

Chapter 1300 Allowance and Issue

- 1301 Substantially Allowable Application, Special**
- 1302 [Reserved]**
- 1302.01** General Review of Disclosure
- 1302.02** Requirement for a Rewritten Specification
- 1302.03** Notice of Allowability
- 1302.04** Examiner’s Amendments and Changes
 - 1302.04(a)** Title of Invention
 - 1302.04(b)** [Reserved]
 - 1302.04(c)** Cancellation of Claims to Nonelected Invention
 - 1302.04(d)** Cancellation of Claim Lost in Interference
 - 1302.04(e)** Cancellation of Rejected Claims Following Appeal
 - 1302.04(f)** [Reserved]
 - 1302.04(g)** Identification of Claims
 - 1302.04(h)** Rejoinder of Claims
- 1302.05** Correction of Drawing
- 1302.06** Prior Foreign Application
- 1302.07** [Reserved]
- 1302.08** Interference Search
- 1302.09** Classification, Print Figure, and Other Notations
- 1302.10** Issue Classification Notations
- 1302.11** [Reserved]
- 1302.12** Listing of References
- 1302.13** Signing
- 1302.14** Reasons for Allowance
- 1303 Notice of Allowance**
- 1303.01** Amendment Received After Allowance
- 1303.02** Undelivered
- 1303.03** Not Withheld Due to Death of Inventor
- 1304 Amendments After D-10 Notice**
- 1304.01** Withholding From Issue of “Secrecy Order” Applications
- 1305 Jurisdiction**
- 1306 Issue Fee**
- 1306.01** Deferring Issuance of a Patent
- 1306.02** Simultaneous Issuance of Patents
- 1306.03** Practice After Payment of Issue Fee; Receipt of Issue Notification
- 1307 Change in Classification of Cases Which Are in Issue**
- 1308 Withdrawal From Issue**
- 1308.01** Rejection After Allowance

- 1308.02** For Interference or Derivation Purposes
- 1308.03** Quality Review Program for Examined Patent Applications
- 1309 Issue of Patent**
- 1309.01** [Reserved]
- 1309.02** “Printer Rush” Cases

1301 Substantially Allowable Application, Special [R-08.2012]

When an application is in condition for allowance, except as to matters of form, the application will be considered special and prompt action taken to require correction of formal matters. See [MPEP § 710.02\(b\)](#).

1302 [Reserved]

1302.01 General Review of Disclosure [R-07.2015]

When an application is apparently ready for allowance, it should be reviewed by the examiner to make certain that the whole application meets all formal and substantive (i.e., statutory) requirements and that the language of the claims is enabled by, and finds adequate descriptive support in, the application disclosure as originally filed. Neglect to give due attention to these matters may lead to confusion as to the scope of the patent.

There should be clear support or antecedent basis in the specification for the terminology used in the claims. Usually, the original claims follow the nomenclature of the specification; but sometimes in amending the claims or in adding new claims, applicant employs terms that do not appear in the specification. This may result in uncertainty as to the interpretation to be given such terms. See [MPEP § 608.01\(o\)](#). It should be noted, however, that exact terms need not be used *in haec verba* to satisfy the written description requirement of [35 U.S.C. 112\(a\)](#). *Eiselstein v. Frank*, 52 F.3d 1035, 1038, 34 USPQ2d 1467, 1470 (Fed. Cir. 1995); *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 265, 191 USPQ 90, 98 (CCPA 1976). See also [37 CFR 1.121\(e\)](#) which merely requires *substantial* correspondence between the language of the claims and the language of the specification.

The claims should be renumbered as required by [37 CFR 1.126](#), and particular attention should be given to claims dependent on previous claims to see that the numbering is consistent. See [MPEP § 608.01\(j\)](#) and [§ 608.01\(n\)](#).

The abstract should be checked for an adequate and clear statement of the disclosed invention. See [MPEP § 608.01\(b\)](#). The length of the abstract should be limited to 150 words. For changes to the abstract by examiner's amendment, see [MPEP § 1302.04](#).

The title should also be checked. The title may not exceed 500 characters in length and must be as short and specific as possible. See [37 CFR 1.72](#). The title should be descriptive of the invention claimed, even though a longer title may result. If a satisfactory title is not supplied by the applicant, the examiner may change the title on or after allowance. See [MPEP § 606](#) and [§ 606.01](#).

All amendments should be reviewed to assure that they were timely filed.

1302.02 Requirement for a Rewritten Specification [R-08.2012]

Whenever interlineations or cancellations have been made in the specification or amendments which would lead to confusion and mistake, the examiner should require the entire portion of specification affected to be rewritten before passing the

application to issue. See [37 CFR 1.125](#) and [MPEP § 608.01\(q\)](#).

Form paragraph 13.01 should be used when making such a requirement.

¶ 13.01 Requirement for Rewritten Specification

The interlineations or cancellations made in the specification or amendments to the claims could lead to confusion and mistake during the issue and printing processes. Accordingly, the portion of the specification or claims as identified below is required to be rewritten before passing the case to issue. See [37 CFR 1.125](#) and [MPEP § 608.01\(q\)](#).

Examiner Note:

1. Specific discussion of the sections of the specification or claims required to be rewritten must be set forth.
2. See form paragraph 6.28.01 for a substitute specification.

1302.03 Notice of Allowability [R-07.2015]

A Notice of Allowability form PTOL-37 is used whenever an application has been placed in condition for allowance. The date of any communication and/or interview which resulted in the allowance should be included in the notice.

In *all* instances, both before and after final rejection, in which an application is placed in condition for allowance, applicant should be notified promptly of allowability of the claims by a Notice of Allowability PTOL-37. Prompt notice to applicant is important because it may avoid an unnecessary appeal and act as a safeguard against a holding of abandonment.

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--------------|---|---|--|
| Notice of Allowability | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | AIA (First Inventor to File) Status No | | |
| <p style="text-align: center;"><i>-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--</i></p> <p>All claims being allowable, PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS (OR REMAINS) CLOSED in this application. If not included herewith (or previously mailed), a Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) or other appropriate communication will be mailed in due course. THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWABILITY IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS. This application is subject to withdrawal from issue at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. See 37 CFR 1.313 and MPEP 1308.</p> <p>1. <input type="checkbox"/> This communication is responsive to _____. <input type="checkbox"/> A declaration(s)/affidavit(s) under 37 CFR 1.130(b) was/were filed on _____.</p> <p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> An election was made by the applicant in response to a restriction requirement set forth during the interview on _____; the restriction requirement and election have been incorporated into this action.</p> <p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> The allowed claim(s) is/are _____. As a result of the allowed claim(s), you may be eligible to benefit from the Patent Prosecution Highway program at a participating intellectual property office for the corresponding application. For more information, please see http://www.uspto.gov/patents/init_events/pph/index.isg or send an inquiry to PPHfeedback@uspto.gov.</p> <p>4. <input type="checkbox"/> Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</p> <p>Certified copies:</p> <p>a) <input type="checkbox"/> All b) <input type="checkbox"/> Some *c) <input type="checkbox"/> None of the:</p> <p>1. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</p> <p>2. <input type="checkbox"/> Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.</p> <p>3. <input type="checkbox"/> Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</p> <p>* Certified copies not received: _____.</p> <p>Applicant has THREE MONTHS FROM THE "MAILING DATE" of this communication to file a reply complying with the requirements noted below. Failure to timely comply will result in ABANDONMENT of this application. THIS THREE-MONTH PERIOD IS NOT EXTENDABLE.</p> <p>5. <input type="checkbox"/> CORRECTED DRAWINGS (as "replacement sheets") must be submitted. <input type="checkbox"/> including changes required by the attached Examiner's Amendment / Comment or in the Office action of Paper No./Mail Date _____.</p> <p>Identifying indicia such as the application number (see 37 CFR 1.84(c)) should be written on the drawings in the front (not the back) of each sheet. Replacement sheet(s) should be labeled as such in the header according to 37 CFR 1.121(d).</p> <p>6. <input type="checkbox"/> DEPOSIT OF and/or INFORMATION about the deposit of BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL must be submitted. Note the attached Examiner's comment regarding REQUIREMENT FOR THE DEPOSIT OF BIOLOGICAL MATERIAL.</p> <p>Attachment(s)</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%; border: none;"> 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statements (PTO/SB/08), Paper No./Mail Date _____ 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit of Biological Material 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413), Paper No./Mail Date _____ </td> <td style="width: 50%; border: none;"> 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Amendment/Comment 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance 7. <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ </td> </tr> </table> | | | | 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statements (PTO/SB/08), Paper No./Mail Date _____ 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit of Biological Material 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413), Paper No./Mail Date _____ | 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Amendment/Comment 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance 7. <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ |
| 1. <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statements (PTO/SB/08), Paper No./Mail Date _____ 3. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Comment Regarding Requirement for Deposit of Biological Material 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413), Paper No./Mail Date _____ | 5. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Amendment/Comment 6. <input type="checkbox"/> Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance 7. <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____ | | | | |

1302.04 Examiner's Amendments and Changes [R-10.2019]

With the exception of the following no corrections or interlineations may be made by the examiner in the body of written portions of the specification or any other paper filed in the application for patent, except by examiner's amendment approved by applicant and as described hereinafter. (See [37 CFR 1.121](#).):

(A) Renumber the claims in accordance with [37 CFR 1.126](#);

(B) Correct erroneous citations on an Information Disclosure Statement (see [MPEP § 707.05\(g\)](#));

(C) Correct an amendment filed under [37 CFR 1.312](#) that is non-compliant under [37 CFR 1.121](#) whose entry would otherwise be recommended (see [MPEP § 714.16](#));

(D) Cancel claims directed to a non-elected invention, where the election was made without traverse and the claims are not eligible for rejoinder (see [MPEP § 821.02](#)); and

(E) Amendment and/or cancellation of claims following a decision by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board as described in [MPEP §§ 1214](#), [1214.05](#), and [1214.06](#).

The prior practice of informal examiner's amendments are not permitted in Image File Wrapper (IFW) applications. Any amendment of an IFW application must be by way of an examiner's amendment, as described below, or be an amendment made by the applicant.

For continuing applications filed under [37 CFR 1.53\(b\)](#), a reference to a parent application in the first sentence(s) of the specification is no longer required when the reference appears in an Application Data Sheet. If a reference to the parent application has not been included in the first sentence(s) of the specification an examiner should not add a reference to the prior application without the approval of the applicant and an examiner's amendment. If applicant has included a reference to the parent application, the examiner should review the statement and the application data sheet for accuracy. Applicant may decide to delete the benefit

claim in the application filed under [37 CFR 1.53\(b\)](#). Furthermore, a petition under [37 CFR 1.78](#) to accept an unintentionally delayed benefit claim may be required if the application is a utility or plant application filed on or after November 29, 2000. See [MPEP § 211.04](#).

An examiner's amendment may be used to correct informalities in the body of the written portions of the specification as well as all errors and omissions in the claims. The examiner's amendment must be signed by the primary examiner, entered into the file and a copy sent to applicant. The changes specified in the amendment are entered by the technical support staff in the regular way. An examiner's amendment should include form paragraph 13.02 and form paragraph 13.02.01. Form paragraph 13.02.02 should be used if an extension of time is required.

¶ 13.02 Examiner's Amendment

An examiner's amendment to the record appears below. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by [37 CFR 1.312](#). To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Examiner Note:

This form paragraph is NOT to be used in a reexamination proceeding (use form paragraph 22.06 instead).

¶ 13.02.01 Examiner's Amendment Authorized

Authorization for this examiner's amendment was given in an interview with [1] on [2].

¶ 13.02.02 Extension of Time and Examiner's Amendment Authorized

An extension of time under [37 CFR 1.136\(a\)](#) is required in order to make an examiner's amendment that places this application in condition for allowance. During a conversation conducted on [1], [2] requested an extension of time for [3] MONTH(S) and authorized the Director to charge Deposit Account No. [4] the required fee of \$ [5] for this extension and authorized the following examiner's amendment. Should the changes and/or additions be unacceptable to applicant, an amendment may be filed as provided by [37 CFR 1.312](#). To ensure consideration of such an amendment, it MUST be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee.

Examiner Note:

1. See [MPEP § 706.07\(f\)](#) which explains when an extension of time is needed in order to make amendments to place the application in condition for allowance.

2. In no case can any extension carry the date for reply to an Office action beyond the maximum period of SIX MONTHS set by statute ([35 U.S.C. 133](#)).

Although [37 CFR 1.121](#) has been amended to require amendments to the specification/claims to be made in compliance with [37 CFR 1.121\(b\)\(1\)](#), [\(b\)\(2\)](#), or [\(c\)](#), where appropriate, [37 CFR 1.121\(g\)](#) permits the Office to make amendments to the specification, including the claims, by examiner's amendments without the need to comply with the requirements of [37 CFR 1.121\(b\)\(1\)](#), [\(b\)\(2\)](#), or [\(c\)](#) in the interest of expediting prosecution and reducing cycle time. Examiners may continue to make additions or deletions of subject matter in the specification, including the claims, in examiner's amendments by instructions to make the change at a precise location in the specification and/or the claims. Examiners may use an examiner's amendment to correct a non-compliant amendment filed by the applicant if the amendment would otherwise place the application in condition for allowance (e.g., a reply to a non-final Office action or an after-final amendment includes an incorrect status identifier). See [MPEP § 714](#), subsection II.E, Examiner's Amendments.

As an alternative, the examiner's amendment utilizing paragraph/claim replacement can be created by the examiner with authorization from the applicant. The examiner's amendment can also be created from a facsimile transmission or e-mailed amendment received by the examiner and referenced in the examiner's amendment and attached thereto. Any subject matter, in clean version form (containing no brackets or underlining), to be added to the specification/claims should be set forth separately by applicant in the e-mail or facsimile submission apart from the remainder of the submission. A clean version of a paragraph/claim, or portion of a paragraph/claim, submitted by applicant in a fax or e-mail, should be printed and attached to the examiner's amendment and may be relied on as part of the examiner's amendment. The examiner should mark "requested" on the entire attachment to indicate that the fax or e-mail was requested by the examiner, so as to not lead to a reduction in patent term adjustment ([37 CFR 1.704\(c\)\(8\)](#)). As the attachment is made part of the examiner's amendment, it does not get a separate PALM code and will not trigger any reduction in patent term adjustment. A paper

copy of the entire e-mail or facsimile submission should be entered in the application file. Examiners are not required to electronically save any e-mails once any e-mails or attachments thereto are printed and become part of an application file record. The e-mail practice that is an exception for examiner's amendments is restricted to e-mails to the examiner from the applicant and should not be generated by the examiner to the applicant unless such e-mails are in compliance with all of the requirements set out in [MPEP § 502.03](#).

The amendment or cancellation of claims by examiner's amendment is permitted when passing an application to issue where these changes have been authorized by applicant (or his/her attorney or agent) in an interview. The examiner's amendment should indicate that the changes were authorized, the date and type of interview, and with whom it was held.

The examiner's amendment practice may be used to make charges against deposit accounts or credit cards under special conditions.

An examiner's amendment can be used to make a charge against a deposit account, provided prior approval is obtained from the applicant, attorney or agent, in order to expedite the issuance of a patent on an application otherwise ready for allowance. When such an examiner's amendment is prepared, the prior approval is indicated by identification of the name of the authorizing party, the date and type (personal or telephone) of authorization, the purpose for which the charge is made (additional claims, etc.), and the deposit account number.

Charges can also be made against a credit card in an examiner's amendment. Once the examiner has informed applicant of the required charges, applicant must submit by facsimile, a properly completed and signed PTO-2038, authorizing the necessary charges. After completion of processing in the Office of Finance, form PTO-2038 will be removed from the record. Office employees may not accept oral (telephonic) instructions to complete the Credit Card Payment Form or otherwise charge a patent process or trademark process fee (as opposed to information product or service fees) to a credit card. Further identifying data, if deemed necessary and requested

by the applicant, should also be included in the examiner's amendment.

Form paragraph 13.06 may be used to charge an extension of time fee in an examiner's amendment.

¶ 13.06 Extension of Time by Examiner's Amendment

An extension of time under [37 CFR 1.136\(a\)](#) is required to place this application in condition for allowance. During a telephone conversation conducted on [1], [2] requested an extension of time for [3] MONTH(S) and authorized the Director to charge Deposit Account No. [4] the required fee of \$ [5] for this extension.

Examiner Note:

1. See [MPEP § 706.07\(f\)](#), item J which explains when an extension of time is needed in order to make amendments to place the application in condition for allowance. In no case can any extension carry the date for reply to an Office action beyond the maximum period of SIX MONTHS set by statute ([35 U.S.C. 133](#)).
2. When an examiner's amendment is also authorized, use form paragraph 13.02.02 instead.

At the time of allowance, substantive changes made by the examiner to the abstract must be done by an examiner's amendment after first obtaining approval from the applicant. As noted by the court the abstract may be used to determine the meaning of claims. See *Pandrol USA, LP v. Airboss Railway Products, Inc.*, 320 F.3d 1354, 1363 n.1, 65 USPQ2d 1985, 1996 n.1 (Fed. Cir. 2003), *Hill-Rom Co. v. Kinetic Concepts, Inc.*, 209 F.3d 1337, 1341 n.1, 54 USPQ2d 1437, 1443 n.1 (Fed. Cir. 2000). Since the abstract may be relied upon to determine the scope of the claimed invention, examiners should review the abstract for compliance with [37 CFR 1.72\(b\)](#) and point out defects noted to the applicant in the first Office action, or at the earliest point in the prosecution that the defect is noted, so that applicant may make the necessary changes to the abstract.

No examiner's amendment may make substantive changes to the written portions of the specification, including the abstract, without first obtaining applicant's approval.

For applications filed prior to September 16, 2012 a reference to a prior filed application, for which benefit is claimed, is required in either the first sentence(s) of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. For applications filed after September

16, 2012 a reference to a prior filed application, for which benefit is claimed, is required in the Application Data Sheet. If the application data sheet fails to include a required reference applicant should be contacted to supply a Supplemental or Corrected Application Data Sheet, in compliance with [37 CFR 1.76\(c\)](#). See [MPEP § 601.05\(a\)](#) and [\(b\)](#). To minimize the possibility of the claim for the benefit to an earlier filing date under [35 U.S.C. 119\(e\)](#), [35 U.S.C. 120](#), [121](#), [365\(c\)](#), or [386\(c\)](#) being overlooked it is recommended that the statement, "This is a division (continuation, continuation-in-part) of Application Number -/---, filed ---" appear as the first sentence(s) of the specification. For design applications see [MPEP § 1504.20](#). In the case of an application filed under [37 CFR 1.53\(b\)](#) as a division, continuation or continuation-in-part of a CPA, there would be only one reference to the series of applications assigned the same application number with the filing date cited being that of the original non-continued application. In applications claiming the benefit under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), a statement such as "This application claims the benefit of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/ - --, filed - --" should appear as the first sentence(s) of the specification. In addition, for an application which is claiming the benefit under 35 U.S.C. 120 of a prior application which in turn claims the benefit of a provisional application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e), a suitable reference would read, "This application is a continuation of U.S. Application No. 08/ - --, filed - --, now abandoned, which claims the benefit of U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/ - --, filed - --." Any such statements appearing elsewhere in the specification should be relocated.

References cited as being of interest by examiners when passing an application to issue will not be supplied to applicant, but foreign patent documents and non-patent literature will be scanned and added to the IFW for viewing and downloading by the applicant, if desired. The references will be cited as usual on form PTO-892, a copy of which will be attached to the Notice of Allowability, form PTOL-37.

Where an application is ready for issue except for a slight defect in the drawing not involving a change in structure, the examiner will prepare a letter indicating the change to be made and, if necessary,

including a marked-up copy of the drawing showing the addition or alteration to be made. See [MPEP § 608.02\(w\)](#).

No other changes may be made by any person in any record of the U.S. Patent and Trademark office without the written approval of the Director of the United States Patent and Trademark Office.

In reviewing the application, all errors should be carefully noted. It is not necessary that the language be the best; it is, however, essential that it be clear in meaning, and free from errors in syntax. Any necessary examiner's amendment is usually made at the time an application is being prepared for issue by the examiner and a copy of any examiner's amendment is sent to the applicant as an attachment to the Notice of Allowability, PTOL-37.

Examiners will not cancel claims on the basis of an amendment which argues for certain claims and, alternatively, purports to authorize their cancellation by the examiner if other claims are allowed. See generally *In re Willingham*, 282 F.2d 353, 356, 127 USPQ 211, 215 (CCPA 1960).

In all instances, both before and after final rejection, in which an application is placed in condition for allowance as by an interview or amendment, applicant should be notified promptly of this fact by means of a Notice of Allowability (PTOL-37). See [MPEP § 714.13](#) and [§ 1302.03](#).

If after reviewing, screening, or surveying an allowed application the Office of Patent Quality Assurance discovers any informality in the application suitable for correction by examiner's amendment or in an informality in an examiner's amendment, the Review Quality Assurance Specialist will return the application to the Technology Center (TC) personnel via the TC Director suggesting, as appropriate, specific changes for approval and correction by the examiner through the use of an examiner's amendment.

1302.04(a) Title of Invention [R-08.2012]

Where the title of the invention is not specific to the invention as claimed, see [MPEP § 606.01](#).

1302.04(b) [Reserved]

1302.04(c) Cancellation of Claims to Nonelected Invention [R-08.2012]

See [MPEP § 821.01](#) and [§ 821.02](#).

1302.04(d) Cancellation of Claim Lost in Interference [R-08.2012]

See [MPEP Chapter 2300](#).

1302.04(e) Cancellation of Rejected Claims Following Appeal [R-10.2019]

See [MPEP § 1214.06](#), [§ 1215.03](#), [§ 1215.04](#) and [§ 1216.01](#).

1302.04(f) [Reserved]

1302.04(g) Identification of Claims [R-07.2015]

To identify a claim, an examiner's amendment should refer to it by the original number and, if renumbered in the allowed application, also by the new number.

1302.04(h) Rejoinder of Claims [R-08.2012]

Any previously withdrawn claims that are being rejoined and allowed must be listed in the index of claims and on the Notice of Allowability to avoid a printer query. The examiner should notify the applicant of the rejoinder. See [MPEP § 821.04](#).

1302.05 Correction of Drawing [R-10.2019]

Where an application otherwise ready for issue requires correction of the drawing, the application is processed for allowance in the Technology Center and then forwarded to the Office of Data Management. Any papers subsequently filed by the applicant, including replacement drawings, are matched with the application file. If the drawings that are received are still not acceptable for

publishing, the Office will mail a “Notice to File Corrected Application Papers,” giving the applicant a time period in which to file the corrected drawings. See [MPEP § 608.02\(z\)](#).

1302.06 Prior Foreign Application [R-07.2015]

See [MPEP § 202](#) and [§ 214](#).

1302.07 [Reserved]

1302.08 Interference Search [R-10.2019]

When an application is in condition for allowance, an interference search must be made by using the most efficient and effective manner based on the claimed subject matter in the broadest claim (*e.g.*, by performing a text search of the “US-PGPUB” database in EAST or WEST). Examiners are reminded that some applications, such as continuation-in-part applications, may contain claims entitled to different effective filing dates (see [MPEP §§ 2133.01](#) and [2152.01](#)), and that each effective filing date should be considered when performing the interference search. If the application contains a claim directed to a nucleotide or peptide sequence, the examiner must submit a request to STIC to

perform an interference search of the sequence. If the search results identify any potential interfering subject matter, the examiner will review the application(s) with the potential interfering subject matter to determine whether interfering subject matter exists. If interfering subject matter does exist, the examiner will follow the guidance set forth in [MPEP Chapter 2300](#). If there is no interfering subject matter then the examiner should prepare the application for issuance. The interference search must be made of record in the application file. See [MPEP § 719.05](#), subsection III. The search for interfering applications must not be limited to only the classes or subgroups in which the application is classified, but must be extended to all classes in which it has been necessary to search in the examination of the application.

An interference search may be required in TC Working Group 3640. Inspection of pertinent prints, drawings, brief cards, and applications in TC Working Group 3640 will be done on request by an examiner in TC Working Group 3640.

1302.09 Classification, Print Figure, and Other Notations [R-07.2015]

The examiner preparing the application for issue completes the Issue Classification sheet.

| | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| Issue Classification | Application/Control No. | Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |

| | | |
|--------|------|---------|
| CPC | | |
| Symbol | Type | Version |
| | | |

| | | | | |
|----------------------|------|-----|---------|---------|
| CPC Combination Sets | | | | |
| Symbol | Type | Set | Ranking | Version |
| | | | | |

| | | | |
|----------------------|--------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| (Assistant Examiner) | (Date) | Total Claims Allowed: | |
| (Primary Examiner) | (Date) | O.G. Print Claim(s) | O.G. Print Figure |

| | | |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| Issue Classification | Application/Control No. | Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |

| US ORIGINAL CLASSIFICATION | | | | | | INTERNATIONAL CLASSIFICATION | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|----------|--|--|------------------------------|--|--|--|--|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| CLASS | | | SUBCLASS | | | CLAIMED | | | | | NON-CLAIMED | | | | | | |
| CROSS REFERENCE(S) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CLASS | SUBCLASS (ONE SUBCLASS PER BLOCK) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | |
|----------------------|--------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| (Assistant Examiner) | (Date) | Total Claims Allowed: | |
| (Primary Examiner) | (Date) | O.G. Print Claim(s) | O.G. Print Figure |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Part of Paper No.

| | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Issue Classification | Application/Control No. | Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination |
| | Examiner | Art Unit |

| <input type="checkbox"/> Claims renumbered in the same order as presented by applicant | | <input type="checkbox"/> CPA | | <input type="checkbox"/> T.D. | | <input type="checkbox"/> R.1.47 | | | | | | | | | |
|--|----------|------------------------------|----------|-------------------------------|----------|---------------------------------|----------|-------|----------|-------|----------|-------|----------|-------|----------|
| Final | Original | Final | Original | Final | Original | Final | Original | Final | Original | Final | Original | Final | Original | Final | Original |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| | | | |
|----------------------|--------|------------------------------|-------------------|
| (Assistant Examiner) | (Date) | Total Claims Allowed: | |
| (Primary Examiner) | (Date) | O.G. Print Claim(s) | O.G. Print Figure |

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Part of Paper No.

Examiners must review the data regarding prior U.S. applications to make sure that the information is correct when preparing the application for issue. If

any claim to domestic benefit under [35 U.S.C. 119\(e\)](#), [120](#), [121](#), [365\(c\)](#), or [386\(c\)](#) is added, deleted, and/or modified during prosecution of the application

and such addition, deletion, and/or modification has been approved, the examiner must make sure that the information in the PALM database is current and up to date. If the PALM system has not been updated, the application must be forwarded to the Technology Center (TC) Legal Instrument Examiner, with an explanation of the correction to be made. Examiners should also review the data regarding prior provisional and foreign applications for accuracy.

See [MPEP § 202](#) for notations to be placed in the file history as to parent or prior U.S. applications, including provisional applications, and foreign patent applications.

See [MPEP § 1302.13](#) for name of examiner.

Examiners, when preparing an application for issue, are to record the number of the claim selected for printing in the *Official Gazette* in the box labeled “PRINT CLAIM” on the Issue Classification Sheet.

The claim or claims should be selected in accordance with the following instructions:

(A) The broadest claim should be selected.

(B) Examiners should ordinarily designate but one claim on each invention, although when a plurality of inventions are claimed in an application, additional claims up to a maximum of five may be designated for publication.

(C) A dependent claim should not be selected unless the independent claim on which it depends is also printed. In the case where a multiple dependent claim is selected, the entire chain of claims for one embodiment should be listed.

(D) In reissue applications, the broadest claim with changes or the broadest additional reissue claim should be selected for printing.

When recording this information in the box provided, the following items should be kept in mind:

(A) If multiple claims are selected, the claim numbers should be separated by commas.

(B) The claim designated must be referred to by using the renumbered patent claim number rather than the original application claim number

Examiners, when preparing an application for issue, are to record the figure selected for printing in the *Official Gazette* in the box labeled “Print Fig.” on the Issue Classification sheet.

Ordinarily a single figure is selected for printing. This figure should be consistent with the claim to be printed in the *Official Gazette*. The figure to be printed in the *Official Gazette* must not be one that is labeled “prior art.” If there is no figure illustrative of or helpful in understanding the claimed invention, no figure need be selected. “None” may be written in the box labeled “Print Fig.” on the Issue Classification Sheet.

1302.10 Issue Classification Notations [R-10.2019]

See [MPEP §§ 903.07](#) and [905](#) through [907](#) for notations to be applied on the Issue Classification sheet. The Issue Classification sheet is automatically populated with the Cooperative Patent Classification symbols applied to a family of documents (continuations, divisionals, and/or foreign documents in the family). These symbols are based on the inventive concepts in the disclosure, rather than solely based on the claimed subject matter. As such, it is possible that an issue classification will include classification group/subgroup symbols that were not searched by the examiner.

In all reissue applications, the number of the original patent which is being reissued should be placed in the box provided therefor below the box for the applicant’s name.

1302.11 [Reserved]

1302.12 Listing of References [R-07.2015]

All references which have been cited by the examiner during the prosecution, including those appearing in Patent Trial and Appeal Board decisions or listed in the reissue oath, must be listed on either a form PTO-892 or on an Information Disclosure Statement (PTO/SB/08) and initialed. All such reference citations will be printed in the patent. References listed by a patent examiner on a “Notice

of References Cited,” form PTO-892, will be indicated with an asterisk in the “References Cited” section of the front page of a patent document. An example of how the “References Cited” section of the patent will appear is as follows:

[56] **References Cited**

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

2,234,192 * 7/1955 Greene..... 75/507
 4,991,048 8/1990 Larkin.....206/207
 5,000,186 12/1991 Amis.....267/340
 5,000,993 * 12/1991 Thomas et al.....75/507

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

9500000 * 6/1995 Belgium.....75/507
 200000 * 6/1990 Japan 75/507
 9400000 9/1994 United Kingdom.

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

Hill, “Ferrous Precipitation,” *Journal of the American Defenestration Association*, Jan. 1989, Pages 34–46.* Clymerhill-Irons, “Ferrous Ascension for the Eighties,” *Proceedings of the International Ferrous Ascension Society*, Jan.– Mar. 1979, Pages 1111– 1163.

* cited by examiner

Indication of whether a reference was listed by the examiner will be helpful in compiling statistical data related to prior art submissions so that the USPTO can better consider whether changes are required to the rules governing prior art statements.

Indication of a reference with an asterisk should not be considered to reflect any significance other than that the reference was listed on a “Notice of References Cited,” form PTO-892. When an examiner lists references on a form PTO-892, the

examiner lists references that are relied upon in a prior art rejection or mentioned as pertinent. See [MPEP § 707.05\(c\)](#). The examiner does not list references which were previously cited by the applicant (and initialed by an examiner) on an Information Disclosure Statement, for example, on a PTO/SB/08. See [MPEP § 609](#) and [§ 707.05\(b\), \(c\)](#) and [\(d\)](#). No distinction will be made in the “References Cited” section for other sources of references. Thus, references cited in a protest, by an attorney or agent not acting in a representative capacity but on behalf of a single inventor, and by the applicant will not be distinguished.

At time of allowance, the examiner may cite pertinent art in an examiner’s amendment or statement of reasons for allowance. Such pertinent art should be listed as usual on form PTO-892, a copy of which is attached to the Notice of Allowability form PTOL-37. Such pertinent art is not sent to the applicant, but foreign patent documents and non-patent literature will be scanned and added to the Image File Wrapper (IFW) for viewing and downloading by the applicant, if desired. Such citation of art is important in the case of continuing applications where significant prior art is often of record in the parent case. In the rare instance where no art is cited in a continuation application, all the references cited during the prosecution of the parent application will be listed at allowance for printing in the patent. See [MPEP § 707.05](#) and [§ 707.05\(a\)](#).

When preparing an application for allowance, the technical support staff will verify that there is at least one list of references (PTO-892 or PTO/SB/08) in the application. The technical support staff will also verify that each reference on the Information Disclosure Statement has either been initialed by the examiner or lined-through by the examiner. All lists of references are maintained in the application file.

In the first action after termination of an interference or derivation, the examiner should make of record in each application all references not already of record which were pertinent to any preliminary motions and which were discussed in the decision on motion.

In any application, otherwise ready for issue, in which an erroneous citation has not been formally corrected in an official paper, the examiner is directed to correct the citation by an examiner's amendment. See [MPEP § 707.05\(g\)](#).

Any new reference cited when the application is in issue, under the practice of [MPEP § 1308.01](#), should be added by way of a PTO-892 or PTO/SB/08.

1302.13 Signing [R-07.2015]

The primary examiner and the assistant examiner involved in the allowance of an application will apply E-Signatures on the Issue Classification sheet. A primary examiner who prepares an application for issue signs the file wrapper only in the "Primary Examiner" box on the Issue Classification sheet.

Only the names of the primary examiner and the assistant examiner appearing on the Issue Classification Sheet will be listed in the printed patent.

1302.14 Reasons for Allowance [R-10.2019]

37 CFR 1.104 Nature of examination.

(e) *Reasons for allowance.* If the examiner believes that the record of the prosecution as a whole does not make clear his or her reasons for allowing a claim or claims, the examiner may set forth such reasoning. The reasons shall be incorporated into an Office action rejecting other claims of the application or patent under reexamination or be the subject of a separate communication to the applicant or patent owner. The applicant or patent owner may file a statement commenting on the reasons for allowance within such time as may be specified by the examiner. Failure by the examiner to respond to any statement commenting on reasons for allowance does not give rise to any implication.

I. REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

One of the primary purposes of [37 CFR 1.104\(e\)](#) is to improve the quality and reliability of issued patents by providing a complete file history which should clearly reflect, as much as is reasonably possible, the reasons why the application was allowed. Such information facilitates evaluation of the scope and strength of a patent by the patentee and the public and may help avoid or simplify litigation of a patent.

It should be noted that the setting forth of reasons for allowance is not mandatory on the examiner's part. However, in meeting the need for the application file history to speak for itself, it is incumbent upon the examiner in exercising his or her responsibility to the public, to see that the file history is as complete as is reasonably possible.

When an application is finally acted upon and allowed, the examiner is expected to determine, at the same time, whether the reasons why the application is being allowed are evident from the record.

Prior to allowance, the examiner may also specify allowable subject matter and provide reasons for indicating such allowable subject matter in an Office communication.

In determining whether reasons for allowance should be recorded, the primary consideration lies in the first sentence of [37 CFR 1.104\(e\)](#) which states:

If the examiner believes that the record of the prosecution *as a whole* does not make clear his or her reasons for allowing a claim or claims, the examiner may set forth such reasoning. (Emphasis added).

In most cases, the examiner's actions and the applicant's replies make evident the reasons for allowance, satisfying the "record as a whole" proviso of the rule. This is particularly true when applicant fully complies with [37 CFR 1.111\(b\)](#) and [\(c\)](#) and [37 CFR 1.133\(b\)](#). Thus, where the examiner's actions clearly point out the reasons for rejection and the applicant's reply explicitly presents reasons why claims are patentable over the reference, the reasons for allowance are in all probability evident from the record and **no** statement should be necessary. Conversely, where the record is not explicit as to reasons, but allowance is in order, then a logical extension of [37 CFR 1.111](#) and [1.133](#) would dictate that the examiner should make reasons of record and such reasons should be specific.

Where specific reasons are recorded by the examiner, care must be taken to ensure that statements of reasons for allowance (or indication of allowable

subject matter) are accurate, precise, and do not place unwarranted interpretations, whether broad or narrow, upon the claims. The examiner should keep in mind the possible misinterpretations of his or her statement that may be made and its possible effects. Each statement should include at least (1) the major difference in the claims not found in the prior art of record, and (2) the reasons why that difference is considered to define patentably over the prior art if either of these reasons for allowance is not clear in the record. The statement is not intended to necessarily state all the reasons for allowance or all the details why claims are allowed and should not be written to specifically or impliedly state that all the reasons for allowance are set forth. Where the examiner has a large number of reasons for allowing a claim, it may suffice to state only the major or important reasons, being careful to so couch the statement. For example, a statement might start: “The primary reason for the allowance of the claims is the inclusion of the limitation in all the claims which is not found in the prior art references,” with further amplification as necessary.

Stock paragraphs with meaningless or uninformative statements of the reasons for the allowance should not be used. It is improper to use a statement of reasons for allowance to attempt to narrow a claim by providing a special definition to a claim limitation which is argued by applicant, but not supported by a special definition in the description in cases where the ordinary meaning of the term in the prior art demonstrates that the claim remains unpatentable for the reasons of record, and where such claim narrowing is only tangential to patentability. Cf. *Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kinzoku Kogyo Kabushiki Co.*, 535 U.S. 722, 741, 62 USPQ2d 1705, 1714 (2002). The statement of reasons for allowance by the examiner is intended to provide information equivalent to that contained in a file in which the examiner’s Office actions and the applicant’s replies make evident the examiner’s reasons for allowing claims.

Examiners are urged to carefully carry out their responsibilities to see that the application file contains a complete and accurate picture of the Office’s consideration of the patentability of the application.

Under [37 CFR 1.104\(e\)](#), the examiner must make a judgment of the individual record to determine whether or not reasons for allowance should be set out in that record. These guidelines, then, are intended to aid the examiner in making that judgment. They comprise illustrative examples as to applicability and appropriate content. They are not intended to be exhaustive.

II. EXAMPLES OF WHEN IT IS LIKELY THAT A STATEMENT SHOULD BE ADDED TO THE RECORD

(A) Claims are allowed on the basis of one (or some) of a number of arguments and/or affidavits presented, and a statement is necessary to identify which of these were persuasive, for example:

(1) When the arguments are presented in an appeal brief.

(2) When the arguments are presented in an ordinary reply, with or without amendment of claims.

(3) When both an affidavit under [37 CFR 1.131](#) and arguments concerning rejections under [35 U.S.C. 102](#) and/or [103](#) are presented.

(B) First action issue:

(1) Of a noncontinuing application, wherein the claims are very close to the cited prior art and the differences have not been discussed elsewhere.

(2) Of a continuing application, wherein reasons for allowance are not apparent from the record in the parent case or clear from preliminary filed matters.

(C) Withdrawal of a rejection for reasons not suggested by applicant, for example:

(1) As a result of an appeal or pre-appeal brief conference.

(2) When applicant’s arguments have been misdirected or are not persuasive alone and the examiner comes to realize that a more cogent argument is available.

(3) When claims are amended to avoid a rejection under [35 U.S.C. 102](#), but arguments (if any) fail to address the question of obviousness.

(D) Allowance after remand from the Patent Trial and Appeal Board.

(E) Allowance coincident with the citation of newly found references that are very close to the claims, but claims are considered patentable thereover:

(1) When reference is found and cited (but not argued) by applicant.

(2) When reference is found and cited by examiner.

(F) Where the reasons for allowance *are* of record but, in the examiner's judgment, are unclear (e.g., spread throughout the file history) so that an unreasonable effort would be required to collect them.

(G) Allowance based on a claim interpretation which might not be readily apparent, for example:

(1) Article claims in which method limitations impart patentability.

(2) Method claims in which article limitations impart patentability.

(3) Claim is so drafted that "nonanalogous" art is not applicable.

(4) Preamble or functional language "breathes life" into claim.

(H) Allowance following decision by the United States Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit or District Court of the District of Columbia. The reasons for allowance should refer to and incorporate the briefs and the court decision.

(I) Where the claims are considered patentable over the X and/or Y references cited in a search report of a corresponding PCT application and the reasons for allowance are not apparent from the record.

III. EXAMPLES OF STATEMENTS OF SUITABLE CONTENT

(A) The primary reason for allowance of the claims is the inclusion of .03 to .05 percent nickel in all of the claims. Applicant's second affidavit in example 5 shows unexpected results from this restricted range.

(B) During two telephonic interviews with applicant's attorney, Mr..... on 5/6 and 5/09/2014, the examiner stated that applicant's remarks about the placement of the primary teaching's grid member were persuasive, but he

pointed out that applicant did not claim the member as being within the reactor. Thus, an amendment doing such was agreed to.

(C) The claims in the application are deemed to be directed to a nonobvious improvement over the invention patented in Pat. No. 3,953,224. The claims comprise baffle means 12 whose effective length in the extraction tower may be varied so as to optimize and to control the extraction process.

(D) Upon reconsideration, this application has been awarded the effective filing date of application number -/---. Thus the rejection under [pre-AIA 35 U.S.C. 102\(d\)](#) and [103](#) over Belgium Patent No. 757,246 is withdrawn.

(E) The specific limitation as to the pressure used during compression was agreed to during the telephone interview with applicants' attorney. During said interview, it was noted that applicants contended in their amendment that a process of the combined applied teachings could not result in a successful article within a particular pressure range (see page 3, bottom, of applicant's amendment). The examiner agreed and allowed the application after incorporating the pressure range into the claim.

(F) In the examiner's opinion, it would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art first to eliminate one of top members 4, second to eliminate plate 3, third to attach remaining member 4 directly to tube 2 and finally to substitute this modified handle for the handle 20 of Nania (see Fig. 1) especially in view of applicant's use of term "consisting."

(G) The application is allowable for the reasons set forth on page -- of the decision of the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit, which is hereby incorporated by reference. As noted therein, and as argued on page -- of Appellant's brief, the claimed invention requires a one piece tubular member whereas the closest prior art requires a multiple piece assembly which does not teach or suggest the claimed invention.

IV. EXAMPLES OF STATEMENTS THAT ARE NOT SUITABLE AS TO CONTENT

(A) The 3-roll press couple has an upper roll 36 which is swingably adjustable to vary the pressure selectively against either of the two lower rolls. (NOTE: The significance of this statement may not be clear if no further explanation is given.)

(B) The main reasons for allowance of these claims are applicant's remarks in the appeal brief and an agreement reached in the appeal conference.

(C) The instant composition is a precursor in the manufacture of melamine resins. A thorough search of the prior art did not bring forth any composition which corresponds to the instant composition. The examiner in the art also did not know of any art which could be used against the instant composition.

(D) Claims 1-6 have been allowed because they are believed to be both novel and nonobvious.

(E) The examiner should *not* include in his or her statement any matter which does not relate directly to the reasons for allowance. For example:

(1) Claims 1 and 2 are allowed because they are patentable over the prior art. If applicants are aware of better art than that which has been cited, they are required to call such to the attention of the examiner.

(2) The reference Jones discloses and claims an invention similar to applicant's. However, a comparison of the claims, as set forth below, demonstrates the conclusion that the inventions are noninterfering.

Most instances when the examiner finds a need to place in the file a statement of the reasons for allowing a claim or claims will come at the time of allowance. In such cases, the examiner should (a) check the appropriate box on the form PTOL-37 and (b) attach thereto a paper containing the examiner's statement of reasons for allowance. The paper should identify the application number and be clearly labeled "Statement of Reasons for Allowance." It should also specify that comments may be filed by the applicant on the statement and should preferably be submitted with the payment of the issue fee so as not to delay processing of the application and in any event no later than payment of the issue fee.

Form paragraph 13.03 may be used for this purpose.

¶ 13.03 Reasons for Allowance

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: [1]

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee.

Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Examiner Note:

1. Do not use this form paragraph in reexamination proceedings, see form paragraph 22.16.
2. In bracket 1, provide a detailed statement of the reason(s) certain claim(s) have been indicated as being allowable or as containing allowable subject matter.

A statement may be sent to applicant with other communications, where appropriate, but should be clearly labeled as a "Statement of Reasons for Allowance" and contain the data indicated above.

Form paragraph 13.03.01 may be used to specify the reasons for indicating allowable subject matter in a communication prior to allowance.

¶ 13.03.01 Reasons for Indication of Allowable Subject Matter

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: [1]

Examiner Note:

1. This form paragraph is for use in an Office action prior to allowance of the application. Use form paragraph 13.03 in the Notice of Allowability.
2. In bracket 1, provide a detailed statement of the reason(s) certain claim(s) have been indicated as being allowable or as containing allowable subject matter.

V. APPLICANT'S COMMENTS ON THE REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

The examiner's statement of reasons for allowance is an important source of prosecution file history. See *Zenith Labs., Inc. v. Bristol-Myers Squibb Co.*, 19 F.3d 1418, 30 USPQ2d 1285 (Fed. Cir. 1996). The examiner's statement of reasons for allowance is the personal opinion of the examiner as to why the claims are allowable. The examiner's statement should not create an *estoppel*. Only applicant's statements should create an *estoppel*. The failure of applicant to comment on the examiner's statement of reasons for allowance should not be treated as acquiescence to the examiner's statement. See *Salazar v. Procter & Gamble Co.*, 414 F.3d 1342, 1347, 75 USPQ2d 1369, 1373 (Fed. Cir. 2005). Any inferences or presumption are to be determined on a case-by-case basis by a court reviewing the patent, the USPTO examining the patent in a reissue application or a reexamination proceeding, the Patent

Trial and Appeal Board reviewing the patent in an interference or derivation proceeding, etc. Applicant may set forth his or her position if he or she disagrees with the examiner's reasons for allowance.

Comments filed by the applicant on the examiner's statement of reasons for allowance, should preferably be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee, to avoid processing delays. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance." Comments will be entered in the application file by the Office of Data Management with an appropriate document code in the file wrapper.

The application file generally will not be returned to the examiner after the entry of such comments made by applicant on the examiner's statement of reasons for allowance. Therefore, the absence of an examiner's response to applicant's comments does not mean that the examiner agrees with or acquiesces in the reasoning of such comments. See [37 CFR 1.104\(e\)](#). While the examiner may review and comment upon such a submission, the examiner has no obligation to do so.

1303 Notice of Allowance [R-07.2015]

37 CFR 1.311 Notice of Allowance.

(a) If, on examination, it appears that the applicant is entitled to a patent under the law, a notice of allowance will be sent to the applicant at the correspondence address indicated in [§ 1.33](#). The notice of allowance shall specify a sum constituting the issue fee and any required publication fee ([§ 1.211\(e\)](#)) which issue fee and any required publication fee must both be paid within three months from the date of mailing of the notice of allowance to avoid abandonment of the application. This three-month period is not extendable.

(b) An authorization to charge the issue fee or other post-allowance fees set forth in [§ 1.18](#) to a deposit account may be filed in an individual application only after mailing of the notice of allowance. The submission of either of the following after the mailing of a notice of allowance will operate as a request to charge the correct issue fee or any publication fee due to any deposit account identified in a previously filed authorization to charge such fees:

- (1) An incorrect issue fee or publication fee; or
- (2) A fee transmittal form (or letter) for payment of issue fee or publication fee.

A Notice of Allowance is prepared and mailed, and the mailing date appearing thereon is recorded in the image file wrapper table of contents.

If an application is subject to publication under [37 CFR 1.211](#), the Notice of Allowance will require both the issue fee and the publication fee. See [37 CFR 1.211\(e\)](#). It is noted that the publication fee was reset to \$0.00 effective January 1, 2014. See Setting and Adjusting Patent Fees (78 FR 4212, Jan. 18, 2013). A "Notice of Allowance and Fee(s) Due." (PTOL-85) will be mailed to the correspondence address of record. The form includes the amount of any required publication fee, as provided in [37 CFR 1.211\(e\)](#) and [1.311](#). The form includes an indication that the publication fee is due, if the application was subject to publication and the publication fee has not already been paid. Part B of the form (PTOL-85B) must be returned to the Office with the payment of the issue fee. Applicants are reminded to transmit an extra copy of the PTOL-85B when payment of the issue fee is by way of authorization to debit a Deposit Account. See [MPEP § 509.01](#).

For more information about eighteen month publication and publication fees, visit the USPTO Internet web site at www.uspto.gov.

For applications filed on or after September 16, 2012, if an application is in condition for allowance but does not include an oath or declaration in compliance with [37 CFR 1.63](#), or a substitute statement in compliance with [37 CFR 1.64](#), executed by or with respect to each actual inventor, the Office will issue a "Notice of Allowance and Fee(s) Due" (PTOL-85) together with a "Notice of Allowability" (PTOL-37) including a "Notice Requiring Inventor's Oath or Declaration" (PTOL-2306) requiring the applicant to file an oath or declaration in compliance with [37 CFR 1.63](#), or substitute statement in compliance with [37 CFR 1.64](#), executed by or with respect to each actual inventor, no later than the date of payment of the issue fee to avoid abandonment. If applicant receives a "Notice Requiring Inventor's Oath or Declaration" and fails to file a proper reply to the notice before or with the payment of the issue fee, the application will be regarded as abandoned. See [37 CFR 1.53\(f\)\(3\)\(ii\)](#).



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

NOTICE OF ALLOWANCE AND FEE(S) DUE

EXAMINER

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED:

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

| | | | | | | |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|----------------------|------------------|----------|
| APPLN. TYPE | ENTITY STATUS | ISSUE FEE DUE | PUBLICATION FEE DUE | PREV. PAID ISSUE FEE | TOTAL FEE(S) DUE | DATE DUE |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|----------------------|------------------|----------|

THE APPLICATION IDENTIFIED ABOVE HAS BEEN EXAMINED AND IS ALLOWED FOR ISSUANCE AS A PATENT. PROSECUTION ON THE MERITS IS CLOSED. THIS NOTICE OF ALLOWANCE IS NOT A GRANT OF PATENT RIGHTS. THIS APPLICATION IS SUBJECT TO WITHDRAWAL FROM ISSUE AT THE INITIATIVE OF THE OFFICE OR UPON PETITION BY THE APPLICANT. SEE 37 CFR 1.313 AND MPEP 1308.

THE ISSUE FEE AND PUBLICATION FEE (IF REQUIRED) MUST BE PAID WITHIN THREE MONTHS FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS NOTICE OR THIS APPLICATION SHALL BE REGARDED AS ABANDONED. THIS STATUTORY PERIOD CANNOT BE EXTENDED. SEE 35 U.S.C. 151. THE ISSUE FEE DUE INDICATED ABOVE DOES NOT REFLECT A CREDIT FOR ANY PREVIOUSLY PAID ISSUE FEE IN THIS APPLICATION. IF AN ISSUE FEE HAS PREVIOUSLY BEEN PAID IN THIS APPLICATION (AS SHOWN ABOVE), THE RETURN OF PART B OF THIS FORM WILL BE CONSIDERED A REQUEST TO REAPPLY THE PREVIOUSLY PAID ISSUE FEE TOWARD THE ISSUE FEE NOW DUE.

HOW TO REPLY TO THIS NOTICE:

I. Review the ENTITY STATUS shown above. If the ENTITY STATUS is shown as SMALL or MICRO, verify whether entitlement to that entity status still applies.

If the ENTITY STATUS is the same as shown above, pay the TOTAL FEE(S) DUE shown above.

If the ENTITY STATUS is changed from that shown above, on PART B - FEE(S) TRANSMITTAL, complete section number 5 titled "Change in Entity Status (from status indicated above)".

For purposes of this notice, small entity fees are 1/2 the amount of undiscounted fees, and micro entity fees are 1/2 the amount of small entity fees.

II. PART B - FEE(S) TRANSMITTAL, or its equivalent, must be completed and returned to the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) with your ISSUE FEE and PUBLICATION FEE (if required). If you are charging the fee(s) to your deposit account, section "4b" of Part B - Fee(s) Transmittal should be completed and an extra copy of the form should be submitted. If an equivalent of Part B is filed, a request to reapply a previously paid issue fee must be clearly made, and delays in processing may occur due to the difficulty in recognizing the paper as an equivalent of Part B.

III. All communications regarding this application must give the application number. Please direct all communications prior to issuance to Mail Stop ISSUE FEE unless advised to the contrary.

IMPORTANT REMINDER: Utility patents issuing on applications filed on or after Dec. 12, 1980 may require payment of maintenance fees. It is patentee's responsibility to ensure timely payment of maintenance fees when due.

PART B - FEE(S) TRANSMITTAL

**Complete and send this form, together with applicable fee(s), to: Mail Mail Stop ISSUE FEE
 Commissioner for Patents
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 or Fax (571)-273-2885**

INSTRUCTIONS: This form should be used for transmitting the ISSUE FEE and PUBLICATION FEE (if required). Blocks 1 through 5 should be completed where appropriate. All further correspondence including the Patent, advance orders and notification of maintenance fees will be mailed to the current correspondence address as indicated unless corrected below or directed otherwise in Block 1, by (a) specifying a new correspondence address; and/or (b) indicating a separate "FEE ADDRESS" for maintenance fee notifications.

CURRENT CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS (Note: Use Block 1 for any change of address)

Note: A certificate of mailing can only be used for domestic mailings of the Fee(s) Transmittal. This certificate cannot be used for any other accompanying papers. Each additional paper, such as an assignment or formal drawing, must have its own certificate of mailing or transmission.

Certificate of Mailing or Transmission

I hereby certify that this Fee(s) Transmittal is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage for first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Mail Stop ISSUE FEE address above, or being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO (571) 273-2885, on the date indicated below.

| |
|--------------------|
| (Depositor's name) |
| (Signature) |
| (Date) |

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

TITLE OF INVENTION: CAPTURING AND RESTORING SESSION STATE OF A MACHINE WITHOUT USING MEMORY IMAGES

| | | | | | | |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|----------------------|------------------|----------|
| APPLN. TYPE | ENTITY STATUS | ISSUE FEE DUE | PUBLICATION FEE DUE | PREV. PAID ISSUE FEE | TOTAL FEE(S) DUE | DATE DUE |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------|----------------------|------------------|----------|

| | | |
|----------|----------|----------------|
| EXAMINER | ART UNIT | CLASS-SUBCLASS |
|----------|----------|----------------|

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>1. Change of correspondence address or indication of "Fee Address" (37 CFR 1.363).</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Change of correspondence address (or Change of Correspondence Address Form PTO/SB/122) attached.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> "Fee Address" indication (or "Fee Address" Indication form PTO/SB/47; Rev 03-02 or more recent) attached. Use of a Customer Number is required.</p> | <p>2. For printing on the patent front page, list</p> <p>(1) The names of up to 3 registered patent attorneys or agents OR, alternatively, _____ 1</p> <p>(2) The name of a single firm (having as a member a registered attorney or agent) and the names of up to 2 registered patent attorneys or agents. If no name is listed, no name will be printed. _____ 2</p> <p>_____ 3</p> |
|---|---|

3. ASSIGNEE NAME AND RESIDENCE DATA TO BE PRINTED ON THE PATENT (print or type)

PLEASE NOTE: Unless an assignee is identified below, no assignee data will appear on the patent. If an assignee is identified below, the document has been filed for recordation as set forth in 37 CFR 3.11. Completion of this form is NOT a substitute for filing an assignment.

(A) NAME OF ASSIGNEE _____

(B) RESIDENCE: (CITY and STATE OR COUNTRY) _____

Please check the appropriate assignee category or categories (will not be printed on the patent) : Individual Corporation or other private group entity Government

- | | |
|---|---|
| <p>4a. The following fee(s) are submitted:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Issue Fee</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Publication Fee (No small entity discount permitted)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Advance Order - # of Copies _____</p> | <p>4b. Payment of Fee(s): (Please first reapply any previously paid issue fee shown above)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> A check is enclosed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Payment by credit card. Form PTO-2038 is attached.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The director is hereby authorized to charge the required fee(s), any deficiency, or credits any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number _____ (enclose an extra copy of this form).</p> |
|---|---|

5. Change in Entity Status (from status indicated above)
- Applicant certifying micro entity status. See 37 CFR 1.29
- Applicant asserting small entity status. See 37 CFR 1.27
- Applicant changing to regular undiscounted fee status.
- NOTE:** Absent a valid certification of Micro Entity Status (see forms PTO/SB/15A and 15B), issue fee payment in the micro entity amount will not be accepted at the risk of application abandonment.
- NOTE:** If the application was previously under micro entity status, checking this box will be taken to be a notification of loss of entitlement to micro entity status.
- NOTE:** Checking this box will be taken to be a notification of loss of entitlement to small or micro entity status, as applicable.

NOTE: This form must be signed in accordance with 37 CFR 1.31 and 1.33. See 37 CFR 1.4 for signature requirements and certifications.

| | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| Authorized Signature _____ | Date _____ |
| Typed or printed name _____ | Registration No. _____ |



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
 United States Patent and Trademark Office
 Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
 P.O. Box 1450
 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
 www.uspto.gov

| | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|

| |
|----------|
| EXAMINER |
|----------|

| | |
|----------|--------------|
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|

DATE MAILED:

Determination of Patent Term Adjustment under 35 U.S.C. 154 (b)
 (Applications filed on or after May 29, 2000)

The Office has discontinued providing a Patent Term Adjustment (PTA) calculation with the Notice of Allowance.

Section 1(h)(2) of the AIA Technical Corrections Act amended 35 U.S.C. 154(b)(3)(B)(i) to eliminate the requirement that the Office provide a patent term adjustment determination with the notice of allowance. See Revisions to Patent Term Adjustment, 78 Fed. Reg. 19416, 19417 (Apr. 1, 2013). Therefore, the Office is no longer providing an initial patent term adjustment determination with the notice of allowance. The Office will continue to provide a patent term adjustment determination with the Issue Notification Letter that is mailed to applicant approximately three weeks prior to the issue date of the patent, and will include the patent term adjustment on the patent. Any request for reconsideration of the patent term adjustment determination (or reinstatement of patent term adjustment) should follow the process outlined in 37 CFR 1.705.

Any questions regarding the Patent Term Extension or Adjustment determination should be directed to the Office of Patent Legal Administration at (571)-272-7702. Questions relating to issue and publication fee payments should be directed to the Customer Service Center of the Office of Patent Publication at 1-(888)-786-0101 or (571)-272-4200.

OMB Clearance and PRA Burden Statement for PTOL-85 Part B

The Paperwork Reduction Act (PRA) of 1995 requires Federal agencies to obtain Office of Management and Budget approval before requesting most types of information from the public. When OMB approves an agency request to collect information from the public, OMB (i) provides a valid OMB Control Number and expiration date for the agency to display on the instrument that will be used to collect the information and (ii) requires the agency to inform the public about the OMB Control Number's legal significance in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.5(b).

The information collected by PTOL-85 Part B is required by 37 CFR 1.311. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 12 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450. **DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.** Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

Privacy Act Statement

The Privacy Act of 1974 (P.L. 93-579) requires that you be given certain information in connection with your submission of the attached form related to a patent application or patent. Accordingly, pursuant to the requirements of the Act, please be advised that: (1) the general authority for the collection of this information is 35 U.S.C. 2(b)(2); (2) furnishing of the information solicited is voluntary; and (3) the principal purpose for which the information is used by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office is to process and/or examine your submission related to a patent application or patent. If you do not furnish the requested information, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office may not be able to process and/or examine your submission, which may result in termination of proceedings or abandonment of the application or expiration of the patent.

The information provided by you in this form will be subject to the following routine uses:

1. The information on this form will be treated confidentially to the extent allowed under the Freedom of Information Act (5 U.S.C. 552) and the Privacy Act (5 U.S.C. 552a). Records from this system of records may be disclosed to the Department of Justice to determine whether disclosure of these records is required by the Freedom of Information Act.
2. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, in the course of presenting evidence to a court, magistrate, or administrative tribunal, including disclosures to opposing counsel in the course of settlement negotiations.
3. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Member of Congress submitting a request involving an individual, to whom the record pertains, when the individual has requested assistance from the Member with respect to the subject matter of the record.
4. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a contractor of the Agency having need for the information in order to perform a contract. Recipients of information shall be required to comply with the requirements of the Privacy Act of 1974, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552a(m).
5. A record related to an International Application filed under the Patent Cooperation Treaty in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the International Bureau of the World Intellectual Property Organization, pursuant to the Patent Cooperation Treaty.
6. A record in this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to another federal agency for purposes of National Security review (35 U.S.C. 181) and for review pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act (42 U.S.C. 218(c)).
7. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the Administrator, General Services, or his/her designee, during an inspection of records conducted by GSA as part of that agency's responsibility to recommend improvements in records management practices and programs, under authority of 44 U.S.C. 2904 and 2906. Such disclosure shall be made in accordance with the GSA regulations governing inspection of records for this purpose, and any other relevant (i.e., GSA or Commerce) directive. Such disclosure shall not be used to make determinations about individuals.
8. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to the public after either publication of the application pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 122(b) or issuance of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 151. Further, a record may be disclosed, subject to the limitations of 37 CFR 1.14, as a routine use, to the public if the record was filed in an application which became abandoned or in which the proceedings were terminated and which application is referenced by either a published application, an application open to public inspection or an issued patent.
9. A record from this system of records may be disclosed, as a routine use, to a Federal, State, or local law enforcement agency, if the USPTO becomes aware of a violation or potential violation of law or regulation.

1303.01 Amendment Received After Allowance [R-07.2015]

If the amendment is filed under [37 CFR 1.312](#), see [MPEP § 714.15](#) to [§ 714.16\(e\)](#). If the amendment contains claims copied from a patent to provoke an

interference, see MPEP [Chapter 2300](#). Any submissions of replacement drawings filed after allowance should be forwarded to the Office of Data Management.

Reference to an Issue Batch Number is no longer necessary because the Office no longer stores and tracks applications according to issue batches.

Any paper filed after receiving the Issue Notification should include the indicated patent number, unless the application has been withdrawn from issue.

1303.02 Undelivered [R-07.2015]

In case a Notice of Allowance is returned, and a new notice is sent (see [MPEP § 707.13](#)), the date of sending the notice must be changed in the file to agree with the date of such remailing. The original document, a copy of the returned document with any markings, and the remailed document should be retained in the application so that the file history is clear.

1303.03 Not Withheld Due to Death of Inventor [R-07.2015]

The Notice of Allowance will not be withheld due to death of the inventor if the executor or administrator has not intervened. See [MPEP § 409.01\(a\)](#) for applications filed on or after September 16, 2012 or [MPEP § 409.01\(b\)](#) for applications filed before September 16, 2012.

1304 Amendments After D-10 Notice [R-08.2012]

For amendments received after D-10 Notice, see [MPEP § 130](#).

1304.01 Withholding From Issue of “Secrecy Order” Applications [R-08.2012]

“Secrecy Order” applications are not sent to issue even when all of the claims have been allowed. Instead of mailing a Notice of Allowance, a D-10 Notice is sent. See [MPEP § 130](#).

If the “Secrecy Order” in an application is withdrawn after the D-10 notice is mailed, the application should then be treated like an ordinary application in condition for allowance.

1305 Jurisdiction [R-10.2019]

Jurisdiction of the application remains with the primary examiner until the Notice of Allowance is mailed. However, the examiner may permit amendments under [37 CFR 1.312](#) which are confined to matters of form in the specification or claims, or to the cancellation of a claim or claims. The examiner’s action on other amendments under [37 CFR 1.312](#) consists of a recommendation to the Director.

To regain jurisdiction over the application, the examiner must write a letter to the Director requesting it. See [MPEP § 1308](#) and [§ 1308.02](#).

Once the patent has been granted, the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office can take no action concerning it, except as provided in [35 U.S.C. 135](#), [35 U.S.C. 154](#), [35 U.S.C. 251](#) through [256](#), [35 U.S.C. 302](#) through [307](#), [35 U.S.C. 311](#) through [319](#) and [35 U.S.C. 321](#) through [329](#).

1306 Issue Fee [R-10.2019]

The issue fee and any required publication fee are due 3 months from the date of the Notice of Allowance. The period for payment of the issue fee and any required publication fee is not extendable, see [37 CFR 1.311\(a\)](#). The amount of the issue fee and any required publication fee are shown on the Notice of Allowance. The Notice of Allowance will also reflect any issue fee previously paid in the application. The issue fee due does not reflect a credit for any previously paid issue fee in the application. If an issue fee has previously been paid in the application as reflected in the Notice of Allowance, the return of Part B (Fee(s) Transmittal form) will be considered a request to reapply the previously paid issue fee toward the issue fee that is now due. For example, if the application was allowed and the issue fee paid, but applicant withdrew the application from issue and filed a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and the application was later allowed, the Notice of

Allowance will reflect an issue fee amount that is due and the issue fee that was previously paid.

Under the changes to [35 U.S.C. 151](#) in the Patent Law Treaties Implementation Act (PLTIA) (Public Law 112-211), the sum specified in the notice of allowance will constitute the issue fee and any required publication fee, and the Office will proceed to issue a patent when the applicant pays the sum specified in the notice of allowance, regardless of the issue fee and/or publication fee in effect on the date the sum specified in the notice of allowance is paid. The amounts due under [35 U.S.C. 41\(a\)](#) (i.e., the issue fee, but not the publication fee) are reduced by 50 per centum for small entities and 75 per centum for micro entities.

Applicants and their attorneys or agents are urged to use the Fee(s) Transmittal form (PTOL-85B) provided with the Notice of Allowance when submitting their payments, even when no additional fee is due. Unless otherwise directed, all post allowance correspondence should be addressed “Mail Stop Issue Fee.”

Where it is clear that an applicant actually intends to pay the issue fee and required publication fee, but the proper fee payment is not made, for example, an incorrect issue fee amount is supplied, or a PTOL-85B Fee(s) Transmittal form is filed without payment of the issue fee, a general authorization to pay fees or a specific authorization to pay the issue fee, submitted prior to the mailing of a notice of allowance, will be allowed to act as payment of the correct issue fee. [37 CFR 1.311\(b\)](#). In addition, where the deposit account information is added to the Fee(s) Transmittal form (PTOL-85B), but the check box authorizing that the deposit account be charged the issue fee is not checked, the deposit account will still be charged the required issue fee and any required publication fee.

Technology Center personnel should forward all post allowance correspondence to the Office of Patent Application Processing (OPAP). The papers received by the OPAP will be scanned and matched with the appropriate application and the entire application will be forwarded to the appropriate Technology Center for processing.

The payment of the issue fee due may be simplified by using a U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account or a credit card payment with form PTO-2038 for such a fee. See [MPEP § 509](#). However, any such payment must be specifically authorized by reference to the “issue fee” or “fees due under [37 CFR 1.18](#).”

The fee(s) due will be accepted from the applicant, assignee, or a registered attorney or agent, either of record or under [37 CFR 1.34](#).

The Director has no authority to extend the time for paying the issue fee. Intentional failure to pay the issue fee within the 3 months permitted by [35 U.S.C. 151](#) does not amount to unintentional delay in making payment.

1306.01 Deferring Issuance of a Patent [R-10.2019]

37 CFR 1.314 Issuance of patent.

If applicant timely pays the issue fee, the Office will issue the patent in regular course unless the application is withdrawn from issue ([§ 1.313](#)) or the Office defers issuance of the patent. To request that the Office defer issuance of a patent, applicant must file a petition under this section including the fee set forth in [§ 1.17\(h\)](#) and a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary to defer issuance of the patent.

There is a public policy that the patent will issue in regular course once the issue fee is timely paid. [37 CFR 1.314](#). It has been the policy of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to defer issuance of a patent, upon request, for a period of up to 1 month only, in the absence of extraordinary circumstances or requirement of the regulations (e.g., [37 CFR 1.177](#)) which would dictate a longer period. Situations like negotiation of licenses, time for filing in foreign countries, collection of data for filing a continuation-in-part application, or a desire for simultaneous issuance of related applications are not considered to amount to extraordinary circumstances.

A petition to defer issuance of a patent is not appropriate until the issue fee is paid. Issuance of a patent cannot be deferred after an allowed application receives a patent number and issue date unless the application is withdrawn from issue under [37 CFR 1.313\(b\)](#) or (c). See [MPEP § 1306.03](#). The petition to defer is considered at the time the petition

is correlated with the application file before the appropriate deciding official ([MPEP § 1002.02\(b\)](#)). In order to facilitate consideration of a petition for deferment of issue, the petition should be filed with the Fee(s) Transmittal form (PTOL-85B) and clearly labeled as a Petition to Defer Issue; Attention: Office of Petitions.

1306.02 Simultaneous Issuance of Patents [R-08.2012]

Where applications have been allowed and a Notice of Allowance and Fee(s) Due (PTOL-85) has been mailed in each application, a request for simultaneous issuance will be granted. Unless all the applications have reached this stage of processing, or a specific requirement of the regulations is involved (e.g., [37 CFR 1.177](#)), a request for simultaneous issuance generally will not be granted.

Applicants and their attorneys who desire the simultaneous issue of allowed applications must submit the request to: Mail Stop Issue Fee, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, Attention: Office of Patent Publication.

The request must contain the following information about *each* allowed application for which simultaneous issue is requested:

- (A) Application number,
- (B) Filing date,
- (C) Name(s) of inventor(s),
- (D) Title of invention, and
- (E) Date of allowance.

Separate copies of the request must accompany *each* Fee(s) Transmittal (PTOL-85B).

1306.03 Practice After Payment of Issue Fee; Receipt of Issue Notification [R-10.2019]

Under the current publication process, utility and reissue patents are issued within about four weeks after the issue fee and any required publication fee are received in the Office. A patent number and issue

date will be assigned to an application and an Issue Notification will be mailed after the issue fee has been paid and processed by the USPTO. Because the Issue Notification may be mailed less than two weeks before the application is expected to issue as a patent, applicants are advised to file any continuing application before receiving the Issue Notification to avoid loss of copendency.

Since the Office cannot ensure that any paper filed after payment of the issue fee will reach the appropriate USPTO official before the date the application issues as a patent, applicants are also encouraged to file any necessary amendments, assignments, petitions, information disclosure statements, or other papers prior to the date of issue fee payment, preferably within one month after the Notice of Allowance has been mailed. See [MPEP § 502](#) for post allowance correspondence. See [MPEP § 1308](#), subsection I.B, for submission of an information disclosure statement after payment of the issue fee under the Quick Path Information Disclosure Statement (QPIDS) Program.

In order to minimize disruptions and delays in the printing process, the application is **not** available after the Notice of Allowance has been mailed unless necessary for “Query Printer Waiting”, amendments submitted under [37 CFR 1.312](#), information disclosure statements, and petitions. Corrected filing receipts will not be mailed after the date of mailing of the Notice of Allowance unless special circumstances exist. Duplicate filing of papers is not recommended (and may be treated as a failure to engage in reasonable efforts to conclude prosecution pursuant to [37 CFR 1.704\(c\)\(10\)](#)). The same correspondence should not be mailed and faxed to the Office unless the duplication has been specifically required by the Office. See [MPEP § 719.01\(a\)](#).

1307 Change in Classification of Cases Which Are in Issue [R-07.2015]

See [MPEP § 903.07](#).

1308 Withdrawal From Issue [R-10.2019]

37 CFR 1.313 Withdrawal from issue.

(a) Applications may be withdrawn from issue for further action at the initiative of the Office or upon petition by the applicant. To request that the Office withdraw an application from issue, applicant must file a petition under this section including the fee set forth in [§ 1.17\(h\)](#) and a showing of good and sufficient reasons why withdrawal of the application from issue is necessary. A petition under this section is not required if a request for continued examination under [§ 1.114](#) is filed prior to payment of the issue fee. If the Office withdraws the application from issue, the Office will issue a new notice of allowance if the Office again allows the application.

(b) Once the issue fee has been paid, the Office will not withdraw the application from issue at its own initiative for any reason except:

- (1) A mistake on the part of the Office;
- (2) A violation of [§ 1.56](#) or illegality in the application;
- (3) Unpatentability of one or more claims; or
- (4) For interference or derivation proceeding.

(c) Once the issue fee has been paid, the application will not be withdrawn from issue upon petition by the applicant for any reason except:

(1) Unpatentability of one of more claims, which petition must be accompanied by an unequivocal statement that one or more claims are unpatentable, an amendment to such claim or claims, and an explanation as to how the amendment causes such claim or claims to be patentable;

(2) Consideration of a request for continued examination in compliance with [§ 1.114](#); or

(3) Express abandonment of the application. Such express abandonment may be in favor of a continuing application.

(d) A petition under this section will not be effective to withdraw the application from issue unless it is actually received and granted by the appropriate officials before the date of issue. Withdrawal of an application from issue after payment of the issue fee may not be effective to avoid publication of application information.

I. WITHDRAWAL FROM ISSUE AT THE INITIATIVE OF THE APPLICANT

A. *Prior to the Payment of Issue Fee*

If the applicant wishes to have an application withdrawn from issue, he or she must petition the Director under [37 CFR 1.313\(a\)](#) or file a request for continued examination (RCE) under [37 CFR 1.114](#) with a submission and the fee set forth in [37 CFR 1.17\(e\)](#). A submission may be an information disclosure statement ([37 CFR 1.97](#) and [1.98](#)) or an amendment. The RCE practice does not apply to utility or plant applications filed before June 8, 1995 and design applications. See [MPEP § 706.07\(h\)](#),

subsections I, II and IX. If an applicant files a RCE (with the fee and a submission), the applicant need not pay the issue fee to avoid abandonment of the application. Applicants are cautioned against filing a RCE prior to payment of the issue fee and subsequently paying the issue fee (before the Office acts on the RCE) because doing so may result in issuance of a patent without consideration of the RCE (if the RCE is not matched with the application before the application is processed into a patent).

Petitions under [37 CFR 1.313\(a\)](#) to have an application withdrawn from issue should be directed to the Technology Center (TC) Director to which the application is assigned (see [MPEP § 1002.02\(c\)](#)). Unless applicant receives a written communication from the Office that the application has been withdrawn from issue, the issue fee must be timely submitted to avoid abandonment.

Applicant may also file a continuing application on or before the day the issue fee is due and permit the parent application to become abandoned for failure to pay the issue fee ([35 U.S.C. 151](#)).

B. *After the Payment of Issue Fee*

In May of 2012 the Office launched the Quick Path Information Disclosure Statement (QPIDS) Pilot Program. This program allows, under specific circumstances, for the submission of an IDS after payment of the issue fee but prior to patent grant. Information on the QPIDS Program can be found on the USPTO website <https://www.uspto.gov/patent/initiatives/quick-path-information-disclosure-statement-qpids>.

Once the issue fee is paid, withdrawal is permitted only for the reasons stated in [37 CFR 1.313\(c\)](#). The status of the application at the time the petition is filed is determinative of whether the petition is considered under [37 CFR 1.313\(a\)](#) or [37 CFR 1.313\(c\)](#). Petitions under [37 CFR 1.313\(c\)](#) to have an application withdrawn after payment of the issue fee should be directed to the Office of Petitions (see [MPEP § 1002.02\(b\)](#)).

In addition to the specific reasons identified in [37 CFR 1.313\(c\)\(1\)-\(3\)](#) applicant should identify some specific and significant defect in the allowed

application before the application will be withdrawn from issue. A petition under [37 CFR 1.313\(c\)](#) based on the reason specified in [37 CFR 1.313\(c\)\(2\)](#) can only be filed in utility or plant applications filed on or after June 8, 1995 because the request for continued examination (RCE) practice does not apply to these types of applications filed before June 8, 1995 and design applications. See [MPEP § 706.07\(h\)](#), subsections I and IX. Such a petition under [37 CFR 1.313\(c\)\(2\)](#) along with the petition fee set forth in [37 CFR 1.17\(h\)](#) must include a request for continued examination in compliance with [37 CFR 1.114](#) (e.g., a submission and the fee set forth in [37 CFR 1.17\(e\)](#)). The continued prosecution application (CPA) practice under [37 CFR 1.53\(d\)](#) only applies to design applications. See [MPEP § 201.06\(d\)](#). To withdraw from issue a utility or plant application, an applicant may wish to file a petition under [37 CFR 1.313\(c\)\(2\)](#) with a RCE or under [37 CFR 1.313\(c\)\(3\)](#) for the express abandonment of the application in favor of a continuing application under [37 CFR 1.53\(b\)](#).

Any petition filed under [37 CFR 1.313\(c\)](#) to withdraw an application from issue after payment of the issue fee should be clearly marked “Petition under [37 CFR 1.313\(c\)](#).” Petitions to withdraw an application from issue under [37 CFR 1.313\(c\)](#) may be:

(A) mailed to “Mail Stop Petition, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450”;

(B) transmitted by facsimile to (571) 273-0025;

(C) hand-carried to the Office of Petitions (see [MPEP § 1730](#) for the location); or

(D) filed via EFS-Web as an ePetition.

Applicants are strongly advised to use EFS-Web, transmit by facsimile or hand-carry the petition to the Office of Petitions to allow sufficient time to process the petition and if the petition can be granted, withdraw the application from issue. While a petition to withdraw an application from issue may be granted as late as one day prior to the patent issue date, to avoid publication and dissemination, the petition decision must be granted at least 3 weeks prior to the issue date.

The Office cannot ensure that any petition under [37 CFR 1.313\(c\)](#) will be acted upon prior to the date of patent grant. See *Filing of Continuing Applications, Amendments, or Petitions after Payment of Issue Fee*, Notice, 1221 *Off. Gaz. Pat. Office* 14 (April 6, 1999). Since a RCE (unlike a CPA under [37 CFR 1.53\(d\)](#)) is not any type of new application filing, the Office cannot grant a petition to convert an untimely RCE to a continuing application under [37 CFR 1.53\(b\)](#). Therefore, applicants are strongly cautioned to file any desired RCE prior to payment of issue fee. In addition, applicants considering filing a RCE after payment of the issue fee are strongly cautioned to call the Office of Petitions to determine whether sufficient time remains before the patent issue date to consider (and grant) a petition under [37 CFR 1.313\(c\)](#) and what steps are needed to ensure that a grantable petition under [37 CFR 1.313\(c\)](#) is before an appropriate official in the Office of Petitions in sufficient time to grant the petition before the patent is issued.

Once a petition under [37 CFR 1.313\(c\)\(1\)](#) or [\(c\)\(2\)](#) has been granted, the application will be withdrawn from issue, the applicant’s submission(s) will be entered, and the application forwarded to the examiner for consideration of the submission and further action. If an application has been withdrawn from issue after the payment of the issue fee and the application is again found allowable, see [MPEP § 1306](#) regarding request to reapply a previously paid issue fee toward the issue fee that is now due in the same application.

II. WITHDRAWAL FROM ISSUE AT THE INITIATIVE OF THE OFFICE

The Director may withdraw an application from issue under [37 CFR 1.313](#) on his or her own initiative. See *BlackLight Power Inc. v. Rogan*, 295 F.3d 1269, 1273, 63 USPQ2d 1534, 1537 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (USPTO may withdraw a patent application from issuance after the issue fee has been paid.) and *Harley v. Lehman*, 981 F. Supp. 9, 12, 44 USPQ2d 1699, 1702 (D.D.C. 1997) (adoption of [37 CFR 1.313\(b\)](#) permitting applications to be withdrawn from issue under certain narrow circumstances not directly covered by the statute was not unreasonable). [35 U.S.C. 151](#) provides that upon payment of the issue fee, “the patent shall issue.”

Thus, an application cannot be withdrawn from issue after payment of the issue fee consistent with [35 U.S.C. 151](#) unless there has been a determination that at least one of the conditions specified at [37 CFR 1.313\(b\)\(1\) through \(4\)](#) exist such that the applicant is no longer “entitled to a patent under the law” as provided in [35 U.S.C. 151](#). See *BlackLight Power Inc. v. Rogan*, 295 F.3d at 1273, 63 USPQ2d at 1537 (Fed. Cir. 2002) (USPTO is not required to make final determination of unpatentability before withdrawing an application from issue pursuant to [37 CFR 1.313\(b\)\(3\)](#), which permits the Office to withdraw an application after payment of the issue fee on ground of “unpatentability of one or more claims.”); *Harley v. Lehman*, 981 F. Supp. at 11-12, 44 USPQ2d at 1701-02 (D.D.C. 1997) (Commissioner may adopt rules permitting applications to be withdrawn from issue after payment of the issue fee in situations in which the applicant is not entitled to a patent under the law); and see *Sampson v. Dann*, 466 F. Supp. 965, 973-74, 201 USPQ 15, 22 (D.D.C. 1978) (Commissioner not authorized to withdraw an application from issue after payment of the issue fee on an *ad hoc* basis, but only in situations which meet the conditions of [37 CFR 1.313\(b\)](#)).

The authority to withdraw an application from issue at the initiative of the USPTO after payment of the issue fee under [37 CFR 1.313\(b\)](#) has been delegated to TC Directors (see [MPEP § 1002.02\(c\)](#)). The Office of Petitions has also been delegated the authority to withdraw an application from issue after payment of the issue fee in those situations in which the request for withdrawal from issue is at the initiative of the USPTO by someone other than a TC Director (see [MPEP § 1002.02\(b\)](#)).

[35 U.S.C. 151](#) and [37 CFR 1.313\(b\)](#) do not authorize the USPTO to withdraw an application from issue after payment of the issue fee for any reason **except**:

- (1) a mistake on the part of the Office;
- (2) a violation of [37 CFR 1.56](#) or illegality in the application;
- (3) unpatentability of one or more claims; or
- (4) for interference or derivation.

See [37 CFR 1.313\(b\)](#).

Examples of reasons that do **not** warrant withdrawing an application from issue after payment of the issue fee at the initiative of the Office are:

- (A) to permit the examiner to consider an information disclosure statement;
- (B) to permit the examiner to consider whether one or more claims are unpatentable; or
- (C) to permit the applicant to file a continuing application (including a CPA).

An application may be removed from the Office of Data Management, without it being withdrawn from issue under [37 CFR 1.313\(b\)](#), to permit the examiner to consider an information disclosure statement or whether one or more claims are unpatentable, see [MPEP § 1309.02](#). Only if such consideration results in a determination that one or more claims are unpatentable does [37 CFR 1.313\(b\)](#) authorize the application to be withdrawn from issue. If uncertainty exists as to whether prosecution will in fact be re-opened, the uncertainty must be resolved before the application is withdrawn from issue. If there is a question whether an application must be withdrawn from issue and no TC Director is available to decide whether withdrawal from issue is appropriate and to sign the withdrawal Notice, the application should be sent to the Office of Petitions for decision on whether withdrawal from issue is appropriate and to effect the withdrawal.

Any notice withdrawing an application from issue after payment of the issue fee must specify which of the conditions set forth in [37 CFR 1.313\(b\)\(1\) through \(4\)](#) exists and thus warrants withdrawal of the application from issue. Any petition under [37 CFR 1.181](#) to review the decision of a TC Director to withdraw an application from issue after payment of the issue fee will be decided by the Deputy Commissioner for Patent Examination Policy.

If an application has been withdrawn from issue after the payment of the issue fee and the application is again found allowable, see [MPEP § 1306](#) regarding request to reapply a previously paid issue fee toward the issue fee that is now due in the same application.

Procedure to be followed when an application is withdrawn from issue

The procedure set forth below is to be followed when a TC Director withdraws an application from issue. This processing is to be done in the Technology Center without the need to send the application to the Office of Data Management.

First, determine (via PALM) whether the issue fee has been paid, and whether the application has been assigned a patent number and issue date.

A. *Withdrawal From Issue Before Payment of Issue Fee*

If the issue fee **has not** been paid and the deadline for payment has not expired:

(A) Prepare and mail a “Withdrawal from Issue” letter signed by the TC Director to the applicant to effectuate the withdrawal from issue, using form paragraph 10.01. This action will change the status of the application to status code 091 (Withdraw From Issue - Awaiting Action) and enter the Withdrawal from Issue letter in the application file and make it of record on the application file contents and forward the application to the examiner for **prompt** appropriate action (*e.g.*, reopen prosecution, initiate interference proceedings).

¶ 10.01 Withdrawal From Issue, Fee Not Paid

In re Application of [1]: Appl. No.: [2]: **WITHDRAWAL FROM ISSUE** Filed: [3]: [37 CFR 1.313](#) For: [4]:

The purpose of this communication is to inform you that the above identified application is being withdrawn from issue pursuant to [37 CFR 1.313](#).

The application is being withdrawn to permit reopening of prosecution. The reasons therefor will be communicated to you by the examiner.

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office records reveal that the issue fee and the publication fee have not been paid. If the issue fee and the publication fee have been submitted, the applicant may request a refund, or may request that the fee be credited to a deposit account. However, applicant may wait until the application is either again found allowable or held abandoned. If the application is allowed, upon receipt of a new Notice of Allowance and Fee(s) Due, applicant may request that the previously submitted issue fee and publication fee be applied toward payment of the issue fee and publication fee in the amount identified on the new Notice of Allowance and Fee(s) Due. If the application is abandoned, applicant may request either a refund or a credit to a specified Deposit Account.

The application is being forwarded to the examiner for action.

[5]

Director,

Technology Center [6]

[7]

Examiner Note:

1. This letter is printed with the USPTO letterhead and must be signed by the TC Director.
2. DO NOT use this form letter if the issue fee and publication fee have been paid.
3. In bracket 7, insert the correspondence address of record.

B. *Withdrawal From Issue After Payment of Issue Fee*

If the issue fee **has** been paid:

(A) Prepare a “Notice of Withdrawal From Issue under [37 CFR 1.313\(b\)](#)” indicating that the application has been withdrawn from issue.

(B) If the application has been assigned a patent number and issue date:

(1) E-mail the memorandum to the Director of the Office of Data Management and the persons copied on the memorandum to inform them that the application has been withdrawn from issue.

(2) The “Notice of Withdrawal From Issue under [37 CFR 1.313\(b\)](#)” letter to applicant must be signed, date stamped, and mailed no later than the Monday before the issue date to be effective to withdraw the application from issue.

(3) The Office of Data Management updates the PALM status to remove the patent issue data and place the application in status 95.

(C) Mail and enter the “Notice of Withdrawal From Issue under [37 CFR 1.313\(b\)](#)” and the “Withdrawal from Issue of” memorandum, if applicable, in the application file and make it of record on the application file contents, which will update the PALM status code to change the status of the application to status code 066 (Previous Action Withdrawn - Awaiting Further Action) by using PALM transaction code 1040.

(D) Forward the application to the examiner for prompt appropriate action (*e.g.*, reopen prosecution, initiate interference proceedings).

III. HANDLING OF APPLICATIONS THAT CONTAIN AN EXAMINER'S AMENDMENT

When an application is withdrawn from issue, either at the initiative of the applicant or by the Office, and the application contains an examiner's amendment, the claims as amended by the examiner's amendment are the claims subject to further examination.

1308.01 Rejection After Allowance [R-10.2019]

A claim noted as allowable shall thereafter be rejected only with the approval of the primary examiner. Great care should be exercised in authorizing such rejection. See [MPEP § 706.04](#).

When a new rejection is discovered, which obviously is applicable to one or more of the allowed claims in an application in issue, a memorandum is addressed to the Technology Center (TC) Director, requesting that the application be withdrawn from issue for the purpose of applying the new grounds of rejection. This memorandum should cite the rationale for the new rejection, including any new reference(s), and, if need be, briefly state its application. If the examiner's proposed action is not approved, the memorandum requesting withdrawal from issue should not be placed in the file.

If the request to withdraw from issue is approved, the TC Director should withdraw the application from issue as explained in [MPEP § 1308](#). After the TC Director has withdrawn the application from issue, the examiner will prepare an Office action stating that the application has been withdrawn from issue, citing any new reference(s), and rejecting the claims based upon the approved new grounds of rejection. See [MPEP § 706.07](#) for guidance on making this rejection final.

If the issue fee has already been paid and prosecution is reopened, the applicant may request a refund or request that the fee be credited to a deposit account. However, applicant may wait until the application is either found allowable or held abandoned. If

allowed, upon receipt of a new Notice of Allowance, applicant may request that the previously submitted issue fee be applied (the Notice of Allowance will reflect an issue fee amount that is due and the issue fee that was previously paid). See [MPEP § 1306](#) regarding request to reapply a previously paid issue fee toward the issue fee that is now due in the same application. If abandoned, applicant may request refund or credit to a deposit account.

1308.02 For Interference or Derivation Purposes [R-07.2015]

It may be necessary to withdraw a case from issue for reasons connected with an interference or derivation. For the procedure to be followed, see [MPEP Chapter 2300](#).

1308.03 Quality Review Program for Examined Patent Applications [R-07.2015]

The Office of Patent Quality Assurance administers a program for reviewing the quality of the examination of patent applications. The general purpose of the program is to improve patent quality and increase the likelihood of patents being found to be valid.

The quality review is conducted by Review Quality Assurance Specialists on a randomly selected sample of allowed applications from each examiner. The sample is computer generated under the office-wide computer system (PALM), which selects a predetermined number of allowed applications from each examiner per year for review. A subsample of the selected allowed applications are both reviewed and independently searched by the reviewers. The only applications excluded from the sample are those in which there has been a decision by the Patent Trial and Appeal Board, or by a court.

The Review Quality Assurance Specialist independently reviews each sampled application assigned to his or her docket to determine whether any claims may be unpatentable. The Review Quality Assurance Specialist may consult with, discuss, or review an application with any other reviewer or professional in the examining corps, except the professional who acted on the application. The

review will, with or without additional search, provide the examining corps personnel with information which will assist in improving the quality of issued applications. The program shall be used as an educational tool to aid in identifying problem areas in the examining Technology Centers (TCs).

Reviewed applications may be returned to the examining TCs for consideration of the reviewer's question(s) as to adequacy of the search and/or patentability of a claim(s).

If, during the quality review process, it is determined that one or more claims of a reviewed application are unpatentable, the prosecution of the application will be reopened. The Office action should contain, as an opening, form paragraph 13.04.

¶ 13.04 Reopen Prosecution - After Notice of Allowance

Prosecution on the merits of this application is reopened on claim [1] considered unpatentable for the reasons indicated below:

[2]

Examiner Note:

1. This paragraph should be used when a rejection is made on any previously allowed claim(s) which for one reason or another is considered unpatentable after the Notice of Allowance (PTOL-85) has been mailed.
2. Make appropriate rejection(s) as in any other action.
3. In bracket 1, identify claim(s) that are considered unpatentable.
4. In bracket 2, state all appropriate rejections for each claim considered unpatentable.

If the issue fee has already been paid in the application, the application must be withdrawn from issue by the Office of Data Management, and the action should contain not only the above quoted paragraph, but also form paragraph 13.05.

¶ 13.05 Reopen Prosecution - Vacate Notice of Allowance

Applicant is advised that the Notice of Allowance mailed [1] is vacated. If the issue fee has already been paid, applicant may request a refund or request that the fee be credited to a deposit account. However, applicant may wait until the application is either found allowable or held abandoned. If allowed, upon receipt of a new Notice of Allowance, applicant may request that the previously submitted issue fee be applied. If abandoned, applicant may request refund or credit to a specified Deposit Account.

Examiner Note:

1. This form paragraph must be used when the prosecution is reopened after the mailing of the Notice of Allowance.
2. In bracket 1, insert date of the Notice of Allowance.

Quality Assurance forms and papers are *not* to be included with Office actions, nor should such forms or papers be retained in the file of any reviewed application whether or not prosecution is to be reopened. The application record should *not* indicate that a review has been conducted by Quality Assurance.

Whenever an application has been returned to the TC under the Quality Assurance Program, the TC should promptly decide what action is to be taken in the application and inform the Office of Patent Quality Assurance of the nature of that action by use of the appropriate form. If prosecution is to be reopened or other corrective action taken, only the forms should be returned to the Office of Patent Quality Assurance initially, with the application being returned to the Office of Patent Quality Assurance when action is completed. In all other instances, both the application and the forms should be returned to the Office of Patent Quality Assurance.

1309 Issue of Patent [R-10.2019]

Under the current publication process, electronic capture of most of the information to be printed in a patent will begin as soon as an electronic message concerning the allowed application is received in the Office of Data Management, immediately after the Notice of Allowance has been mailed. The application is then electronically exported to Initial Data Capture (IDC) for electronic capture of the patent filed. This process takes approximately 6 weeks. Upon IDC completion, an electronic message is then sent to the File Maintenance Facility to ensure that all post allowance correspondence, fees and drawings have been updated. The application may stay in FMF for 1-2 weeks or until all post-allowance requirements are met.

When the issue fee is paid and all other requirements have been met (e.g., drawings) for issuance as a patent, the application is then electronically exported to the Final Data Capture (FDC) stage. The FDC

makes any updates necessary to the electronic file and places the allowed patent application in an issue. The average time that an allowed application is in the FDC process is 5 weeks (2 weeks of processing time for assignment of issue date). The "Issue Notification" is mailed approximately 3 weeks prior to the issue date of the patent.

A bond paper copy of the patent grant is sealed and mailed by the Office of Data Management.

All allowed applications ready for printing will be selected by chronological sequence based on the date the issue fee was paid. Special handling will be given to the following applications in these categories:

(A) Allowed cases which were made special by the Director.

(B) Allowed cases that have a U.S. effective filing date more than 5 years old.

(C) Allowed reissue applications.

(D) Allowed applications having an effective filing date earlier than that required for declaring an interference with a copending application claiming the same subject matter.

(E) Allowed application of a party involved in a terminated interference.

35 U.S.C. 2 Powers and duties.

(b) SPECIFIC POWERS.— The Office—

(1) shall adopt and use a seal of the Office, which shall be judicially noticed and with which letters patent, certificates of trademark registrations, and papers issued by the Office shall be authenticated;

35 U.S.C. 153 How issued.

Patents shall be issued in the name of the United States of America, under the seal of the Patent and Trademark Office, and shall be signed by the Director or have his signature placed thereon and shall be recorded in the Patent and Trademark Office.

I. PRINTING NAMES OF PRACTITIONERS AND FIRM ON PATENTS

The Fee(s) Transmittal form (PTOL-85B) provides a space (item 2) for the person submitting the base

issue fee to indicate, for printing, (1) the names of up to three registered patent attorneys or agents or, alternatively, (2) the name of a single firm, which has as a member at least one registered patent attorney or agent, and the names of up to two registered patent attorneys or agents. If the person submitting the issue fee desires that no name of practitioner or firm be printed on the patent, the space on the Fee(s) Transmittal form should be left blank. If no name is listed on the form, no name will be printed on the patent.

II. ASSIGNMENT PRINTED ON PATENT

The Fee(s) Transmittal form (PTOL -85B) provides a space (item 3) for assignment data which should be completed in order to comply with [37 CFR 3.81](#). The Office does not look to the assignment record to determine the name of the assignee to be printed on the front of the patent. Therefore, unless an assignee's name and address are identified in item 3 of the Fee(s) Transmittal form PTOL-85B, the patent will issue to the applicant. Assignment data printed on the patent will be based solely on the information so supplied. See [MPEP § 307](#). Recording of the assignment, or submission of the assignment for recordation as set forth in [37 CFR 3.11](#) is required for a Patent to issue to an assignee. See [37 CFR 3.81\(a\)](#).

III. ASSIGNEE NAMES

Only the first appearing name of an assignee will be printed on the patent where multiple names for the *same* party are identified on the Fee(s) Transmittal form, PTOL-85B. Such multiple names may occur when both a legal name and an "also known as" or "doing business as" name is also included. This printing practice will not, however, affect the practice of recording assignments with the Office in the Assignment Division. The assignee entry on form PTOL-85B should still be completed to indicate the assignment data as recorded in the Office. For example, the assignment filed in the Office and therefore the PTOL-85B assignee entry might read "Smith Company doing business as (d.b.a.) Jones Company." The assignee entry on the printed patent will read "Smith Company."

1309.01 [Reserved]

1309.02 “Printer Rush” Cases [R-10.2019]

When the printer finds an apparent error in an application or other issue which prevents publication, the file is returned to the examiner, a "Printer Rush" form is included in the Image File Wrapper (IFW) and is indicated with a "RUSH" document code, noting the supposed error or issue. Additional issues which may prevent publication until they are resolved include but are not limited to: amendments under [37 CFR 1.312](#), a Request for Correction of Inventorship under [37 CFR 1.48](#) and Information Disclosure Statements which have not been initialed by the examiner.

These applications are placed on the examiner's "expedited" tab in Docket Application Viewer (DAV) and should be taken up for immediate action. The examiner annotates the "RUSH" document in Adobe to indicate the course of action taken to correct the error or an indication as to why the application is considered to be correct as it stands. If correction requires the mailing of an Office Action, such as an examiner's amendment or Supplemental Notice of Allowance, the annotated "RUSH" document is included in the eRedFolder (ERF) of the Office Action. If correction does not require mailing of an Office Action, the examiner creates an action entitled "Printer Rush - No mailing" and imports the "RUSH" document along with any other required forms into the action. The annotated "RUSH" form is scanned into the IFW and will not be mailed to the applicant in either circumstance.