

SPRINGER BRIEFS IN BIOTECH PATENTS

Series Editor: Ulrich Storz

Ulrich Storz · Martin Quodbach
Scott D. Marty · Derek E. Constantine
Matthew Parker

Biopatent Law: European vs. US Patent Law



Springer

SpringerBriefs in Biotech Patents

Series Editor

Ulrich Storz, Duesseldorf, Germany

For further volumes:

<http://www.springer.com/series/10239>

Ulrich Storz · Martin Quodbach
Scott D. Marty · Derek E. Constantine
Matthew Parker

Biopatent Law: European vs. US Patent Law

Ulrich Storz
Michalski Huettermann & Partner Patent
Attorneys
Duesseldorf
Germany

Derek E. Constantine
Georgia State University
Atlanta, GA
USA

Martin Quodbach
Cornelius Bartenbach Haesemann
& Partners
Cologne
Germany

Matthew Parker
Maynard, Cooper & Gale, P.C.
Huntsville, AL
USA

Scott D. Marty
Ballard Spahr LLP
Atlanta, GA
USA

ISSN 2192-9904 ISSN 2192-9912 (electronic)
ISBN 978-3-642-41292-9 ISBN 978-3-642-41293-6 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-41293-6
Springer Heidelberg New York Dordrecht London

Library of Congress Control Number: 2013950015

The information provided herein reflect the personal views and considerations of the authors. They do not represent legal counsel and should not be attributed to the companies or law firms the authors work for.

© The Author(s) 2014

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed. Exempted from this legal reservation are brief excerpts in connection with reviews or scholarly analysis or material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work. Duplication of this publication or parts thereof is permitted only under the provisions of the Copyright Law of the Publisher's location, in its current version, and permission for use must always be obtained from Springer. Permissions for use may be obtained through RightsLink at the Copyright Clearance Center. Violations are liable to prosecution under the respective Copyright Law. The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

While the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication, neither the authors nor the editors nor the publisher can accept any legal responsibility for any errors or omissions that may be made. The publisher makes no warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

Preface

Patents protecting biotechnological invention become ever more important. Because Biotechnology has many differences with respect to other technologies, lessons learned in other fields of technology cannot simply be transferred to adopt a suitable strategy for dealing with Biotechnology inventions.

In this issue, legal aspects of biotech patents will be discussed. This involves questions of biopatent prosecution, including novelty, inventive step, written disclosure and sufficiency of enablement, as well as questions of law enforcement of biotech patents. Another issue are particular aspects of US patent law, which can have tremendous differences compared to European law.

Duesseldorf, Germany
Cologne, Germany
Atlanta, GA, USA
Atlanta, GA, USA
Huntsville, AL, USA

Ulrich Storz
Martin Quodbach
Scott D. Marty
Derek E. Constantine
Matthew Parker

Contents

Patentability Requirements of Biotech Patents	1
Ulrich Storz	
1 Introduction	1
2 Foreplay: Requirements Specific to Either the EPC or USC 35.	2
2.1 Industrial Application (Art. 57 EPC) and Exclusion of Methods of Treatment and Diagnosis (Art. 53 (c) EPC).	2
2.2 Sufficiency of Disclosure (Art. 83 EPC).	4
2.3 Enablement and Written Description Requirement (USC 35; § 112)	6
2.4 Best Mode (USC 35; § 112).	8
3 Novelty and Inventive Step/Non-Obviousness: The Moving Target . . .	9
3.1 Novelty	9
3.2 Inventive Step/Non-Obviousness	11
References	21
Law Enforcement of Biotech Patents	23
Martin Quodbach	
1 Introduction	23
2 Identifying the Infringing Object, Documentation of Evidence Against the Background of the Burden of Proof of the Patent Owner	25
2.1 Preparing the Technical Facts of the Case (If the Claimant has Access to the Infringing Article)	25
2.2 Gaining First Access to the Infringing Article.	26
3 Determination of the Scope of Protection of a Patent Claim, Evaluation of Patent Features	27
3.1 General Rules of Patent Claim Interpretation	27
3.2 Literal Scope of Protection of a Patent Claim and the Doctrine of Equivalents	29
3.3 Restrictions of Disclosed Industrial Applications of Biosequences	30
3.4 The Monsanto Versus Cefetra/Toepfer Case	31
4 Determination of Jurisdiction/the Competent Court	32
5 Choosing the Adequate Litigation Procedure	33

5.1	Preliminary Injunctions Versus “Normal” Proceedings	33
5.2	Border Seizure	35
6	Procedural Problems Regarding Biotechnological Cases.	35
6.1	Staying of Infringement Proceedings on Grounds of Opposition Proceedings/Nullity Actions Against the Patent. . .	35
6.2	Dependency on Expert Opinions	36
6.3	“Italian Torpedo”	36
7	Legal Consequences of Infringing Biotechnological Patents	37
7.1	Standards Set by the IPR Enforcement Directive.	37
7.2	Damages and National Case Law on Tort.	38
8	Conclusion	39
	Particular Aspects of US Patent Law in Biotechnologies	41
	Scott D. Marty, Derek E. Constantine and Matthew Parker	
1	Priority.	42
1.1	United States.	42
1.2	Europe	44
1.3	The America Invents Act	44
2	Novelty	45
2.1	United States.	45
2.2	Europe	48
2.3	The America Invents Act	49
3	Written Description	50
3.1	United States.	50
3.2	Europe	51
3.3	The America Invents Act	52
4	Information Disclosure Statements.	52
4.1	United States.	52
4.2	Europe	54
5	Obviousness	55
5.1	United States: Non-Obviousness	55
5.2	Europe: Inventive Step.	57
6	Best Mode	59
6.1	United States.	59
6.2	Europe: No Requirement	59
7	Enablement.	60
7.1	United States.	60
7.2	Europe	61
8	Patent-Eligible Subject Matter.	62
8.1	United States.	62
8.2	Europe	64
	About the Authors.	67

Patentability Requirements of Biotech Patents

Ulrich Storz

Abstract This chapter discusses patentability requirements in the two major patent jurisdictions, namely novelty, non-obviousness/inventive step, enablement/written description, best mode, and sufficiency of disclosure. Differences between Europe and the United States are highlighted, and practical implications are discussed with respect to the biopatent field.

Keywords Novelty · Obviousness · Enablement · Written description · Best mode · Industrial applicability · Inventive step · Sufficiency of disclosure · Biotech

1 Introduction

As discussed earlier in this book series, the allowance of a patent is subject to substantial examination. During this process, a number of tests is carried out, part of which are similar in the major patent jurisdictions, while others differ from one another substantially.

In the US patent system, the United States Code, Section 35 (USC 35) is decisive, whereas in the European patent system, the European Patent Convention (EPC) sets the standards. The following list gives an overview of the patentability requirements under USC 35 and EPC.

U. Storz (✉)
Michalski Huettermann and Partner Patent Attorneys, Speditionstrasse 21
40221 Duesseldorf, Germany
e-mail: st@mhpatent.de