of the drawing to cure defects must be embodied in a separate letter to the draftsman. MPEP §

608.02(r). (D) is not the best answer because it incorporates (A) and (B), and (E) is not the best answer because it incorporates (B).

Petitioner argues that answer (E) is correct. Petitioner contends that (B) as well as (C) is likely to result in a notice of allowance which is the most favorable result because both (B) and (C) are responsive to the Office action.

Petitioner's arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Contrary to petitioner's statement that (B) as well as (C) is likely to result in a notice of allowance which is the most favorable result because both (B) and (C) are responsive to the Office action, (B) is not equally likely because any proposal by an applicant for amendment of the drawing to cure defects must be embodied in a separate letter to the draftsman. MPEP § 608.02(r). (B) may result in a Quayle action, but not a notice of allowance as suggested by petitioner. Accordingly, model answer (C) is correct and petitioner's answer (E) is incorrect.

No error in grading has been shown. Petitioner's request for credit on this question is denied.

Afternoon question 29 reads as follows:

29. Your Canadian client, UpNorth Incorporated, came to you on August 11, 2000 with a valuable invention for pulping timber. UpNorth informed you it had been successfully using the invention commercially for the past fourteen months deep in the Canadian forests. The invention has not been used anywhere else by UpNorth, and the pulped timber from the UpNorth operations has not left Canada. At least one competitor, another Canadian company, lawfully observed the invention in operation during its first month of use with no restriction as to confidentiality or disclosure. UpNorth filed a Canadian patent application prior to commercial use of the invention, but (in an effort to hold down expenses) chose not file a corresponding application in the United States. The Canadian patent application remains pending. UpNorth just learned that two months ago its competitor began using the invention commercially in the United States. The invention was never disclosed or used in the United States prior to two months ago. UpNorth would like for you seek a United States patent on the invention to block the competitor from continued use of the invention. Which of the following would be reasonable advice from you to UpNorth?

(A) Since Canada is a NAFTA country, UpNorth is precluded from getting a United States patent because the Canadian application was filed more than twelve months ago and the invention was in public use more than one year prior to any possible United States filing date for an UpNorth patent application.

(B) UpNorth should promptly file an application in the United States claiming the benefit of the filing date of the Canadian application and should fully disclose the Canadian commercial activities, the observation of the invention in Canada by UpNorth's competitor, and the competitor's commercial activities in the United States.

(C) UpNorth should promptly file an application in the United States without claiming the benefit of the filing date of the Canadian application and should fully disclose the Canadian commercial activities, the observation of the invention in Canada by UpNorth's competitor, and the competitor's commercial activities in the United States.

(D) UpNorth should abandon the pending Canadian application to avoid the possibility the Canadian application could be used as prior art against a United States patent application, and then file a patent application in the United States.

(E) Since UpNorth's activities concerning the invention all took place in Canada, the competitor's commercial use in the United States prior to any possible United States filing date for an UpNorth patent application precludes UpNorth from obtaining a United States patent.

The model answer is selection C.

With regard to Statement (A), public use in Canada is not a statutory bar under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) regardless of whether Canada is a NAFTA country. MPEP § 706.02(c). Thus, although UpNorth cannot claim priority to the Canadian application under 35 U.S.C. § 119, their commercial activity is not a bar. Statement (B) is incorrect because UpNorth cannot rely on the Canadian application for priority. 35 U.S.C. § 119. Under the given facts, the Canadian application would not be prior art against a U.S. application regardless of whether the Canadian application was abandoned. Thus, (D) is not reasonable advice. Under 35 U.S.C. § 104, UpNorth can rely on Canadian activities to establish a date of invention prior to the competitor's commercial use in the United States. Statement (E) is therefore not reasonable advice.

Petitioner argues that answer (B) is correct. Petitioner contends that (B) would at the worst result in the same filing date as (C) and at best might result in priority based on the Canadian application.

Petitioner's arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Contrary to petitioner's statement that (B) would at the worst result in the same filing date as (C) and at best might result in priority based on the Canadian application, making a priority claim where the practitioner knows the claim cannot be supported may be considered lack of candor and good faith due under 37 CFR 1.56 and potentially fraud

upon the Office, ^{uh, ah} ~~which~~ could seriously undermine UpNorth's rights. Accordingly, model answer (C) is correct and petitioner's answer (B) is incorrect.

No error in grading has been shown. Petitioner's request for credit on this question is denied.

Afternoon question 33 reads as follows:

33. Mike and Jill are members of the Virginia Bar with a general law practice. Jill is registered to practice before the USPTO and is constantly poking fun at Mike for not being registered. Jake, one of Mike's former clients, owns a small tool shop and while attempting to remove a broken drill bit from a work piece, invented a tool that easily extracts a broken bit. The tool is simple to make. Jake asked Mike if he could patent his invention, and Mike, desiring to impress Jill with his patent skills, said, "No problem." Using a "how to" book that he obtained from the INTERNET, Mike prepared an application on Jake's invention and filed it in the USPTO together with a power of attorney which Jake executed naming Jack as attorney of record. Shortly thereafter, the Mike and Jill firm hired Jim, a registered patent attorney, and Mike physically filed a document with the USPTO naming Jim as an associate attorney in Jake's application. Upon reviewing Jake's application, Jim discovered that the original claims omitted the recitation of a critical element which was disclosed in the specification. Assuming a preliminary amendment is filed with the USPTO adding the critical element to the claims, and explaining in the REMARKS that the critical element was inadvertently omitted at the time of filing the application, which of the following is the most comprehensive answer in identifying the individual(s), if any, who by signing the amendment will be recognized by the USPTO for representation?

- (A) Jake
- (B) Jim
- (C) Jill
- (D) All of the above
- (E) None of the above

The model answer is selection D.

Jake is the applicant, and Jim and Jill are registered practitioners. "An applicant for patent may file and prosecute his or her own application..." MPEP § 401. The applicant, Jake, is not required to revoke Mike's power of attorney because Jack is unregistered, and therefore his appointment is void ab initio. MPEP § 402, Form Paragraph 4.09 (first paragraph). Jim and Jill's signature constitutes "a representation to the Patent and Trademark Office that...he or she is authorized to represent the particular party in whose behalf he or she acts." 37 C.F.R. § 1.34. This privilege applies whether or

not the registered attorney is of record. 37 C.F.R. § 1.31; MPEP § 402. (A), (B), and (C) are wrong because they do not represent the “most comprehensive” answer. (E) is wrong because it is inconsistent with (D), which is correct.

Petitioner argues that answer (A) is correct. Petitioner contends that Jim would not be recognized because he is not authorized.

Petitioner’s arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Contrary to petitioner’s statement that Jim would not be recognized because he is not authorized, Jim and Jill’s signature constitutes “a representation to the Patent and Trademark Office that...he or she is authorized to represent the particular party in whose behalf he or she acts.” 37 C.F.R. § 1.34. This privilege applies whether or not the registered attorney is of record. 37 C.F.R. § 1.31; MPEP § 402. Accordingly, model answer (D) is correct and petitioner’s answer (A) is incorrect.

No error in grading has been shown. Petitioner’s request for credit on this question is denied.

Afternoon question 37 reads as follows:

37. You have taken over prosecution of a patent application in January 1998 that had previously been handled by another patent practitioner. The original application had been filed with all required fees, a preliminary amendment, and a signed inventor’s declaration referring to the original application. The original application contained independent claims 1 and 7 and dependent claims 2-6 and 8-14. The preliminary amendment added independent claim 15 and dependent claims 16-19, but made no changes to the specification. A first, nonfinal Office action issued wherein the examiner determined that claim 17 included new matter. The examiner rejected claim 17 on this basis and required cancellation of the claim. All other claims were allowed. You have been asked to respond to the Office action. Which of the following is the most reasonable reply?

(A) File a Request for Reconsideration explaining that since the Preliminary Amendment was filed concurrently with the original application, the examiner should consider the Preliminary Amendment to be part of the original disclosure and the rejection should be removed.

(B) File a Petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.181 for a review of the examiner’s determination that claim 17 includes new matter along with any required fees.

(C) File a Notice of Appeal along with any required fees.

(D) Submit a new inventor's declaration that refers to both the original application and the preliminary amendment along with a Request for Reconsideration explaining that since the Preliminary Amendment was filed concurrently with the original application, the examiner should consider the Preliminary Amendment to be part of the original disclosure and the rejection should be removed.

(E) Submit a new inventor's declaration that refers to both the original application and the preliminary amendment, file a Petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.182 along with the petition fee, requesting that the original oath or declaration be disregarded and that the application be treated as an application filed without an oath or declaration, and pay the surcharge for missing parts.

The model answer is selection E.

MPEP §§ 608.04(b) and 608.04(c). Answer (A) is incorrect because the preliminary amendment does not enjoy the status as part of the original disclosure in an application accompanied by a signed declaration unless the preliminary amendment is referred to in the declaration. (B) is incorrect because a petition under §1.181 would only be appropriate if the new matter is confined to the specification. If the new matter is introduced into or affects the claims, the question becomes an appealable one. (C) is incorrect because the Office action is a first, non-final action and the issue is therefore not yet ripe for appeal. 37 C.F.R. § 1.191. (D) is incorrect because the original disclosure cannot be altered merely by filing of a subsequent oath or declaration referring to different papers.

Petitioner argues that answer (D) is also correct. Petitioner contends that (D) would result in successful prosecution and the original declaration could be considered merely defective.

Petitioner's arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Contrary to petitioner's statement that (D) would result in successful prosecution and the original declaration could be considered merely defective, the original disclosure cannot be altered merely by filing of a subsequent oath or declaration referring to different papers. MPEP §§ 608.04(b) and 608.04(c). Accordingly, model answer (E) is correct and petitioner's answer (D) is incorrect.

No error in grading has been shown. Petitioner's request for credit on this question is denied.

Afternoon question 40 reads as follows:

40. Stan, through a registered practitioner, files an application for a patent. During the prosecution of Stan's patent, in an amendment, the practitioner admitted in his discussion as to "all the claims" of Stan's application, that "the most pertinent available prior art known to the Applicants and their representatives is the Acme Patent, cited by the examiner." Within one year after the patent issues, Stan comes to you and wants to file a reissue to broaden his claims, based on the fact that the Acme patent is not prior art. He has ample evidence to show that he conceived and reduced his invention to practice before the filing date of the Acme patent. Which of the following is true?

(A) Stan should file a reissue application accompanied by a declaration under 37 C.F.R. 1.131 to swear behind the date of the Acme reference. The statement by the registered practitioner, who formerly represented Stan, that the Acme patent was prior art constituted error without deceptive intent and may be corrected by reissue.

(B) Stan should file a request for reexamination and submit the Acme patent along with evidence in the form of affidavits or declarations showing that the Acme patent is not prior art.

(C) The explicit admission by registered practitioner, who formerly represented Stan, that the Acme patent constituted prior art is binding on Stan in any later proceeding involving the patent.

(D) Since Acme patent was cited by the examiner and not by the registered practitioner, who formerly represented Stan, Stan can not be held accountable for the error. Moreover, the statement by was directed to the pertinence of the prior art and not to the issue of whether the date of the Acme patent could be sworn behind. Accordingly, the statement has no binding effect.

(E) (A) and (D).

The model answer is selection C.

Admissions by applicant constitute prior art. As explained in *Tyler Refrigeration v. Kysor Industrial Corp.*, 777 F.2d 687, 227 USPQ 845 (Fed. Cir. 1985), the Fed. Circuit found that the district court decided on two separate and independent grounds that the Aokage patent was such prior art. One basis was Tyler's admission of the Aokage reference as prior art before the PTO during the prosecution of the '922 Subera patent. The court found that, in a wrap-up amendment, the Tyler attorney admitted in his discussion as to "all the claims" of the three Subera applications, that "the most pertinent available prior art known to the Applicants and their representatives is the Aokage U.S. Patent 4,026,121 cited by the Examiner" (emphasis added). In view of this explicit admission, the district court's decision was proper and was sufficiently based on clear and

convincing evidence. The controlling case law in this court recognizes this principle. See *Aktiebolaget Karlstads Mekaniska Werkstad v. ITC*, 705 F.2d 1565, 1574, 217 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 865, 871 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Fout*, 675 F.2d 297, 300, 213 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 532, 536 (CCPA 1982), and *In re Nomiya*, 509 F.2d 566, 571, 184 U.S.P.Q. (BNA) 607, 612 (CCPA 1975). Thus, we must affirm the court's decision that the Aokage patent was prior art and as such binding on Tyler. (Here again, we do not pass on the other grounds on which the court concluded that the Aokage was prior art within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102.) Since (C) is true, (D) is not true. Answers (A), (B) and (D) also are not true since the Acme patent can not be sworn behind or otherwise removed as a result of the admission. (E) is not true because (A) and (D) are not true.

Petitioner argues that answer (B) is correct. Petitioner contends that the practioner's admission that Acme is the most pertinent prior art is not an admission that Acme anticipates the invention.

Petitioner's arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive. Contrary to petitioner's statement that the practioner's admission that Acme is the most pertinent prior art is not an admission that Acme anticipates the invention, answer (C) does not state that Acme necessarily anticipates the broadened claims, but only that Acme must be considered prior art because of applicant's admission. The only basis for applicant's distinguishing Acme in the fact pattern is the date of Acme as not being prior to the reduction to practice, which cannot be made at issue because of applicant's admission, making answer (C) correct. (B) cannot be correct because of applicant's admissions. Accordingly, model answer (C) is correct and petitioner's answer (B) is incorrect.

No error in grading has been shown. Petitioner's request for credit on this question is denied.

ORDER

For the reasons given above, one point has been added to petitioner's score on the Examination. Therefore, petitioner's score is 66. This score is insufficient to pass the Examination.

Upon consideration of the request for regrade to the Director of the USPTO, it is ORDERED that the request for a passing grade on the Examination is denied.

This is a final agency action.



Robert J. Spar
Director, Office of Patent Legal Administration
Office of the Deputy Commissioner
for Patent Examination Policy