

The Limited Monopoly™

Staking Your (Patent) Claims - Part II

by Robert Gunderman, PE and John Hammond, PE

Our last article discussed a few basic principles of the often misunderstood and sometimes mysterious world of patent claims. This article will briefly describe some of the types of claims you may encounter in United States utility patents and published patent applications.

There are three forms of claims in patent applications: independent claims, dependent claims, and multiple dependent claims. Utility patent applications have at least one independent claim and usually (but not always), several dependent claims. The United States Patent and Trademark Office charges an application filing fee that is based upon the number of claims submitted. Currently, three independent claims and 20 total claims can be submitted for the basic filing fee. There is a charge for each independent claim in excess of three, and a further charge for total claims in excess of 20. But if those extra claims mean an obstacle to a competitor or increased licensing revenue, the additional fees are insignificant. Multiple dependent claims are not as frequently used in patent applications, mainly because the Patent Office charges dearly for them.

The Independent Claim

An independent claim stands alone and is self contained. It does not depend on or include limitations of any other claim in the patent application to make it complete. An independent claim is always broader than the dependent claims that follow. In many patent applications, several independent claims are submitted. Each independent claim attempts to broadly cover the invention on which a patent is desired. It is good practice to use the number of independent claims necessary to cover the solutions to all problems solved by the invention.

I claim:

1. Polymerized tetrafluoroethylene.

An example of a fictitious independent claim is “1. A hammer comprising a wooden handle and a metal head attached to the handle.”

The Dependent Claim

A dependent claim refers back to and further limits another claim or claims in the same patent application. Dependent claims are construed to include all the limitations of the parent claim, and are incorporated by making reference back to the parent claim.



An example of a dependent claim is: “2. The hammer of claim 1, wherein the metal head is cylindrical.”

Another example of a dependent claim is: “3. The hammer of claim 1, further including a nail claw comprising a pair of wedges extending from the head and separated by a gap.”

A dependent claim incorporates by reference everything in the parent claim¹, and adds some

further statements, limitations, or restrictions. These limitations may be directed to one or more of the elements of the parent claim (as in the example above where the metal head was further limited to being cylindrical). The limitations may also be the addition of one or more elements (as in the example above where the claimed hammer was limited to further include a claw for removing nails).

Dependent claims allow one to completely cover the invention and the various embodiments of the invention. A dependent claim is narrower in scope than the parent claim. It is important to note that a dependent claim cannot subtract an element from the parent claim. For example, the claim, “The hammer of claim 2 without the handle,” or the claim, “The hammer of claim 1, wherein the handle is not made of wood” are both improper. In order to delete an element from a claim, a new claim must be written. There is no limit to the number of dependent claims that may depend upon an independent claim (except possibly financial limitations).

Multiple Dependent Claims

A multiple dependent claim is any dependent claim which refers to more than one other claim, and must refer to such other claims in the alternative only.² So an example of an acceptable multiple dependent claim is “A hammer according to claims 2 or 3, further comprising a neoprene layer over the handle.” An example of an improper multiple dependent

claim is “A hammer according to claims 2 and 3, further comprising a neoprene layer over the handle.” A multiple dependent claim also cannot serve as the basis for any other multiple dependent claim. Multiple dependent claims have high filing fees, and can result in more complicated prosecution. They are generally not necessary, as properly structured and less costly dependent claims can be used more effectively.

Omnibus Claims

Omnibus claims are not permitted in the United States because they do not “particularly point out and distinctly claim” the invention. An example of an omnibus claim is “All of the features of novelty of the hammer as shown and described.” Some countries allow omnibus claims or variations of them.

Apparatus and Machine Claims

Apparatus and machine claims can be independent, dependent, or multiple dependent. The term “apparatus” refers to machines or devices. They may be largely mechanical machines, electrical circuits, hydraulic devices, computer apparatus, or anything having cooperating parts that accomplish some useful result. A fictitious example would be “An apparatus for driving nails comprising a cartridge for holding nails, a pneumatic cylinder having an actuating head in proximity to the cartridge, and a source of compressed air connected to the pneumatic cylinder.”

Method and Process Claims

Method and process claims can be independent, dependent, or multiple dependent. They recite the inventive steps to accomplish something useful. Typically, method claims are used for computer, electrical and mechanical inventions and process claims are used for chemical related inventions. The elements of a method or process claim are acts or steps, usually written as gerunds (i.e., “striking”). A simple fictitious example of a method claim is “A method for hammering a nail comprising the steps of grasping the nail with one hand, placing the nail against a workpiece, grasping a hammer with another hand, and striking the nail repeatedly with the hammer.” It is interesting to note that methods or process steps can be patented, with the exception of medical or surgical procedures that do not involve patented pharmaceuticals or patented devices.³

Composition of Matter Claims

A composition of matter is a product where the chemical makeup of the substances or materials used is the defining characteristic. Composition of matter claims are largely used

in chemical related patent applications. An example of a fictitious composition of matter claim is “A cleaning solution for wooden handled hammers comprising an aqueous solution of citric acid from about 10 to 60 grams per liter; and an alkaline pH-modifying substance in an amount sufficient to adjust the pH to a value of from about 4.5 to 6.”

Article of Manufacture Claims

An article of manufacture claim is very similar to a machine or apparatus claim. The article of manufacture is usually a combination of elements that interrelate and are useful. An article of manufacture usually has no moving parts, whereas a machine or apparatus does. Our previous example of an independent claim “A hammer comprising a wooden handle and a metal head attached to the handle” is an article of manufacture claim.

Product-by-Process Claims

A product-by-process claim is where the article or at least one element of an article is claimed by reciting the process for fabricating the article or element.⁴ A fictitious example would be “A citric acid cleaning solution produced according to the process of claim 7.”

Biotechnology Claims

Biotechnology involves the use of living organisms to make products and processes. The U.S. Supreme Court has held living organisms to constitute patentable subject matter, and patents have been granted on processes by which new animal life may be created. But if the living organism is a human being, patent protection in the U.S. has been found to be unconstitutional.⁵

Jepson Claims

A Jepson claim is a claim that starts with what is existing or known, followed by a phrase such as “wherein the improvement comprises,” and then sets out the elements that the applicant considers new and improved. The style of a Jepson claim points out what is prior art and what the applicant considers the improvement. “Jepson” refers to a 1917 court case by the same name.

Markush Claims

A Markush claim is mainly used in chemical cases. It recites multiple functionally equivalent chemical entities. An Exemplary Markush claim is, “The nail of claim 1, further comprising a surface coating containing a lubricant selected from the group consisting of a silicone, a fluorocarbon, and a hydrocarbon.” Markush claims were named after Eugene Markush, the first inventor to use such a claim

style in a patent. Markush style claims and their resulting number of possible compounds makes patent searching of chemical related inventions difficult and time consuming.

Beauregard Claims

A Beauregard claim is a computer readable media claim named after the court decision by the same name. A Beauregard claim recites a computer readable storage device (such as a CD or memory) that is considered an article of manufacture where the storage device contains a set of instructions that causes a computer to perform a process.

Some Concluding Thoughts

Claim drafting is a specialized skill that should not be taken lightly. There are some basic requirements that must be met just to get the claims through prosecution within the Patent Office with an allowance of the application. A well drafted set of claims needs to not only stand up to Patent Office scrutiny, but also must be able to stand up to attack in possible litigation, where every word in every claim is taken apart, analyzed, and interpreted. This article just touches on a few general concepts.

1. MPEP 608.01(n).

2. 237 CFR 1.75(c).

3. See our February 2009 article “Under the Knife - Patenting Surgical Procedures.” Free reprints of this article can be obtained at www.patenteducation.com/patentarticles.html. The article is listed under the heading “Patentability of Inventions.”

4. MPEP 2113, 2173.05(p)

5. See our January 2008 article “Defining Patentable Subject Matter- Software and Silicon Life Forms”. Free reprints of this article can be obtained at www.patenteducation.com/patentarticles.html. The article is listed under the heading “Patentability of Inventions.”

Authors Robert D. Gunderman P.E. (Patent Technologies, LLC www.patenttechnologies.com) and John M. Hammond P.E. (Patent Innovations LLC www.patent-innovations.com) are both registered patent agents and licensed professional engineers. They offer several courses that qualify for PDH credits. More information can be found at www.patenteducation.com. Copyright 2009 John Hammond and Robert Gunderman, Jr.



Note: This short article is intended only to provide cursory background information, and is not intended to be legal advice. No client relationship with the authors is in any way established by this article.