

Client Advisory | *March 23, 2009*

Tafas v. Doll, Appeal 2008-1352 (Fed.Cir. March 20, 2009)

On March 20, 2009, a three-judge panel of the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit (Federal Circuit) rendered a decision that has important implications for U.S. patent practice. The decision was in the suits brought by Glaxo SmithKline (GSK) and Triantafyllos Tafas against the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) and the Director of the USPTO, requesting that the Court hold that certain Final Rules promulgated by the USPTO in 2007 were beyond the rulemaking authority of the USPTO, and impermissibly restricted the rights of patent applicants.

The Federal Circuit panel held that Final Rule 78, limiting the filing of continuation applications, was beyond the USPTO's rulemaking authority. The Court reversed the District Court's summary judgment that Final Rules 75, 114 and 265 were invalid, but remanded the case to the District Court to decide whether the Final Rules are beyond the USPTO rulemaking authority on other grounds.

In previous proceedings, the District Court had enjoined the USPTO from giving effect to promulgated Final Rules of the USPTO that would have made drastic changes in the patent application process (for a discussion of those Final Rules, see EAPD Client Advisories dated September 4, 2007 and October 17, 2007). The Federal Circuit's decision does not disturb the District Court's injunction, and none of the proposed Final Rules will come into effect without further proceedings.

The most controversial of the Final Rules was Rule 78, which would have effectively limited the number of continuation applications that an applicant can file. The three judge Federal Circuit

panel was unanimous in its decision that proposed Final Rule 78 is invalid because it is inconsistent with 35 U.S.C. §120, which governs the filing of continuation applications. The USPTO therefore cannot enforce Final Rule 78.

However, the Federal Circuit did not render a final decision as to whether three other Rules on Appeal (Final Rules 75, 114 and 265) are proper. Final Rule 114 limits the number of requests for continued examination (RCE) that can be filed. Final Rule 75 requires the submission of an examination support document (ESD) when an application or a group of related applications with patentably indistinct claims exceed a threshold limit of 5 independent and 25 total claims (the so-called 5/25 rule). Final Rule 265 sets forth the requirements of the ESD, and requires an applicant to conduct a preexamination prior art search. The District Court had held all three Rules outside the scope of the USPTO authority. The panel remanded the case to the District Court to consider whether any of the Final Rules, either on their face or as applied in any specific circumstances,

are proper. The guidelines provided by the Court include determining whether the Rules are arbitrary and capricious; whether any of the Final Rules conflict with the Patent Act in ways not specifically addressed in the Federal Circuit's opinion; whether all USPTO rulemaking is subject to notice and comment under 5 U.S.C. §553; whether any of the Final Rules are impermissibly vague; and whether the Final Rules are impermissibly retroactive.

Although this is an important decision by a Federal Circuit panel, it is not the last word on the Final Rules. As noted, the injunction against the USPTO putting them in effect is still in force. Though rare, it is possible that the Federal Court will decide to review the decision of the 3-judge panel en banc. The District Court must still decide whether Final Rules 75, 114 and 265 can be enforced. In view of the CAFC's decision that Rule 78 is invalid, it also is possible that the USPTO may rethink its position as to the other rules. EAPD will continue to monitor these issues and provide updates when further decisions are announced.

This advisory is for guidance only and is not intended to be a substitute for specific legal advice. If you would like further information, please contact the Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge LLP attorney responsible for your matters or any of our Intellectual property attorneys listed below:

Peter F. Corless, Partner

617.517.5557

PCorless@eapdlaw.com

This advisory is published by Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge for the benefit of clients, friends and fellow professionals on matters of interest. The information contained herein is not to be construed as legal advice or opinion. We provide such advice or opinion only after being engaged to do so with respect to particular facts and circumstances. The firm is not authorized under the U.K. Financial Services and Markets Act 2000 to offer UK investment services to clients. In certain circumstances, as members of the U.K. Law Society, we are able to provide these investment services if they are an incidental part of the professional services we have been engaged to provide.

Please note that your contact details, which may have been used to provide this bulletin to you, will be used for communications with you only. If you would prefer to discontinue receiving information from the firm, or wish that we not contact you for any purpose other than to receive future issues of this bulletin, please contact us at contactus@eapdlaw.com.

© 2009 Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge LLP a Delaware limited liability partnership including professional corporations and Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge UK LLP a limited liability partnership registered in England (registered number OC333092) and regulated by the Solicitors Regulation Authority.

Disclosure required under U.S. Circular 230: Edwards Angell Palmer & Dodge LLP informs you that any tax advice contained in this communication, including any attachments, was not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of avoiding federal tax related penalties, or promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein.

ATTORNEY ADVERTISING: This publication may be considered "advertising material" under the rules of professional conduct governing attorneys in some states. The hiring of an attorney is an important decision that should not be based solely on advertisements. Prior results do not guarantee similar outcomes.

**EDWARDS
ANGELL
PALMER &
DODGE**

111 Huntington Avenue
Boston, MA 02199
Tel 617.239.0100
Fax 617.227.4420
eapdlaw.com