

**Notice of Changes in Requirement
for a Substantial New Question of Patentability for
a Second or Subsequent Request for Reexamination
While an Earlier Filed Reexamination is Pending**

A. Summary: The United States Patent and Trademark Office (Office) revised section 2240 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) in May of 2004 to set forth a new policy when a second or subsequent request for reexamination is filed while an “earlier filed reexamination” is **pending**, and the second or subsequent request cites only prior art (hereinafter “old art”) which raised a substantial new question of patentability (SNQ) in the pending reexamination proceeding. See MPEP § 2240 (8th ed. 2001)(Rev. 2, May 2004). Under the new policy, the second or subsequent request for reexamination will be ordered **only** if that old prior art raises a substantial new question of patentability which is **different** than that raised in the pending reexamination proceeding. If the old prior art cited (in the second or subsequent request) raises only the same issues that were raised to initiate the pending reexamination proceeding, the second or subsequent request will be denied.

It is to be noted that reliance on prior art cited in the pending reexamination (old art) does not preclude the existence of a SNQ that is based exclusively on that old art. Determinations on whether a SNQ exists in such an instance shall be based upon a fact-specific inquiry done on a case-by-case basis. For example, a SNQ may be based solely on old art where the old art is being presented/viewed in a new light, or in a different way, as compared with its use in the earlier concluded examination(s), in view of a material new argument or interpretation presented in the request. The presentation/viewing of old art in a new light, or in a different way, is discussed in Ex parte Chicago Rawhide, 223 USPQ 351 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1984).

B. Background: A request for ex parte reexamination of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 302, and a request for inter partes reexamination of a patent pursuant to 35 U.S.C. 311, must raise a substantial new question of patentability (SNQ) in order for a reexamination of the patent to be initiated. More than one reexamination request may be filed for the same patent, and a second or subsequent reexamination request for reexamination of a patent, where a first reexamination proceeding is pending, has historically been granted based on the **same** prior art that raised the SNQ in a pending first reexamination proceeding.

It has been the Office’s experience, however, that both patent owners and third party requesters have used a second or subsequent reexamination request (based on the same substantial new question of patentability initially raised or existing in the pending reexamination proceeding) to prolong the reexamination proceeding, and in some instances, to turn it essentially into an inter partes proceeding. These actions by patent owners and third party requesters have resulted in multiple reexaminations taking years to conclude, thus making it extremely difficult for the Office to conclude reexamination proceedings with “special dispatch” as required by statute (35 U.S.C. 305 for ex parte reexamination, 35 U.S.C. 314 inter partes reexamination). For example, under the prior practice, a patent owner whose claims are rejected in a pending

reexamination proceeding could repeatedly file multiple ex parte reexamination requests based on the same substantial new question of patentability raised, or existing, in the pending reexamination proceeding. By doing so, the patent owner could keep the reexamination proceeding pending indefinitely, to delay the issue of a reexamination certificate canceling the claims of the patent being reexamined. Additionally, a third party requester could file a second or subsequent reexamination request, while a first reexamination proceeding is pending, based on the same substantial new question of patentability raised, or existing, in the first reexamination proceeding, in order to address any responses to Office actions made by the patent owner. This use of a second or subsequent reexamination request has permitted third party requesters to, in effect, obtain an inter partes type of reexamination process in an ex parte reexamination proceeding.

Moreover, concerns regarding lengthy ex parte reexamination pendency resulting from multiple reexamination request filings were raised by witnesses at the Office's Round Table on the Equities of Inter Partes Reexamination Proceedings held February 17, 2004.

C. Implementation of New Policy: Responsive to these concerns, the Office revised its policy to be as is now set forth in the current (May 2004) revision of MPEP § 2240, that is: **the SNQ for a second or subsequent request for reexamination must be new and different than any SNQ that was raised, or existed, during any prior pending or concluded reexamination proceeding for the patent.** This revised policy is consistent with the statutory mandate of special dispatch and the intent of the ex parte reexamination statute (an ex parte reexamination proceeding is not an inter partes type of reexamination process). Further, 35 U.S.C. 303(a) states that “[w]ithin three months following the filing of a request for reexamination under the provisions of section 302 of this title, the Director will determine whether a substantial new question of patentability affecting any claim of the patent concerned is raised by the request.” It is reasonable to interpret this provision as requiring each request for reexamination to raise its own substantial new question of patentability as compared not only to the original prosecution (in the application for the patent) and any earlier, concluded reexamination proceedings, but to pending reexamination proceedings as well. To accompany the revision of MPEP § 2240, MPEP § 2640, which was newly added to the MPEP in May of 2004 to address inter partes reexamination proceedings, was drafted to implement this revision of policy for inter partes reexamination proceedings.

D. Transition Procedure: It is noted that, as a consequence of the changes made to MPEP § 2240, a patent owner will now be prevented from obtaining entry of an amendment and/or evidence not entered after final rejection in an ex parte reexamination proceeding by filing another request for reexamination based on the same substantial question of patentability raised/existing in the pending reexamination proceeding. In order to provide relief to the patent owner, the Office plans to propose a revision to the patent rules to provide for the filing of a request for continued reexamination (RCR) which would be similar to the request for continued examination (RCE) practice for applications. If the RCR practice is implemented, the patent owner, by filing an RCR, could obtain continued prosecution on the merits in the reexamination

proceeding, including entry of an amendment and/or evidence that was denied entry after a final rejection in an ex parte reexamination proceeding or after an action closing prosecution in an inter partes reexamination proceeding.

Until these new rules become effective, however, patent owners are advised to use either: (1) the petition procedure under 37 CFR § 1.181 to seek review of a denial of entry of an amendment submitted after final rejection in an ex parte reexamination proceeding or after an action closing prosecution in an inter partes reexamination proceeding; or (2) the petition procedure under 37 CFR § 1.182 to seek relief that is not currently provided by an existing rule, but that would be provided when a new request for continued reexamination (RCR) practice is in effect.

E. Inquiries: Inquiries regarding this matter may be directed to Kenneth M. Schor, Senior Legal Advisor, Office of Patent Legal Administration at telephone: (571) 272-7710.

Date: 2/2/05

Signed: /S/
JOSEPH J. ROLLA
Deputy Commissioner
for Patent Examination Policy