LAW AND PRACTICE

RELATING TO

LETTERS PATENT FOR INVENTIONS

TREATISE

ON THE

LAW AND PRACTICE

RELATING TO

Letters Patent for Inventions

WITH

AN APPENDIX

OF

STATUTES, INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION, RULES, FORMS AND PRECEDENTS, ORDERS, &c.

BY

ROBERT FROST, B.Sc. (LOND.)

FELLOW OF THE CHEMICAL SOCIETY;
OF LINCOLN'S INN, ESQUIRE, BARRISTER-AT-LAW

VOLUME I

THIRD EDITION

LONDON
STEVENS AND HAYNES
Law Publishers
BELL YARD, TEMPLE BAR
1906

c ǂ
UK
945
FRO

TX
F939l
ed. 3

PRINTED BY
WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, LIMITED,
LONDON AND BECCLES.

OCT 5 1907

TO

THE RIGHT HONOURABLE LORD ALVERSTONE,

LORD CHIEF JUSTICE OF ENGLAND,

THIS WORK IS BY PERMISSION

Dedicated

PREFACE.

Since the last edition of this work was published two Patent Acts, viz., those of 1901 and 1902, have been added to the Statute Book; new Rules regulating matters of procedure at the Patent Office and before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council have been made; and many important cases have been decided.

In response to suggestions from both Bench and Bar, I have divided the book into two volumes. I have endeavoured to so arrange the text that only one volume will be required during the hearing of a particular matter, whether in Court, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, Judge's Chambers, or at the Patent Office; and the Table of Cases and Index will be found in each separate volume. If desired, the Publishers will supply the two volumes bound in one.

Though the result of my labour falls far short of perfection, I venture to hope that those who consult the book will consider it satisfactorily brought up to date.

I have pleasure in thanking Mr. W. C. Fairweather for the great assistance he gave me in correcting the proof sheets as they came from the press.

5 New Court,
Lincoln's Inn, W.C.,
October 1906.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

THIS book is my attempt to bring within a reasonable compass our law, as it at present exists, in reference to Letters Patent for Inventions. Any complete history of our legislation in the past upon the subject would have inconveniently added to the bulk of the volume; and, consequently, it has not been referred to, except where necessary to explain the present practice. For the same reason I have omitted all reference to the laws of foreign countries where legal protection to Inventors is afforded.

To the extent that the book approximates to the end I had in view, so must be the measure of its success or failure. Whatever its shortcomings, I hope it may be found of use.

ROBERT FROST.

8 KING'S BENCH WALK, TEMPLE,
January 1891.

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS WORK.

A. & E.	Adolphus and Ellis' Reports.
B. & Ad.	Barnewall and Adolphus' Reports.
B. & Ald.	Barnewall and Alderson's Reports.
B. & C.	Barnewall and Cresswell's Reports.
Beav.	Beavan's Reports.
B. & S.	Best and Smith's Reports.
Bing. N. C.	Bingham's New Cases.
B. & P. N. R.	Bosanquet and Puller's New Reports.
Brod. & Bing.	Broderip and Bingham's Reports.
Bull. N. P.	Buller's Nisi Prius.
Camp.	Campbell's Reports.
C. B.	Common Bench Reports.
C. B. N. S.	Common Bench Reports, New Series.
Car. & K.	Carrington and Kirwan's Reports.
Car. & P.	Carrington and Payne's Reports.
Carp. P. C.	Carpmael's Patent Cases.
C. L. R.	Common Law Reports.
Cl. & F.	Clark and Finnelly's Reports.
Co. R.	Coke's Reports.
Coop. Ch. Ca.	Cooper's Chancery Cases.
Cr. M. & R.	Crompton, Meeson, and Roscoe's Reports.
D. & L.	Danson and Lloyd's Reports.
Dav. P. C.	Davies' Patent Cases.
De G. F. & J.	De Gex, Fisher, and Jones' Reports.
De G. & J.	De Gex and Jones' Reports.
De G. M. & G.	De Gex, Macnaghten, and Gordon's Reports.
De G. J. & S.	De Gex, Jones, and Smith's Reports.
Dowl. & Ry.	Dowling and Ryland's Reports.
Dr. & S.	Drewry and Smale's Reports.
E. & B.	Ellis and Blackburn's Reports,
E. B. & E.	Ellis, Blackburn, and Ellis' Reports.
E. & E.	Ellis and Ellis' Reports.
Eng.	The Engineer (a weekly publication).
Eq. Rep.	Equity Reports.
Exch.	Exchequer Reports.
F. & F.	Foster and Finlason's Reports.
Giff.	Giffard's Reports.
Griff. L. O. C.	Griffin's Patent Cases decided by the Comptroller-General and Law Officers in 1887.
Griff. P. C.	Griffin's Patent Cases.
G. P. C.	Goodeve's Patent Cases.
G. P. P.	Goodeve's Patent Practice.
H. Bl.	H. Blackstone's Reports.
H. & M.	Hemming and Miller's Reports.
H. L. C.	House of Lords Cases.
Holt N. P.	Holt's Nisi Prius Cases.
H. & N.	Hurlstone and Norman's Exchequer Reports.
Ir. Ch. Rep.	Irish Chancery Reports.
Iron	Iron (a weekly publication).

Johns.	Johnson's Reports.
J. & H.	Johnson and Hemming's Reports.
Jur. N. S.	Jurist, New Series.
Jur. O. S.	Jurist, Old Series.
K. & J.	Kay and Johnson's Reports.
L. J. N. S. Ch.	Law Journal Reports, New Series, Chancery.
L. J. N. S. C. P.	" " " Common Pleas.
L. J. N. S. Ex.	" " " Exchequer.
L. J. N. S. Q. B.	" " " Queen's Bench.
L. J. O. S.	Law Journal Reports, Old Series.
L. O. C.	Griffin's Patent Cases decided by the Comptroller-General and Law Officers in 1887.
L. R. App. Cas.	Law Reports, Appeal Cases.
L. R. Ch.	" Chancery Appeals.
L. R. Ch. D.	" Chancery Division.
L. R. C. P.	" Common Pleas Cases.
L. R. E. & I. App.	" English and Irish Appeal Cases.
L. R. Eq.	" Equity Cases.
L. R. Ex.	" Exchequer Cases.
L. R. H. L.	" House of Lords.
L. R. P. C.	" Privy Council Cases.
L. R. Q. B. D.	" Queen's Bench Division.
L. T.	Law Times, Old Series.
L. T. N. S.	Law Times, New Series.
M. & G.	Manning and Granger's Reports.
M. & S.	Maule and Selwyn's Reports.
M. & W.	Meeson and Welsby's Reports.
Mac. & G.	Macnaghten and Gordon's Reports.
Macr. P. C.	Macrory's Patent Cases.
Marsh.	Marshall's Reports.
Mer.	Merivale's Reports.
Moo. P. C. N. S.	Moore's Reports of Cases in the Privy Council, New Series.
Moo. P. C. O. S.	Moore's Reports of Case in the Privy Council, Old Series.
Myl. & Cr.	Mylne and Craig's Reports.
N. R.	The New Reports.
Newt. L. J. C. S.	Newton's London Journal of Arts and Sciences, Conjointed Series.
Newt. L. J. N. S.	Newton's London Journal of Arts and Sciences, New Series.
Parl. Rep.	Parliamentary Reports.
Phill.	Phillips' Reports.
P. O. R.	Patent Office Reports of Patent Cases.
Q. B.	Queen's Bench Reports.
R.	The Reports.
R. P. C.	Patent Office Reports of Patent Cases.
R. S. C.	Rules of the Supreme Court.
Russ.	Russell's Reports.
Russ. & M.	Russell and Mylne's Reports.
Ry. & M.	Ryan and Moody's Reports.
Scott N. R.	Scott's New Reports.
Stark. R.	Starkie's Reports.
Taunt.	Taunton's Reports.
T. R.	Term Reports.
Times R.	Times Law Reports.
Tyr.	Tyrwhitt's Reports.
Ves.	Vesey's Reports.
W. N.	Weekly Notes.
W. P. C.	Webster's Patent Cases.
W. R.	The Weekly Reporter.
Y. & C.	Younge and Collyer's Reports.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

VOLUME I.

	PAGE
ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS WORK	xi
TABLE OF CASES	xxi
LIST OF DEFENDANTS IN ACTIONS	lxvii
ADDENDA	lxxxi

CHAPTER I.

THE PATENTEE.

Introductory	1
Who may apply for Letters Patent	4
True and First Inventor	5
Master and Servant	12
Communicators of Foreign Inventions	16
Persons incapable of being Patentees	19

CHAPTER II.

SUBJECT-MATTER.

General	22
Any manner of new Manufacture	22
Subject-matter must be an Art	24
Subject-matter defined by the Courts and Early Text-writers	26
Discovery and Invention	29
Invention	30
Classes of Invention	42
Principles	43
Processes	53
Products	64
Combinations	67
Improvements	75
New Uses of Old Appliances	80

CHAPTER III.

NOVELTY.

PAGE
Novelty at Common Law . . . 105
Public Knowledge . . . 108
Want of Novelty in Part . . . 112
Analogous Uses . . . 116
Novelty and Discovery . . . 116
Anticipation and Publication . . . 117
Equivalents . . . 118
Rediscovery of Lost Art . . . 118
Publication by Prior User . . . 119
Publication by Personal Communications . . . 140
Publication by Documents . . . 140

CHAPTER IV.

UTILITY.

Utility at Common Law . . . 157
Meaning of Utility in Law . . . 162
Amount of Utility . . . 164
Invention must be Useful as Specified . . . 164
Lack of Utility in Essential Part . . . 166
Utility of Improvements . . . 171

CHAPTER V.

THE SPECIFICATIONS.

Origin and Development . . . 172
The Title . . . 175
The Provisional Specification . . . 182
Functions of Provisional Specifications . . . 182
Provisional Protection . . . 187
Variations between the Specifications . . . 188
Legitimate Developments of the Invention . . . 188
Disconformity . . . 190
The Complete Specification . . . 199
Conditions by Law required . . . 201
The Claiming Clauses . . . 248
Construction of the Specifications . . . 265

CHAPTER VI.

REVOCATION OF LETTERS PATENT.

The Petition . . . 290
The Petitioner . . . 293
Grounds for Revocation . . . 297
Practice . . . 301

CHAPTER VII.

ACTION TO RESTRAIN THREATS OF LEGAL PROCEEDINGS.

PART I.

PAGE

General 309
Person aggrieved 313
What is a Threat? 314
The Proviso 318

PART II.

Practice 323
Pleadings 323
Issues 323
Particulars 324
Interlocutory Injunction 325
Damages 327
Certificate of Validity 328
Certificate as to Particulars 328
Breach of Injunction 329
Costs 330

CHAPTER VIII.

ACTION OF INFRINGEMENT.

General 331
Infringement 335
Proceedings before commencement of Action 385
Parties 387
Pleadings 392
Writ 392
Statement of Claim 393
Particulars of Breaches 395
Defence 401
Particulars of Objections 412
Interlocutory Injunction 427
Discovery and Inspection 440
Discovery 440
Inspection 449
Evidence 454
Trial 473
Consolidation of Actions 480
New Trial 481
Appeal 482
Perpetual Injunction 486
Account or Damages 494
General 494
Account 499
Damages 501
Destruction or Delivery to Plaintiff of Infringing Articles 508

PAGE

Costs 510
    Discontinuance 513
    Separate Issues 514
    Apportionment 514
    Certificates as to Particulars 518
    Certificate of Validity 525
    Public Authority 531
    Party and Party 531
    Experts' Fees 531
    Drawings and Models 532
    Three Counsel 532
    Shorthand Notes 532
    Inquiry as to Damages 533
    Costs on Higher Scale 533
Stay pending Appeal 535

INDEX i

VOLUME II.

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS WORK xi
TABLE OF CASES xxi
LIST OF DEFENDANTS IN ACTIONS lxvii
ADDENDA lxxxi

CHAPTER I.

OBTAINING LETTERS PATENT FOR INVENTIONS.

Prerogative of the Crown 1
Patent Agents 2
Application 4
    Examination and Acceptance 6
    Statutory Offences 12
    Filing the Complete Specification 13
    Applications under International and Colonial Arrangements 19
Opposition 23
    General 23
    Grounds of Opposition 30
        First Ground of Opposition 30
        Second Ground of Opposition 34
        Third Ground of Opposition 50
Sealing the Patent 51
Extent and Duration of Letters Patent 53
Illustrated Journal and Report of Cases 55
Patent Office Museum 56
Register of Patents 56

CHAPTER II.

AMENDMENT OF THE SPECIFICATIONS.

PART I.

PAGE

General 62
 Nature of Allowable Amendments 63
 Disclaimer 70
 Correction and Explanation 75
 Conditions 78
 Retrospective Effect of Amendments 81
 Amendment after Action for Infringement 82
 Amendment after Order for Revocation 83

PART II.

Practice 83
 No Action for Infringement or Petition for Revocation Pending . . . 83
 Amendment Pending Action for Infringement or Petition for Revocation 90

CHAPTER III.

ASSIGNMENT OF LETTERS PATENT.

Origin of Power to Assign 101
Assignment by Deed 106
Co-owners 110
Assignment of Improvements 113
Estoppel 115
Warranty 118
Rights of Assignees 122
Assignment and Partnership 124
Assignment by Act and Operation of Law 125
Registration of Assignments 127
Surrender 130

CHAPTER IV.

LICENCES.

Origin of Power to Grant Licences 131
How Licences may be Granted 132
Classification of Licences 134
 Express or Implied 134
 Compulsory or Voluntary 136
 Revocable or Irrevocable 139
 General, Limited, or Exclusive 141
 Assignable or Not Assignable 144
Right of Crown to Use of Inventions 145
Consideration 147

PAGE
Covenants . . . 147
Estoppel . . . 148
Registration . . . 152
Recovery of Royalties . . . 153
Licensor's and Licensee's Powers to Sue in respect of an Infringement . 156

CHAPTER V.

EXTENSION OF LETTERS PATENT.

Prolongation prior to 1884 . . . 157
Extension by Petition under Act of 1883 . . . 161
The Petitioner . . . 162
The Petition . . . 165
Opposition . . . 170
Hearing of the Petition . . . 172
Grounds for Extension . . . 174
Merit . . . 176
Insufficient Remuneration owing to no Fault of the Patentee . . . 180
Accounts . . . 182
The New Grant . . . 190
Costs . . . 193

APPENDIX.

STATUTES.
Statute of Monopolies (21 Jac. I. c. 3) . . . 197
Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act, 1883 (46 & 47 Vict. c. 57) . 202
Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Amendment Act, 1885 (48 & 49 Vict. c. 63) . . . 245
Patents Act, 1886 (49 & 50 Vict. c. 37) . . . 247
Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks Act, 1888 (51 & 52 Vict. c. 50) . 249
Patents Act, 1901 (1 Edw. VII. c. 18) . . . 257
Patents Act, 1902 (2 Edw. VII. c. 34) . . . 258
Trade Marks Act, 1905 (5 Edw. VII. c. 15) . . . 262

INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE PROTECTION OF INDUSTRIAL PROPERTY . . . 285
Final Protocol . . . 297
Accession of Her Majesty's Government . . . 302
Declaration of Acceptance of Accession . . . 303

RULES.
Patent Rules, 1903 . . . 304
Patent Rules, 1905 . . . 316
Law Officers' Rules . . . 323
Privy Council Rules—
Old Rules . . . 325
Rules of 1898 . . . 328
Rules of 1903 . . . 332
Register of Patent Agents Rules, 1889 . . . 337
Register of Patent Agents Rules, 1891 . . . 343

PAGE

FORMS.

Application for Patent 345
Application for Patent for Invention communicated from Abroad . 347
Application for Patent under International and Colonial Arrangements 349
Provisional Specification 350
Complete Specification 351
Opposition to Grant of Patent 353
Notice that Hearing before the Comptroller will be Attended . . 354
Application for Amendment of Specification 355
Opposition to Amendment of Specification 356
Application for Compulsory Grant of Licence or Revocation of Patent 357
Petition for Grant of Compulsory Grant of Licence or Revocation of Patent 358
Opposition to Petition for Grant of Compulsory Licence or Revocation of Patent 359
Application for Certificate of Payment or Renewal 360
Certificate of Payment or Renewal 360
Application for Enlargement of Time for Payment of Renewal Fee . 361
Request to enter Name upon the Register of Patents 362
Request to enter Notification of Licence or other Document in the Register of Patents 363
Application for Duplicate of Patent 364
Notice of Intended Exhibition of an Unpatented Invention . . . 365
Request for Correction of Clerical Error 366
Certificate of Comptroller 367
Notice of Alteration of an Address in Register 368
Application for Entry of Order of Privy Council in Register . . 369
Appeal to Law Officer 370
Application for Extension of Time for leaving a Complete Specification 371
Application for Extension of Time for Acceptance of a Complete Specification 372
Form of Patent 373
Notice of Desire to have Patent Sealed 375
Appendices to Patent Agents Rules, 1889 376
Appendix to Patent Agents Rules, 1891 377
Assignment of Letters Patent 378
Licence to use Patented Invention 380
Mortgage of Letters Patent 383
Action of Infringement—
Indorsement on Writ 386
Statement of Claim 386
Particulars of Breaches 389
Defence 390
Particulars of Objection 393
Notice of Motion for leave to Amend a Specification pending Action for Infringement 394
Notice of Motion for Interlocutory Injunction 396
Judgment for Plaintiff after Trial of Action 396
Judgment for Defendant after Trial of Action 399
Notice of Appeal to Court of Appeal 400
Judgment of Court of Appeal Affirming the Judgment of the Court Below 401

PAGE

FORMS—*continued.*
Action of infringement—*continued.*
Judgment of Court of Appeal Varying the Judgment of the Court Below 402
Certificate of Validity 403
Action to restrain Threats of Legal Proceedings—
Indorsement on Writ 404
Statement of Claim 404
Defence 406
Reply 407
Rejoindure 408
Revocation of Letters Patent—
Petition for Revocation 409
Fiat of Attorney-General 411
Memorial to the Attorney-General for His Fiat 411
Extension of Letters Patent—
Advertisement of Intention to present Petition 413
Caveat 413
Notice of Objections 414
Advertisement of Day fixed for Hearing of Petition 415
Petition for Extension of Letters Patent 415
Accounts to accompany Petition for Extension 424

ORDERS
For Revocation of Letters Patent 443
For Further and Better Particulars of Objections 443
For Leave to amend Specification during Action of Infringement . 444
For Leave to amend Specification pending Petition for Revocation of Patent 445
For Inspection 445
Of Reference to Independent Expert for Report to the Court during Action of Infringement 446
For Experiments before Scientific Expert and his Report to the Court during Action of Infringement 446
LIST OF FEES 449

INDEX i

TABLE OF CASES.

PAGE

A B's Patent, [1902] 19 R. P. C. 403 . . . . ii. 52

A B's Patent, [1902] 19 R. P. C. 556 . . . . ii. 53

A & B's Patent, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 63 . . . . ii. 52

Abel's Patent, [1876] Johns. Pat. Man. 178 . . . . ii. 76

Acetylene Illuminating Co., Ld. v. Midland Acetylene (Parent) Syndicate, [1900] 17 R. P. C. 534 527

Acetylene Illuminating Co., Ld. v. United Alkali Co., Ld., [1902] 1 Ch. 494; 19 R. P. C. 213; 20 R. P. C. 161; 22 R. P. C. 145 . . 30, 58, 83, 521, 522, 527: ii. 20

Ackroyd and Best, Ld. v. Thomas, [1904] 21 R. P. C. 463, 737 . . 53, 207

Actien Gesellschaft für Cartonagen Industrie v. Remus, [1895] 12 R. P. C. 94 480

Actien Gesellschaft für Cartonagen Industrie v. Temler, [1899] 16 R. P. C. 447; 18 R. P. C. 6 . . . . 428: ii. 57, 106

Actien Gesellschaft für Cartonagen Industrie v. Schrœder, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 466 . . . . 39, 40, 342

Adair v. Young, [1879] L. R. 11 Ch. D. 136; 12 Ch. D. 13; [1879] W. N. 8 . . . . 380, 381, 389, 456, 492, 499, 535

Adair's Patent, [1881] L. R. 6 App. Cas. 176; L. J. P. C. 68 . ii. 166, 167, 183, 187, 188, 190

Adam's Patent, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 548 . . . . ii. 46

Adam's Patent, [1898] 16 R. P. C. 1 . . . . ii. 167

Adamant Stone Paving Co. v. Corporation of Liverpool, [1896] 14 R. P. C. 11, 264 . . . . . . 42, 81, 84, 103, 183, 193, 253, 379

Adams v. North British Railway Co., [1873] 25 L. J. N. S. 367 . . 388

Adamson's Patent, [1856] 6 De G. M. & G. 420; 25 L. J. Ch. 456 . 124

Adie v. Clark, [1876] L. R. 2 App. Cas. 423. *See also* Clark v. Adie . ii. 149

African Gold Recovery Co. v. Sheba Gold Mining Co., [1897] 14 R. P. C. 660 . . . . ii. 153

Ainsworth's Patent, [1895] 13 R. P. C. 76 . . . . . . ii. 79, 80

Aire and Calder Glass Bottle Works, and Walker's Application, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 345 . . . . ii. 29, 36, 38

Airey's Patent, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 348 . . . . ii. 25, 36, 47

Aktiebolaget Separator v. Dairy Outfit Co., [1896] 13 R. P. C. 725; 14 R. P. C. 473 . . . . 282, 343, 367, 413

Albo-Carbon Light Co. v. Kidd, [1887] 4 R. P. C. 535; 5 R. P. C. 581; 6 R. P. C. 194 . . . . 81, 92, 522

Alcock v. Cooke, [1829] 5 Bing. 340 205

Alexander v. Henery, [1895] 12 R. P. C. 360 505

Alexander Turnbull & Co., Ld. v. Cruikshank, [1905] 22 R. P. C. 363, 521. 291

Allan's Patent, [1867] L. R. 1 P. C. 507; 4 Moo. P. C. N. S. 443 . 466: ii. 178, 179

PAGE
Allen v. Doulton, [1887] 4 R. P. C. 377 . . . . ii. 94, 96
Allen v. Duckett, [1893] 10 R. P. C. 397 . . . . . 200, 227, 228, 478
Allen v. Flood, [1898] A. C. 1 . . . . 372, 414
Allen v. Horton, [1893] 10 R. P. C. 412 478
Allen v. Oates, [1898] 15 R. P. C. 298, 744 412
Allen v. Pyatt, [1898] 15 R. P. C. 723; 16 R. P. C. 185 345
Allen v. Rawson, [1845] 1 C. B. 551 . . . . 13, 14, 16, 371
Allen's Patent, [1887] Griff. L. O. C. 3 . . . . ii. 70, 79, 80
Alliance Pure White Lead Syndicate v. MacIvor's Patents, [1891] 8 R. P. C. 321; 39 W. R. 487 . . . . 418, 421, 422, 446
Allison's Patent, [1898] 15 R. P. C. 408 . . . . ii. 79, 80
Allison's Patent, [1900] 17 R. P. C. 298, 513 . . . . 303: ii. 94, 98
Alma Veneer Felt Co. v. Fisher, [1897] 14 R. P. C. 159 . . . . ii. 155
Alsop's Patent, [1905] 23 R. P. C. 65; [1906] 1 Ch. 85 . . . . ii. 91, 99
Aluminium Co. v. Domeiere, [1897] 15 R. P. C. 32 . . . . 428, 487
American Braided Wire Co. v. Thomson, [1887] 4 R. P. C. 316; 5 R. P. C. 113, 375, 538, 696; 6 R. P. C. 518; 7 R. P. C. 47, 152; L. R. 44 Ch. D. 274; [1890] W. N. 68. *See* Thomson, v. Braided American Wire Co. . 31, 32, 39, 81, 82, 99, 102, 466, 483, 484, 499, 505, 506, 507
American Steel and Wire Co., v. T. W. Glover & Co., Ld., [1902] 19 R. P. C. 111; [1902] W. N. 17 . . . . 521, 522
Amory v. Brown, [1869] L. R. 8 Eq. 663; 38 T. J. Ch. 593 . . 393, 459, 461
Amos v. Chadwick, [1876] L. R. 4 Ch. D. 869 481
Anderson and McKinnell's Application, [1887] Griff. L. O. C. 23 . ii. 28, 42, 45
Anderson v. Bank of British Columbia, [1875] L. R. 2 Ch. D. 644 . . 448
Anderson v. Liebig's Extract of Meat Co., [1881] 45 L. T. N. S. 757 . 312, 322
Anderson v. Patent Oxonite Co., [1886] 3 R. P. C. 279 . . . . 388, 437
Anderson's Patent, [1890] 7 R. P. C. 323 . . . . . . ii. 14, 40
Anderton, *In re*, [1887] Griff. L. O. C. 25 . . . . ii. 8, 37, 48
Andrew v. Crossley, [1892] 9 R. P. C. 165; [1892] 1 Ch. 492; 61 L. J. Ch. 437 . . . . ii. 81
Anglo-American Brush Electric Light Corporation v. Crompton, [1886] L. R. 34 Ch. D. 152; 4 R. P. C. 27; 59 L. J. Ch. 167 417
Anti-Vibration Incandescent Lighting Co., Ld. v. Crossley, [1904] 22 R. P. C. 157, 441 104
Appleby's Twin Roller Chain, Ld. v. Albert Eadie Chain, Ld., [1899] 16 R. P. C. 318 . . . . 320, 322, 328, 420, 467, 474
Appostoloff's Patent, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 275 . . . . . . 117: ii. 18
Arkwright v. Nightingale, [1785] 1 W. P. C. 60; Dav. P. C. 55 . 208, 220, 384, 405, 407, 507
Armstrong's Patent, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 501; 14 R. P. C. 747; 77 L. T. N. S. 267 . . . . 307, 308: ii. 83, 94, 100
Arnold v. Bradbury, [1871] L. R. 6 Ch. App. 706; 24 L. T. N. S. 613 . 45, 253, 277, 278, 417
Arnold's Application, [1882] Griff. L. O. C. 5 . . . . . ii. 78, 87
Arnot v. Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld., [1904] 22 R. P. C. 105, 472 40
Ashenhurst's Patent, [1853] 2 W. R. 3 . . . . ii. 8
Ashworth v. English Card Clothing Co., Ld., [1901] 18 R. P. C. 367; 19 R. P. C. 463; 20 R. P. C. 790 51
Ashworth v. English Card Clothing Co., Ld., A, [1904] 21 R. P. C. 553 53, 356, 451
Ashworth v. English Card Clothing Co., Ld., B, [1904] 21 R. P. C. 555 281, 336, 486
Ashworth v. Horsfall, [1903] 21 R. P. C. 47 513
Ashworth v. Law, [1890] 7 R. P. C. 231 . . . . . 402: ii. 115, 148

PAGE

Ashworth *v.* Roberts, [1890] L. R. 45 Ch. D. 623; 7 R. P. C. 451; 9 R. P. C. 89, 309; 60 L. J. Ch. 27 . . . . . 444, 446: ii. 149
Ashworth's Application, [1878] Griff. L. O. C. 6 . ii. 70, 71, 74, 76, 78, 79, 89
Atherton's Patent, [1889] 16 R. P. C. 547 . . . . ii. 43
Atkins and Applegarth *v.* Castner-Kellner Alkali Co., [1891] 18 R. P. C. 281 . . . . 58, 163, 165, 202
Attorney-General *v.* Vestry of Bermondsey, [1883] L. R. 23 Ch. D. 60 390
Aube's Patent, [1854] 9 Moo P. C. 48 . . . . ii. 187
Automatic Coal-Gas Retort Co. *v.* Mayor of Salford, [1897] 14 R. P. C. 450 . . . . 84, 190, 495, 496
Automatic Diversions Syndicate *v.* Urry, [1897] 14 R. P. C. 365 . 351
Automatic Weighing Machine Co. *v.* Combined Weighing Machine Co., [1889] 6 R. P. C. 121, 367 . . . 52, 153, 312, 338, 365, 407, 529
Automatic Weighing Machine Co. *v.* Fearby, [1893] 10 R. P. C. 442 . 365, 510, 530
Automatic Weighing Machine Co. *v.* International Hygienic Society, [1889] 6 R. P. C. 475 . . . . 153, 365, 529, 531, 534
Automatic Weighing Machine Co. *v.* Knight, [1889] 6 R. P. C. 113, 297; W. N. (1888) 250 . 52, 53, 62, 64, 153, 270, 272, 273, 353, 358, 364, 419, 422, 448, 469, 515, 526, 534
Automatic Weighing Machine Co. *v.* National Exhibitions Association, [1891] 8 R. P. C. 345; 9 R. P. C. 41 . . 52, 153, 281, 364, 365, 531
Aveling *v.* Maclaren, [1881] L. R. 17 Ch. D. 139 415
Avery's Patent, [1887] 4 R. P. C. 152, 322; L. R. 36 Ch. D. 307; 56 L. J. Ch. 580, 1007 . . . . 18, 294, 300, 301, 302: ii. 4, 23
Axman *v.* Lund, [1874] L. R. 18 Eq. 330; 43 L. J. Ch. 655 . 309, 409, 410: ii. 151

Bacon *v.* Jones, [1839] 4 M. & C. 436 . . . . . 427, 428, 437, 439
Bacon *v.* Spottiswood, [1839] 1 Beav. 382 . . . . . . 487, 500
Badham *v.* Bird, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 238 . . . . 461, 477
Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik *v.* Basle Chemical Works. *See* Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik *v.* Johnson
Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik *v.* Chemische Fabrik vormals Sandoz, [1903] 20 R. P. C. 413; 21 R. P. C. 533 392
Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik *v.* Chemische Fabrik vormals Sandoz in Basel, [1904] 21 R. P. C. 345 393
Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik *v.* Dawson, [1889] 6 R. P. C. 387 . 471
Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik *v.* Johnson, [1896] L. R. (1896) 1 Ch. 25; [1897] 2 Ch. 322; [1898] A. C. 200; 65 L. J. Ch. 174; 12 R. P. C. 535; 14 R. P. C. 211, 405, 919 . . 375, 376, 383, 390, 392, 536
Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik *v.* Hickson, [1904] 22 R. P. C. 63; [1905] 2 Ch. 495; 23 R. P. C. 433 . . . . 376, 480, 511
Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik *v.* Isler, [1906] 1 Ch. 605; [1906] W. N. 163; 23 R. P. C. 173 . . . . 378, 379
Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik *v.* La Société des Usines du Rhône, [1897] 14 R. P. C. 875; 15 R. P. C. 359 . . 58, 145, 202, 208, 210, 220, 225, 280, 416, 478, 526, 532
Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik *v.* Levinstein, [1883, 1885, 1887] L. R. 24 Ch. D. 156; 29 Ch. D. 366; 12 App. Cas. 710; 52 L. J. Ch. 704; 2 R. P. C. 73, 143; 4 R. P. C. 449; 6 R. P. C. 387 . 51, 58, 62 73, 118, 152, 163, 165, 202, 204, 210, 211, 214, 219, 220, 230, 237, 283, 284, 341, 353, 445, 459, 460, 465, 466, 472, 477, 508, 517
Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik *v.* Spivey, [1904] 22 R. P. C. 65 . 486

PAGE
Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik v. Thomson (W. G.), Ld., [1902] 19 R. P. C. 502; 20 R. P. C. 422 . . . . 393, 487, 491
Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik v. Thomson (W. G.), Ld., [1904] 21 R. P. C. 469, 473 . . . . 174, 292
Bagot Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Clipper Pneumatic Tyre Co., [1901] 1 Ch. 196; [1902] 1 Ch. 146; 19 R. P. C. 69 . . . . ii. 121
Bailey, *Ex parte*, [1872] L. R. 8 Ch. 61 . . . . ii. 53
Bailey, *Re*, [1884] Griff. P. C. 269 . . . . ii. 41
Bailey, *Re*, [1887] Goodeve P. C. 57 . . . . ii. 36, 38
Bailey v. Robertson, [1878] L. R. 3 App. Cas. 1055 . . 137, 173, 184, 188, 191, 193, 194, 208, 224, 238, 251, 256
Bailey v. Taylor, [1829] 1 Russ. & M. 73 497
Bailey's Patent, [1884] 1 R. P. C. 1 . . . . ii. 188, 190, 193
Bainbridge v. Wrigley, [1810] Parl. Rep. 192; 1 Carp. P. C. 270 . 180, 206
Baird v. Moule's Earth Closet, [1881] L. R. 17 Ch. D. 139 415
Baird v. Neilson, 8 Cl. & Fin. 726 . . . . 410: ii. 148
Bairstow's Patent, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 286 . . . . ii. 7, 32, 35
Baker v. Kinnell, [1892] 9 R. P. C. 441 . . . . 81, 94, 426
Baker v. White, [1884] 1 Times R. 64 437
Bakewell's Patent, [1862] 15 Moo. P. C. 385 . . . . . 466: ii. 179, 181
Ball's Patent, [1879] L. R. 4 App. Cas. 171; 48 L. J. P. C. 24 . ii. 171, 173
Bamlett v. Picksley, [1875] Griff. P. C. 40 . . . . 56, 92, 98
Bancroft v. Smith, [1897] 14 R. P. C. 172 484
Bancroft's Application, [1905] 23 R. P. C. 89 . . . . . 249: ii. 14
Barber v. Grace, [1847] 1 Exch. 339; 17 L. J. Ex. 122 . . . . 53, 62, 283
Barff and Bower's Patent, [1895] 12 R. P. C. 383; L. R. (1895) A. C. 675; 73 L. T. N. S. 36; 11 R. 579 . . . . ii. 186
Barker v. Shaw, 1 W. P. C. 126 n. 15
Barlow v. Bayliss, [1875] Griff. P. C. 44 119
Barnett v. Barnett's Screw Stopper Bottling Co., Ld., [1884] 1 R. P. C. 9 . . . . 313, 327: ii. 156
Barney v. United Telephone Co., [1885] 2 R. P. C. 173; L. R. 28 Ch. D. 394 . . . . 312, 326, 327
Bartlett's Patent, [1892] 9 R. P. C. 511 . . . . ii. 37, 40
Basket v. Cunningham, [1762] 2 Eden 137 291
Bassett v. Graydon, [1897] 13 R. P. C. 79, 537, 608; 14 R. P. C. 701 . 379, 492: ii. 136, 142, 149
Bateman v. Gray, [1853] Macr. P. C. 102 . . . . 73, 342, 352
Bateman and Moore's Patent, [1854] Macr. P. C. 116 . . . . ii. 68, 69
Bates v. Horsfall, [1905] 22 R. P. C. 519 524
Bates v. Redgate, [1876] L. R. 4 Ch. 577; 38 L. J. Ch. 501 . . 187: ii. 53
Bates' Patent, [1836] 1 W. P. C. 739 . . . . ii. 180
Batley v. Kynock, [1874] L. R. 19 Eq. 90, 229; L. R. 20 Eq. 642; 44 L. J. Ch. 391, 565; 31 L. T. N. S. 573; 33 L. T. N. S. 45 . 397, 398, 450, 451, 520, 531, 532
Baxter v. Combe, [1850] 1 Ir. Ch. R. 284 . . . . 427, 428
Baxter v. Marsden, [1904] 22 R. P. C. 18 971
Baxter's Patent, [1849] 13 Jur. 593 . . . . ii. 191
Beard v. Egerton, [1846] 2 Car. & K. 667; 3 C. B. 97; 8 C. B. 165; 15 L. J. C. P. 270; 19 L. J. C. P. 36 . 4, 19, 181, 203, 218, 219, 230, 237, 265, 277
Beard v. Turner, [1866] 13 L. T. N. S. 746 496
Beardsell v. Schwan, Seton, 3rd ed. 910 . . . . 439, 452
Beavis v. Rylands Glass and Engineering Co., Ld., [1899] 17 R. P. C. 93, 704 . . . . 42, 153, 460, 461

PAGE
Beck and Justice, *Re*, [1877] Griff. L. O. C. 10 . . . . ii. 76
Beddon *v.* Beddon, [1878] L. R. 9 Ch. D. 89 310
Bell, *Re*, [1887] Griff. L. O. C. 10 . . . . ii. 88, 89
Bell and Coleman's Patent, Griff. P. C. 320 . . . . . . 296: ii. 87
Bell's Patent, [1846] 2 W. P. C. 160; 10 Jur. 363 . . . . . . ii. 176
Bennett *v.* Lord Bury, [1880] L. R. 5 C. P. 339 481
Bennington *v.* Hill, [1891] 8 R. P. C. 326 518
Benno, Jaffi und Darmstaedter Lanolin Fabrik *v.* Richardson, [1893] 10 R. P. C. 136; 11 R. P. C. 93, 261; 62 L. J. Ch. 710 . 40, 59, 111, 267, 275, 343, 444, 445, 446
Bentley *v.* Flemming, [1844] 1 C. & K. 587; 1 C. B. 479 . 126, 131, 133, 134
Bentley *v.* Keighley, [1844] 7 M. & G. 652; 8 Scott. N. R. 372 . . . 421
Bereham *v.* Wren, [1904] 21 R. P. C. 683 . . . . ii. 120
Berdan's Patent, [1875] L. R. 20 Eq. 346 . . . . . . ii. 60, 76, 88
Bereton *v.* Richardson, [1884] 1 R. P. C. 165 . . . . . 121, 125, 126
Bergman *v.* McMillan, [1881] L. R. 17 Ch. D. 423 . 387, 500: ii. 112, 153
Berliner *v.* Edison Bell Consolidated Phonograph Co., Ld., [1899] 16 R. P. C. 336 321
Berrington's Patent, cited L. R. 1 P. C. 509; 4 Moo. P. C. N. S. 445; Coryton 225 . . . . ii. 179
Berry's Patent, [1850] 7 Moo. P. C. 187 . . . . ii. 164, 165
Beryl, the, L. R. 9 P. D. 137 474
Bessmans *v.* Wright, [1858] 6 W. R. 719 . . . . ii. 148
Bethell *v.* Gage, [1897] 14 R. P. C. 699 . . . . 513, 521
Bett's Patent, [1862] 1 Moo. P. C. N. S. 49; 9 Jur. N. S. 137; 7 L. T. N. S. 177 . . . . ii. 176, 177, 178, 183, 187, 189
Betts *v.* de Vitre, [1864-73] L. R. 3 Ch. App. Cas. 429; L. R. 5 H. L. 1; L. R. 6 H. L. 319; 34 L. J. Ch. 289, 291; 37 L. J. Ch. 325; 11 Jur. N. S. 9, 217, 445; Seton, 4th ed. 354 . . 147, 389, 390, 487, 508, 530
Betts *v.* Gallairs, [1870] L. R. 10 Eq. 392 . . . . 488, 496
Betts *v.* Menzies, [1857-62] 1 E. & E. 990; 3 Jur. N. S. 357; 4 Jur. N. S. 477; 27 L. J. Q. B. 154; 28 L. J. Q. B. 361; 30 L. J. Q. B. 81; 31 L. J. Q. B. 233; 7 L. T. N. S. 110; 10 H. L. C. 117 . . 111, 126, 134, 141, 144, 147, 151, 267, 268, 274, 432, 433, 462
Betts *v.* Neilson, [1866-71] W. N. (1866) 170; 2 De G. J. & S. 82; L. R. 3 Ch. 429; 5 H. L. 1; 34 L. J. Ch. 537; 40 L. J. Ch. 317; 3 De G. J. & S. 22; 6 N. R. 221; 18 L. T. N. S. 159 . 111, 127, 141, 223, 264, 380, 382, 389, 440, 458
Betts *v.* Noel, Seton, 4th ed. 355 498
Betts *v.* Walker, [1850] 14 Q. B. 363 402
Betts *v.* Willmott, [1870] L. R. 6 Ch. 239; 16 W. R. 305; 18 W. R. 946 . . . . 337, 377, 386, 470, 471, 472: ii. 134, 135, 148
Bevan *v.* Welsbach Incandescent Gas Light Co., Ld., [1902] 20 R. P. C. 69 . . . . 315, 329
Bickford *v.* Skewes, [1837-41] 1 W. P. C. 211; 8 L. J. Ch. 188; 10 L. J. Q. B. 302; 1 Q. B. 938 . 203, 211, 218, 220, 241, 265, 283, 431, 433, 437, 467
Bidder *v.* Bridges, [1885] L. R. 29 Ch. D. 29 . . . . 441, 442
Birch *v.* Harrap, [1895] 12 R. P. C. 431; 13 R. P. C. 615 . . . 72, 456, 420
Birch *v.* Mather, [1883] L. R. 22 Ch. D. 629; 52 L. J. Ch. 292 . 423, 440, 441, 482
Birmingham Pneumatic Tyre Syndicate *v.* Reliance Tyre Co., [1900] 17 R. P. C. 277; 19 R. P. C. 293; 20 R. P. C. 238 . . . 417, 518, 425
Birt's Patent, [1892] 9 R. P. C. 489 . . . . ii. 50

PAGE
Bishop v. Inman, [1900] 17 R. P. C. 749 . . . 315, 318, 322
Blackwell v. Crabb, 36 L. J. Ch. 504 . . . 333
Blake's Patent, [1878] L. R. 4 P. C. 535; 9 Moo. P. C. N. S. 378 . ii. 187
Blakey v. Latham, [1888] 6 R. P. C. 29, 184 . 32, 65, 77, 81, 84, 93, 99, 414, 462, 483, 484, 517, 518, 534
Blaihond's Patent, [1860] 3 L. T. N. S. 800 . . . ii. 77
Blank v. Footman, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 653; L. R. 39 Ch. D. 678; 57 L. J. Ch. 909 . . . 140
Blofield v. Payne, 4 B. & A. 410 . . . 333
Bloxam v. Elsee, [1825-27] 1 C. & P. 558; 6 B. & C. 169; 1 Cowp. 444; 1 W. P. C. 132 n.; 9 Dowl. & Ry. 215; 3 L. J. (O. S.) Q. B. 93 . 4, 13, 112, 113, 166, 168, 171, 180, 205, 224, 287, 388, 456: ii. 125
Boake, Roberts & Co. v. Stevenson, [1895] 12 R. P. C. 228 . . . 513
Bodmer's Patent, [1838] 2 Moo. P. C. 471; 1 W. P. C. 740; Newton L. J. O. S. 175 . . . ii. 159
Bodmer's Patent, [1849] 6 Moo. P. C. 468 . . . ii. 123, 162, 164
Bodmer's Patent, [1853] 8 Moo. P. C. 282 . . . ii. 176, 187, 192
Booth v. Kennard, [1856] 1 H. & N. 527; 2 H. & N. 84; 26 L. J. Ex. 23, 305 . . . 45, 56, 61, 71, 75, 203, 251, 255, 256, 404, 462
Borrowman's Patent, [1902] 19 R. P. C. 156; [1902] W. N. 56 . . 304
Bostock v. Ramsey Urban District Council, [1900] 1 Q. B. 357 . . 531
Boult's Patent, [1893] 10 R. P. C. 275 . . . ii. 36, 38
Boulton v. Bull, [1795] 2 H. Bl. 463, 482, 493; Dav. P. C. 162; 3 Ves. 140 . . . 8, 23, 25, 42, 54, 60, 64, 6[illegible], 75, 158, 208, 229, 274, 287, 367
Bovill v. Cowan, [1867] W. N. 115 . . . 447
Bovill v. Crate, [1865] L. R. 1 Eq. 388 . . . 385, 427, 428, 439, 487, 498
Bovill v. Finch, [1870] L. R. 5 P. C. 523; 39 L. J. C. P. 277 . . ii. 191
Bovill v. Goodier, [1865-71] L. R. 1 Eq. 35; L. R. 2 Eq. 195; 35 L. J. Ch. 174; 36 L. J. Ch. 360; 35 Beav. 427; Griff. L. O. C. 47 . 402, 414, 434, 436, 476, 529
Bovill v. Hadley, [1864] 17 C. B. N. S. 435; 10 L. T. N. S. 650 . 525, 529
Bovill v. Hitchcock, [1868] L. R. 3 Ch. 417 . . . 473, 476
Bovill v. Keyworth, [1857] 7 E. & B. 725; 29 L. T. 194; 3 Jur. N. S. 817 . . . 67, 71
Bovill v. Moore, [1815] 2 Coop. Ch. Ca. 56 n.; Dav. P. C. 361; 2 Marsh R. 211; reported as Brown v. Moore, 3 Bligh [illegible]78 . 67, 71, 73, 75, 76, 159, 163, 232, 242, 28[illegible], 449, 452, 461, 464
Bovill v. Pimm, [1856] 11 Exch. 718 . . . 53, 62, 265, 356
Bovill v. Smith, [1866-68] L. R. 2 Eq. 459; W. N. (1867) [illegible]40; Griff. L. O. C. 52 . . . 392, 429, 434, 438, 442, 44[illegible], 462, 464, 468
Bovill's Patent, [1863] 1 Moo. P. C. N. S. 348 . . . ii. 162, 176
Bowden's Patent, [1904] 22 R. P. C. 49 . . . ii. 83
Bowden's Patents Syndicate (E. M.), Ld. v. Smith, [1904] 2 Ch. 122; 21 R. P. C. 438, 596; 22 R. P. C. 498 . . . ii. 122
Bowden's Patent Syndicate, Ld. v. Wilson, [1903] 20 R. C. P. 644 . 373
Bow[illegible]-Barff's Patent, [1895] 12 R. P. C. 3[illegible]3; L. R. (1895) A. C. 675. *See* Barff and Bower's Patent . . . ii. 164, 165
Bowman v. Taylor, [1834] 1 W. P. C. 292; 2 A. & E. 278 . 133, 409: ii. 115, 116, 148, 151
Bown v. Centaur Cycle Co., [1891] 8 R. P. C. 119 . . . 533
Bown v. Humber, [1889] 6 R. P. C. 9 . . . ii. 144
Boyd v. Farrar, [1887] 5 R. P. C. 33 . . . 412, 418, 422, 425
Boyd v. Horrocks, [1886-89] 3 R. P. C. 285; 5 R. P. C. 557; 6 R. P. C. 152, 528; 9 R. P. C. 77 . 70, 282, 283, 338, 342, 356, 358, 367, 422, 424, 425, 463, 515, 518, 521, 522

PAGE
Boyd *v.* Tootal Broadhurst Lee Co., [1894] 11 R. P. C. 175 . 494, 502, 506, 507
Boxwell *v.* Cochran, [1895] 12 R. P. C. 169 . . . . 420, 467
Bradford Dyers Association *v.* Bury, [1901] 18 R. C. P. 161; 19 R. C. P. 125 . . . . 224, 335, 532
Bramah *v.* Hardcastle, [1789] Holroyd 8; 1 Carp. P. C. 168; 1 W. P. C. 44 n. 133, 136
Brandon's Patent, [1884] 1 R. P. C. 154; L. J. P. C. 84; L. R. 9 App. Cas. 589 . . . . ii. 167, 187
Brand's Patent, [1895] 12 R. P. C. 102 . . . . ii. 26, 47
Bray *v.* Gardner, [1887] 4 R. P. C. 40, 400 . . 147, 218, 283: ii. 81, 93, 94
Bridge's Patent, [1901] 18 R. P. C. 267 . . . . 33: ii. 38
Bridson *v.* Benecke, [1849] 12 Beav. 1 . . . . 427, 428
Bridson *v.* McAlpine, [1846] 8 Beav. 230 . . . . . . 431, 436
Bridson's Patent, [1852] 7 Moo. P. C. 499 . . . . . . ii. 171, 194
Briggs *v.* Lardeur, [1884] 1 R. P. C. 126; 2 R. P. C. 13 . 389, 427, 432, 437
Britain *v.* Hirsch, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 74, 226 . . . 30, 33, 413, 455, 456
Bristol *v.* North Somerset Railway Co., *Re*, [1877] L. R. 3 Q. B. D. 10 ii. 138
British Dynamite Co. *v.* Krebs, [1875–79] G. P. C. 88; 13 R. P. C. 190 213, 214, 223, 260, 265, 266, 289
British Insulated Wire Co., Ld. *v.* Dublin Tramway Co., Ld., [1899] 17 R. P. C. 14 . . . . 468, 496, 502
British Motor Syndicate, Ld. *v.* Andrews & Co. (T. E. H.), Ld., [1899] 16 R. P. C. 577; 18 R. P. C. 85 . . . . 266, 283
British Motor Syndicate, Ld. *v.* Friswell, [1901] 18 R. P. C. 497 . . 252
British Motor Syndicate, Ld. *v.* Taylor & Sons (John), Ld., [1899] 17 R. P. C. 189; [1900] 1 Ch. 577; [1901] 1 Ch. 122 . 375, 377, 380, 383, 502, 506
British Motor Syndicate, Ld. *v.* Sherrin, [1901] 18 R. P. C. 265 . . 521
British Mutoscope and Biograph Co., Ld. *v.* Homer, [1901] 18 R. P. C. 177 . . . . ii. 127
British Tanning Co. *v.* Groth, [1889] 7 R. P. C. 1; 8 R. P. C. 113; 60 L. J. Ch. 235 . . . . 356, 434, 439: ii. 20
British Thomson-Houston Co., Ld. *v.* Mayor of Manchester, [1903] 20 R. P. C. 461 . . . . 97, 531
British United Shoe Machinery Co., Ld. *v.* Claughton (Hugh), Ld., [1906] 23 R. P. C. 321 280
British United Shoe Machinery Co., Ld. *v.* Thomson, [1904] 22 R. P. C. 177 . . . . 38, 245, 246, 247, 367
British Vacuum Cleaners Co., Ld. *v.* Suction Cleaners, Ld., 21 R. P. C. 300, 303 . . . . 32, 39, 42, 57, 493
Brodribb *v.* Brodribb, [1886] L. R. 11 Pr. D. 66 493
Brook *v.* Aston, [1857–59] 8 E. & B. 478; 27 L. J. Q. B. 145; 28 L. J. Q. B. 175; affirmed 5 Jur. N. S. 1025 . . 36, 40, 88, 100, 108, 162
Brooke *v.* Wigg, [1878] L. R. 8 Ch. D. 510 476
Brooks *v.* Hall, [1903] 21 R. P. C. 29 524
Brooks *v.* Lamplugh, [1897] 15 R. P. C. 33 . 103, 194, 282, 351, 355, 356, 366, 367, 405, 524
Brooks *v.* Lycett (E.), Ld., [1902] 19 R. P. C. 166, 364; 20 R. P. C. 390 513
Brooks *v.* Lycett's Saddle and Motor Accessories Co., Ld., [1903] 20 R. P. C. 575; 21 R. P. C. 651; [1904] 1 Ch. 512 . 436, 479, 498: ii. 91
Brooks *v.* Steel, [1896] 14 R. P. C. 47 . . . . . . 339, 458, 459
Brown, *Re*, [1887] Griff. L. O. C. 1 . . . . 176: ii. 8
Brown *v.* Evered, [1904] 21 R. P. C. 501 494
Brown *v.* Hastie, [1904] 21 R. P. C. 390; 23 R. P. C. 361 . . 414, 416

PAGE

Brown *v.* Jackson, [1895] 12 R. P. C. 324; L. R. (1895) A. C. 446; 64 L. J. P. C. 180 . . . . 77, 358
Brown *v.* Sansom, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 510 448
Brown's Patent, Griff. L. O. C. 1 283
Brownhill's Patent, [1889] 6 R. P. C. 135 . . . . . . ii. 37, 50
Brunton *v.* Hawkes, [1820] 1 Carp. P. C. 405; 4 B. & Ald. 541 .. 67, 74, 81, 113, 159, 461, 464
Buchan *v.* Hill, W. N. (1888) 233 . . . . ii. 126
Bulnois *v.* Mackenzie, [1837] 1 W. P. C. 260; 4 Bing. N. S. 127 . 402, 413
Bunge *v.* Higginbottom, [1901] 18 R. P. C. 20; 19 R. P. C. 187 . 281, 335, 343
Burdett *v.* Hay, [1863] 4 De G. J. & S. 41; Seton, 4th ed. 172 . . 533
Burgess *v.* Hanley, [1859] 26 Beav. 249 . . . . . . 386, 511, 612
Burgess *v.* Hills, [1859] 26 Beav. 244 386
Burlington's Patent, [1898] 15 R. P. C. 195 . . . . ii. 176
Burnett *v.* Tate, [1882] 45 L. T. N. S. 743 . . . . . 310, 312, 352
Burt *v.* Morgan, [1887] 4 R. P. C. 278; W. N. (1887) 123 . . 315, 318
Bush *v.* Fox, [1852-56] Macr. P. C. 152, 166, 178; 23 L. J. Ex. 275; 24 L. J. Ex. 251; 5 H. L. C. 707 . . . . 60, 81, 86, 147, 404, 462
Butler *v.* Butler, [1888] L. R. 13 Pr. D. 73 493

C's Patent, [1890] 7 R. P. C. 250 . . . . ii. 14
Caldwell *v.* Van Vlissingen, [1851] 9 Hare 415; 21 L. J. N. S. Ch. 97; 16 Jur. 115 . . . . 152, 380, 382, 390, 432
Calvert *v.* Ashburn, Prac. Mech. Journ., 2nd ser., vol. vii. p. 97 . . 81, 93
Campion *v.* Benyon, [1821] 6 B. Moo. 71; 3 Brod. & Bing. 5 . 177, 207
Canham *v.* Jones, 2 Ves. 218 . . . . ii. 103
Cannington *v.* Nuttall, [1871] L. R. 5 H. L. 205; 40 L. J. Ch. 739 . 72, 110, 119, 342, 353: ii. 70, 74
Cardiff Steamship Co. *v.* Barwick, [1885] 53 L. J. N. S. 56 . . . 534
Cardwell's Patent, [1856] 10 Moo. P. C. 488 . . . . . ii. 174, 175, 181
Carey's Application, [1889] 6 R. P. C. 552 . . . . . 20: ii. 19, 21
Carmont's Patent, [1897] 14 R. P. C. 239 . . . . ii. 182
Carpenter *v.* Smith, [1841] 1 W. P. C. 530, 540; 11 L. J. Ex. 213; 9 M. & W. 300 . . . . 17, 67, 122, 125, 126, 127, 133, 134, 148, 243
Carpenter's Patent, 2 Moo. P. C. N. S. 191 n. . . . . ii. 192
Carr's Patent, [1873] L. R. 4 P. C. 530; 9 Moo. P. C. 379 . . . . ii. 190
Carter *v.* Leyson, [1901] 18 R. P. C. 508; 19 R. P. C. 473 . 31, 79, 96, 108
Cartsburn Sugar Refining Co. *v.* Sharp, [1884] 1 R. P. C. 181 . 375, 472
Cartwright *v.* Amatt, [1799] 2 Bos. & Pul. 43 . . . . ii. 107
Cartwright *v.* Eames, [1807] 14 Ves. 131 . . . . 202, 331
Case *v.* Cressey, [1900] 17 R. P. C. 255; 18 R. P. C. 419 . . 30, 39, 96
Cassalla *v.* Levenstein, [1891] 8 R. P. C. 473 . . . . . 397, 398
Cassel Gold Extracting Co. *v.* Cyanide Gold Recovery Syndicate, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 638; 12 R. P. C. 232 . 44, 59, 150, 152, 184, 190, 192, 196, 253, 280, 282, 419, 518
Castner-Kellner Alkali Co. *v.* The Commercial Development Corporation, [1898] 15 R. P. C. 645; 16 R. P. C. 251; 17 R. P. C. 593; [1899] 1 Ch. 803 . . . . 191, 192, 194, 384, 524, 533
Cera Light Co. *v.* Dobbie, [1892] 11 R. P. C. 10 194
Cerckel's Patent, [1898] 15 R. P. C. 500 (*See* Addenda) 305
Chadburn *v.* Mechan, [1895] 12 R. P. C. 120 . . . . 112, 192, 253, 420, 536
Chadburn's (Ship) Telegraph Co. *v.* Robinson, [1905] 22 R. P. C. 468 . 527
Challender *v.* Royle, [1887] L. R. 36 Ch. D. 425; 56 L. J. Ch. 995; 4 R. P. C. 363 . . . . . . 312, 317, 318, 319, 320, 321, 323, 326

PAGE

Chamberlain and Hookham, Ld. *v.* Mayor, &c., of Bradford, [1900] 17 R. P. C. 762; 19 R. P. C. 78; 20 R. P. C. 673 . 51, 52, 53, 108, 162, 340, 342, 356, 531
Chamberlain and Hookham, Ld. *v.* Mayor, &c., of Huddersfield, [1901] 18 R. P. C. 454 . . . . 531, 520, 531
Chambers *v.* Crichley, [1864] 33 Beav. 374 410
Chameleon Patents Manufacturing Co., Ld. *v.* Marshalls, Ld., [1900] 17 R. P. C. 527 334
Chandler's Patent, [1884] Griff. P. C. 270 . . . . ii. 29, 48
Chanter *v.* Dewhurst, [1844] 12 M. & W. 823; 13 L. J. Ex. 198 . . ii. 133
Chanter *v.* Johnson, [1845] 14 M. & W. 408 . . . . ii. 133
Chanter *v.* Leese, [1838] 8 L. J. Ex. 58; 9 L. J. Ex. 327; 4 M. & W. 295; 5 M. & W. 698; 1 W. P. C. 295 . . . . ii. 150
Chappell *v.* Davidson, [1856] 8 De G. M. & G. 1 437
Chappell *v.* Purday, [1845] 14 M. & W. 310 419
Chartered Institute of Patent Agents *v.* Lockwood, [1893] 10 R. P. C. 167; 11 R. P. C. 374 . . . . ii. 3
Chatwood's Patent, [1899] 16 R. P. C. 370 . . . . ii. 91, 98
Chatwood's Patent, [1874] L. R. 5 P. C. App. Cas. 88 n. . . . . ii. 182
Chatwood's Patent, 37 Eng. 285 . . . . ii. 190
Chatwood's Patent Safe and Lock Co., Ld. *v.* Mercantile Bank of Lancashire, Ld., [1899] 17 R. P. C. 23 . . . . ii. 94
Chatwood's Patent Safe and Lock Co., Ld. *v.* Ratner Safe Co., Ld., [1899] 16 R. P. C. 449 . . . . ii. 94
Cheavin *v.* Walker, [1877] L. R. 5 Ch. D. 858; 46 L. J. Ch. 265; 35 L. T. 757 . . . . 5: ii. 12
Cheeseborough's Patent, [1884] Griff. P. C. 303 . . . . . . ii. 28, 80
Cheetham *v.* Nuttall, [1893] 10 R. P. C. 321 . . . . . ii. 139, 141, 147
Cheetham *v.* Oldham, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 617, 622, 624; 7 R. P. C. 116 . 136, 396, 398, 450, 451, 453, 520
Cheltenham and Swansea Railway Carriage and Waggon Co., *In re*, [1868] L. R. 8 Eq. 58 493
Chemische Fabrik vorm. Sandoz *v.* Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik, [1904] 21 R. P. C. 533 393
Child's Patent, 56 Eng. 435 . . . . ii. 190
Chollet *v.* Hoffman, [1857] 7 E. & B. 686; 26 L. J. Q. B. 249 . . . ii. 129
Church (Walter C.), Engineering Co. *v.* Wilson, [1886] 3 R. P. C. 123 . 398, 399
Church's Patent, [1886] 3 R. P. C. 95 . . ii. 162, 164, 165, 173, 176, 192
Claridge's Patent, [1851] 7 Moo. P. C. 394 . . . . . ii. 123, 163, 164
Clark *v.* Adie, [1873] L. R. 10 Ch. 667; 3 Ch. D. 134; 2 App. Cas. 315; 46 L. J. Ch. 583; 21 W. R. 456 . 71, 242, 243, 244, 246, 248, 257, 266, 267, 270, 272, 274, 276, 277, 285, 287, 288, 339, 342, 344, 345, 349, 352, 356: ii. 148, 150
Clark *v.* Nicholls, [1895] 12 R. P. C. 310 438
Clark's Patent, [1870] L. R. 3 P. C. 421; 7 Moo. P. C. N. S. 255 . . ii. 165, 166, 173, 182, 190
Clark's Patent, [1899] 16 R. P. C. 431 . . . . ii. 164, 173, 182, 183, 185
Claughton *v.* Foster, [1903] 21 R. P. C. 17 528
Cleaver *v.* Wallwork, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 277 356
Clifton's Patent, [1904] 2 Ch. 357; 21 R. P. C. 515 305
Clothworkers of Ipswich Case, [1615] Godb. R. 252; S. C. 1 Roll. R. 4 . 2, 16, 28, 106
Cobley's Patent, [1861] 8 Jur. N. S. 106 . . . . ii. 8
Cochrane *v.* Braithwaite, 3 Lon. Journ. N. S. 42 73

PAGE

Cochrane *v.* Smethurst, [1816] 2 Coop. Ch. Cas. 57; 1 Stark R. 205 . 176
Cochrane's Patent, [1885] Griff. P. C. 304 . . . . . . ii. 63, 70, 71
Cocking's Patent, [1885] 2 R. P. C. 151 . . . . . ii. 176, 179, 190, 191
Codd, *Re*, [1884] Griff. P. C. . . . . 305: ii. 29, 88, 95
Codd *v.* Bratby, [1884] 1 R. P. C. 209 . . . . ii. 89, 95
Coghlan *v.* Cumberland, [1898] 1 Ch. 704 485
Colburn *v.* Simms, [1843] 2 Hare 543; 12 L. J. Ch. 388 512
Cole *v.* Saqui, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 489; 6 R. P. C. 41; 58 L. J. Ch. 237; L. R. 40 Ch. D. 132 . . 99, 205, 237, 419, 466, 501, 519, 521, 526, 538
Coles *v.* Baylis, [1886] 3 R. P. C. 178 434
Collard *v.* Allinson, [1839] 4 My. & Cr. 487 433
Colley *v.* Hart, [1888] 6 R. P. C. 17; 7 R. P. C. 101; L. R. 44 Ch. D. 179; 38 W. R. 501; 62 L. T. 424 . . . . . 313, 321, 322, 327, 330
Collinge *v.* Bowman, [1834] 1 W. P. C. 295 . . . . ii. 153
Collins *v.* Walker, [1859] 7 W. R. 222 511
Collyer *v.* Isaacs, [1882] 45 L. J. N. S. 567; 30 W. R. 71 533
Combination Hubs, Ld., *v.* Seabrook, [1906] 23 R. P. C. 205 . . 352
Combined Weighing Machine Co. *v.* Automatic Weighing Machine Co., [1889] 6 R. P. C. 502; L. R. 42 Ch. D. 665; 61 L. T. 474; 58 L. J. Ch. 709; 38 W. R. 233 . . . . 315, 320, 321, 323, 327, 330
Commercial Development Corporation *v.* Castner-Kellner Alkali Co., [1897] 14 R. P. C. 939 311
Commissioners of Sewers *v.* Glace, [1873] L. R. 15 Eq. 302 442
Conniff's Application, [1872] Johns. Pat. Man. 6th ed. 165 . . . 15
Consolidated Car Heating Co. *v.* Came, [1903] 20 R. P. C. 745 . 51, 53, 339, 340, 342, 343, 345, 351, 352
Consolidated Pneumatic Tool Co., Ld. *v.* Churchill & Co., Ld., [1905] 22 R. P. C. 209, 367 . . . . 415, 513, 527
Continental Gas Glühlicht Actien Gesellschaft (Meteor) Petition, [1897] 15 R. P. C. 732 . . . . ii. 139
Cook *v.* Pearce, [1844] 8 Q. B. 1044, 1054; 13 L. J. Q. B. 189; 12 L. J. Q. B. 187 . . . . 176, 179
Cooper *v.* Cooper, [1875] L. R. 2 Ch. D. 492 536
Cooper *v.* Whittingham, [1880] L. R. 15 Ch. D. 501; 49 L. J. Ch. 752 337, 511
Cooper & Co. (Birmingham), Ld. *v.* Baedeker, [1899] 16 R. P. C. 363; 17 R. P. C. 209 96
Cooper Patent Anchor Rail Joint Co., Ld. *v.* London County Council, [1906] 23 R. P. C. 289 522
Cooper's Patent, [1901] 19 R. P. C. 53 . . . . 25: ii. 7
Copeland *v.* Webb, [1862] 11 W. R. 134; 1 N. R. 119 . . . . 291, 439
Coppin *v.* Lloyd, [1898] 15 R. P. C. 373 . . . . ii. 140
Cornish *v.* Keen, [1835-37] 1 W. P. C. 501, 513; L. J. C. P. 225; 3 Bing. N. S. 570 . 7, 25, 60, 119, 120, 125, 136, 137, 141, 165, 459, 461, 467, 468
Corrigal *v.* Armstrong, Whitworth & Co., Ld., [1903] 20 R. P. C. 523; 22 R. P. C. 268 . . . . 277: ii. 97
Couchman *v.* Greener, [1884] 1 R. P. C. 197 . . . . . . 286: ii. 149
Crabtree's Patent, Eng. Rep. Jan. to Mar. 1881 . . . . . ii. 79, 80
Craig and Macfarlane's Application, P. M. J. vol. iv. 3 series 366 . . ii. 11, 34, 47
Crampton *v.* Patents Investments Co., [1888] 5 R. P. C. 382; 6 R. P. C. 287 . . . . 189, 190, 196, 239, 312, 315, 322, 328, 459, 535
Crane *v.* Price, [1842] 1 W. P. C. 377, 393; 12 L. J. C. P. 81; 4 M. & G. 580 . . . 6, 12, 23, 31, 32, 33, 53, 55, 60, 65, 68, 69, 71, 75, 76, 464, 468
Craven *v.* Pinto Leite, [1871] L. R. 7 Ch. App. 90 442

PAGE
Crighton's Patent, 3 Eng. 135 . . . . ii. 173
Crist's Patent, [1903] 20 R. P. C. 475 . . . . ii. 18
Crocker *v.* Aerators, Ld., [1903] 20 R. P. C. 621 358
Crofts *v.* Peach, [1830] 1 W. P. C. 268 451
Croll *v.* Edge, [1847] 9 C. B. 479; 19 L. J. C. P. 261 . . . . 178, 179
Crompton *v.* Anglo-American Brush Corporation, [1886] L. R. 35 Ch. D. 283; 56 L. J. Ch. 802; 4 R. P. C. 197 426
Crompton *v.* Ibbotson, [1828] 6 L. J. O. S. 214; 1 W. P. C. 83 . . 215
Cropper *v.* Smith, [1884] 1 R. P. C. 81; 2 R. P. C. 17, 61; L. R. 24 Ch. D. 305; L. R. 26 Ch. D. 700; L. R. 28 Ch. D. 148; L. R. 10 App. Cas. 249; 53 L. J. Ch. 891; 54 L. J. Ch. 287; 55 L. J. Ch. 12 . 39, 81, 113, 251, 257, 264, 272, 275, 276, 318, 411, 412, 416, 506, 526, 535: ii. 91, 92, 118, 149
Crossdale *v.* Fisher, [1884] 1 R. P. C. 21 127
Crossley *v.* Beverley, [1829] 1 W. P. C. 106, 112; 3 Car. & P. 513; 1 Russ. & M. 166 n.; 9 B. & C. 63 . 39, 51, 113, 210, 229, 239, 283, 341, 459, 488
Crossley *v.* Coates, [1904] 21 R. P. C. 282 . . . . 121, 478
Crossley *v.* Derby Gas Co., [1829] 1 W. P. C. 119; 44 L. J. Ch. 25; 3 My. & Cr. 428 . . . . 488, 495, 496, 497, 500
Crossley *v.* Dixon, [1863] 10 H. L. C. 293; 32 L. J. Ch. 617 . . 409: ii. 133, 140, 148, 149, 150
Crossley *v.* Potter, [1853] Macr. P. C. 240 . . . . 44, 205, 238, 251, 254
Crossley *v.* Stewart, [1863] 1 N. R. 426; 7 L. T. N. S. 848 . . 442, 447
Crossley *v.* Tomey, [1876] L. R. 2 Ch. D. 533 . . . . . 440, 446
Crossthwaite *v.* Moorwood, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 558 406
Crossthwaite *v.* Steel, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 220; 6 R. P. C. 190 . . 286, 410
Crow *v.* Wallis, [1886] 3 R. P. C. 1 131
Crowther *v.* United Flexible Metallic Tubing Co., Ld., [1905] 22 R. P. C. 549 318
Croysley *v.* Potter, [1853] Macr. P. C. 240 184
Cumming's Patent, [1884] Griff. P. C. 277 . . . . ii. 37
Cunningham *v.* Collings, Seton, 4th ed., p. 355 498
Currie and Timmis's Patent, L. R. [1898] A. C. 347; 15 R. P. C. 63 . ii. 179, 191, 193
Curtis and André's Patent, [1892] 9 R. P. C. 495 . . . . . . ii. 41
Curtis *v.* Cutts, [1839] 8 L. J. Ch. 184; 2 Coop. C. C. 60 n.; 3 Jur. 34 . 393, 431, 433
Curtis *v.* Platt, [1863-66] L. R. 3 Ch. D. 135 n.; 8 L. T. N. S. 657; 10 L. T. N. S. 383; 11 L. T. N. S. 245; 33 L. J. C. P. 255; 35 L. J. Ch. 852; L. R. 1 H. L. 337; 10 Jur. N. S. 823; Good P. C. 102; Griff. L. O. C. 53 . 53, 62, 63, 184, 283, 339, 341, 342, 355, 356, 357, 358, 359, 361, 366, 367, 406, 413, 416, 421, 424, 456
Cutlan *v.* Dawson, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 710; 14 R. P. C. 249 . . 473: ii. 140
Cutler *v.* Bower, [1848] 11 Q. B. 973; 17 L. J. Q. B. 217 . 409: ii. 148, 154

Dalglish *v.* Jarve, [1850] 2 Mac. & G. 231 431
Dangerfield *v.* Jones, [1865] 13 L. T. N. S. 142 . . . 48, 409: ii. 151
Daniel's Application, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 413 . . . . ii. 29, 36, 38, 39
Daniell's Patent, Godson Pat. 274 68
Darby's Patent, [1891] 8 R. P. C. 380 . . . . . ii. 165, 175, 184, 193
Darcy *v.* Allin, [1602] Noy, R. 178, 182; 1 W. P. C. 1; Moore's Reps. 675; 11 Co. R. 84 . . . . 2, 28, 106, 153, 292: ii. 1

PAGE
Darrah v. Purser, [1889] 6 R. P. C. 365 . . . . 415, 424
Dart's Patent, Griff. P. C. 307 . . . . ii. 17
Davenport v. Goldberg, [1865] 2 H. & N. 282 . . . . . 434, 436
Davenport v. Jepson, [1862] 4 De G. F. & J. 440; 1 N. R. 173, 307; Seton, p. 346; Pemberton, 4th ed. 484 . 392, 431, 432, 434, 437, 450, 452
Davenport v. Phillips, [1865] 5 N. R. 485 475
Davenport v. Richards, [1860] 3 L. T. N. S. 503 . . . . 387, 433, 472
Davenport v. Rylands, [1865] L. R. 1 Eq. 302; 35 L. J. Ch. 204 . 337, 375, 386, 447, 488, 497, 498, 500, 504, 511, 529, 530
David v. Woodley, [1884] Griff. L. O. C. 26 . . . . . 13, 15: ii. 31
Davies v. Curtis and Harvey, Ld., [1902] 19 R. P. C. 580; 20 R. P. C. 561 . . . . ii. 114
Davies v. Townsend, [1899] 16 R. P. C. 497 336
Davies' Patent, [1893] 11 R. P. C. 27 . . . . ii. 168, 198
Daw v. Eley [1865-67] 2 H. & M. 925; 36 L. J. Ch. 482; L. R. 1 Eq. 38; L. R. 3 Eq. 496; 14 W. R. 126 . 152, 249, 414, 441, 442, 454, 492, 493
Day v. Davies, [1904] 22 R. P. C. 34 389
Day v. Foster, [1890] 7 R. P. C. 54; W. N. (1890) 36; L. R. 43 Ch. D. 435 . . . . 319, 320, 321
De Joung v. United Motor Co., [1903] 20 R. P. C. 472 . . (*see* Addenda)
De la Rue v. Dickinson, [1857] 29 L. T. 194; 7 E. & B. 738; 3 K. & J. 388 . . . . 443, 446, 494
De Vitre v. Betts, [1873] L. R. 6 H. L. 319; 21 W. R. 705 . . 494, 501
Deacon's Patent, [1887] 4 R. P. C. 119 . . . . ii. 186
Deeley v. Perks, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 581; 14 R. P. C. 3; 65 L. J. Ch. 912; L. R. (1896) A. C. 496; 75 L. T. N. S. 233 . . 308, 384: ii. 82, 83, 97
Deeley's Patent, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 72; 12 R. P. C. 65, 192; 13 R. P. C. 581; L. R. (1895) 1 Ch. 687; L. R. (1896) A. C. 496; 64 L. J. Ch. 480; 65 L. J. Ch. 912; 72 L. T. N. S. 702; 75 L. T. N. S. 233; 43 W. R. 517; 12 R. 272 . 306, 308, 408, 485: ii. 55, 65, 93, 99, 100
Defries v. Sherwood, [1897] 14 R. P. C. 313 . . . . . . 150, 462
Dege's Patent, [1895] 12 R. P. C. 448 . . . . . . 296, 306
Dellwick's Patent, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 591; 65 L. J. Ch. 905 . ii. 67, 99
Dellwick's Patent, [1898] 15 R. P. C. 682 . . . . . 58, 202: ii. 71
Delta Metal Co. v. Maxim Nordenfelt Guns and Ammunition Co., [1891] 8 R. P. C. 169, 247 . . . . 426, 440, 446, 528
De Mare's Patent, [1899] 16 R. P. C. 150 316
Denley v. Blore, [1851] 38 Lond. Jour. 224 389
Dent v. Turpin, [1861] 2 J. & H. 139; 50 L. J. Ch. 495 . . . . ii. 112
Derosne v. Fairie, [1835] 1 W. P. C. 154; 2 Cr. M. & R. 476; 5 Tyre 393 . . . 178, 211, 222, 223, 233, 236, 237, 289, 406, 464: ii. 150
Derosne's Patent, [1835-44] 2 W. P. C. 2; 4 Moo. P. C. 417; 24 Newton, L. J. O. S. 459; Carp. P. C. 698 68: ii. 169, 174, 175, 177, 180, 193
Deutsche Mähmaschimen Fabrik vorm Wertheim v. Pfaff, [1890] 7 R. P. C. 16, 251 74
Dewrance v. Fletcher, [1899] 16 R. P. C. 150 121
Dick v. Ellams Duplicator Co., [1899] 16 R. P. C. 414; 17 R. P. C. 196 150, 251
Dick v. Haslam, [1891] 8 R. P. C. 196 490
Dick v. Tullis, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 149 462
Dicks v. Brooks, [1880] L. R. 15 Ch. D. 22; 49 L. J. Ch. 812 . 311, 501
Dilly v. Doig, [1794] 2 Ves. 486 391

PAGE
Dismore's *v.* Patent, [1853] 18 Beav. 538 . . . . ii. 76
Dixon *v.* The London Small Arms Co., [1875] L. R. 10 Q. B. 130; L. R. 1 App. Cas. 632; 44 L. J. Q. B. 63; 46 L. J. Q. B. 617 . ii. 145, 146, 192
Dobbs *v.* Penn, 3 Exch. 427 141
Dolbear's Patent, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 203 . . . . ii. 181
Dollond's Case, [1776] 1 W. P. C. 43; 2 H. Bl. 463 . . . 8, 116, 117, 125
Douglass *v.* Pintsch's Patent Lighting Co., [1895] 13 R. P. C. 601, 673; 65 L. J. Ch. 919; L. R. (1897) 1 Ch. 176; 75 L. T. N. S. 332; 45 W. R. 108 . . . . 315, 327
Dover (H. W.) and Dover, Ld. *v.* New Townsend Cycle Co., Ld., [1903] 21 R. P. C. 135 486
Dowler *v.* Keeling, [1898] 15 R. P. C. 214 121
Dowling *v.* Billington, [1890] 7 R. P. C. 191 . . 42, 57, 269, 384, 400, 490
Downes *v.* Falcon Works, [1886] 3 R. P. C. 70 269
Downes *v.* Hughes & Co., [1880] 69 L. T. 150 473
Downton's Patent, [1839] 1 W. P. C. 565 . . . . . ii. 175, 178, 194
Dowson Taylor *v.* Drosophore Co., [1894] 11 R. P. C. 536; 12 R. P. C. 95 . . . . 324, 325
Drake *v.* Muntz Metal Co., [1886] 3 R. P. C. 43 . . . . . 450, 452
Dredge *v.* Parnell, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 392; 15 R. P. C. 84; 16 R. P. C. 625 . . . . 42, 79, 96, 311
Driffield *v.* Waterloo & Co., [1886] 3 R. P. C. 46; L. R. 31 Ch. D. 638; 55 L. J. Ch. 391 . . . . 315, 318, 327
Drummond's Patent, [1889] 6 R. P. C. 756 302
Dubowski *v.* Goldstein, [1896] L. R. 1 Q. B. 478 . . . . . . ii. 109
Duckett *v.* Sankey, [1899] 16 R. P. C. 357 519
Duckett *v.* Whitehead, [1895] 12 R. P. C. 187, 376 . . . . 40, 68, 489
Dudgeon *v* Thomson, [1874-77] 30 L. T. N. S. 244; L. R. 3 App. Cas. 34; Sc. 22 W. R. 464. . 53, 248, 270, 334, 336, 338, 342, 343, 401, 411, 431, 432, 434, 435, 490, 492: ii. 67, 71, 75, 81
Duncan and Wilson's Patent, [1884] 1 W. P. C. 257 . . ii. 164, 188, 189
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.* Actien Gesellschaft für Motor, &c., [1902] 19 R. P. C. 46 380
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.* British and Colonial Motor Car Co., Ld., [1901] 18 R. P. C. 313 380
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.* Buckingham and Adams Cycle and Motor Co., Ld., [1901] 18 R. P. C. 423 . . . . . . ii. 142
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.* Clifton Rubber Co., Ld., [1902] 19 R. P. C. 433, 527; 20 R. P. C. 393 . . . . 316, 347
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.* Cresswell, [1901] 18 R. P. C. 473 . 347: ii. 142
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.* Excelsior Tyre and Cement Co., [1901] 18 R. P. C. 209 . . . . 373: ii. 134
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.* Green, [1900] 17 R. P. C. 234 . 504
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.* Gunn, [1900] 17 R. P. C. 234 . . 504
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.* Holborn Tyre Co., Ld., [1901] 18 R. P. C. 222 . . . . 373: ii. 134
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.* Hubbard Patents and Tyre Syndicate, Ld., [1902] 19 R. P. C. 546 427
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.* Hyde Rubber Co., Ld., [1904] 21 R. P. C. 208 348
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.* Moseley (David) & Sons, Ld., [1903] 21 R. P. C. 53, 274; [1904] 1 Ch. 612 . . . 371, 372, 373
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.* Neal, [1899] 1 Ch. 807; 16 R. P. C. 247 . . . . 373, 470: ii. 134

PAGE

Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.* New Lamb Tyre Co., 20 R. P. C. 303 . . . 348
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.* New Ixion Tyre and Cycle Co., Ld., [1898] 15 R. P. C. 389; 16 R. P. C. 16 . . . 347, 487, 530
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.* New Seddon Pneumatic Tyre and Self-closing Tube Co., Ld., [1897] 14 R. P. C. 332; 76 L. T. N. S. 405 . . . 316
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.* North British Rubber Co., [1904] 21 R. P. C. 208 . . . ii. 142, 143
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.* Rimington, [1900] 17 R. P. C. 665 . 386
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.* Stone and Corser, [1897] 14 R. P. C. 263 . . . 428
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.* United Rubber Works, Ld., [1902] 19 R. P. C. 406 . . . 348
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.* Wapshaw Tube Co., Ld., [1900] 17 R. P. C. 433 . . . 347
Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.* Wilson, [1900] 17 R. P. C. 332 . 373, 530: ii. 134
Dunnicliff *v.* Mallett, [1859] 7 C. B. N. S. 209; 29 L. J. C. P. 70. . 387: ii. 109, 115, 132
Dutton *v.* Brierly, [1897] 14 R. P. C. 685 . . . 121
Duvergier *v.* Fellows, [1828] 10 B. & C. 829; 1 C. & F. 39 . . . ii. 105

Eades *v.* Starbruck Waggon Co., [1881] W. N. 160 . . . 223
Earl de la Warr *v.* Miles, [1881] L. R. 19 Ch. D. 80 . . . 533
Earl of Devon's Case, 11 Co. R. 90 . . . 6
Easterbrook *v.* Great Western Railway Co., [1885] 2 R. P. C. 201; 3 R. P. C. 94 . . . 51, 165, 167, 204, 250, 282, 336, 534
Edelston *v.* Edelston, [1863] 1 De G. J. & S. 203 . . . 386
Edge *v.* Harrison, [1891] 8 R. P. C. 74 . . . 474
Edge *v.* Johnson, [1892] 9 R. P. C. 142 . . . 535
Edge's Patent, [1890] W. N. 149 . . . 305
Edgebury *v.* Stephens, [1691] 2 Salk 447; 1 W. P. C. 35; Dav. P. C. 36 . . . 17, 28
Edie's Patent, [1885] Griff. P. C. 279 . . . ii. 33
Edison Electric Co. *v.* Shippey, [1887] 4 R. P. C. 471 . . . 414, 481
Edison Telephone Co. *v.* Indiarubber Co., [1881] L. R. 17 Ch. D. 137 . 415, 419
Edison United Phonograph *v.* Young, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 489 . 479, 480
Edison and Swan Co. *v.* Holland, [1886-89] 3 R. P. C. 395; 5 R. P. C. 213, 459; 6 R. P. C. 243; 55 L. J. Ch. 943; L. R. 33 Ch. D. 497; L. R. 41 Ch. D. 28 . 68, 76, 150, 162, 163, 215, 218, 220, 222, 224, 225, 267, 274, 380, 391, 392, 407, 436, 448, 449, 465, 466, 467, 469, 477, 508, 510, 518, 528, 534
Edison and Swan Co. *v.* Woodhouse, [1886-87] 3 R. P. C. 167, 183; 4 R. P. C. 79, 99; L. R. 32 Ch. D. 520 . 67, 68, 218, 223, 238, 240, 249, 266, 277, 280, 283, 289, 471
Edison-Bell Consolidated Phonograph Co., Ld. *v.* Columbia Co., [1900] 18 R. P. C. 4 . . . 424
Edison-Bell Consolidated Phonograph Co., Ld. *v.* Rosenberg, [1899] 16 R. P. C. 608 . . . 471
Edison-Bell Phonograph Corporation *v.* Bernstein, [1897] 14 R. P. C. 153 . . . 435

PAGE
Edison-Bell Phonograph Corporation *v.* Edison Phonograph Co., [1893] 11 R. P. C. 33 . . . . 527, 528
Edison-Bell Phonograph Corporation *v.* Hough, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 594 428
Edison-Bell Phonograph Corporation *v.* London Phonograph Corporation, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 193, 471 . . . . 437, 489
Edison-Bell Phonograph Corporation *v.* Smith, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 148, 164, 389 . 32, 39, 50, 84, 248, 249, 250, 273, 278, 417, 481, 490, 491, 534
Edison's Patent, [1877] No. 2909 . . . . ii. 80
Edlin *v.* Pneumatic Tyre and Brooks' Cycling Agency, [1893] 10 R. P. C. 311 . . . . 315, 321, 325, 493
Edmonds' Patent, [1888-89] 6 R. P. C. 355; W. N. (1888) 234 . . 305, 308
Edmunds' Patent, [1886] Griff. P. C. 281 . . . 18: ii. 29, 30, 32, 33
Edwards' Patent, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 461 . . . . ii. 50
Ehrlich *v.* Ihlee, [1887-88] 4 R. P. C. 115; 5 R. P. C. 37, 198, 437 . 32, 39, 147, 162, 163, 169, 170, 260, 338, 342, 352, 358, 415, 440, 441, 465, 466
Electric Construction Co., Ld. *v.* Imperial Tramways Co., Ld., [1899] 16 R. P. C. 631; 17 R. P. C. 537 . . . . . . 154, 264, 270, 287
Electric Telegraph Co. *v.* Brett, [1851] 10 C. B. 838; 20 L. J. C. P. 123 . . . . 49, 61, 73, 76, 181, 387
Electric Telegraph Co. *v.* Nott, [1847] 4 C. B. 462; 11 Jur. 273; 2 Coop. C. C. 41; 16 L. J. C. P. 174 . . . . 398, 430, 431, 432, 436
Electrolytic Plating Apparatus Co. *v.* Holland, [1901] 18 R. P. C. 521 . . 127
Elias *v.* Grovesend Tinplate Co., [1890] 7 R. P. C. 455 . . 32, 33, 36, 40
Ellam *v.* Martyn, [1898] 16 R. P. C. 28 . . . : . . . 329
Ellington *v.* Clark, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 135, 319; 58 L. T. N. S. 818 . 224, 269, 286, 338, 534
Elliot *v.* Turner, [1845] 2 C. B. 446; 15 L. J. C. P. 49 . . 211, 266, 283
Ellwood *v.* Christy, [1864] 17 C. B. N. S. 754; 18 C. B. N. S. 495; 34 L. J. C. P. 130 . . . . 497, 505: ii. 129
Elmer *v.* Creasy, [1873] L. R. 9 Ch. App. 69; 43 L. J. Ch. 166 . . 443
Elmore *v.* Pirrie, [1887] 57 L. T. N. S. 333 497
Elmslie *v.* Boursier, [1869] L. R. 9 Eq. 217; 39 L. J. Ch. 328 . . 375
Elsas *v.* Williams, [1884] 1 Times R. 144 487
Elsey *v.* Butler, [1884] 1 R. P. C. 189 398
Elwes *v.* Payne, [1879] L. R. 12 Ch. D. 468 436
Embossed Metal Plate Co. *v.* Saupe, [1891] 8 R. P. C. 355 . . . 81, 94
Emperor of Austria *v.* Day, [1861] 3 De G. F. & J. 217 . . . 508
Engels *v.* Hubert Unchangeable Eylet Syndicate, [1902] W. N. 48; [1904] 19 R. P. C. 201 . . . . 315, 320, 326, 330
English and American Machinery Co. *v.* Gare Machine Co., [1894] 11 R. P. C. 627 . . . . 312, 322, 325
English and American Machinery Co. *v.* Union Boot and Shoe Machine Co., [1894] 11 R. P. C. 137, 367 154, 342, 348, 419, 505, 506, 536
Errard's Patent, [1835] 1 W. P. C. 557 . . . . ii. 165, 173, 175, 176
Evans, *Re*, 9 T. R. 109 490
Evans and Otway's Patent, [1884] Griff. P. C. 279 . . . . . ii. 33
Evans and Taunton, Ld. *v.* Hoskins and Sewell, Ld., [1904] 21 R. P. C. 675 . . . . 72, 279, 536
Everitt's Patent, [1887] Griff. L. O. C. 27 . . . . . 185: ii. 14, 33

Fabriques de Produits Chimiques de Thann *v.* Caspers, [1897] 15 R. P. C. 94 . . . . 339, 370
Fabriques de Produits Chimiques de Thann et Mulhouse *v.* Lafitte, [1899] 16 R. P. C. 61 . . . . 41, 530

PAGE
Fairburn *v.* Household, [1885] 2 R. P. C. 195; 3 R. P. C. 128, 263 . 228, 250, 283, 478
Fairfax *v.* Lyons, [1891] 8 R. P. C. 401 . . . . 81, 94, 113
Farbenfabriken vorm. F. Bayer *v.* Bowker, [1891] 8 R. P. C. 389 . 41, 426, 470, 478, 534: ii. 67, 92
Farbenfabriken vormals Friedrich Bayer & Co. *v.* Chemische Fabrik von Heyden, [1905] 22 R. P. C. 501 . . . . 66, 532
Farbenfariken vorm. F. Bayer *v.* Laporte, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 190 . 490
Fawcett *v.* Homan, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 268, 398 . 32, 41, 70, 141, 156, 163, 164, 165, 204, 260
Feather *v.* The Queen, [1865] 6 B. & S. 257; 35 L. J. Q. B. 200 . 331: ii. 145, 146
Felton *v.* Greaves, [1829] 2 Stark. R. 249; 3 Car. & P. 611 . . 176, 204, 206
Fenner *v.* Wilson, [1893] 10 R. P. C. 283 . . . . . . 315, 316
Fennessey *v.* Clarke, [1888] L. R. 37 Ch. D. 184 . . . . 442, 443, 494
Fernie *v.* Young, [1866] L. R. 1 H. L. 63 479
Ferranti *v.* British Thomson Houston Co., Ld., [1902] 19 R. P. C. 147; 20 R. P. C. 145 345
Ferranti's Patent, [1901] 18 R. P. C. 518 . . . . . . ii. 166, 194
Fiechter, *Re*, [1882] Griff. P. C. 284 . . . . ii. 33
Finch's Patent, [1898] 15 R. P. C. 674 . . . . ii. 164, 165
Finnegan *v.* James, [1874] L. R. 19 Eq. 72 440
Fisher *v.* Dewick, [1838] 1 W. P. C. 264, 551 n.; 4 Bing. N. C. 706; 7 L. J. C. P. 279 . . . . 180, 416, 417, 418, 424, 426
Fleet *v.* The Managers of the Metropolitan Asylums District, [1886] . 458
Fletcher *v.* Arden, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 46 74
Fletcher *v.* Glasgow Gas Commissioners, [1887] 4 R. P. C. 386 . 380, 387, 512
Fletcher, *Re*, [1886] Griff. L. O. C. 30 . . . . ii. 30, 37
Fletcher's Patent, [1893] 10 R. P. C. 252 . . . . ii. 58
Flower *v.* Lloyd, [1876-77] W. N. (1876) 169; 45 L. J. Ch. 746; 20 S. J. 860; Seton, 4th ed. 351 . . 399, 413, 418, 422, 423, 452, 453, 482
Foard's Patent, [1855] 9 Moo. P. C. 376 . . . . . . ii. 175, 180
Ford *v.* Foster, [1872] L. R. 7 Ch. App. Cas. 611 . . . . . 333, 496
Forsyth *v.* Riviere, [1819] 1 Camp. Rep. 401; 1 W. P. C. 97 . . 61
Fountain Livet's Patent, [1892] 9 R. P. C. 327 . . . . ii. 173, 177, 188
Fowler *v.* Down, [1797] 1 B. & P. 44 . . . . ii. 126
Fowler *v.* Gaul, [1886] 3 R. P. C. 247 . . . . 424, 425
Fox *v.* Dellestable, [1866] 15 W. R. 195 75
Fox, *Ex parte*, [1812] 1 V. & B. 67; 1 W. P. C. 431 n. . . . . . ii. 8
Fox's Patent, [1878] No. 3988 . . . . ii. 79, 80
Foxwell *v.* Bostock, [1863-64] 12 W. R. 723; 4 De G. J. & S. 298; 10 L. T. N. S. 144 . 67, 71, 188, 190, 242, 244, 245, 246, 247, 352: ii. 63
Foxwell *v.* Webster, [1863] 3 N. R. 103; 9 Jur. N. S. 1189; 2 Drew. & Sm. 250; 9 L. T. N. S. 362, 528 . . . . 443, 481
Fradella *v.* Weller, [1831] 2 Russ. & My. 247 . . . . . 386, 512
Franklin Hocking & Co. *v.* Franklin Hocking, [1886-89] 3 R. P. C. 291; 4 R. P. C. 255, 434; 6 R. P. C. 69. *See* Hocking Co. *v.* Hocking . . . . ii. 115
Franklin Hocking & Co. *v.* Fraser, [1885] 3 R. P. C. 7. *See* Hocking *v.* Fraser 489
Fraser *v.* Province of Brescia Steam Tramways Co., [1887] 56 L. T. N. S. 771; 3 Times R. 587 534
Frearson *v.* Loe, [1878] 26 W. R. 138; L. R. 9 Ch. D. 48 . 146, 253, 374, 383, 400, 413, 452, 486, 490, 508
Frentzell *v.* Dougill, [1904] 21 R. P. C. 641 . . . . ii. 132

PAGE
Fritz v. Hobson, [1880] L. R. 14 Ch. D. 542 497
Fryer's Patent, 47 Eng. 49 . . . . ii. 189
Fuller v. Handy, [1903] 21 R. P. C. 6 40
Fullwood v. Fullwood, [1878] L. R. 9 Ch. D. 176 487
Furnes's Patent, [1885] 2 R. P. C. 175 . . . . ii. 190, 193
Fusee Vesta Co. v. Bryant and May, [1887-88] 4 R. P. C. 71, 191; L. R. 34 Ch. D. 458; L. R. 37 Ch. D. 120; 56 L. J. Ch. 187 . 313, 323: ii. 89, 96

Gadd v. Mayor of Manchester, [1892] 9 R. P. C. 259, 516 . 39, 82, 140, 150, 190, 192, 196
Gale's Patent, [1891] 8 R. P. C. 488 . . . . 300, 305
Galloway v. Bleaden, [1839] 1 W. P. C. 268 n., 521 . 120, 121, 151, 208, 418, 461
Galloway's Patent, [1843] 1 W. P. C. 724; 7 Jur. 453 . 163, 180: ii. 176, 177
Gamble v. Kurtz, [1846] 3 C. B. 425 . . . . 73, 338
Gammons v. Battersby, [1903] 20 R. P. C. 540; 21 R. P. C. 322 . 32, 252, 407
Gammons v. Singer Manufacturing Co., Ld., [1901] 22 R. P. C. 129, 452 . . . . 407, 408, 483, 532
Gandy v. Reddaway, [1885] 2 R. P. C. 49 . . . . . 223, 251, 280, 289
Gardner v. Broadbent, [1856] 2 Jur. N. S. 1041; 4 W. R. 767 . 430, 432, 439
Gare's Patent, [1884] L. R. 26 Ch. D. 105 . . . . ii. 77
Garnett v. Bradley, [1878] L. R. 3 App. Cas. 944 520
Garnett's Patent, [1899] 16 R. P. C. 154 . . . . ii. 18
Garrard v. Edge, [1889-90] 6 R. P. C. 372, 563; 7 R. P. C. 139; L. R. 44 Ch. D. 224; 58 L. J. Ch. 397; 59 L. J. Ch. 379; 60 L. T. N. S. 557; 62 L. T. N. S. 510; 37 W. R. 501; 38 W. R. 455; W. N. (1890) 43, 68 . . . . 338, 352, 451, 483, 516, 523
Garthwaite's Patent, [1886] Griff. P. C. 284 . . . . ii. 33
Gaulard v. Lindsay, [1888] 4 R. P. C. 189; 5 R. P. C. 192; L. R. 38 Ch. D. 38; 56 L. T. N. S. 506; 57 L. J. Ch. 687 . . 315, 316: ii. 94, 96
Gaulard and Gibbs's Patent, [1887-89] 5 R. P. C. 189, 525; 6 R. P. C. 215; L. R. 34 Ch. D. 396; 50 L. J. Ch. 606; 57 L. J. Ch. 209; Griff. P. C. 320; W. N. (1887) 211; W. N. (1888) 163; W. N. (1889) 60 . 33, 141, 154, 190, 191, 196, 224, 296, 302, 304: ii. 65, 67, 68, 94, 95, 97
Gaunt's Patent, [1897] 14 R. P. C. 388 . . . . ii. 44
Gavioli v. Shephard, [1899] 17 R. P. C. 107 504
Geary v. Norton, [1846] 1 De G. & S. 9 . . . . 337, 386, 487, 512
Geipel v. Lord Mayor, &c., of Manchester, [1903] 21 R. P. C. 48 . . 103
Geipel's Patent, [1903] 2 Ch. 715; [1904] 1 Ch. 239; 20 R. P. C. 545; 21 R. P. C. 379 . . . . 104, 189, 190: ii. 94, 99
General Electric Co. (1900), Ld. v. Safety Lift and Elevator Co., Ld., [1903] 21 R. P. C. 109 . . . . 423, 440
Germ Milling Co. v. Robinson, [1884-86] 1 R. P. C. 217; 3 R. P. C. 11, 254, 399; 55 L. J. Ch. 287; 53 L. T. N. S. 696; 34 W. R. 194 . 133, 135, 450, 451, 452, 453, 521, 522: ii. 150
Gibson v. Brand, [1841-42] 1 W. P. C. 627; 4 M. & G. 179; 11 L. J. C. P. 177 . . 7, 55, 113, 161, 200, 218, 225, 228, 371, 461, 472
Gillett v. Wiltby, [1839] 9 Car. & P. 334; 1 W. P. C. 270 . 402, 461, 527
Glossop, *Re*, [1884] Griff. P. C. 285 . . . . ii. 35, 36
Gloucester Waggon Co., *Re*, [1887] Griff. L. O. C. 57 . . . . . ii. 32

PAGE
Glover (W. T.) & Co., Ld. *v.* American Steel and Wire Co., [1902] 19 R. P. C. 102 283
Goerz and Hough's Patent, [1895] 12 R. P. C. 370 303
Gonville *v.* Hay, [1903] 21 R. P. C. 49 . . . . 410: ii. 148
Gordon *v.* Rolte, [1849] 4 Exch. 365 389
Gormully and Jefferey Manufacturing Co., Ld. *v.* North British Rubber Co., Ld. (*See* North British Rubber Co., Ld. *v.* Gormully and Jefferey Manufacturing Co., Ld.) 282
Gormully and Jeffery Manufacturing Co.'s Petition, [1899] 16 R. P. C. 641 . . . . ii. 139
Gosnell *v.* Bishop, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 41, 151 . . 32, 62, 269, 355, 356, 358
Goucher *v.* Clayton, [1865] 11 Jur. N. S. 107, 462; 34 L. J. Ch. 239; 13 L. T. N. S. 115 . . . . 371, 411, 412: ii. 151
Goucher's Patent, [1865] 2 Moo. P. C. N. S. 532 . . . . . . ii. 193
Gozney's Patent, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 597 . . . . ii. 42, 43
Grafton *v.* Watson, [1884] 51 L. T. N. S. 141 534
Graham *v.* Campbell, [1877] L. R. 7 Ch. D. 490 437
Graham *v.* Eli, [1898] 15 R. P. C. 259 . . . . ii. 4
Graham *v.* Fanta [1872] 9 R. P. C. 164 . . . . ii. 4
Gramaphone and Typewriter, Ld. *v.* Ullmann, [1906] 23 R. P. C. 260 . 31, 39
Greaves *v.* The Eastern Counties Ry. Co., [1859] 1 E. & E. 961; 28 L. J. Q. B. 290 520
Green, *Re*, [1857] 24 Beav. 145 . . . . ii. 60
Green's Patent, [1887] Griff. P. C. 286 . . . . ii. 39, 40
Greenfell and McEvoy's Patent, [1890] 7 R. P. C. 151 . . . . . ii. 13
Greenhalgh's Patent, [1897] 14 R. P. C. 388 . . . . ii. 44
Greenwell *v.* Howell, [1900] 1 Q. B. 535 . . . .
Greer *v.* Bristol Tanning Co., [1885] 2 R. P. C. 268 428
Gregory *v.* Piper, [1829] 9 B. & C. 591 389
Griffin *v.* Feaver, [1889] 6 R. P. C. 396 522
Griffin's Patent, [1888] 6 R. P. C. 296 . . . . ii. 30
Griffith *v.* Blake, [1884] L. R. 27 Ch. D. 474 438
Griffiths *v.* The Birmingham Stopper and Cycle Components Co., [1899] 16 R. P. C. 383 351
Grover and Baker Sewing Machine Co. *v.* Millard, [1862] 8 Jur. N. S. 713 . . . . ii. 153
Grover and Baker Sewing Machine Co. *v.* Wilson, [1870] W. N. (1870) 78 . . . . 413, 424
Guest and Barrow's Patent, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 312 . . . . ii. 41, 42, 44
Guilbert-Martin *v.* Kerr, [1887] 4 R. P. C. 18 . . . . 33, 518
Guyot *v.* Thompson, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 541; 71 L. T. N. S. 416; 64 L. J. Ch. 32; L. R. (1894) 3 Ch. 388; 8 R. 174 n. . 402: ii. 140, 143, 144
Gwynne *v.* Drysdale, [1885-86] 2 R. P. C. 160; 3 R. P. C. 65 . 353, 384

Haddan's Patent, *Re*, [1884] 51 L. T. N. S. 190; 54 L. J. Ch. 126; W. N. (1884) 192 440
Haddan's Patent, *Re*, [1885] Griff. L. O. C. 12 . . . . . 308: ii. 80
Haddon's Patent, *Re*, [1885] 2 R. P. C. 218 . . . . 299, 301
Haggenmacher *v.* Watson, [1897] 14 R. P. C. 349, 631 . . . 121, 482, 485
Haldon *v.* Hall, [1904] 21 R. P. C. 609 164
Hall *v.* Conder, [1857] 2 C. B. N. S. 22; 26 L. J. C. P. 138, 288 . 409: ii. 119, 148, 154
Hall *v.* Jarvis, [1822] 1 W. P. C. 100; 1 C. P. C. 423 . 55, 81, 85, 471, 472

PAGE
Hall *v.* Trigg, [1897] L. R. (1897) 2 Ch. 222 490
Hall *v.* Truman, [1885] L. R. 29 Ch. D. 307 . . . . . . 448, 449
Hall's Patent, [1817] 1 W. P. C. 97 68
Hall's Patent, [1883] L. R. 23 Ch. D. 644 438
Hall's Patent, [1895] 12 R. P. C. 401 . . . . ii. 178
Hall and Hall's Patent, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 283; L. R. 21 Q. B. D. 137; 57 L. J. Q. B. 494; 59 L. T. N. S. 37; 36 W. R. 892 . ii. 42, 49, 64, 65, 94, 95, 100
Halsey *v.* Brotherhood, [1880–81] L. R. 15 Ch. D. 514; L. R. 19 Ch. D. 386; 49 L. J. Ch. 514, 786; 51 L. J. Ch. 233; 45 L. T. N. S. 640 . . . . 309, 310, 311
Hamilton's Patent, [1901] 19 R. P. C. 33 . . . . . ii. 41, 42, 49
Hampton and Facer's Patent, [1887] Griff. L. O. C. 13 . . ii. 28, 66, 88
Hancock *v.* Bewley, [1860] 1 Johns. 601 . . . . ii. 132
Hancock *v.* Moulton, [1852] Johns. Pat. 6th ed. 254 . . . 73, 352, 370
Hancock *v.* Somervell, [1851] 39 Newton, L. J. 158 . . 125, 127, 133, 137
Hardmuth *v.* Baker, [1904] 21 R. P. C. 504; 22 R. P. C. 66 . 351, 355
Hardy's Patent, [1849] 6 Moo. P. C. 441 . . . . ii. 187
Harmer *v.* Plane, [1807–9] 14 Ves. 130; 11 East, 101; Dav. P. C. 311 . 75, 105, 106, 157, 221, 230, 247, 431, 437: ii. 158
Harrild and Parkin's Patent, [1900] 17 R. P. C. 617 . . . ii. 18, 38, 49
Harris *v.* Rothwell, [1886–88] 3 R. P. C. 243, 383; 4 R. P. C. 225; L. R. 35 Ch. D. 416; 56 L. J. Ch. 459 . . 141, 142, 424, 425, 461, 462
Harrison *v.* Anderston Foundry Co., [1876] L. R. 1 App. Cas. 574 . 71, 242, 245, 246, 250, 266, 269, 273, 336
Harrison *v.* Taylor, [1865] 11 Jur. N. S. 408 496
Harrison's Patent, [1853] Macr. P. C. 31 . . . . ii. 79
Harrop *v.* Mayor of Ossett, [1898] 1 Ch. 525 531
Hartley's Patent, [1777] 1 W. P. C. 54; 2 H. Bl. 493 . . . . . 61, 81
Harwood *v.* Great Northern Ry. Co., [1860–65] 11 H. L. C. 654; 29 L. J. Q. B. 193; 31 L. J. Q. B. 198; 35 L. J. Q. B. 27; 6 L. T. N. S. 90; 12 L. T. N. S. 771; 10 W. R. 422; 14 W. R. 1; 2 B. & S. 194 . . . . 30, 31, 34, 81, 90, 91, 99, 462
Haskell Golf Ball Co., Ld. *v.* Hutchinson, [1904] 21 R. P. C. 497; 22 R. P. C. 205; 23 R. P. C. 125; [1906] 1 Ch. 518 . 51, 53, 121, 224, 316, 321, 462, 513, 514, 518, 519, 532, 534
Haslam *v.* Hall, [1887-88] 4 R. P. C. 203; 5 R. P. C. 1, 144; L. R. 20 Q. B. D. 491 . . 33, 147, 396, 398, 399, 448, 518, 526: ii. 92
Haslam Foundry and Engineering Co. *v.* Goodfellow, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 28; L. R. 37 Ch. D. 118; 57 L. J. Ch. 245 . . . . . . ii. 96
Haslett *v.* Hutchinson, [1891] 8 R. P. C. 457 . . . . . ii. 58, 120
Hassall *v.* Wright, [1870] L. R. 10 Eq. 509; 40 L. J. Ch. 145 . ii. 122, 129
Hasting's Case, [1561] Noy, R. 182; 1 W. P. C. 6 . . . . . 2, 106
Hastings *v.* Brown, [1853] 1 E. & B. 450; 22 L. J. Q. B. 161 . . 226
Hatfield's Patent, [1884] Griff. P. C. 288 . . . . ii. 31
Hattersley *v.* Hodgson, [1903] 20 R. P. C. 591; 21 R. P. C. 517; 22 R. P. C. 229; 23 R. P. C. 192 . 208, 252, 281, 287, 288, 474, 492, 493: ii. 72, 75
Hattersley and Jackson's Patent, [1904] 21 R. P. C. 233 . . ii. 71, 72
Haworth *v.* Hardcastle, [1834] 1 W. P. C. 485; 1 Bing. N. C. 122; 1 M. & Sc. 732; 3 L. J. C. P. 311 . . 169, 208, 251, 255, 270, 276, 306
Haws *v.* Harding, [1897] 14 R. P. C. 641, 930 . . . . . 33, 81, 96
Haydock *v.* Bradbury, [1887] 4 R. P. C. 74 . . . . . . 527, 528
Hayne *v.* Maltby, [1789] 3 T. R. 439; 1 W. P. C. 291 . . ii. 115, 116, 151
Haythornthwaite's Application, [1890] 7 R. P. C. 70 . . ii. 38, 39, 40

PAGE
Hayward v. Hamilton, [1879-81] Griff. P. C. 115 . . . 31, 32, 41, 69, 342
Hayward v. Pavement Light Co., [1884] 1 R. P. C. 207 . . . 338, 434
Hazeland's Patent, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 467 . . . . . ii. 177, 190, 193
Hazelhurst v. Rylands, [1892] 9 R. P. C. 1 . . . . . . ii. 106, 120
Heald v. Incandescent Gas Light Co., [1893] 10 R. P. C. 165 . . 401
Heald's Patent, [1891] 8 R. P. C. 429 . . . . 16: ii. 31
Healey's Application, Johns. Pat. 6th ed. 165 . . . . . . 13, 15
Heap v. Hartley, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 603: 6 R. P. C. 495; L. R. 42 Ch. D. 461; 58 L. J. Ch. 790; 41 L. T. N. S. 538; 38 W. R. 136; 5 T. R. 710 . . . . 377: ii. 59, 134, 143, 156
Hearson's Patent, [1884] 1 R. P. C. 213; Griff. P. C. 266 . . . ii. 9, 78, 100
Heath v. Smith, [1854] 2 W. P. C. 268; 23 L. J. Q. B. 166; 3 E. & B. 256 . . . . 125, 126, 127, 130, 135
Heath v. Unwin, [1842-55] 10 M. & W. 684; 13 M. & W. 583; 1 W. P. C. 551; 2 W. P. C. 216, 236; 2 D. N. S. 482; 12 L. J. Ex. 46; 14 L. J. Ex. 153; 16 L. J. Ch. 283; 22 L. J. C. P. 7; 12 C. B. 522; 15 S. M. 55 n.; 5 H. L. C. 505; 16 C. B. 713; 25 L. J. C. P. 8 . . . . 80, 118, 136, 232, 233, 336, 337, 353, 354, 369, 426
Heath and Frost's Patent, [1886] Griff. P. C. 288, 310 . ii. 35, 36, 38, 68, 87
Heath's Patent, [1853] 2 W. P. C. 247; 8 Moo. P. C. 217 . ii. 173, 177, 182, 188, 190
Heathfield v. Greenway, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 17 . . . 417, 422, 426, 452
Hedge's Patent, [1895] 12 R. P. C. 136 . . . . ii. 33
Heine v. Conico Incandescent Light Co., [1904] 21 R. P. C. 202 . . 104
Heine v. Norden, [1904] 21 R. P. C. 513 435
Heine v. Spong, [1904] 22 R. P. C. 110 . . . . ii. 119
Henderson v. The Runcorn Soap and Alkali Co., [1868] W. N. (1868) 250; 19 L. T. N. S. 459 475
Henderson's Patent, [1901] A. C. 616; 18 R. P. C. 449 . . ii. 164, 183, 184, 188, 194
Henry's Patent, [1872] L. R. 8 Ch. 167; 38 Eng. 343, 352 . ii. 32, 36, 53, 190
Hensee v. Hardie, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 421 . . . . 395, 402
Herbert v. Sayer, [1844] 5 Q. B. 965 . . . . ii. 126
Herberts' Patent, [1867] L. R. 1 P. C. 399; 4 Moo. P. C. N. S. 300 . ii. 123, 179, 180, 191
Herrberger v. Squire, [1888-89] 5 R. P. C. 581; 6 R. P. C. 194 . 33, 73, 93, 154, 312, 321, 323, 328, 330
Hess v. Stevenson, [1808] 3 Bos. & P. 505 . . . . ii. 125, 126
Hetherington's Patent, [1889] 7 R. P. C. 419 . . . . . . ii. 45
Heugh v. Chamberlain, [1877] 25 W. R. 742 . . . . . . 409, 411, 412
Heurteloup's Patent, [1836] 1 W. P. C. 533 141
Hewett v. Nurse, [1900] 17 R. P. C. 264 334
Heys v. Hallmark, [1891] 9 R. P. C. 25 . . . . . . 33, 40, 42, 523
Hicks v. Simmons, [1904] 21 R. P. C. 413, 632 355
Higgin's Patent, [1891] 9 R. P. C. 74 . . . . 18: ii. 32
Higginson and Dean, In re, [1899] 1 Q. B. 325 . . . . . . ii. 126
Higgs v. Goodwin, [1858] E. B. & E. 529; 27 L. J. Q. B. 421 . 56, 373, 380
Hill v. Adams, [1893] 10 R. P. C. 102 456
Hill v. Evans, [1862] 4 De G. F. & J. 288; 31 L. J. Ch. 457; 8 Jur. N. S. 525; 6 L. T. N. S. 90 . . 10, 110, 141, 148, 149, 265, 267, 268, 486, 501
Hill v. Thompson, [1817-18] 1 W. P. C. 229; 3 Mer. 622; 2 B. Moo. 424; 8 Taunt. 375; 1 Carp. P. C. 377 . 6, 8, 55, 67, 70, 73, 75, 76, 113, 114, 116, 137, 159, 243, 251, 252, 265, 430, 431, 433, 434, 439, 464, 465, 468
Hill v. Tombs, [1881] 51 Eng. 274 . . . . 113, 166, 167

PAGE
Hill v. Touts 453
Hilleary v. Taylor, [1887] L. R. 36 Ch. D. 262 532
Hills v. Laming, [1853] 9 Exch. 256; 23 L. J. Ex. 60 . . . . . ii. 148
Hills v. London Gas Light Co., [1857-60] 27 L. J. Ex. 60; 29 L. J. Ex. 409; 5 H. & N. 312 . 41, 120, 123, 153, 181, 208, 222, 255, 256, 268, 283, 462
Hill's Application, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 599 . . . . . . ii. 41, 42, 43
Hill's Patent, [1863] 1 Moo. P. C. N. S. 258; 9 L. T. N. S. 101; 9 Jur. N. S. 1209; 18 Newton, L. J. N. S. 109 . 68: ii. 165, 177, 182, 186, 188, 189, 194
Hind v. Osborne, [1884-85] 1 R. P. C. 221; 2 R. P. C. 45, 64 . 416, 483, 484
Hinks v. Safety Lighting Co., [1876] L. R. 4 Ch. D. 607; 46 L. J. Ch. 185; 36 L. T. N. S. 391 . . 40, 67, 68, 223, 224, 235, 250, 270, 274, 283, 287, 289, 459
Hirschfeld's Patent, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 514 . . . . 303, 305
Hitchcock's Patent, [1903] 20 R. P. C. 767 305
Hocking v. Fraser, [1886] 3 R. P. C. 3 . . . . . . 462, 498, 509, 535
Hocking v. Hocking, [1886-89] 3 R. P. C. 291; 4 R. P. C. 255, 434; 6 R. P. C. 69 . . . . 53, 409: ii. 116
Hoe v. Foster, [1898] 15 R. P. C. 573; 16 R. P. C. 33 . . . . 107, 124
Hoffman v. Postill, [1869] L. R. 4 Ch. App. Cas. 673 . . . . 440, 442
Hoffman's Patent, [1890] 7 R. P. C. 92 . . . . ii. 42, 43, 44
Hoffnung v. Salsbury, [1899] 16 R. P. C. 375 . . . 96, 313, 315, 324, 328
Hogg v. Kirby, 8 Ves. 215 . . . . ii. 103
Holland v. Fox, [1853-54] 1 W. R. 448; 23 L. J. Q. B. 211, 357; 3 E. & B. 977 . . . . 418, 494
Holliday v. Heppenstall, [1889] 6 R. P. C. 320; L. R. 41 Ch. D. 109; 58 L. J. Ch. 829 . . . . 414, 416, 419, 420, 422, 467
Hollins v. Capper, [1886] 5 R. P. C. 289 133
Holmes v. London & North-Western Ry. Co., [1852] Macr. P. C. 4; 12 C. B. 831; 22 L. J. C. P. 57 . . . . 222, 243; ii. 78
Holophane, Ld. v. Berend, [1897] 15 R. P. C. 18 432
Holste v. Robertson, [1876] L. R. 4 Ch. D. 9; 46 L. J. Ch. 1; 33 L. T. N. S. 457; 25 W. R. 35 . . . . 406, 414
Holstrom, *Re*, [1904] 22 R. P. C. 213 . . . . ii. 60
Holt, *Re*, [1879] L. R. 11 Ch. D. 168 491
Homan's Case, [1889] 6 R. P. C. 104; G. P. C. 33 . . . . . 16: ii. 32
Honiball v. Bloomer, [1854] 2 W. P. C. 199; 10 Exch. 538; 24 L. J. Ex. 11 . . . . 125, 126, 127, 133
Honiball's Patent, [1855] 2 W. P. C. 201; 9 Moo. P. C. 378; 25 L. T. 1; L. R. 3 Eq. 225 . . . . 125, 126: ii. 174, 194
Hookham v. Johnson, [1897] 14 R. P. C. 525 534
Hookham's Patent, [1886] Griff. L. O. C. 32 . . . . . ii. 35, 36, 42, 87
Hopkinson v. St. James's Electric Light Co., [1893] 10 R. P. C. 46 . 112, 223, 289, 498, 534: ii. 66
Hopkinson's Patent, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 114; 14 R. P. C. 5; 66 L. J. P. C. 38; L. R. (1897) A. C. 249; 75 L. T. N. S. 462 . 112: ii. 163, 164, 165, 170, 194
Horace, The, [1884] L. R. 9 P. D. 86 535
Hornblower v. Boulton, [1799] Dav. P. C. 221; 8 T. R. 95; 1 Carp. P. C. 156 . . . . 23, 44, 75, 76, 220, 459
Hornby's Patent, [1853] 7 Moo. P. C. 503 . . . . ii. 194
Horne v. Ivy, 1 Sid. 441; 1 Vent. 47 508
Horrocks v. Stubbs, [1886, 1896] 3 R. P. C. 221; 74 L. T. N. S. 58 . 190, 193, 196, 407, 408, 520, 532

PAGE

Horsey's Patent, [1884] 1 R. P. C. 225 . . . . ii. 165, 166
Horsley and Knighton's Patent, [1869] L. R. 8 Eq. 475; L. R. 4 Ch. 784; 39 L. J. Ch. 157 . . . . ii. 60, 113
Horton *v.* Mabon, [1862-64] 12 C. B. N. S. 437; 16 C. B. N. S. 141; 31 L. J. C. B. 255 . . . . 30, 74, 81, 91
Hoskin's Patent, [1884] Griff. P. C. 291 . . . . . . ii. 34, 41, 47
Houghton's Patent, [1871] L. R. 3 P. C. 461; 7 Moo. P. C. N. S. 309 . ii. 164, 173
Househill Co. *v.* Neilson, 1 W. P. C. 676; 9 C. & F. 788 . 6, 23, 46, 51, 62, 107, 118, 119, 121, 122, 131, 141, 143, 175, 233, 403, 404, 417, 500
Household *v.* Fairburn, [1884] 1 R. P. C. 109; 2 R. P. C. 142 . . 320
How *v.* MacKernan, [1862] 30 Beav. 547 447
Howard *v.* Tweedales, [1895-96] 12 R. P. C. 519; 13 R. P. C. 211. 389, 496
Howes *v.* Webber, [1894-95] 11 R. P. C. 586; 12 R. P. C. 465; 13 R. P. C. 39 . . . . 351, 433, 536
Huddart *v.* Grimshaw, [1803] 1 W. P. C. 85; Dav. P. C. 265; 2 B. & Ald. 377 . . . . . . 23, 67, 141, 159, 205, 220, 269, 471, 472
Hudson *v.* Bennett, [1886] 14 W. R. 911 386
Hudson *v.* Osgerby, [1884] 32 W. R. 566; W. N. (1884) 83 . . . 534
Hudson's Patent, [1904] 22 R. P. C. 218 . . . . ii. 51
Hugh *v.* Magill, [1897] W. N. (1897) 62 433
Hughes's Patent, [1879] L. R. 4 App. Cas. 174; 48 L. J. C. P. 20. ii. 179, 180
Hughes's Patent, [1898] 15 R. P. C. 371 . . . . . . ii. 184, 185
Hull *v.* Bolland, [1856] 1 H. & N. 134; 25 L. J. Ex. 304 . . 418, 456
Hullett *v.* Hague, [1831] 9 L. J. (O. S.) K. B. 242; 2 B. & Ad. 370; 1 Carp. P. C. 501. . . . . 11, 120
Hulton and Bleakley's Petition, [1898] 15 R. P. C. 749 . . . ii. 139
Humpherson *v.* Syer, [1887] 4 R. P. C. 184, 407 . 15, 108, 109, 121, 126, 127, 131, 146, 526, 535
Humphreys' Patent, 1 W. P. C. 7; Noy, R. 183 106
Hunt *v.* Chambers, [1882] L. R. 20 Ch. 365 476
Hunt *v.* City of London Real Property Co., [1877] L. R. 3 Q. B. D. 19 481
Hunt *v.* Hunt, [1884] 54 L. J. Ch. 289 438
Hutchinson *v.* Patullo, [1887-88] 4 R. P. C. 329; 5 R. P. C. 351 . 185, 193, 224, 269
Hutchinson's Patent, [1861] 14 M. P. C. 222, 364 . . . ii. 167, 171, 183
Huth's Patent, [1884] Griff. P. C. 292 . . . . ii. 37
Hyam *v.* Terry, [1880] 29 W. R. 536

Incandescent Gas Light Co. *v.* Brogden, [1899] 16 R. P. C. 179 . 375, 378: ii. 142
Incandescent Gas Light Co. *v.* Cantelo, [1895] 12 R. P. C. 262 . 378: ii. 142
Incandescent Gas Light Co. *v.* De Mare Incandescent Gas Light System, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 301, 559 . . 62, 211, 212, 272, 281, 339, 342, 343, 345, 346, 366, 369, 384, 533
Incandescent Gas Light Co. *v.* Keegan, [1899] 17 R. P. C. 44 . . 490
Incandescent Gas Light Co. *v.* New Incandescent Mantle Co., [1897] 15 R. P. C. 81; 76 L. T. N. S. 47 . . . . 372, 373, 479
Incandescent Gas Light Co. *v.* Riemer, [1900] 17 R. P. C. 378 . . 490
Incandescent Gas Light Co. *v.* Sluces, [1900] 17 R. P. C. 173 . 490, 491
Incandescent Gas Light Co. *v.* Sunlight Incandescent Gas Lamp Co., [1896] 13 R. P. C. 333; 14 R. P. C. 180 . . 316, 345, 346, 384, 532, 533

PAGE

Ingram's Patent, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 446 305
Innes v. Beal, [1898] 15 R. P. C. 449 (*See* Addenda) 372

J and J's Patent, [1902] 19 R. P. C. 555. . . . . ii. 35
Jablochkoff's Patent, [1891] 8 R. P. C. 281; L. R. (1891) A. C. 293; 60 L. J. P. C. 61 . . . . ii. 168, 170
Jackson v. Needle, [1884] 1 R. P. C. 174; 2 R. P. C. 191 . 33, 431, 432, 439
Jackson v. Wolstenholms, [1884] 1 R. P. C. 105 . . . . . 250, 336
Jackson's Patent, [1905] 22 R. P. C. 384 300
Jahncke v. Bell, [1892] 9 R. P. C. 94 356
Jameson's Patent, [1902] 19 R. P. C. 246 . . . . 19, 296, 301
Jandus Arc Lamp and Electric Co., Ld. v. Arc Lamp Co., [1903] 21 R. P. C. 115; 22 R. P. C. 384 . . 29, 30, 42, 84, 286, 490: ii. 75, 97
Jandus Arc Lamp and Electric Co., Ld. v. Johnson, [1900] 17 R. P. C. 361 . . . . 283: ii. 154
Jardine v. King, Mendham & Co., [1896] 13 R. P. C. 411 . . 356, 524
Jenkins v. Hope, [1895] 13 R. P. C. 57 . . . . . . 337, 487, 488
Jenson v. Smith, [1885] 2 R. P. C. 249 . . . . 74, 137
Jessop, *Re*, 1 W. P. C. 42 n.; Dav. P. C. 182 76
Johnson v. Edge, [1892] 9 R. P. C. 142; L. R. (1892) 2 Ch. 1; 61 L. J. Ch. 262 . . . . 317, 318, 322
Johnson v. Wyatt, [1863] 2 De G. J. & S. 18, 25 487
Johnson and Atkinson's Patent, [1873] L. R. 5 P. C. 87 . ii. 165, 182, 190, 192
Johnson's Patent, [1871] L. R. 4 P. C. 75; 8 Moo. P. C. N. S. 282 . ii. 165, 166, 187, 189, 194
Johnson's Patent, [1877] L. R. 5 Ch. D. 503 . . . . ii. 76
Johnson's Patent, [1878] L. R. 13 Ch. D. 398 n. . . . . . . ii. 52
Johnson's Patent, [1896] 13 R. P. 659 . . . . . ii. 68, 71, 72, 75, 77
Johnson's Patent, [1901] 19 R. P. C. 56 . . . . 25: ii. 71
Jones v. Berger, [1843] 3 M. & G. 208; 1 W. P. C. 544, 178 n. . 141, 402, 418, 421, 425, 426
Jones v. Heaton, 1 W. P. C. 404 n. 239
Jones v. Lee, [1856] 25 L. J. Ex. 241; 26 L. J. Ex. 9; 1 H. & N. 189 398
Jones v. Monte Video Gas Co., [1880] L. R. 5 Q. B. D. 556 448
Jones v. Pearce, [1832] 1 W. P. C. 121, 122; 5 M. & G. 208 . 6, 119, 120, 121, 171, 373, 374, 468
Jones's Patent, [1840] 1 W. P. C. 577 . . . . . . ii. 174, 179, 180
Jones's Patent, [1854] 9 Moo. P. C. 41 . . . . ii. 194
Jones's Patent, [1887] Griff. L. O. C. 33 . . . . ii. 9, 17, 29, 36, 39, 63
Jordan v. Moore, [1866] L. R. 1 C. P. 624; 35 L. J. C. P. 268 . 81, 91, 251, 280
Joy's Patent, [1893] 10 R. P. C. 89 . . . . ii. 193
Jupe v. Pratt, [1837] 1 W. P. C. 144, 145 . . 51, 53, 62, 268, 342, 403
Justice's Patent, [1900] 18 R. P. C. 240. . . . . ii. 83

Kane v. Boyle (J.) & Co., [1901] 18 R. P. C. 325 488
Kane v. Guest, [1899] 16 R. P. C. 433 . . . . 518, 521
Kay v. Marshall, [1836-41] 1 My. & Cr. 373; 1 Keen, 190; 5 Bing. N. C. 492; 7 Scott, 548; 8 L. J. C. P. 261; 2 W. P. C. 71, 79; 8 Cl. & F. 245; 5 Jur. 1028 . . . . 81, 84, 93, 113, 243, 277, 393
Kaye v. Chubb, [1888] 4 R. P. C. 23, 289; 5 R. P. C. 641 . 145, 242, 266, 269, 277, 284, 352, 459, 517, 518, 534

PAGE
Kay's Patent, [1839] 1 W. P. C. 568; 3 Moo. P. C. 24 . ii. 173, 176, 177, 188
Kay's Patent, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 279 303
Keely v. Heathman, [1890] 7 R. P. C. 343 247
Kelley's Patent, [1900] 17 R. P. C. 476 . . . . ii. 176
Kelly v. Batchelor, [1893] 10 R. P. C. 289 . . . . . . 371, 470
Kelly v. Byles, [1879] L. R. 13 Ch. D. 682 533
Kempton and Mollan's Patent, [1905] 22 R. P. C. 373 . . . . . ii. 27
Kenny's Patent Button-holing Co. v. Somervell, [1878] 26 W. R. 787; 38 L. J. N. S. 870 . . . . ii. 124, 125, 139
Kensington and Knightsbridge Electric Light Co. v. Lane-Fox Electrical Co., [1891] 8 R. P. C. 277; L. R. (1891) 2 Ch. 573 . 313, 314, 318, 323, 438
Kerr and Hoeggen v. Crompton and Horrocks, [1901] 19 R. P. C. 9 513, 520
Kerrison v. Smith, [1897] L. R. (1897) 2 Q. B. 445 . . . . . ii. 141
Kilner's Patent, [1889] 8 R. P. C. 35 . . . . ii. 45
King Brown v. Anglo-American Brush Corporation, [1889-92] 6 R. P. C. 414; 7 R. P. C. 436; 9 R. P. C. 313 . 39, 131, 148, 150, 190, 193, 196, 221, 283, 419
King & Co.'s Trade Mark, [1892] 9 R. P. C. 350; L. R. (1892) 2 Ch. 462; 62 L. J. Ch. 153 . . . . 302, 303
Klaber's Patent, [1902] 19 R. P. C. 174 108
Klaber's Patent, [1904] 22 R. P. C. 1, 205; 23 R. P. C. 461 . . 207: ii. 83
Knight, *Re*, [1886] Griff. L. O. C. 35 . . . . ii. 8
Knott v. Morgan, 2 Keen, 213 333
Kollman's Patent, [1839] 1 W. P. C. 564 . . . . ii. 181
Kopp v. Rosenwald, [1902] 19 R. P. C. 205; 20 R. P. C. 154 . 64, 65, 227, 324
Kratz-Boussac v. Bechmann, [1905] 22 R. P. C. 448 39
Kurtz v. Spence, [1886-88] 3 R. P. C. 368; 4 R. P. C. 427; 5 R. P. C. 161; L. R. 33 Ch. D. 579; L. R. 36 Ch. D. 770; 55 L. J. Ch. 919; 57 L. J. Ch. 238 . 13, 15, 126, 163, 203, 208, 255, 312, 315, 317, 323, 402, 466
Kynoch and Co., Ld. v. Webb, [1899] 15 R. P. C. 269; 17 R. P. C. 100 . . . . 76, 77, 245, 246, 247, 251, 287, 476

La Société Anonyme Trade Mark, [1893] 10 R. P. C. 290 304
Lacy's Patent, [1890] 7 R. P. C. 469 . . . . ii. 77
Lainson v. Tremere, 1 A. & E. 792 . . . . ii. 115
Lake's Patent, [1887] Griff. L. O. C. 16 . . . . . . ii. 65, 68, 71, 89
Lake's Patent, [1887] Griff. L. O. C. 35 . . . . ii. 35
Lake's Patent, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 415 . . . . ii. 30, 32, 33
Lake's Patent, [1889] 6 R. P. C. 548 . . . . ii. 29
Lake's Patent, [1891] 8 R. P. C. 228 . . . . ii. 184, 185
Lamb v. Evans, [1893] 1 Ch. 218 16
Lamb v. Nottingham Manufacturing Co., cited L. R. 19 Eq. 230 . 398
Lambert Co. v. International Phonograph Indestructible Record Co., Ld., [1903] 20 R. P. C. 705; 21 R. P. C. 247 . . . . . 340, 366
Lancashire Explosives Co. v. Roburite Explosives Co., [1895-97] 12 R. P. C. 393, 470; 13 R. P. C. 429; 14 R. P. C. 303 . 41, 64, 153, 335, 336, 345, 484, 492, 493, 535
Lancaster's Patent, [1864] 2 Moo. P. C. N. S. 189 . . . . . ii. 192
Lancaster's Patent, [1884] Griff. P. C. 293 . . . . . ii. 28, 35, 36, 41
Lancaster's Patent, [1902] 20 R. P. C. 366 . . . . ii. 50
Lane v. Herold, [1892] 9 R. P. C. 447 . . . . 342, 348

PAGE
Lane-Fox v. Kensington and Knightsbridge Electric Lighting Co., [1892] 9 R. P. C. 221, 413; L. R. (1892) 3 Ch. 424; 67 L. T. N. S. 440 . . . 29, 165, 191, 193: ii. 65, 67
Lane-Fox's Patent, [1892] 9 R. P. C. 411 . . . ii. 173, 177, 186
Lang v. Gisborne, [1862] 31 Beav. 133; 31 L. J. Ch. 769; 6 L. T. N. S. 771 . . . 6, 142, 143
Lang v. Whitecross Co., [1889] 6 R, P. C. 570; 7 R. P. C. 389 . . . ii. 93, 97
Lang's Patent, [1890] 7 R. P. C. 469 . . . ii. 78, 100
Law v. Ashworth, [1890] 7 R. P. C. 86 . . . 324
Lawes v. Purser, [1856] 6 E. & B. 930; 26 L. J. Q. B. 25 . . . ii. 148, 154
Lawrence v. Perry, [1885] 2 R. P. C. 179 . . . 141, 164, 282, 358: ii. 91
Lawrence's Patent, [1892] 9 R. P. C. 85 . . . ii. 178, 183
Lawrie v. Baker, [1885] 2 R. P. C. 213 . . . 517
Lawson v. Donald Macpherson & Co., [1897] 14 R. P. C. 696 . . . ii. 145
Leadbeater v. Kitchin, [1890] 7 R. P. C. 235 . . . 251, 277
Leaf v. Topham, [1845] 14 M. & W. 146; 14 L. J. Ex. 231 . . . 426
Leather-Cloth Co. v. Hirschfeld, [1863-66] 1 H. & M. 295; L. R. 1 Eq. 299. . . . 447, 499
Ledgard v. Bull, [1886] L. R. 11 App. Cas. 648. *See also* 3 R. P. C. 390 . . . 396
Ledsam v. Russell, [1847] 1 H. L. C. 687. *See* Russell v. Ledsam . ii. 167, 174, 193
Lee v. Wigan, &c., Co., [1895] L. 568 . . . 523
Leeds Forge Co. v. Clayton, [1905] 22 R. P. C. 325 . . . 291
Leeds Forge Co. v. Deighton's Patent Flue and Tube Co., [1901] 18 R. P. C. 233; 19 R. P. C. 285; 20 R. P. C. 185; 21 R. P. C. 487 267, 283, 286, 484, 528, 535
Lee's Patent, [1856] 10 Moo. P. C. 226 . . . ii. 176
Lee's Patent, [1906] 23 R. P. C. 233 . . . 305
Lees v. West London Cycle Works, [1892] 9 R. P. C. 300 . . . 334, 523
Legge v. Wakeham, [1893] 10 R. P. C. 379 . . . 478
Leggott v. McGeoch, [1893] 10 R. P. C. 429 . . . 77, 243
Leonardt v. Kallé, [1894-95] 11 R. P. C. 534; 12 R. P. C. 103, 306 . 215, 279, 427, 428, 532, 534
Levenstein's Patent, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 349 . . . ii. 29, 47
Lewis v. Davis, [1829] 3 Car. & P. 502; 1 W. P. C. 488; 1 Carp. P. C. 471 . . . 67, 75, 171
Lewis v. Marling, [1829] 10 B. & C. 22; 4 Car. & P. 52; 1 W. P. C. 290 . . . 9, 39, 124, 130, 133, 169, 170, 202, 203, 228, 235, 467
Lewis and Stinckler's Patent, [1897] 14 R. P. C. 24 . . . 154, 204, 306
Liardet v. Electric Lighting Co., [1883] W. N. (1883) 96 . . . ii. 148
Liardet v. Johnson, [1778] 1 W. P. C. 53; 1 Carp. P. C. 35 . 32, 224, 234, 235
Lifeboat Co. v. Chambers, [1891] 8 R. P. C. 418 . . . 133, 224
Lindon's Patent, [1897] 14 R. P. C. 643 . . . ii. 167, 170
Lines v. Usher, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 685; 14 R. P. C. 206 . . . ii. 154
Linoleum Co. v. Nairn, [1877] L. R. 7 Ch. D. 834 . . . ii. 12
Lister v. Dix, [1898] 16 R. P. C. 89 . . . 283
Lister v. Eastwood, [1855-64] 3 C. L. R. 1249; 26 L. T. 4; 9 L. T. N. S. 766 . . . 380, 435
Lister v. Leather, [1857-58] 3 Jur. N. S. 433, 811; 5 W. R. 603; 8 E. & B. 1004, 1031; 27 L. J. Q. B. 295; 4 K. & J. 425 . 53, 67, 71, 75, 76, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 352, 456
Lister v. Norton, [1884-86] 1 R. P. C. 114; 2 R. P. C. 68, 135; 3 R. P. C. 199 . 83, 127, 133, 145, 277, 427, 428, 432, 438, 439, 442, 443, 446, 517

PAGE
Lister *v.* Wood, Seton, 3rd ed. p. 909 391
L'Oiseau and Pierrard's Application, [1887] Griff. L. O. C. 36 . ii. 21, 23, 28, 36
London, Chatham and Dover Ry. Co. *v.* South Eastern Ry. Co., [1893] L. R. (1893) A. C. 429 . . . . ii. 155
London and Leicester Hosiery Co. *v.* Griswold, [1886] 3 R. P. C. 250 . 410: ii. 114, 117
London and Leicester Hosiery Co. *v.* Higham, Lawson, 2nd ed. p. 498 425
London and South-Western Ry. Co. *v.* Groom, [1881] L. R. 20 Ch. D. 589 533
Longbottom *v.* Shaw, [1888-91] 5 R. P. C. 497; 6 R. P. C. 143, 510; 8 R. P. C. 333; L. R. 43 Ch. D. 46; 58 L. J. Ch. 734; 61 L. T. N. S. 325; 37 W. R. 792 . 31, 32, 33, 40, 79, 81, 93, 108, 330, 417, 511, 521, 523
Longmaid's Patent, 1 Eng. 347 . . . . ii. 177
Loog *v.* Bean, [1884] L. R. 26 Ch. D. 306 310
Lorrain's Patent, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 142 . . . . . . ii. 36, 39, 41, 47
Losh *v.* Hague, [1837-39] 1 W. P. C. 200; 8 L. J. Ex. 251; 5 M. & W. 387 . . . . 6, 31, 55, 81, 85, 128, 129, 386, 429, 433, 461
Lovell *v.* Hicks, [1836] 2 Y. & C. 46; 5 L. J. Ex. 101; 6 L. J. Ex. 85. ii. 115
Lowe's Patent, [1856] 25 L. J. Ch. 454 . . . . ii. 8, 29
Lowe's Patent, [1846] 2 W. P. C. 158 . . . . ii. 181
Lowe's Patent, [1852] 10 Jur. 363 . . . . ii. 183
Lowndes *v.* Davies, [1834] 6 Sim. 468 442
Lucas *v.* Miller, [1885] 2 R. P. C. 155 . 165, 183, 189, 190, 196, 250, 336, 465
Lucas (Joseph) Ld. *v.* Miller (H) and Co. [1899] 17 R. P. C. 165 . 474, 478
Lucas' Patent, [1854] Macr. P. C. 235 . . . . ii. 68, 79, 81
Ludington Cigarette Machine Co. *v.* Baron Cigarette Machine Co., [1900] 1 Ch. 508; 17 R. P. C. 25, 214, 745 . . . . ii. 80, 94, 98
Luke's Patent, [1886] Griff. P. C. 294 . . . . ii. 27, 29, 31, 33, 34
Lumly *v.* Gye, [1853] 2 E. & B. 216 372
Lupton and Place's Patent, [1897] 14 R. P. C. 261 . . . . . ii. 49
Lycett Saddle and Motor Accessories Co., Ld. *v.* Brook (T. B.) & Co., Ld., [1904] 21 R. P. C. 656 . . . . 319, 320
Lynde's Patent, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 663 . . . . ii. 42, 47, 48
Lyon *v.* Goddard, [1893-94] 10 R. P. C. 121, 334, 348; 11 R. P. C. 113, 354 . . 39, 42, 57, 68, 112, 120, 227, 233, 241, 342, 375, 465, 487, 489, 497
Lyon *v.* Mayor and Corporation of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 218 439
Lyons *v.* Martin, [1838] 8 A. & E. 512; 3 N. & P. 509 389
Lyon's Patent, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 537 . . . . ii. 176, 192

Macdonald *v.* Fraser, [1893] 10 R. P. C. 386; 11 R. P. C. 169 . . 351
MacDougall *v.* General Sewage and Manure Co., [1875] W. N. (1875) 64 479
Macevoy's Patent, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 285 . . . . . . ii. 35, 36, 87
Macfarlane *v.* Price, [1818] 1 Stark. N. P. 199; 1 W. P. C. 74 n. . 200, 225, 244
Macfarlane's Patent, Johns. Pat. 6th ed. 165 . . . . . . 13, 15
MacIntosh *v.* Everington, 2 Carp. R. 180, 191 211
Macintosh's Patent, [1837] 1 W. P. C. 739 n. . . . . . ii. 170, 194
Mackelcan *v.* Rennie, [1862] 13 C. B. N. S. 52 . 81, 185, 236, 244, 283, 289
Mackie *v.* Salvo Laundry Co., [1892] 9 R. P. C. 465 325

PAGE
Macnamara *v.* Hulse, [1842] Car. & M. 471; 2 W. P. C. 128 n. . 215, 228, 237, 402
Magee *v.* Tangyes, [1897] 14 R. P. C. 255 194
Main's Patent, [1890] 7 R. P. C. 13 . . . . ii. 20, 23
Makepeace *v.* Jackson, 4 Taunt. 770 13
Mallet's Patent, [1866] L. R. 1 C. P. 308; 4 Moo. P. C. N. S. 175 . ii. 180, 192
Mandelberg *v.* Morley, [1893-95] 10 R. P. C. 256; 11 R. P. C. 1; 12 R. P. C. 35; 64 L. J. Ch. 245; 72 L. T. N. S. 106; 43 W. R. 266; 13 R. 322 . . . . 396, 398, 520, 521, 523
Manning's Patent, [1902] 20 R. P. C. 74 . . . . ii. 60
Mansell's Patent, [1624] 1 W. P. C. 19 137
Manton *v.* Manton, [1815] Dav. P. C. 333; 1 Carp. P. C. 278; 1 W. P. C. 192 n. 158, 162, 461
Manton *v.* Parker, [1815] Dav. P. C. 327; 1 W. P. C. n., 484 n. . 113, 158, 162, 167, 464
Markwick's Patent, [1860] 13 Moo. P. C. 310; 8 W. R. 333 . ii. 123, 183, 191
Marsden *v.* Saville Street Foundry and Engineering Co., [1878] L. R. 3 Ex. D. 203 18
Marsden's Patent, [1896] 12 R. P. C. 87 . . . . . . ii. 37, 42, 46
Marsden's Patent, [1897] 14 R. P. C. 174 . . . . ii. 46
Marshall and Naylor's Patent, [1900] 17 R. P. C. 553 . . . 16, 300, 301
Marshall's Application, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 661 . . . 46: ii. 30, 32
Marshall's, Ld. *v.* Chameleon Patents Manufacturing Co., [1901] 18 R. P. C. 400 282
Martin's Patent, Griff. P. C. 320 . . . . 296, 297
Massam *v.* T. W. Thorley's Cattle Food Co., [1877-80] L. R. 6 Ch. D. 574; L. R. 14 Ch. D. 748 334
Massey *v.* Haynes, [1888] L. R. 21 Q. B. D. 330 391
Master Wardens and Society of Gunmakers *v.* Fell, Willis, R. 388 . 26
Mathers *v.* Green, [1865] L. R. 1 Ch. 29; 34 L. J. Ch. 298; 34 Beav. 170; 35 L. J. Ch. 1 . . . . ii. 113, 132
Mathews *v.* Parmentier, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 514 . . . . . 116, 121
Mathias *v.* Yates, [1882] 46 L. T. N. S. 497 390
Maxim and Silverman's Patent, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 314 . . ii. 37, 47
Maxim-Nordenfelt Guns and Ammunition Co. *v.* Anderson, [1897] 14 R. P. C. 371, 671; 15 R. P. C. 421 . . . . 212, 255, 270, 370: ii. 146
Mayer *v.* Spence, [1860] 1 J. & H. 87 430
McAlpine *v.* Mangnall, [1846] 15 L. J. C. P. 298 . . . . . ii. 125
McCormick *v.* Gray, [1861] 7 H. & N. 25; 31 L. J. Ex. 42 . . 336, 371
McDougall *v.* Partington, [1890] 7 R. P. C. 216 . . . . . . ii. 105
McDougal's Patent, [1884] 2 R. P. C. 11 . . . . ii. 178
McDougall's Patent, [1867] L. R. 2 P. C. 1; 37 L. J. P. C. 17; 5 Moo. P. C. N. S. 1 . . . . ii. 175, 176, 178
McGruther *v.* Pitcher, [1904] 2 Ch. 307 379
McHardy's Patent, [1891] 8 R. P. C. 432 . . . . ii. 42
McInnes' Patent, [1868] L. R. P. C. 54; 37 L. J. P. C. 23; 5 Moo. P. C. N. S. 72 . . . . ii. 175, 176, 178, 189
McLay *v.* Lawes & Co., Ld., [1905] 22 R. P. C. 199 97
McNaught *v.* Dawson, [1905] 22 R. P. C. 289; 23 R. P. C. 219 . . 40
Meadows *v.* Kirkman, [1860] 29 L. J. Ex. 205 . . . . . 450, 451
Medlock's Patent, [1865] Newton, Lond. Jour. (N. S.) vol. xxii. p. 69 . 211: ii. 78, 80
Merchant Shipping Co. *v.* Armitage, [1873] L. R. 9 Q. B. 99 . . ii. 155

PAGE
Merry *v.* Nickalls, [1873] L. R. 8 Ch. App. Cas. 205 536
Meyenburg and The Clayton Anilin Co.'s Application *v.* Meyer's Patent, [1899] 16 R. P. C. 526. . . . . ii. 35, 36, 45
Meyer's Patent, [1899] 16 R. P. C. 526 . . . . ii. 88
Mica Insulator Co. *v.* Bruce Peebles & Co., Ld., [1905] 22 R. P. C. 363, 527 . . . . 395, 396
Mica Insulator Co. *v.* Electrical Co., [1898] 15 R. P. C. 489 418
Middleton *v.* Bradley, [1895] 12 R. P. C. 390; L. R. (1895) 2 Ch. 716; 64 L. J. Ch. 888; 73 L. T. N. S. 81; 43 W. R. 684; 13 R. 737 520, 521
Millar *v.* Taylor, 4 Burr. 2303 . . . . ii. 101
Miller *v.* Barker, [1893] 10 R. P. C. 106 165
Miller *v.* Clyde Bridge Street Co., [1891] 8 R. P. C. 198; 9 R. P. C. 470 358
Miller *v.* Searle, [1893] 10 R. P. C. 106 . 165, 190, 196, 223, 287, 289, 404, 478
Miller's Patent, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 55 304
Miller's Patent, [1898] 15 R. P. C. 205, 718 . . . . 135, 137: ii. 50, 83
Milligan *v.* Marsh, [1856] 2 Jur. N. S. 1083 . . . . . . 18: ii. 23
Mills *v.* Carson, [1892] 9 R. P. C. 338; 10 R. P. C. 9 . . . . . ii. 154
Mills's Patent, [1901] 18 R. P. C. 322 . . . . ii. 18, 49
Milner's Patent, [1854] 9 Moo. P. C. 39 . . . . ii. 194
Milner's Patent, [1898] 15 R. P. C. 205 119
Minter *v.* Mower, [1835] 1 W. P. C. 140; 4 L. J. Ex. 72; 6 A. & E. 735 . . . . 12, 71, 75, 120, 222
Minter *v.* Wells, [1834] 1 W. P. C. 127; 1 C. M. & R. 505; 4 A. & E. 251; 4 L. J. Ex. 2 . . . . . 6, 13, 48, 51, 159, 338, 459, 461, 464
Minter *v.* Williams, [1835] 4 A. & E. 251; 5 L. K. J. B. 60; 1 W. P. C. 135 376
Mitchell *v.* Reynolds, [1713] 1 P. Wms. 181; 10 Moo. 130 . . . . 2, 26
Mitchell's Patent, [1847] 30 Newton, L. J. O. S. 356 . . . . . ii. 193
Moncrieff's Patent, 22 Iron, 35 . . . . ii. 193
Monforts *v.* Marsden, [1895] 12 R. P. C. 266 . . . . ii. 121
Monnet *v.* Beck, [1897] 14 R. P. C. 777 . . 58, 145, 202, 203, 251, 532, 533
Monopolies, Case of, Noy, 182. *See* Darcy *v.* Allin
Montain *v.* Parker, [1903] 20 R. P. C. 769 330
Montgomerie *v.* Paterson, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 221, 633 . . 278, 310, 342, 371
Moore *v.* Bennett, [1884] 2 R. P. C. 129 . 242, 243, 245, 246, 464, 477, 516
Moore *v.* Craven, [1874] L. R. 7 Ch. App. 94 442
Moore *v.* Thomson, [1890] 7 R. P. C. 325. *See* Thomson *v.* Moore . 63, 282, 341, 356, 408
Morewood *v.* Tupper, [1885] 3 C. L. R. 718 380
Morey's Patent, [1858] 25 Beav. 581; 6 W. R. 612 . . . . . ii. 60
Morgan *v.* Fuller, [1866] L. R. 2 Eq. 297 . . . . 406, 421
Morgan *v.* Seaward, [1835-37] 1 W. P. C. 167, 187; 2 Carp. P. C. 37, 96, 104; 2 M. & W. 544; 6 L. J. Ex. 153; 1 Jur. 527; M. & H. 55 55, 73, 79, 112, 113, 124, 126, 131, 133, 134, 135, 136, 159, 160, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 169, 170, 180, 204, 205, 214, 218, 221, 223, 228, 232, 234, 289, 298, 345, 352, 403, 430, 437, 439, 454, 466, 468, 471
Morgan *v.* Windover, [1887-90] 4 R. P. C. 422; 5 R. P. C. 295; 7 R. P. C. 139, 446 . 32, 33, 39, 40, 69, 81, 83, 93, 99, 119, 121, 131, 171, 466
Morgan's Patent, [1843] 1 W. P. C. 737 . . . . 183, 189: ii. 163, 174, 175
Morgan's Patent, [1876] 24 W. R. 245 . . . . ii. 60, 77
Morgan's Patent, [1886] Griff. L. O. C. 17 . . . . . . ii. 71, 75, 89
Morgan's Patent, [1887] 5 R. P. C. 186 295
Morgan-Brown's Patent, [1886] 3 R. P. C. 212 . . . . . . ii. 194
Morrell *v.* Pearson, [1849] 12 Beav. 284 486

PAGE

Morris *v.* Branson, [1776] Bull N. P. 76; 1 Carp. P. C. 30; 1 W. P. C. 51 . . . . 71, 75
Morris *v.* Young, [1895] 12 R. P. C. 455 . . 71, 145, 270, 276, 336, 342, 356, 485, 519, 526, 528
Morrison *v.* Asplen, [1904] 21 R. P. C. 557 528
Morris Wilson & Co. *v.* Coventry Machinists Co., [1891] 3 Ch. 419; 8 R. P. C. 353 415
Morton *v.* Middleton, [1863] 1 Ct. of Sess., 3rd series, 721 67
Morton's Patent, 51 Eng. 274; 17 Iron, 250 . . . . ii. 191
Moseley *v.* Victoria Rubber Co., [1886-87] 3 R. P. C. 351; 4 R. P. C. 241; 55 L. T. N. S. 482 . 67, 72, 121, 147, 183, 189, 190, 196, 218, 219, 239, 397, 445
Moser *v.* Jones, [1893] 10 R. P. C. 368 . . . . . . 431, 435, 437
Moser *v.* Marsden, [1892-96] 10 R. P. C. 205, 350; 13 R. P. C. 24: 73 L. T. N. S. 667 . . . . 71, 75, 191, 390: ii. 4, 23, 66, 67, 75, 99
Moser *v.* Sewell, [1893] 10 R. P. C. 365 . . . . 435, 437
Moss *v.* Malins, [1886] 3 R. P. C. 373; L. R. 33 Ch. D. 603; 56 L. J. Ch. 126 . . . . 67, 68, 133, 414, 455, 463, 533
Muirhead *v.* Commercial Cable Co., [1894-95] 11 R. P. C. 317; 12 R. P. C. 39, 258, 370 . . . . 73, 282, 476: ii. 149, 155
Mullins *v.* Hart, [1852] 3 Car. & K. 297 133
Muntz *v.* Foster, [1843-44] 2 W. P. C. 93 . 58, 81, 99, 128, 129, 151, 208, 211, 214, 289, 306, 338, 370, 373, 374, 433
Muntz *v.* Grenfell, [1842] 2 W. P. C. 91; 2 Coop. Ch. Cas. 59 . 411, 437
Muntz *v.* Vivian, [1840] 2 W. P. C. 87 430
Muntz's Patent, [1846] 2 W. P. C. 113 . . . . ii. 189
Murchland *v.* Nicholson, [1893] 10 R. P. C. 417 264
Murray *v.* Clayton, [1872] L. R. 15 Eq. 115; L. R. 7 Ch. 570; L. R. 10 Ch. 675 n.; 42 L. J. Ch. 191; 21 W. R. 498 . 12, 31, 56, 67, 68, 69, 70, 79, 119, 152, 171, 248, 352, 499
Musgrave *v.* Hicks, [1886] 3 R. P. C. 49 . . . . 531, 532
Myddleton *v.* Lord Kenyon, 2 Ves. Jr. 408 106
Myers's Patent, [1882] W. N. (1882) 53, 76 . . . . ii. 60

NADEL *v.* Martin, [1902] 20 R. P. C. 129, 721, 723; 23 R. P. C. 41 484: ii. 120
Nähmaschinen Fabrik *v.* Singer Manufacturing Co., [1893] 10 R. P. C. 310 316
Nairn's Patent, [1891] R. P. C. 444 . . . . ii. 76
Nanhsen's Patent, [1900] 17 R. P. C. 203 . . . . ii. 37
Napier's Patent, [1861] 13 Moo. P. C. 543; 9 W. R. 390 . ii. 123, 164, 180
Napier's Patent, [1881] L. R. 6 App. Cas. 174; 50 L. J. C. P. 40; 29 W. R. 745 . . . . ii. 176
National Company for the Distribution of Electricity by Secondary Generators, Ld. *v.* Gibbs, [1899] 2 Ch. 289; [1900] 2 Ch. 280; 16 R. P. C. 339; 17 R. P. C. 302 . . . . ii. 110, 111
National Opalite Glazed Brick and Tile Co., Ld. *v.* Grand Hotel (Birmingham), Ld., [1902] 18 R. P. C. 249 469
National Opalite Glazed Brick and Tile Syndicate *v.* Ceralite Syndicate, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 658 489
Needham *v.* Johnson, [1884] 1 R. P. C. 49 . . 53, 272, 273, 276, 353, 515
Needham *v.* Oxley, [1863] 8 L. T. N. S. 604; 11 W. R. 852; Pemberton, 4th ed. 485; Seton, 4th ed. 352, 353; 1 H. & M. 248: 2 N. R. 232, 267, 388 . . . . 396, 397, 498, 509, 533

PAGE
Neil v. Macdonald, [1902] 20 R. P. C. 213 . . . . ii. 114
Neilson v. Betts, [1868-71] L. R. 3 Ch. D. 429; L. R. 5 H. L. 1; 34 L. J. Ch. 537; 40 L. J. Ch. 317; 3 De G. J. & S. 22; 6 N. R. 221; 18 L. T. N. S. 159; 13 W. R. 804; 11 Jur. N. S. 679 . 155, 212, 260, 494, 499, 501
Neilson v. Fothergill, [1841] 1 W. P. C. 287 . . . . ii. 151
Neilson v. Harford, [1841] 1 W. P. C. 295, 324 n., 331, 373; 10 L. J. Ex. 493; 11 L. J. Ex. 20; 2 Coop. Ch. Ca. 61 n.; 8 M. & W. 806 31, 45, 46, 73, 159, 179, 203, 205, 214, 215, 218, 219, 224, 233, 236, 253, 265, 266, 268, 270, 277, 342, 402, 406, 426
Neilson v. Thompson, [1841] 1 W. P. C. 278; 2 Coop. Ch. Ca. 61 n. . 222, 428, 431, 433, 436, 437, 439
Nettlefolds v. Reynolds, [1891-92] 8 R. P. C. 410; 9 R. P. C. 270 . 356, 414, 416
New Conveyor Co., Ld. v. Edinburgh and Leith Gas Commissioners, [1903] 21 R. P. C. 1, 147 . . . . ii. 99
New Inverted Incandescent Gas Lamp Co., Ld. v. General Incandescent Co., Ld., [1905] 22 R. P. C. 614 . . . . . . 520, 521
New Inverted Incandescent Gas Lamp Co., Ld. v. Globe Light, Ld., [1905] 22 R. P. C. 431; 23 R. P. C. 157 . . . . . . 514, 524
New Ixion Tyre and Cycle Co. v. Spilsbury, [1898] 15 R. P. C. 380; [1898] 2 Ch. 484 . . . . ii. 121, 153
Newall v. Elliott, [1858] 4 C. B. N. S. 269; 27 L. J. C. P. 337; 4 Jur. N. S. 562 . . . . 61, 124, 196, 414
Newall v. Elliott, [1863] 9 Jur. N. S. 359; 10 Jur. N. S. 954; 7 L. T. N. S. 753; 10 L. T. N. S. 792; 32 L. J. Ex. 120; 11 W. R. 438; 13 W. R. 11 . . . . 183, 188, 190, 336, 373, 381
Newall v. Wilson, [1852] 2 De G. M. & G. 282; 19 L. T. 161 . 248, 434, 435, 438
Newburry v. James, 2 Mer. 446; 1 Carp. P. C. 367 . . . . 222: ii. 104
Newby v. Harrison, [1861] 3 De G. F. & J. 287; 2 H. & M. 628; 1 J. & H. 393 . . . . 438: ii. 156
Newcomen v. Coulson, [1877] L. R. 7 Ch. D. 764 438
Newman's Patent, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 271, 279; Griff. L. O. C. 40 . ii. 29, 34, 36, 39, 41, 42, 44, 46, 47
Newsum v. Mann, [1890] 7 R. P. C. 307 . . . . 33, 40
Newton v. Grand Junction Ry. Co., [1846] 5 Exch. 331; 20 L. J. Ex. 427 n. 110, 152, 348, 352
Newton v. Vaucher, [1851] 6 Exch. 859; 21 L. J. Ex. 305 . 58, 81, 102, 277, 278
Newton's Patent, [1861] 14 Moo. P. C. 156 . . . . . ii. 162, 180, 193
Newton's Patent, [1862] 15 Moo. P. C. 176; 9 Jur. N. S. 109 . . ii. 187
Newton's Patent, [1881] 51 Eng. 208; 17 Iron, 155, 171 . . ii. 189, 194
Newton's Patent, [1884] L. R. 9 App. Cas. 592; 1 R. P. C. 177; 52 L. T. 329 . . . . ii. 161, 183, 187, 190, 194
Newton's Patent, [1899] 17 R. P. C. 123 . . . . 46, 47, 48
Nickels v. Haslam, [1844] 7 M. & G. 378; 8 Scott, N. R. 97; 13 L. J. C. P. 146 178
Nickels v. Ross, [1849] 8 C. B. 679 . . . . 17, 18, 459: ii. 32
Nickels's Patent, [1841] 1 W. P. C. 650; 4 Beav. 563 . . . . . ii. 76
Nicoll v. Swears, [1893] 10 R. P. C. 240. . . . . 81, 94
Nicols v. Pitman, [1884] L. R. 26 Ch. D. 374. 386
Nobel's Explosives Co. v. Anderson, [1894-95] 11 R. P. C. 128; 12 R. P. C. 164 . . . . 52, 62, 64, 145, 283, 284, 336, 340, 354, 370, 469, 516, 524, 532: ii. 146

PAGE

Nobel's Explosives Co. v. Jones, [1880] L. R. 17 Ch. D. 721; L. R. 8 App. Cas. 5; 50 L. J. Ch. 339; 48 L. T. 490; 30 W. R. 294; 31 W. R. 388. . . . . 336, 382, 389
Noble's Patent, [1850] 7 Moo. P. C. 191. . . . . ii. 169, 170
Nordenfelt v. Gardner, [1884] 1 R. P. C. 10, 61 . . . 53, 71, 338, 342, 483, 484, 515
Nordenfelt v. Maxim-Nordenfelt Guns and Ammunition Co., [1894] L. R. (1894) A. C. 535 . . . . ii. 109, 110
Nordenfelt's Patent, [1887] Griff. L. O. C. 18 . . . . ii. 69, 70, 71, 75
Normand's Patent, [1870] L. R. 3 P. C. 193; 6 Moo. P. C. N. S. 477 ii. 123, 163, 164, 187
Normandy's Patent, [1855] 9 Moo. P. C. 452. . . . . . . ii. 191
North British Rubber Co. v. Gormully and Jeffery Manufacturing Co., [1894-98] 12 R. P. C. 17; 13 R. P. C. 691; 14 R. P. C. 283; 15 R. P. C. 245 . . . . . 342, 347, 385, 428, 436, 440, 535
North British Rubber Co. v. Macintosh, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 477 . 342, 347, 477, 489
North Eastern Marine Engineering Co., Ld. v. Leeds Forge Co., Ld., [1905] 23 R. P. C. 96; [1906] 1 Ch. 324 291
North Metropolitan Tramways Co., Ld. v. London County Council, [1898] 2 Ch. 145 531
Norton v. Brooks, [1861] 7 H. & N. 499 . . . . ii. 148
Norton's Patent, [1863] 1 Moo. P. C. N. S. 339; 9 Jur. N. S. 419; 11 W. R. 720; G. P. C. 553 . . . ii. 123, 163, 164, 175, 179, 181
Norwood's Patent, [1895] 12 R. P. C. 214 . . . . . . 300, 301, 305
Norwood's Patent, [1898] 15 R. P. C. 99 . . . . . . 300, 301
Nunn v. D'Albuquerque, [1865] 34 Beav. 595 . . . 337, 386, 512, 513
Nussey and Leachman's Patent, [1890] 7 R. P. C. 22 . . . . . ii. 180
Nuttall v. Hargreaves, [1891] 8 R. P. C. 273, 450 . . . 75, 183, 191, 193

Oddy v. Smith, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 503 522
Oldham v. Longmead, [1789] 1 W. P. C. 291, 294, 439 n., 441 . 409: ii. 116
Ormson v. Clarke, [1862] 13 C. B. N. S. 337; 14 C. B. N. S. 475, 490; 32 L. J. C. P. 8, 291. . . . . 33, 40, 73, 81, 91
Orr v. Diaper, [1876] L. R. 4 Ch. D. 92 442
Orr-Ewing v. Johnson, [1879-82] L. R. 13 Ch. D. 434; L. R. 7 App. Cas. 219 333
Osborne v. Board, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 740 409
Osmond v. Hirst, [1885] 2 R. P. C. 265 . . . . 429, 433
Osmond v. Mutual Cycle and Manufacturing Co., Ld. [1899] 2 Q. B. 488. *See* Addenda.
Osmonds, Ld. v. Balmoral Cycle Co., Ld., [1898] 15 R. P. C. 505. 194, 524
Otto v. Linford, [1881] 46 L. T. N. S. 35 . 44, 51, 120, 141, 151, 155, 162, 163, 164, 213, 215, 219, 222, 237, 273, 275, 277, 288, 289, 465, 526 535
Otto v. Singer, [1889] 7 R. P. C. 7 . . . . ii. 134
Otto v. Steel, [1885-86] 2 R. P. C. 139; 3 R. P. C. 109; L. R. 31 Ch. D. 241; 55 L. J. Ch. 196. . . . . 142, 414, 508, 509, 530, 534, 535
Overton v. Burns, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 455 325
Owen's Patent, [1898] 15 R. P. C. 755; 43 S. J. 43 . . 169, 297, 307: ii. 64, 90, 100
Owen's Patent, [1899] 1 Ch. 157; 17 R. P. C. 68, 637 202, 205, 307, 482: ii. 82
Oxley v. Holden, [1860] 8 C. B. N. S. 666; 30 L. J. C. P. 68; 2 L. T. N. S. 464; 8 W. R. 626 . . . . 133, 145, 146, 178, 271, 277, 377

PAGE
PALMER *v.* Cooper, [1853] 9 Exch. 532; 23 L. J. Ex. 82 . . 416, 423
Palmer *v.* Edwards, 1 Doug. 187 n. . . . . ii. 143
Palmer *v.* Wagstaffe, [1853-54] 8 Exch. 840; 9 Exch. 449; 22 L. T. N. S. Ex. 295; 23 L. J. Ex. 217; Newton, L. J. vol. xliii. p. 131 . 158, 160, 161, 203, 273, 421, 422, 471
Palmer Tyre Co., Ld. *v.* Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld., [1899] 16 R. P. C. 451 . . . . 532, 533
Parker *v.* Maignen's Filtre Rapide Co., [1888] 5 R. P. C. 207 . . 416
Parker *v.* Satchwell, [1901] 18 R. P. C. 299 . . . . . 32, 39, 260, 334
Parker *v.* Wells, [1880] L. R. 18 Ch. D. 477 . . . . . . 442, 443
Parkes *v.* Stevens, [1869] L. R. 8 Eq. 358; L. R. 5 Ch. App. Cas. 36; 38 L. J. Ch. 627 . . . . . 74, 81, 91, 242, 246, 248, 265, 352
Parkinson *v.* Simon, [1895] 11 R. P. C. 238, 493; 12 R. P. C. 403 . 250, 274, 277, 280, 282, 283, 356
Parkinson's Patent, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 509 . . . . . . ii. 68, 69
Parmentor *v.* Webber, 8 Taunt. 593; 2 B. Mo. 656; Ship Touch, 266 . ii. 143
Parnell *v.* Mort, [1884-85] 1 R. P. C. 4; 2 R. P. C. 55; L. R. 29 Ch. D. 325 520
Parnell's Patent, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 126 . . . . ii. 58, 128
Parrott *v.* Palmer, [1834] 3 M. & K. 632 . . . . . . 496, 497
Parson's Patent, [1898] 15 R. P. C. 349; [1898] A. C. 673 . . ii. 182, 185
Partington *v.* Hartlepools Pulp and Paper Co., [1895] 12 R. P. C. 295 . 56
Partridge's Patent, [1903] 20 R. P. C. 459 305
Pascall *v.* Toope, [1890] 7 R. P. C. 125 422
Pashley *v.* Linotype Co., Ld., [1903] 20 R. P. C. 633 14
Patent Bottle Envelope Co. *v.* Seymer, [1858] 5 C. B. N. S. 164; 28 L. J. C. P. 22; 5 Jur. N. S. 174 . . . . 81, 87, 90
Patent Exploitation, Ld. *v.* American Novelty and Manufacturing Co., Ld., [1903] 20 R. P. C. 689; 22 R. P. C. 16 . 70, 72, 283, 436, 469, 532
Patent Exploitation, Ld. *v.* Siemens Brothers & Co., Ld., [1902] 19 R. P. C. 113; 20 R. P. C. 225; 21 R. P. C. 541 . 31, 38, 39, 67, 70, 73, 242, 247, 274, 283, 460
Patent Marine Inventions Co. *v.* Chadburn, [1873] L. R. 16 Eq. 447 . 473
Patent Type Foundry Co. *v.* Richards, [1860] 6 Jur. N. S. 39; 1 Johns. 381; 2 L. T. N. S. 359 . . . . 212, 397
Patent Type Foundry Co. *v.* Walter, [1860] 1 Johns. 727 . . 449, 452, 453
Paterson and Dandon's Patents, [1884] Griff. P. C. 295 . . ii. 30, 41, 47
Patterson *v.* Gas Light and Coke Co., [1875] L. R. 2 Ch. D. 812; L. R. 3 App. Cas. 239; 45 L. J. Ch. 843; 47 L. J. Ch. 402 . 20, 45, 47, 57, 58, 77, 108, 144, 146, 251, 252, 253
Patterson *v.* Holland, Hindmarch, p. 293; Higgins's Digest, 354 . 307
Patterson's Patent, [1845] 6 Moo. P. C. 469; 13 Jur. 593 . . ii. 181, 182
Peach's Patent, [1901] 19 R. P. C. 65; [1902] A. C. 414 ii. 165, 166, 183, 187
Peck *v.* Hindes, [1898] 14 Times R. 164; 15 R. P. C. 113 . . . 508
Peckover *v.* Rowland, [1893] 10 R. P. C. 118, 234 . . 247, 356, 419, 456
Pegamoid, Ld. *v.* British Leather Cloth Manufacturing Co., Ld., [1901] 18 R. P. C. 317 . . . . 522, 523
Penn *v.* Bibby, *v.* Jack, *v.* Fernie, [1866] L. R. 1 Eq. 548; L. R. 2 Eq. 314; L. R. 3 Eq. 308; L. R. 5 Eq. 81; L. R. 2 Ch. App. 127; 36 L. J. Ch. 277, 455; 37 L. J. Ch. 136; 14 L. T. N. S. 495; 15 L. T. N. S. 385, 399; 17 L. T. N. S. 407; 14 W. R. 760; 16 W. R. 243 . 36, 81, 100, 183, 184, 185, 190, 196, 238, 390, 406, 413, 415, 421, 461, 462, 463, 494, 505, 506, 529
Perkin's Patent, [1845] 2 W. P. C. 6; 47 Eng. 105 . ii. 170, 174, 186, 190
Perks *v.* Deeley, [1896] 14 R. P. C. 3 . . . . ii. 90

PAGE
Perrin v. Hudson, [1884] 1 R. P. C. 261 . . . . . 454, 461, 527, 534
Perry v. Mitchell, [1840] 1 W. P. C. 269 397
Perry v. Skinner, 2 M. & W. 471 . . . . ii. 81
Perry v. Société de Lunetiers, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 661 . . . . . ii. 67
Peters v. Owen, [1899] 16 R. P. C. 83 335
Pether v. Shaw, [1893] 10 R. P. C. 293 203
Petitt-Smith's Patent, [1850] 7 Moo. P. C. 133 . ii. 162, 164, 173, 182, 192
Petman v. Bull, [1886] 3 R. P. C. 390. *See also* L. R. 11 App. Cas. 648 . 396
Phillips v. Ivel Cycle Co., [1890] 7 R. P. C. 77; 62 L. T. N. S. 392 419, 422
Philpot v. Hanbury, [1885] 2 R. P. C. 33, 153 . 92, 149, 164, 208, 228, 242
Pickard v. Prescott, [1892] 9 R. P. C. 195; L. R. (1892) A. C. 263 140, 143
Pickard v. Sears, [1837] 6 A. & E. 469. . . . . ii. 115
Pidding v. Franks, [1849] 1 Mac. & G. 56; 18 L. J. Ch. 295 . . . ii. 150
Pieper's Patent, [1895] 12 R. P. C. 293; 72 L. T. N. S. 782; 11 R. 581 . . . . ii. 187, 188
Pietschmann's Patent, [1884] Griff. P. C. 314 . . . . . ii. 78, 88
Piggott v. Anglo-American Telegraph Co., [1868] 19 L. T. N. S. 46 449, 450, 451, 453
Pilkington v. Massey, [1904] 21 R. P. C. 421, 696 . . . . . 336, 380
Pilkington v. Yeatley Vacuum Hammer Co., [1901] 18 R. P. C. 459 . 19, 140
Pinker's Patent, [1848] 12 Jur. N. S. 433 . . . . ii. 177
Pirrie v. York Street Flax Spinning Co., [1892-94] 10 R. P. C. 34; 11 R. P. C. 429 . . . . 81, 103, 164, 175
Pitman's Patent, [1871] L. R. 4 P. C. 84; 8 Moo. P. C. N. S. 293 ii. 123, 166, 178, 186
Pitt's Patent, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 343 . . . . ii. 28, 36
Pitt's Patent, [1899]. *See* Ludington Cigarette Machine Co., Ld. v. Baron Cigarette Machine Co. . . . .
Pitt's Patent, [1901] 18 R. P. C. 478 . . . . ii. 79, 80
Plating Co. v. Farquharson, [1879-83] Griff. P. C. 187; L. R. 17 Ch. D. 49 . . . . 283, 453, 493
Plimpton v. Malcolmson, [1875-76] L. R. 20 Eq. 37; L. R. 3 Ch. D. 531; 44 L. J. Ch. 257; 45 L. J. Ch. 505; 34 L. T. N. S. 430; Seton, 4th ed. 354 . 6, 17, 19, 109, 141, 142, 143, 150, 164, 204, 218, 224, 232, 234, 239, 402, 403, 419, 427, 432, 433, 434, 436, 439, 459, 462, 464, 508; ii. 156
Plimpton v. Spiller, [1877] L. R. 4 Ch. D. 286; L. R. 6 Ch. D. 412, 425; L. R. 5 H. L. 433; 35 L. T. N. S. 656; 37 L. T. N. S. 56; 47 L. J. Ch. 211; 25 W. R. 152; 26 W. R. 285; 20 S. J. 859; Higgins's Digest, p. 288 . 6, 115, 141, 142, 143, 144, 248, 249, 260, 263, 270, 275, 276, 277, 337, 342, 423, 424, 427, 436, 438, 439, 490, 492, 493
Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Cash Cycle Co., [1897] 14 R. P. C. 177, 326 . 480
Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Casswell, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 164, 375 . 155, 260, 272
Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Chisholm & Co., [1896] 13 R. P. C. 488 479, 524, 528
Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Dunlop, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 553 . . . . . ii. 115
Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. East London Rubber Co., [1896] 14 R. P. C. 77, 573 . . . 152, 153, 183, 185, 190, 192, 193, 196, 197, 536
Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. English Cycle and Tyre Co., [1897] 14 R. P. C. 851 145
Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Ferguson, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 459 . . . . ii. 155
Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Friswell, [1895] 13 R. P. C. 15 439
Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Goodman, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 723 430
Pneumatic Tyre Co. v. Ixion Patent Pneumatic Tyre Co., [1897] 14 R. P. C. 853 . . . . 190, 193, 196, 347, 532, 533

PAGE

Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.* Leicester Pneumatic Tyre and Automatic Valve Co., [1898] 15 R. P. C. 159; 16 R. P. C. 50, 531 . . 183, 191, 193, 197, 283, 469

Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.* Marwood, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 347; 14 R. P. C. 240 . . . . 435, 462

Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.* New Ixion Tyre and Cycle Co., [1898] 15 R. P. C. 389; 16 R. P. C. 16 . . . . 183, 193, 196

Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.* Parr (J.) & Co., W. N. (1896) 88 524

Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.* Puncture Proof Pneumatic Tyre Co., [1898] 15 R. P. C. 405; 16 R. P. C. 209 . . . . 502, 504, 506

Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.* Tubeless Tyre and Capon Heaton, Ld., [1897-98] 15 R. P. C. 74, 237; 16 R. P. C. 77 . 71, 345, 347, 351, 367

Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.* Warrillow, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 284 . . 430, 436

Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.* West London Rubber Co., [1898] 15 R. P. C. 129 530

Poole's Patent, [1867] L. R. 1 P. C. 514; 4 Moo. P. C. N. S. 452; 36 L. J. P. C. 76 . . . . ii. 188

Pooley *v.* Pointon, [1885] 2 R. P. C. 167 . . . . . . 224, 517

Porter's Patent, 1 Newton, L. J. N. S. 179 . . . . ii. 174

Postcard Automatic Supply Co. *v.* Samuel, [1889] 6 R. P. C. 560 ii. 133, 149, 152

Potter *v.* Parr, 2 B. & S. 216 n. 71, 242, 243

Poulton *v.* Kelley, [1904] 21 R. P. C. 392 334

Poulton's Patent, [1906] 23 R. P. C. 183; 506 125

Pow *v.* Taunton, [1845] 9 Jur. 1056 81

Powell *v.* Birmingham Vinegar Brewery Co., [1896] 14 R. P. C. 1 . 499

Powell *v.* Head, [1879] L. R. 12 Ch. D. 686 . . . . ii. 133

Power *v.* Walker, [1814] 3 M. & S. 7 . . . . ii. 106

Presto Gear Case and Components, Ld. *v.* Orme, Evans & Co., Ld., [1900] 17 R. P. C. 218; 18 R. P. C. 17 356

Presto Gear Case and Components Co., Ld. *v.* Simplex Gear Case Co., Ld., [1898] 15 R. P. C. 638 356

Preston *v.* Black, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 299, 574 380

Price's Patent Candle Co. *v.* Bauwen's Patent Candle Co., [1858] 4 K. & J. 727 . . . . 488, 497

Printing and Numerical Registering Co. *v.* Sampson, [1875] L. R. 19 Eq. 462 . . . . ii. 114

Procter *v.* Bayley, [1889] 6 R. P. C. 106, 538; 59 L. J. Ch. 12; 38 W. R. 100 . . . . 374, 380, 386, 387, 487, 497, 512

Procter *v.* Bennis, [1887] 4 R. P. C. 333; L. R. 36 Ch. D. 740; 57 L. J. Ch. 11; 57 L. T. N. S. 622; 36 W. R. 456 . 53, 62, 67, 242, 243, 245, 246, 281, 338, 342, 344, 352, 353, 356, 358, 364, 366, 367, 390, 487, 496, 535

Proctor *v.* Sutton Lodge Chemical Co., [1888] 5 R. P. C. 184 . 293, 519, 526, 529

Prynne's Patent, [1885] 54 L. J. Ch. 289 438

Pullan's Patent, Johns. Pat. 5th ed. 118 . . . . ii. 78

Punchard *v.* Dale, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 257 . . . . ii. 105

QUINN *v.* Leathem, [1901] A. C. 495 372

R. *v.* Arkwright, [1785] Dav. P. C. 61; 1 W. P. C. 64 . 6, 15, 75, 116, 117, 141, 158, 202, 214, 220, 224, 225, 232, 237, 302, 406, 464

R. *v.* Betts, [1850] 15 Q. B. 540; 19 L. J. Q. B. 531 301

PAGE
R. v. Comptroller-General of Patents, *Ex parte* Tomlinson, [1899] 1 Q. B. 909; 16 R. P. C. 233 . . . . ii. 34, 35, 87, 88
R. v. Crampton, [1886] 3 R. P. C. 367 . . . . 131: ii. 12
R. v. Cutler, [1816, 1847] 4 Q. B. 372 n.; 3 Car. & K. 215; Macr. P. C. 124; 1 W. P. C. 76 . . . . 38, 81, 86, 203
R. v. Eastern Archipelago Co., [1853] 4 De G. M. & G. 199; 21 L. T. 35 307
R. v. Else, [1785] 1 W. P. C. 76 . . . . 242, 251
R. v. Judge of County Court of Halifax, [1891] 8 R. P. C. 338; L. R. (1891) 2 Q. B. 263; 60 L. J. Q. B. 550 473
R. v. Lister, [1826] Webster on Patents, 80 73
R. v. Metcalf, [1817] 1 W. P. C. 141 n; 3 Car. & P. 611; 2 Stark R. 249 . . . . 179, 205, 222
R. v. Mill, [1850-51] 10 C. B. 379; 14 Beav. 312; 20 L. J. C. P. 16; 1 L. M. & P. 695 . . . . 181: ii. 74, 81
R. v. Mussary, [1738] 1 W. P. C. 41 6
R. v. Neilson, [1842] 1 W. P. C. 673 301
R. v. Newton, Hindmarch on Patents, p. 427 307
R. v. Prosser, [1848] 11 Beav. 306; 18 L. J. N. S. Ch. 35; 13 Jur. 71 . 295
R. v. Seine, 40 Newton, Lond. Jour. 71 142
R. v. Townsend, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 265 . . . . 131: ii. 12
R. v. Wallis, [1886] 3 R. P. C. 1 . . . . ii. 12
R. v. Wheeler, [1819, 1850] 2 B. & Ald. 345; 10 C. B. 395 . 53, 209, 228, 265
Railway and Electrical Appliances, *In re*, [1888] L. R. 38 Ch. D. 597 . ii. 107
Ralston v. Smith, [1860-65] 9 C. B. N. S. 471; 11 C. B. N. S. 117; 35 L. J. C. P. 49; 4 L. T. N. S. 549; 11 H. L. C. 223 . 60, 64, 75, 79, 81, 108, 162, 208, 251, 225: ii. 64, 67, 68, 70, 72, 73
Rann v. Hughes, 7 T. R. 350 n. 106
Ransone v. Bentall, 3 L. J. N. S. 161 333
Rawes v. Chance, [1890] 7 R. P. C. 275 . . . . . . 444, 446, 448
Read v. Andrew, [1885] 2 R. P. C. 119 433
Reason Manufacturing Co., Ld. v. Moy (Ernest F.), Ld., [1902] 19 R. P. C. 409; 20 R. P. C. 205 . . . . 73: ii. 75
Reddaway v. Banham, [1896] A. C. 199 333
Redges v. Mullinar, [1892] 10 R. P. C. 21 . . . . . ii. 140, 150, 155
Redmond's Patent, [1828] 1 W. P. C. 642 n.; 5 Russ. 44 . . . . ii. 76
Reece's Patent, [1881] 17 Iron, 155; 51 Eng. 207 . . . ii. 164, 166, 167
Renard v. Levinstein, [1864-65] 3 N. R. 665; 5 N. R. 301; 10 L. T. N. S. 94, 117; 11 L. T. N. S. 505, 766; 13 W. R. 229, 382; 2 H. & N. 62 . . . . 18, 414, 433, 434, 444, 446, 453, 455: ii. 4, 23, 156
Rendell's Patent, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 277; 70 L. T. N. S. 756 . 305, 308
Republic of Bolivia v. The National Bolivian Navigation Co., [1876] 24 W. R. 361 476
Reynolds v. Amos, [1886] 3 R. P. C. 215 . . . . 81, 102, 465
Reynolds v. Smith (Herbert) & Co., Ld., [1902] 20 R. P. C. 123, 410 . 29
Ricci's Patent, [1906] 23 R. P. C. 269 . . . . ii. 178
Richardson v. Castry, [1887] 4 R. P. C. 265 . . . . 338, 476
Richmond & Co. Ld., v. Wrightson [1904] 22 R. P. C. 25 . . . 16
Rickman v. Thierry, [1896] 14 R. P. C. 105. *See* Thierry v. Rickman 31, 32, 40, 64, 81, 95, 108, 162, 485
Riding v. Smith, [1877] L. R. 1 Ex. D. 91 310
Robb v. Green, L. R. (1895) 2 Q. B. 315. 16
Roberts v. Graydon, [1903] 20 R. P. C. 578; 21 R. P. C. 194 . . 427
Roberts v. Heywood, [1879] 27 W. R. 454 113
Robertson v. French, [1803] 4 East, 135 263

PAGE
Robinson's Patent, Griff. 267 . . . . ii. 10
Rockliffe *v.* Priestman, [1898] 15 R. P. C. 155 . . . . . 65, 108
Rollins *v.* Hinks, [1872] L. R. 13 Eq. 355; 41 L. J. Ch. 358 . . 309
Rolls *v.* Isaacs, [1878] L. R. 19 Ch. D. 268; 51 L. J. Ch. 170; W. N. (1878) 87 . . . . 185, 442, 443
Roper's Patent, [1887] 4 R. P. C. 201 . . . . ii. 179, 181
Rose's Patents Co. *v.* Braby, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 198 . . . . . 81, 95
Roskell *v.* Whitworth, [1870] L. R. 5 Ch. App. Cas. 459 . . . 475
Ross's Patent, [1891] 8 R. P. C. 477 . . . . ii. 37, 38
Rothwell *v.* King, [1886-87] 3 R. P. C. 379; 4 R. P. C. 76, 397 . 433, 438, 520, 533
Rothwell *v.* Mackintosh, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 274 418
Rothwell's Patent, Griff. P. C. 320. 296
Rowcliffe *v.* Longford Wire, Iron and Steel Co., [1887] 4 R. P. C. 281. 33, 81, 92, 522
Rowcliffe *v.* Morris, [1886] 3 R. P. C. 17, 145 . . . . 228, 248, 519, 526
Rubery's Patent, [1837] 1 W. P. C. 649 n. . . . . ii. 76
Rushton *v.* Crawley, [1870] L. R. 10 Eq. 522 . . . . . 56, 74, 81
Russel *v.* Crichton, [1837] 15 Decisions of Ct. of Sess. 1st series, 1270 . 450, 453
Russell *v.* Barnsley, [1834] 1 W. P. C. 472; 2 Coop. Ch. Cas. 58 . . 436
Russell *v.* Cowley, [1832-35] 1 W. P. C. 457; 1 C. P. C. 532; 2 Coop. Ch. Cas. 59 n.; 1 C. M. & R. 864 . 71, 73, 75, 159, 230, 249, 269, 270, 273, 439, 449, 450, 452, 453, 464
Russell *v.* Hatfield, [1885] 2 R. P. C. 144 396
Russell *v.* Ledsam, [1843-47] 11 M. & W. 647; 14 M. & W. 574; 16 M. & W. 633; 7 Jur. 585; 9 Jur. 557; 12 L. J. Ex. 439; 14 L. J. Ex. 353; 16 L. J. Ex. 145; 1 H. L. C. 687 . . 342, 417, 418: ii. 13, 54, 123, 191
Russell's Patent, [1857] 2 De G. & J. 130; 30 L. T. 178; 6 W. R. 95; 2 Moo. P. C. 496 . . . . ii. 29, 33, 191
Ruston *v.* Tobin, [1178] 49 L. J. Ch. 262; L. R. 10 Ch. D. 558 . 389, 476
Rylands *v.* Ashley's Patent (Machine made) Bottle Co., [1890] 7 R. P. C. 175 453
Ryland's Patent, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 665 . . . . . . ii. 70, 71, 73, 87

SACCHARIN Corporation, Ld. *v.* Alliance Chemical Co., Ld., [1905] 22 R. P. C. 175 394
Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.* Anglo-Continental Chemical Works, Ld., [1901] 1 Ch. 414; 17 R. P. C. 307 . . . . . . 375, 529
Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.* Chemical and Drugs Co., Ld., [1899] 17 R. P. C. 28, 612, 743; [1900] 2 Ch. 556 . . . 58, 165, 203, 437, 499
Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.* Dawson, [1902] 19 R. P. C. 169 488, 530, 531
Saccharin Corporation, Ltd. *v.* Hay [1905] 22 R. P. C. 212 . . . 524
Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.* Hopkinson, [1904] 21 R. P. C. 272 . 395
Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.* Jackson, [1903] 20 R. P. C. 611 . . 395
Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.* Lyle (D. T. J.) & Son, Ld., [1904] 21 R. P. C. 604 334
Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.* Quincey, [1900] 2 Ch. 246; 17 R. P. C. 337 . . . . 468, 488, 497
Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.* Reitmeyer, [1900] 2 Ch. 659; 17 R. P. C. 606 . . . . 337, 375, 376
Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.* Ross, [1905] 22 R. P. C. 246 . . . 488
Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.* Skidmore, [1903] 21 R. P. C. 31 . . 524

PAGE
Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.* White (R) & Sons, Ld., [1903] 20 R. P. C. 454; [1903] W. N. 120 394
Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.* Wild, [1902] 20 R. P. C. 243; [1903] 1 Ch. 410 394
Sachse's Patent, [1900] 18 R. P. C. 221 . . . . ii. 45
Sandow *v.* Szalay, [1903] 21 R. P. C. 33, 333; 23 R. P. C. 6 . . 53, 185, 340
Sanitas Co. *v.* Condy, [1887] 4 R. P. C. 530 501
Saull *v.* Browne, [1874] L. R. 9 Ch. App. 364 443
Saunders *v.* Aston, [1832] 3 B. & Ald. 881; 1 L. J. K. B. 265; 1 Carp. P. C. 510; 1 W. P. C. 75 n. 33, 67, 208, 251, 255
Saunders *v.* Jones, [1877] L. R. 7 Ch. D. 449 440
Savage & Co., Ld. *v.* Brindle, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 267 194
Savage Bros., Ld. *v.* Brindle, [1900] 17 R. P. C. 228 371
Savage *v.* Harris, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 90, 364 . . . . . 42, 73, 149, 387
Savory *v.* Price, [1823] 1 W. P. C. 83; 1 Ry. & M. 1 . . 203, 232, 233, 235
Saxby *v.* Clums, [1877] 43 L. J. Ex. 228 . . . . 53, 342
Saxby *v.* Easterbrook, [1872] L. R. 7 Ex. 207; L. R. 3 C. P. D. 339; 41 L. T. Ex. 113 . . . . 310, 500
Saxby *v.* Gloucester Waggon Co., [1880–83] L. R. 7 Q. B. D. 305; 50 L. J. Q. B. 577; Griff. L. O. C. 54; W. N. (1880) 28; W. N. (1882) 102; G. P. C. 417 . . . . . 12, 15, 16, 30, 33, 39, 40, 71, 475, 476: ii. 32
Saxby *v.* Hennett, [1873] L. R. 8 Ex. 210 . . . . 338: ii. 53
Saxby's Patent, [1870] L. R. 3 P. C. 292; 7 Moo. P. C. N. S. 82; 19 W. R. 513 . . . . ii. 173, 176, 178, 182, 183, 189
Sayers *v.* Collyer, [1885] L. R. 28 Ch. D. 103 . . 428, 475, 487, 496, 497
Schelfer *v.* City of London Electric Lighting Co., Ld., [1895] 1 Ch. 287 486, 487
Schermuly *v.* Pain, [1901] 18 R. P. C. 529 493
Schlumberger's Patent, [1853] 9 Moo. P. C. 1 . . . . . . ii. 192, 194
Scott *v.* Hamling, [1897] 14 R. P. C. 123 . . . . . . 164, 339, 356
Scott *v.* Hull Steam Fishing and Ice Co., [1896–97] 13 R. P. C. 286; 14 R. P. C. 143 . . . . 339, 356, 422, 487, 488
Scott *v.* Young, [1871] L. R. 6 Ch. 274 . . . . ii. 53
Scott's Patent, [1902] 19 R. P. C. 273; 20 R. P. C. 257 . . . 221, 304, 83
Seed *v.* Higgins, [1858–62] 8 E. & B. 755, 771; 8 H. L. C. 550; 27 L. J. Q. B. 148, 411; 30 L. J. Q. B. 314; 3 L. T. N. S. 101; 4 Jur. N. S. 258; 5 Jur. N. S. 540; 6 Jur. N. S. 1264 . 243, 265, 336, 355, 356, 464, 468: ii. 73
Seixo *v.* Provezende, [1865] L. R. 1 Ch. 192 . . . . . . 333, 339
Sellers *v.* Dickinson, [1850] 5 Exch. 312; 20 L. J. N. S. Ex. 417 . 341, 352, 353
Semet and Solway's Patent, [1894] 12 R. P. C. 10; L. R. (1894) A. C. 78; 64 L. J. Ch. 41; 71 L. T. N. S. 674; 11 R. 362 . . . ii. 179, 180, 188
Serrell's Patent, [1889] 6 R. P. C. 101 . . . . ii. 69
Shallenberger's Application, [1889] 6 R. P. C. 550 . . . . . . ii. 21
Sharp *v.* Bauer, [1886] 3 R. P. C. 193 . . . . . . 33, 81, 92, 310
Sharp's Patent, [1840] 1 W. P. C. 641; 10 L. J. Ch. 86; 3 Beav. 245 . ii. 76
Sharrod *v.* London and North-Western Ry. Co., (1849) 4 Exch. 580 . 389
Shaw *v.* Bank of England, [1852] 22 L. J. N. S. Ex. 26 . . . 450, 451
Shaw *v.* Barton, [1895] 12 R. P. C. 282 . . . . 81, 95
Shaw *v.* Day, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 185 407
Shaw *v.* Jones, [1889] 6 R. P. C. 328 . . . . . 119, 147, 171, 338, 467
Sheehan *v.* Great Eastern Ry. Co., [1880] L. R. 16 Ch. D. 59; 50 L. J. Ch. 68 . . . . 387: ii. 111, 112

PAGE

Shillito *v.* Larmuth, [1884] 2 R. P. C. 1 . . . . . 427, 432, 433, 437

Shoe-Machinery Co. *v.* Cutlan, [1895-96] 12 R. P. C. 3421, 530; 13 R. P. C. 141, 395; L. R. (1896) 1 Ch. 108, 667; 65 L. J. Ch. 44, 314; 73 L. T. N. S. 419; 74 L. T. N. S. 166; 44 W. R. 92 . 296, 306, 356, 384, 396, 399, 400, 407, 413, 416, 480, 487, 490, 516

Shone's Patent, [1892] 9 R. P. C. 438 . . . . . . ii. 165, 175, 188,

Shrewsbury and Talbot Cab Co. *v.* Morgan, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 75 . . 406

Shrewsbury and Talbot Cab Co. *v.* Sterckx, [1895-96] 12 R. P. C. 336; 13 R. P. C. 44 . . . . 150, 152

Siddell and Hilton, Ld. *v.* Wood, [1904] 21 R. P. C. 230 522

Siddell *v.* Vickers, [1887-89] 5 R. P. C. 81, 416; 6 R. P. C. 464; 7 R. P. C. 292; 9 R. P. C. 152; L. R. 36 Ch. D. 92; 61 L. T. N. S. 233. *See* Vickers *v.* Siddell . 16, 53, 183, 188, 189, 238, 239, 248, 249, 494, 495, 500, 501: ii. 56, 74

Siddell's Patent, Griff. P. C. 320 296

Sidebottom *v.* Fielden, [1891] 8 R. P. C. 266 . . . . . 422, 425, 451

Siegert *v.* Findlater, [1878] L. R. 7 Ch. D. 801 333

Sielaff's Application, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 484 . . . . . . ii. 36, 39, 45

Siemens *v.* Karo, [1891] 8 R. P. C. 376 . . . . 422, 425

Siemens *v.* Taylor, [1892] 9 R. P. C. 393 . . . . . . ii. 149, 154

Sillar's Patent, [1882] G. P. C. 581 . . . . ii. 164, 175, 178

Simister's Patent, [1842] 1 W. P. C. 721; 7 Jur. 451; 4 Moo. P. C. 161; 21 Newton, Lond. Jour. 465 . . . . 466: ii. 177, 179, 180, 181

Simmonds *v.* Hitchman, [1885] L. R. 29 Ch. D. 417 515

Simmond's Patent, [1895] 12 R. P. C. 446 306

Simpson *v.* Charlesworth, [1886] W. N. (1886) 255 442

Simpson *v.* Holliday, [1864-66] 20 Newton, Lond. Journ. N. S. 105; 13 W. R. 577; 12 L. T. N. S. 99; 5 N. R. 340; L. R. 1 H. L. 315; 35 L. J. Ch. 811 . 167, 211, 212, 222, 223, 224, 267, 274, 283, 289, 462

Simpson and Isaac's Patent, 21 L. T. N. S. 81 . . . . . ii. 29, 33

Singer *v.* Rudge Cycle Co., [1894] 11 R. P. C. 463, 585 . . 81, 95, 420, 523

Singer *v.* Stassen, [1884] 1 R. P. C. 121; 50 L. T. N. S. 326; W. N. (1884) 83 . . . . ii. 93, 95

Singer Manufacturing Co. *v.* Loog, [1886] L. R. 18 Ch. D. 395 . . 333

Singer Manufacturing Co. *v.* Wilson, [1865] 13 W. R. 560; 5 N. R. 505; 12 L. T. N. S. 140 . . . . 450, 451

Sinnett's Patent, [1898] 15 R. P. C. 761 126

Sirdar Rubber Co., Ld. *v.* Wallington Weston & Co., [1905] 1 Ch. 451; [1906] 1 Ch. 252; 22 R. P. C. 257; 23 R. P. C. 132 228

Skinner *v.* Perry (Shew), [1892-94] 10 R. P. C. 1; 11 R. P. C. 406; L. R. (1893) 1 Ch. 413; L. R. (1894) 2 Ch. 581; 62 L. J. Ch. 196; 64 L. J. Ch. 826; 67 L. T. N. S. 696 . 310, 311, 312, 313, 314, 315, 320, 328

Slazenger *v.* Feltham, [1889] 6 R. P. C. 130 . . . 407, 436, 460, 522

Sleight's Patent, [1893] 10 R. P. C. 447 305

Small Patents, [1606] 1 W. P. C. 9 137

Smelting Company of Australia, Ld. *v.* Commissioners of Inland Revenue, [1896] 2 Q. B. 179; [1897] 1 Q. B. 175 . . . ii. 107, 134

Smith *v.* Buchanan, [1822] 26 S. J. 347 . . . . 375, 377

Smith *v.* Buckingham, [1870] 21 L. T. N. S. 819 . . . . . ii. 119

Smith *v.* Buller, [1874] L. R. 19 Eq. 473 . . . . . . 531, 532

Smith *v.* Davidson, [1857] 19 Ct. of Sess. 2nd series, 696 . . . 126

Smith *v.* Dickinson, [1804] 3 Bos. & Pul. 630 . . . . ii. 105

PAGE

Smith v. Great Western Ry. Co., [1854] 3 W. R. 69; Macr. P. C. 221; 6 E. & B. 405 . . . 446, 454, 497
Smith v. Laing, [1890] 7 R. P. C. 148 . . . 324
Smith v. London and North Western Ry. Co., [1853] 2 E. & B. 69; Macr. P. C. 188 . . . 352: ii. 111
Smith v. London and South Western Ry. Co., [1854] Macr. P. C. 209; 23 L. J. Ch. 562; Kay, 408 . . . 488
Smith v. Neal, [1857] 2 C. B. N. S. 67 . . . ii. 119
Smith v. Roberts, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 61 . . . 386
Smith v. Scott, [1859] 28 L. J. C. P. 325; 6 C. B. N. S. 771; 5 Jur. N. S. 1358 . . . 409: ii. 148, 154
Smith v. Upton, [1843] 6 M. & G. 251 . . . 307
Smith and Robertson's Patent, [1847] 30 Newton, Lond. Jour. O. S. 451 . . . ii. 174
Smith's Patent, [1855] Macr. P. C. 232 . . . ii. 78, 79
Smith's Patent, [1884] Griff. P. C. 268 . . . ii. 49
Smith's Patent, [1885] 2 R. P. C. 14 . . . ii. 191
Smith's Patent, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 200 . . . ii. 36, 39
Smith's Patent, [1904] 22 R. P. C. 57 . . . 14, 16
Soame's Patent, [1843] 1 W. P. C. 729; 23 Newton, Lond. Jour. O. S. 462 . . . ii. 165, 174, 175, 176, 177
Société Anonyme du Générateur du Temple's Patent, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 54 . . . 17, 20: ii. 4, 29
Société Anonyme pour le Fabrication d'Appareils d'Eclairage v. Midland Lighting Co., [1897] 14 R. P. C. 419 . . . ii. 142
Société Anonyme de Manufactures de Glaces v. Tilghman's Patent Sand Blast Co., [1883] L. R. 25 Ch. D. 1; 53 L. J. Ch. 1 . 326, 375, 377, 472: ii. 134, 142, 148
Solvo Laundry Supply Co. v. Mackie, [1893] 10 R. P. C. 68 . 415, 419, 456
Somerset and Walker's Patent, [1879] L. R. 13 Ch. D. 397 . . . ii. 52
Southby's Patent, [1891] 8 R. P. C. 433; L. R. (1891) A. C. 432 . . ii. 179
Southwark and Vauxhall Water Co. v. Quick, [1878] L. R. 3 Q. B. D. 315 . . . 448
Southwell's Patent, [1899] 16 R. P. C. 361 . . . ii. 37, 45
Southworth's Patent, [1837] 1 W. P. C. 486 . . . ii. 162, 179, 180, 181, 191
Speckhart v. Campbell, [1884] Times, Mar. 13, 1884; W. N. (1884) 24 . . . ii. 113
Spencer v. Holt, [1902] 20 R. P. C. 142 . . . 432
Spencer v. Ancoats Vale Rubber Co., [1889] 6 R. P. C. 46 . . 342, 390, 492, 494, 529
Spencer v. Jack, [1862-64] 3 De G. J. & S. 346; 11 L. T. N. S. 242 . 404
Spence's Patent, [1859] 3 De G. & J. 523; 7 W. R. 157 . . . ii. 29
Spettigue's Trusts, [1884] 32 W. R. 385 . . . 535
Spiel's Patent, [1887] 5 R. P. C. 281 . . . ii. 30, 32
Spilsbury v. Clough, [1842] 1 W. P. C. 255; 2 G. & D. 17; 11 L. J. Q. B. 109; L. R. 2 Q. B. 466 . . . 404; ii. 85
Standfield's Patent, [1897] 15 R. P. C. 17} . . . ii. 166
Stark v. Midland Ry. Co., [1881] L. R. 16 Ch. D. 81 . . . 533
Stavert v. Passberg Grain Syndicate, [1891] 8 R. P. C. 400 . . . ii. 121
Stead v. Anderson, [1846] 2 W. P. C. 147, 151; 16 L. J. C. P. 250; 4 C. B. 834 . . . 127, 143, 336
Stead v. Williams, [1843-44] 2 W. P. C. 126, 137; 7 M. & G. 818; 8 Scott, N. R. 449; 13 L. J. C. P. 218; 8 Jur. 930 . 119, 120, 123, 125, 126, 127, 128, 142, 143, 147

PAGE
Steadman v. Marsh, [1856] 2 Jur. N. S. 891 18
Steers v. Rogers, [1892] 9 R. P. C. 117; 10 R. P. C. 245; L. R. (1893) A. C. 232; 62 L. J. Ch. 671; 63 L. T. N. S. 726 . . ii. 113, 127, 132
Steiner v. Heald, [1851] 6 Exch. 607; 20 L. J. Ex. 410; 17 Jur. N. S. 875 . . . . 81, 101, 268
Stell's Patent, [1891] 8 R. P. C. 235 . . . . . . ii. 42, 43, 45, 46
Stevens v. Keating, [1847] 2 W. P. C. 175; 2 Exch. 772; 19 L. J. Ex. 57; 1 M. & G. 659 . . 23, 60, 73, 208, 209, 211, 228, 255, 269, 338, 370, 431, 432, 433, 435, 436, 437, 440, 520
Stewart v. Casey, [1892] 9 R. P. C. 9; L. R. (1892) 1 Ch. 104; 61 L. J. Ch. 61 . . . . 388: ii. 58, 106, 107, 128
Stewart's Patent, [1885] 3 R. P. C. 7 . . . . . ii. 173, 176, 178, 180
Stewart's Patent, [1892] 9 R. P. C. 452 . . . . ii. 29
Stewart's Patent, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 627 . . . . . . ii. 35, 36, 37
Stocker v. Rodgers, [1843] 1 Car. & K. 99 527
Stocker v. Warmor, [1845] 1 C. B. 148; 9 Jur. 136 . . . . . ii. 65
Stoner v. Todd, [1876] L. R. 4 Ch. D. 58; 46 L. J. Ch. 32; 35 L. T. N. S. 661; 25 W. R. 38 . . . . 146, 147, 151, 183, 185
Stoney's Patent, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 518 . . . . ii. 178, 191
Storey v. Graham, [1899] 16 R. P. C. 106 . . . . ii. 3
Stuart's Patent, [1892] 9 R. P. C. 452 . . . . ii. 29, 30
Stubb's Patent, [1884] Griff. P. C. 298 . . . . ii. 28, 29, 37
Sturtz v. De la Rue, [1828] 5 Russ. 322; 1 W. P. C. 83 . 179, 202, 211, 212, 218, 233, 430
Sudbury v. Lee, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 58 . . . . 81, 95
Sugg v. Bray, [1884-85] 1 R. P. C. 45; 2 R. P. C. 223; 54 L. J. Ch. 132 . . . . 310, 311, 338, 358, 463, 464
Sugg v. Silber, [1874-77] L. R. 1 Q. B. D. 362; L. R. 2 Q. B. D. 493, 495; 45 L. J. Q. B. 460 . . . . 413, 456, 473
Sunlight Incandescent Gas Lamp Co. v. Incandescent Gas Light Co., [1897] 14 R. P. C. 757 . . . . . 139, 335, 515, 516, 523, 525, 528
Sutcliffe v. Abott, [1902] 20 R. P. C. 50 420
Swabey v. Sutton, [1863] 1 H. & N. 514 442
Swain v. Edlin-Sinclair Tyre Co., [1903] 20 R. P. C. 435 450
Swinborne v. Nelson, [1852-53] 16 Beav. 416; 22 L. J. Ch. 331 . 443, 446
Sykes v. Howarth, [1879] L. R. 12 Ch. D. 826; 48 L. J. Ch. 769; 41 L. T. N. S. 79; 28 W. R. 215 . . . . . . 79, 372, 389, 399, 456
Sykes v. Sykes, [1824] 3 B. & C. 541 334

TADMAN v. Owens, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 349 427
Talbot v. La Roche, [1854] 15 C. B. 310 . . . . . . 397, 398, 399
Tangye v. Stott, [1865] 14 W. R. 128, 386; W. N. (1866) 68 . 119, 120, 123, 131, 474, 479, 508
Tatham v. Dania, [1869] Griff. P. C. 213 84
Tattersall's Patent, [1892] 9 R. P. C. 150 . . . . ii. 47
Taylor v. Annand, [1899] 16 R. P. C. 126; 18 R. P. C. 53 . . . 38, 39
Taylor v. Hare, [1805] 1 B. & P. N. R. 260; 1 W. P. C. 292 . . . ii. 153
Taylor v. Roe, 68 T. R. 213 490
Taylor's Agreement Trusts, *In re*, [1904] 2 Ch. 737; 21 R. P. C. 713 . ii. 126, 127
Taylor's Patent, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 482 . . . . 121, 128
Teague's Patent, [1884] Griff. P. C. 298 . . . . ii. 41, 46
Temler v. Stevenson, [1897] 15 R. P. C. 24 . . . . . 310, 319, 322

PAGE
Templeton v. Macfarlane, [1848] 1 H. L. C. 595 167
Tennant's Case, [1795] 1 W. P. C. n. 6, 8, 116, 117, 128, 136
Tetley v. Easton, [1852-57] Macr. P. C. 48, 82; 2 E. & B. 956; 18 C. B. 643; 2 C. B. N. S. 706; 23 L. J. Q. B. 77; 25 L. J. C. P. 293; 26 L. J. C. P. 269; 18 Jur. 350 . 77, 81, 88, 163, 171, 211, 224, 232, 233, 239, 243, 251, 254, 255, 288, 447, 463: ii. 74
Thierry v. Riekman, [1895] 12 R. P. C. 412, 543. *See* Rickman v. Thierry 65, 77, 84, 108
Thomas v. Foxwell, [1858-59] 5 Jur. N. S. 37; 6 Jur. N. S. 271 . 251, 268, 274
Thomas v. Hunt, [1864] 17 C. B. N. S. 183 . . . . . . 337: ii. 135
Thomas v. Welch, [1866] L. R. 1 C. P. 192; 35 L. J. C. P. 200 . 185, 250
Thomas v. Williams, [1880] L. R. 14 Ch. D. 864 310
Thomas v. Winter, [1867] 17 L. T. N. S. 148 481
Thomas and Provost's Patent, [1898] 15 R. P. C. 257 . . . . . ii. 18
Thomas and Provost's Patent, [1898] 16 R. P. C. 69 . . . . ii. 18, 29
Thomas's Patent, [1892] 9 R. P. C. 367 . . . . ii. 171, 173, 182, 186
Thompson's Patent, [1902] 19 R. P. C. 565 . . . . . . ii. 175, 179
Thomson v. American Braided Wire Co., [1889] 6 R. P. C. 518. *See* American Braided Wire Co. v. Thomson 36, 99, 147, 260
Thomson v. Batty, [1889] 6 R. P. C. 84 . 76, 111, 151, 237, 240, 338, 342, 416, 426, 465, 514
Thomson v. Hughes, [1889-90] 7 R. P. C. 71, 187 . . . . 436, 437, 449
Thomson v. James, [1863] 32 Beav. 570 74
Thomson v. Macdonald & Co., [1890] 8 R. P. C. 1 . . . . . 417, 419
Thomson v. Moore, [1889-90] 6 R. P. C. 426; 7 R. P. C. 325. *See* Moore v. Thomson 340, 342, 353, 358, 367, 368, 490
Thorley's Cattle Food Co. v. Massam, [1877] L. R. 6 Ch. D. 582 . . 310
Thorn v. Worthing Skating Rink Co., [1876] L. R. 6 Ch. D. 415 n. . 342, 352, 435, 436, 458
Thornborough and Wilk's Patent, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 115 . . . ii. 37, 38
Thornton v. Baker, [1886] 3 Times R. 715 386
Thornycroft's Patent, [1899] A. C. 415; 16 R. P. C. 202 . ii. 178, 181, 185
Three Towns Banking Co. v. Maddever, [1884] L. R. 27 Ch. D. 523 . 487
Thwaite's Patent, [1892] 9 R. P. C. 515 . . . . ii. 28, 30, 31, 38
Tickelpenny v. Army and Navy Co-operative Society, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 405 . . . . 74, 109, 146
Ticket Punch Register v. Colley's Patents, [1894] 12 R. P. C. 1, 171 . 336, 338, 356, 458, 536
Tilghman's Patent Sand Blast Co. v. Wright and Butler, Ld., [1884] 1 R. P. C. 103 399
Todd's Patent, 9 R. P. C. 487 . . . . ii. 36, 38, 42
Tolson v. Speight, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 718 . . . . 164, 251
Tolson's Patent, [1856] 6 De G. M. & G. 422 . . . . ii. 29
Tomlinson, *Ex parte*, [1899] 16 R. P. C. 233 . . . . ii. 34
Toni Tyres, Ld. v. Palmer Tyre, Ld., [1904] 22 R. P. C. 81, 369 . 390, 393
Townsend v. Haworth, [1875] L. R. 12 Ch. D. 831 n.; 48 L. J. N. S. 770; Higgins's Digest, 168 . . . . 372, 375, 391
Toy's Patent, [1893] 10 R. P. C. 89 . . . . ii. 173, 190
Tranter's Patent, [1873] Johns. Pat. Man. 5th ed. 191, 192 . . . ii. 79
Travell v. Carteret, 3 Lev. 135 . . . . 205, 298
Trotman v. Wood, [1864] 16 C. B. N. S. 479 . . . . . . 338: ii. 148
Trotman's Patent, [1866] L. R. 1 P. C. 118; 3 Moo. P. C. N. S. 488 . ii. 173, 186, 189
Tubeless Pneumatic Tyre and Capon Heaton, Ld. v. Trench Tubeless Tyre Co., [1899] 16 R. P. C. 291 . . . . . 154, 164, 165, 194

PAGE

Tubes, Ld. *v.* Perfecta Seamless Steel Tube Co., Ld., [1900] 17 R. P. C. 569; 18 R. P. C. 339; 20 R. P. C. 77 . 106, 207, 208, 230, 247, 248, 249, 266, 278, 331
Tuck *v.* Silver, John. 218 437
Tucker *v.* Kaye, [1891] 8 R. P. C. 58, 230 . . . . 81, 94
Turner *v.* Winter, [1787] Dav. P. C. 145; 1 W. P. C. 77; 1 T. R. 602 . 112, 158, 167, 203, 207, 221, 225, 232, 233, 461, 467
Turton *v.* Turton, [1889] L. R. 42 Ch. D. 128; 58 L. J. Ch. 677; 61 L. T. N. S. 571, 575; 38 W. R. 22 334
Tweedale *v.* Ashworth, [1890] 7 R. P. C. 426; 8 R. P. C. 49; 9 R. P. C. 121 . . . . 281, 339, 341, 361, 362, 470, 528, 534
Tweedale *v.* Ashworth, [1899] 16 R. P. C. 142, 520; 17 R. P. C. 620 . 363
Tweedale *v.* Howard and Bullough, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 522 . 281, 339, 363, 379: ii. 113

Ungar *v.* Sugg, [1889-94] 6 R. P. C. 337; 8 R. P. C. 385; 9 R. P. C. 113 . . . . 324, 327, 328, 533
Union Electrical Power and Light Co. *v.* Electrical Power Storage Co., [1888] 5 R. P. C. 329 324
United Horseshoe and Nail Co. *v.* Stewart, [1885-88] 2 R. P. C. 122; 3 R. P. C. 139; 4 R. P. C. 140; 5 R. P. C. 260; L. R. 13 App. Cas. 401 . . . 141, 167, 169, 170, 465, 498, 499, 500, 501, 503, 505, 506
United Horseshoe and Nail Co. *v.* Swedish Horse Nail Co., [1888] 6 R. P. C. 1 . . . . 73, 74, 166, 169
United Telephone Co. *v.* Bassano, [1885-86] 2 R. P. C. 70; 3 R. P. C. 295; L. R. 31 Ch. D. 630 . . . 162, 163, 282, 283, 352, 466, 483
United Telephone Co. *v.* Dale, [1883] L. R. 25 Ch. D. 778; 53 L. J. Ch. 295 373
United Telephone Co. *v.* Donohoe, [1886] L. R. 31 Ch. D. 399; 55 L. J. Ch. 480; 3 R. P. C. 45 479
United Telephone Co. *v.* Equitable Telephone Co., [1888] 5 R. P. C. 233 . . . . 427, 428, 429
United Telephone Co. *v.* Faulkner, [1886] 3 R. P. C. 282 n. . . . 533
United Telephone Co. *v.* Fleming, [1886] 3 R. P. C. 268, 282 . 498, 533
United Telephone Co. *v.* Harrison, [1882-83] L. R. 21 Ch. D. 720; 51 L. J. Ch. 705; 46 L. T. N. S. 620 . 39, 142, 143, 154, 183, 193, 195, 223, 250, 257, 263, 289, 336, 352, 518
United Telephone Co. *v.* Henry, [1884] 2 R. P. C. 11 377
United Telephone Co. *v.* London and Globe Telephone and Maintenance Co., [1884] 1 R P. C. 117; L. R. 26 Ch. D. 766; 32 W. R. 870 . . . . 337, 380, 381, 510, 512: ii. 80
United Telephone Co. *v.* Mottershead, [1886] 3 R. P. C. 213 . . 476
United Telephone Co. *v.* Neilson, [1887] W. N. (1887) 193 . . 373: ii. 134
United Telephone Co. *v.* Patterson, [1889] 6 R. P. C. 140 . 498, 529, 530
United Telephone Co. *v.* Sharples, [1885] 2 R. P. C. 28; L. R. 29 Ch. D. 164; 52 L. T. N. S. 384; 1 T. R. 259; 54 L. J. Ch. 633 . 374, 375, 391, 437, 501
United Telephone Co. *v.* St. George, [1886] 3 R. P. C. 33, 321 . 338, 352, 529
United Telephone Co. *v.* Tasker, [1888-89] 5 R. P. C. 628; 6 R. P. C. 38; W. N. (1888) 22 . . . . 381, 394, 401, 438, 507
United Telephone Co. *v.* Walker, [1887] 4 R. P. C. 63; 5 R. P. C. 628; 56 L. T. N. S. 508 . . 390, 494, 499, 501, 502, 505, 506, 507, 510
Universities of Oxford and Cambridge *v.* Richardson, [1806] 6 Ves. 689 . . . . 292, 431, 432

PAGE

Unwin *v.* Heath, [1855] H. L. C. 505. *See* Heath *v.* Unwin . . . 73
Upman *v.* Elkan, [1871] L. R. 12 Eq. 145; L. R. 7 Ch. 130; 41 L. J. Ch. 246 . . . . 333, 338, 386
Upman *v.* Forrester, [1883] L. R. 24 Ch. D. 231; 52 L. J. Ch. 946 . 337, 386, 511
Useful Patents Co. *v.* Rylands, [1885] 2 R. P. C. 255 . . 126, 131: ii. 149

VAISEY'S Patent, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 593 . . . . 26, 305
Valveless Gas Engine Syndicate, Ld. *v.* Day, [1898] 15 R. P. C. 233; 16 R. P. C. 97 . . . . ii. 114, 115
Van Berkel *v.* Simpson, [1906] 23 R. P. C. 237 . . . . . 260, 366
Van de Poele's Patent, [1890] 7 R. P. C. 69 . . . . ii. 22
Van Gelder Apsimon & Co. *v.* Sowerby Bridge Flour Society, [1890] 7 R. P. C. 41, 208; L. R. 44 Ch. D. 374; 59 L. J. Ch. 583 . 388: ii. 85, 113, 123, 128
Van Gelder's Patent, [1888] 6 R. P. C. 22; 4 Times R. 754 . . ii. 65, 67
Van Gelder's Patent, [1892] 9 R. P. C. 325 . . . . ii. 47
Vasey (John), Ld. *v.* Walker, Mitchell & Co., [1899] 16 R. P. C. 596 . 478, 536
Vavasseur *v.* Krupp, [1870] L. R. 9 Ch. D. 351 . 25, 382, 390, 391, 509: ii. 127
Vickers *v.* Siddell, [1890] L. R. 15 App. Cas. 496; 7 R. P. C. 292; 60 L. J. Ch. 105; 63 L. T. N. S. 590; 39 W. R. 385. *See* Siddell *v.* Vickers 31, 37, 38, 71, 191
Vidal's Patent, [1898] 15 R. P. C. 721 . . . . 61: ii. 68
Vidi *v.* Smith, [1854] 23 L. J. Q. B. 342; 3 E. & B. 969 . . 454, 494
Vincent's Patent, [1867] L. R. 2 Ch. D. 341 . . . . ii. 53
Viola *v.* Sharpe, [1904] 22 R. P. C. 23 . . . . ii. 57
Voelker Incandescent Mantle, Ld. *v.* Welsbach Incandescent Gas Light Co., Ld., [1901] 18 R. P. C. 494 323
Von Buch, *Re*, [1887] Griff. L. O. C. 40 . . . . ii. 371
Von Heyden and Neustadt, [1880] L. R. 14 Ch. D. 230; 50 L. J. Ch. 126 . . . . 8, 98, 139, 143, 147, 155, 375
Vorwerk *v.* Evans, [1890] 7 R. P. C. 167, 265 . . . . . 64, 153, 272

WAITE and Saville, Ld. *v.* Johnson Die Press Co., [1900] 18 R. P. C. 1 319
Wakefield *v.* Duke of Buccleugh, [1865] 11 Jur. N. S. 523 . . . 437
Walcott *v.* Lyons, [1884] L. R. 29 Ch. D. 584 388
Walker *v.* Clarke, [1887] 4 R. P. C. 111; 56 L. J. Ch. 239 . . 315, 326
Walker *v.* Hydrocarbon Syndicate, [1884] 2 R. P. C. 3; 3 R. P. C. 253 . . . . 299, 307, 338, 483, 484
Walker's Application, Griff. L. O. C. 22 . . . . ii. 68
Walker's Application, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 345 . . . . ii. 29
Wallace *v.* Jack (Alexander) & Sons, Ld., [1904] 22 R. P. C. 581 . . 366
Wallace's Patent, [1889] 6 R. P. C. 134 . . . . ii. 42, 45, 47
Wallace's Patent, [1895] 12 R. P. C. 444 306
Wallington *v.* Dale, [1852] 7 Exch. 888; 23 L. J. Ex. 49 . 61, 67, 75, 211, 219, 265: ii. 85
Wallis and Ratcliff's Application, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 347 . . ii. 29, 36, 38
Waltham *v.* Austin, 8 Co. Rep. 125 a, 127 b; 2 Int. 47 508
Walton *v.* Bateman, [1842] 1 W. P. C. 613 . . 123, 232, 233, 265, 402, 404

PAGE
Walton *v.* Lavater, [1860] 8 C. B. N. S. 162; 29 L. J. C. P. 275; 3 L. T. N. S. 272; 6 Jur. N. S. 1251; 1 W. P. C. 48 n. . . 337, 375, 376, 387, 409: ii. 109, 111, 115, 122, 132
Walton *v.* Potter, [1841] 1 W. P. C. 585, 597; 11 L. J. C. P. 138 . 10, 73, 81, 266, 268, 338, 403, 404, 471
Wapshare Tube Co., Ld. *v.* Hyde Imperial Rubber Co., Ld., [1901] 18 R. P. C. 374 432
Ward *v.* Livesey, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 102 . . . . ii. 140
Ward Bros. *v.* Hill, [1901] 18 R. P. C. 481; 20 R. P. C. 189 . 163, 184, 189, 190, 239, 459
Wardroper *v.* Gibbs (George), Ld., [1902] 19 R. P. C. 553; 20 R. P. C. 355 33
Warman, *Re*, Griff. L. O. C. 43 . . . . ii. 27
Warner *v.* Murdock, [1877] L. R. 4 Ch. D. 750 474
Washburn and Moen Manufacturing Co. *v.* Cunard Steamship Co., [1889] 6 R. P. C. 398 391
Washburn and Moen Manufacturing Co. *v.* Patterson, [1884] L. R. 29 Ch. D. 48; 1 R. P. C. 157, 191; 2 R. P. C. 27 . . 482, 508, 509
Wastney Smith's Patent, [1885] 2 R. P. C. 14 . . . . . . ii. 191
Waterhouse's Patent, [1905] 23 R. P. C. 55; 470 302
Waterson *v.* Lloyds (W. A.) Cycle Fittings, Ld., [1899] 16 R. P. C. 277 96
Watling *v.* Stevens, [1886] 3 R. P. C. 37, 147 . 67, 188, 190, 196, 242, 246, 248, 534
Watling's Patent, Griff. P. C. 320 296
Watson *v.* Holliday, [1882] 30 W. R. 747; 31 W. R. 536; 52 L. J. Ch. 543; L. R. 20 Ch. D. 780 . . . . 494, 501
Webb *v.* Fox, [1797] 7 T. R. 391 . . . . ii. 126
Webb *v.* Kynoch & Co. *See* Kynoch & Co. *v.* Webb.
Webb *v.* Levinstein, [1898] 15 R. P. C. 78 314
Webb Lamp Co., Ld. *v.* Atkinson, [1902] 19 R. P. C. 599 . . . 501
Webster's Patent, [1888] 6 R. P. C. 163 . . . . ii. 36, 38, 49
Wegman *v.* Corcoran, [1878-79] L. R. 13 Ch. D. 65; 27 W. R. 357 . 19, 209, 234, 277, 288, 517
Weir *v.* Denny, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 657 250
Welch's Patent, [1884] Griff. P. C. 300 . . . . ii. 29, 47
Welch's Patent, [1891] 8 R. P. C. 442 . . . . ii. 45
Welsbach Incandescent Gas Light Co., Ld. *v.* Daylight Incandescent Mantle Co., Ld., [1899] 16 R. P. C. 344; 17 R. P. C. 141 . 30, 212, 335, 370, 390, 470, 530, 531
Welsbach Incandescent Gas Light Co., Ld. *v.* Dowle, [1899] 16 R. P. C. 391 . . . . 399, 400
Welsbach Incandescent Gas Light Co., Ld. *v.* General Incandescent Co., Ld., [1901] 18 R. P. C. 533 429
Welsbach Incandescent Gas Light Co., Ld. *v.* Keegan, [1899] 17 R. P. C. 44 490
Welsbach Incandescent Gas Light Co. *v.* Krumm, [1901] 18 R. P. C. 211 527
Welsbach Incandescent Gas Light Co., Ld. *v.* McGrady (John) & Co., [1901] 18 R. P. C. 51 527
Welsbach Incandescent Gas Light Co., Ld. *v.* New Incandescent (Sunlight Patent) Gas Lighting Co., Ld., [1900] 1 Ch. 843; 17 R. P. C. 237 . . . . 162, 163, 283, 390
Welsbach Incandescent Gas Lighting Co., Ld. *v.* Vulcan Incandescent Light Syndicate, Ld., [1901] 18 R. P. C. 279 433

PAGE

Wenham *v.* Carpenter, [1887] 5 R. P. C. 68 . . . . ii. 66
Wenham *v.* May, [1887] 4 R. P. C. 303 . . . . 338, 534
Wenham Gas Co. *v.* Champion Gas Lamp Co., [1890] 8 R. P. C. 22, 313; 9 R. P. C. 49 . . . . . 280, 342, 343, 397, 446, 498, 534
Werdeman *v.* Société Générale d'Electricité, [1881] L. R. 19 Ch. D. 246 . . . . ii. 121
Westhead *v.* Keen, [1838] 1 Beav. 287; 8 L. J. 89; 2 W. P. C. 36 n. . . . . 366, 393: ii. 112
Westinghouse *v.* Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Co., [1884] 1 R. P. C. 98, 229 . 71, 248, 269, 276, 282, 286, 464, 468, 474, 498, 515, 534
Westinghouse *v.* Midland Ry. Co., [1883] 48 L. T. N. S. 98, 462 . . 447
Westinghouse's Patent, [1885] Griff. P. C. 315 . . . . . . ii. 80
Westley *v.* Tolley, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 602 . . . . . 116, 474, 478
Westley, Richards & Co. *v.* Perks, [1893] 10 R. P. C. 181, 382 . 462, 485, 518
Westrupp and Gibbin's Patent, [1836] 1 W. P. C. 554 . . . . . ii. 194
Wharton *v.* Boffin, [1883] W. N. (1883) 96 476
Whateman *v.* Pearson, [1868] L. R. 3 C. P. 422 389
Wheatstone *v.* Wild, [1861] Griff. P. C. 247 434
White *v.* Bertrams, [1897] 14 R. P. C. 501, 735 347
White *v.* Hartley, [1902] 20 R. P. C. 265 516
White *v.* Toms, [1867] 37 L. J. Ch. 204; 17 L. T. N. S. 348 . . 33, 77, 81
Whitehouse's Patent, [1838] 1 W. P. C. 473; Carp. P. C. 565; reported as Russell's Patent, 2 Moo. P. C. 496 . ii. 123, 164, 173, 175, 191, 193
Whittaker's Patent, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 580 . . . . . . ii. 36, 39, 49
Whitton *v.* Jennings, [1860] 1 Dr. & Sm. 110 430
Whitworth's Patent, 48 Eng. 15 . . . . ii. 174
Wield's Patent, [1871] L. R. 4 P. C. 89; 8 Moo. P. C. N. S. 300 . ii. 173, 181, 182, 189, 194
Wilcox and Gibbs' Sewing Machine Co. *v.* James, [1897] 14 R. P. C. 523; 66 L. J. Ch. 525; L. R. (1897) 2 Ch. 71; 45 W. R. 474 . 513, 520, 521
Wilkinson's Patent, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 298 305
Williams *v.* Brodie, [1785] Dav. P. C. 26; 1 W. P. C. 75 76
Williams *v.* Govan, [1895] 12 R. P. C. 387 121
Williams *v.* Guest, [1875] L. R. 10 Ch. App. Cas. 467 476
Williams *v.* Nash, [1859] 28 Beav. 93; 28 L. J. Ch. 886 . . . . ii. 13
Williams *v.* Nye, [1890] 7 R. P. C. 62 . . . . 33, 40
Williams *v.* Williams, 3 Mer. 157 . . . . ii. 104
Williams and Robinson's Patent, [1896] 13 R. P. C. 550 . . . . ii. 185
Willoughby *v.* Taylor, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 45 . . . . . 312, 317, 324, 329
Wills *v.* Dawson, 1 W. R. 234 81
Wilson *v.* Barbour, [1888] 5 R. P. C. 245, 675 342
Wilson *v.* Gann, [1875] W. N. (1875) 78 416
Wilson *v.* Tindal, [1841] 1 W. P. C. 730 n. 431, 437
Wilson *v.* Union Oil Mills, [1892] 9 R. P. C. 57 . . 81, 94, 163, 165, 332: ii. 134, 148, 155
Wilson *v.* Wilson & Co. (Barnsley), Ld., [1899] 16 R. P. C. 215 . 414, 415, 455
Wilson & Co. *v.* Church (Walter E.) Engineering Co., [1885] 2 R. P. C. 175 325
Wilson Brothers Bobbin Co., Ld. *v.* Wilson & Co. (Barnsley), Ld., [1900] 17 R. P. C. 177; 18 R. P. C. 139; 20 R. P. C. 1 . . 163, 164
Wilson's Patent, [1892] 9 R. P. C. 512 . . . . ii. 51
Winby *v.* Manchester Steam Tramways Co., [1889-90] 6 R. P. C. 359; 7 R. P. C. 30; 8 R. P. C. 61 . . . . 74, 121, 127, 147, 338, 464
Winter *v.* Baybut, [1884] 1 R. P. C. 76 . . . . ii. 92, 95

PAGE
Winter v. Turner, [1787] 1 T. R. 602; 1 W. P. C. 77 215
Wirth's Patent, [1879] L. R. 12 Ch. D. 303 , ... 4
Wittman v. Oppenheim, [1884] L. R. 27 Ch. D. 260 . . 337, 386, 511
Wood v. Cockerill, [1819] 2 Coop. Ch. Ca. 58 436
Wood v. Lambert, [1886] 3 R. P. C. 84 487
Wood v. Leadbitter, 9 Jur. 187 . . . . ii. 140
Wood v. Raphael, [1896-97] 13 R. P. C. 730; 14 R. P. C. 496 . 33, 70, 71
Wood v. Zimmer, [1815] Holt, N. P. 58; 1 W. P. C. 44, 82 n.; 1 Carp. P. C. 290 . . . . 133, 135, 200, 232, 233, 235
Woodcroft's Patent, [1841] 1 W. P. C. 740; 2 W. P. C. 18; 10 Jur. 363; 28 Newton, L. J. O. S. 196; 3 Moo. P. C. 171 . 146, 151: ii. 164, 172, 175, 176, 177, 180
Woodhead, Re, [1886] Griff. L. O. C. 44 . . . . ii. 29
Woodward v. Sansum, [1886-87] 3 R. P. C. 357; 4 R. P. C. 166 . . 183, 184, 189, 239, 533, 535
Woolfe v. Automatic Picture Gallery, Ld., [1902] 19 R. P. C. 161; [1903] 1 Ch. 18 . . . . 447: ii. 93, 100
Woolley v. Broad, [1892] 19 R. P. C. 429 . . . . . . 414, 455
Worthington & Co.'s Trade Mark, In re, [1897] L. R. 14 Ch. D. 8 . 333
Worthington Pumping Engine Co. v. Moore, [1902] 20 R. P. C. 41 . 16
Wotherspoon v. Currie, [1872] L. R. 5 H. L. 508 333
Wren v. Weild, [1869] L. R. 4 Q. B. 213, 730; 38 L. J. Q. B. 327. . 310, 324, 398
Wright v. Hitchcock, [1870] L. R. 5 Ex. 37; 39 L. J. Ex. 97 . 67, 190, 196, 197, 337, 352, 375
Wright's Patent, [1839] 1 W. P. C. 575 . . . . ii. 179, 180
Wüterich's Patent, [1903] A. C. 206; 20 R. P. C. 235 . . . ii. 183, 184
Wyeth v. Stone, 1 Story, 273 . . . . 45, 253
Wylie and Morton's Patent, [1897] 13 R. P. C. 97 . 41, 153: ii. 36, 38

YATES and Kellett's Patent, [1887] 4 R. P. C. 150; L. R. 12 App. Cas. 147 . . . . ii. 167, 183, 190
York v. Stowers, [1883] W. N. (1883) 174 . . . . . . 496, 497
Youatt v. Winyard, [1820] 1 J. & W. 394 . . . . ii. 102
Young v. Fernie, [1864] 1 De G. J. & S. 353; 4 Giff. 577; L. R. 1 H. L. 63; 33 L. J. Ch. 192; 35 L. J. Ch. 528; 9 L. T. N. S. 861; 14 L. T. N. S. 637; Griff. P. C. 577; Pemberton, 4th ed. 484; Seton, 4th ed. 355 . . . . 9, 111, 125, 126, 155, 459, 473, 476, 498, 508
Young v. Hermand Oil Co., [1891] 8 R. P. C. 285; 9 R. P. C. 373 . ii. 149
Young v. Morris, [1894] 11 R. P. C. 617; 12 R. P. C. 455 . . . 337
Young v. Rosenthal, [1883] 1 R. P. C. 29 . 108, 127, 162, 200, 269, 282, 336, 337, 352, 474
Young v. White, [1853] 17 Beav. 532; 23 L. J. Ch. 190 . . 441, 459
Young Manufacturing Co., Re, [1900] 2 Ch. 753 437
Young's Patent, P. M. J., 2nd series, vol. 7, p. 41 296

LIST OF DEFENDANTS IN ACTIONS.

Abott, Sutcliffe *v.*
Action Gesellschaft für Motor, &c., Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.*
Adams, Hill *v.*
Adie, Clark *v.*
Aerators, Ld., Crocker *v.*
Alliance Chemical Co., Ld., Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.*
Allin, Darcy *v.*
Allison, Collard *v.*
Amatt, Cartwright *v.*
American Braided Wire Co., Thomson *v.*
American Steel and Wire Co., Glover (W. T.) & Co., Ld. *v.*
Amos, Reynolds *v.*
Ancoats Vale Rubber Co., Spencer *v.*
Anderson, Maxim-Nordenfelt Guns and Ammunition Co. *v.*
Anderson, Nobel's Explosives Co. *v.*
Anderson, Stead *v.*
Anderston Foundry Co., Harrison *v.*
André's Patent, Curtis *v.*
Andrew, Read *v.*
Andrews & Co. (T. E. H.), Ld., British Motor Syndicate, Ld. *v.*
Anglo-American Brush Corporation, Crompton *v.*
Anglo-American Brush Corporation, King Brown *v.*
Anglo-American Telegraph Co., Piggott *v.*
Anglo-Continental Chemical Works, Ld., Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.*
Annand, Taylor *v.*
Arc Lamp Co., Jandus Arc Lamp and Electric Co., Ld. *v.*
Arden, Fletcher *v.*
Arkwright, R. *v.*
Armitage, Merchant Shipping Co. *v.*
Armstrong, Whitworth & Co., Ld., Corrigal *v.*
Army and Navy Co-operative Society, Ticklepenny *v.*
Ashburn, Calvert *v.*
Ashley's Patent (Machine made) Bottle Co., Rylands *v.*
Ashworth, Law *v.*
Ashworth, Tweedale *v.*
Asplen, Morrison *v.*
Aston, Brook *v.*
Aston, Saunders *v.*
Attorney-General, Sheddan *v.*
Austin, Waltham *v.*
Automatic Weighing Machine Co., Combined Weighing Machine Co. *v.*

Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik, Chemische Fabrik vorm Sandoz *v.*
Baedeker, Cooper & Co. (Birmingham), Ld. *v.*
Baker, Hardmuth *v.*
Baker, Lawrie *v.*
Baker, Thornton *v.*
Balmoral Cycle Co., Ld., Osmonds, Ld. *v.*
Banham, Reddaway *v.*
Bank of British Columbia, Anderson *v.*
Bank of England, Shaw *v.*
Barbour, Wilson *v.*
Barker, Miller *v.*
Barnett's Screw Stopper Bottling Co., Ld., Barnett *v.*
Barnsley, Russell *v.*
Baron Cigarette Machine Co., Ludington Cigarette Machine Co. *v.*
Barton, Shaw *v.*
Barwick, Cardiff Steamship Co. *v.*

Basle Chemical Works, Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik *v.*
Bassano, United Telephone Co. *v.*
Batchelor, Kelly *v.*
Bateman, Walton *v.*
Battersby, Gammons *v.*
Batty, Batty *v.*
Bauer, Sharp *v.*
Bauwen's Patent Candle Co., Price's Patent Candle Co. *v.*
Baybut, Winter *v.*
Bayley, Procter *v.*
Baylis, Coles *v.*
Bayliss, Barlow *v.*
Beal, Innes *v.*
Bean, Loog *v.*
Bechmann, Kratz-Boussac *v.*
Beck, Monnet *v.*
Beddon, Beddon *v.*
Bell, Jahncke *v.*
Benecke, Bridson *v.*
Bennett, Hudson *v.*
Bennett, Moore *v.*
Bennis, Procter *v.*
Bentall, Ransome *v.*
Benyon, Campion *v.*
Berend, Holophane, Ld. *v.*
Berger, Jones *v.*
Bernstein, Edison-Bell Phonograph Corporation *v.*
Bertrams, White *v.*
Betts, De Vitre *v.*
Betts, Neilson *v.*
Betts, R. *v.*
Beverley, Crossley *v.*
Bewley, Hancock *v.*
Bibly, Penn *v.*
Billington, Dowling *v.*
Bird, Badham *v.*
Birmingham Stopper and Cycle Components Co., Griffiths *v.*
Birmingham Vinegar Brewery Co., Powell *v.*
Bishop, Gosnell *v.*
Black, Preston *v.*
Blake, Griffith *v.*
Bleaden, Galloway *v.*
Bloomer, Honiball *v.*
Blore, Denley *v.*
Board, Osborne *v.*
Boffin, Wharton *v.*
Bolland, Hull *v.*
Bostock, Foxwell *v.*
Boulton, Hornblower *v.*
Boursier, Elmslie *v.*
Bower, Cutler *v.*
Bowker, Farbenfabriken vorm F. Bayer *v.*
Bowman, Collinge *v.*
Boyle, Kane *v.*
Braby, Heathfield *v.*
Braby, Rose's Patents Co. *v.*
Bradbury, Arnold *v.*
Bradbury, Haydon *v.*
Bradley, Garnett *v.*
Bradley, Middleton *v.*
Braithwaite, Cochrane *v.*
Brand, Gibson *v.*
Branson, Morris *v.*
Bratby, Codd *v.*
Bray, Sugg *v.*
Brett, Electric Telegraph Co. *v.*
Bridges, Bidder *v.*
Brierly, Dutton *v.*
Brindle, Savage *v.*
Brindle, Savage Bros., Ld. *v.*
Bristol Tanning Co., Greer *v.*
British and Colonial Motor-Car Co., Ld., Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.*
British Leather Cloth Manufacturing Co., Ld., Pegamoid, Ld. *v.*
British Thomson-Houston Co., Ld., Ferranti *v.*
Broadbent, Gardner *v.*
Brodie, Williams *v.*
Brodribb, Brodribb *v.*
Brogden, Incandescent Gas Light Co. *v.*
Brooks, Dicks *v.*
Brooks, Lycett Saddle and Motor Accessories Co., Ld. *v.*
Brooks, Norton *v.*
Brotherhood, Halsey *v.*
Brown, Amory *v.*
Brown, Hastings *v.*
Browne, Saull *v.*
Bryant and May, Fusee Vesta Co. *v.*
Buccleugh (Duke), Wakefield *v.*
Buchanan, Smith *v.*
Buckingham and Adams Cycle and Motor Co., Ld., Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.*
Buckingham, Smith *v.*
Bull, Boulton *v.*
Bull, Ledgard *v.*
Bull, Petman *v.*
Buller, Elsey *v.*
Buller, Smith *v.*
Burns, Overton *v.*
Bury, Bradford Dyers Association *v.*
Bury (Lord), Bennett *v.*

Butler, Butler *v.*
Bykes, Kelly *v.*

Cambell, Graham *v.*
Came, Consolidated Car Heating Co. *v.*
Campbell, Speckhart *v.*
Cantelo, Incandescent Gas Light Co. *v.*
Capper, Hollins *v.*
Carpenter, Wenham *v.*
Carson, Mills *v.*
Carteret, Travell *v.*
Cash Cycle Co., Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*
Caspers, Fabriques de Produits Chimiques de Thann *v.*
Cassey, Stewart *v.*
Casswell, Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*
Castner-Kellner Alkali Co., Atkins and Applegarth *v.*
Castner-Kellner Alkali Co., Commercial Development Corporation *v.*
Castry, Richardson *v.*
Centaur Cycle Co., Bown *v.*
Ceralite Syndicate, National Opalite Glazed Brick and Tile Syndicate *v.*
Chadburn, Patent Marine Inventions Co. *v.*
Chadburn's (Ship) Telegraph Co., Robinson *v.*
Chadwick, Amos *v.*
Chamberlain, Heugh *v.*
Chambers, Hunt *v.*
Chambers, Lifeboat Co. *v.*
Chameleon Patents Manufacturing Co., Marshalls, Ld. *v.*
Champion Gas Lamp Co., Wenham Gas Co. *v.*
Chance, Rawes *v.*
Charlesworth, Simpson *v.*
Chemical and Drugs Co., Ld., Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.*
Chemische Fabrik von Heyden, Farbenfabriken vormals Friedrich Bayer & Co. *v.*
Chemische Fabrik vormals Sandoz in Basel, Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik *v.*
Chisholm, Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*
Christy, Ellwood *v.*
Chubb, Kaye *v.*
Church (Walter E.) Engineering Co., Wilson & Co. *v.*
Churchill & Co., Consolidated Pneumatic Tool Co., Ld. *v.*
Churchwardens of All Saints, Wigan, R. *v.*
City of London Electric Lighting Co., Ld., Schilfa *v.*
City of London Real Property Co., Hunt *v.*
Clark, Ellington *v.*
Clarke, Adie *v.*
Clarke, Fennessey *v.*
Clarke, Ormson *v.*
Clarke, Walker *v.*
Claughton (Hugh), British United Shoe Machinery Co., Ld. *v.*
Clayton, Goucher *v.*
Clayton, Leeds Forge Co. *v.*
Clayton, Murray *v.*
Clifton Rubber Co., Ld., Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.*
Clipper Pneumatic Tyre Co., Bagot Pneumatic Tyre Co., *v.*
Clough, Spilsbury *v.*
Clums, Saxby *v.*
Clyde Bridge Street Co., Miller *v.*
Cochran, Boxwell *v.*
Cockerill, Wood *v.*
Colley's Patents, Ticket Punch Register *v.*
Collings, Cunningham, *v.*
Collyer, Sayers *v.*
Columbia Co., Edison-Bell Consolidated Phonograph Co., Ld. *v.*
Combe, Baxter *v.*
Combined Weighing Machine Co., Automatic Weighing Machine Co. *v.*
Commercial Cable Co., Muirhead *v.*
Commercial Development Corporation, Castner-Kellner Alkali, Co. *v.*
Commissioners of Inland Revenue, Smelting Company of Australia, Ld. *v.*
Comptroller-General of Patents, *Ex parte* Tomlinson, Queen *v.*
Conder, Hall *v.*
Condy, Sanitas Co. *v.*
Congreve, Walker *v.*
Conico Incandescent Light Co., Heine *v.*
Cooke, Alcock *v.*
Cooper, Cooper *v.*
Cooper, Palmer *v.*
Corcoran, Wegman *v.*
Corporation of Liverpool, Adamant Stone Paving Co. *v.*
Coulson, Newcomen *v.*
Coventry Machinists Co., Morris Wilson & Co. *v.*
Cowan, Bovill *v.*

Cowley, Russell v.
Crabb, Blackwell v.
Crampton, R. v.
Crate, Bovill v.
Craven, Moore v.
Crawley, Rushton v.
Creasy, Elmer v.
Cressey, Case v.
Cresswell, Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. v.
Crichley, Chambers v.
Crichton, Russell v.
Croll, Edge v.
Crompton, Anglo-American Brush Electric Light Corporation v.
Crompton and Horrocks, Kerr and Hoeggen v.
Crossley, Andrew v.
Crossley, Anti-Vibration Incandescent Lighting Co. v.
Crossley, Coates v.
Cruikshank, Alexander Turnbull & Co., Ld. v.
Cunard Steamship Co., Washburn and Moen Manufacturing v.
Cunningham, Basket v.
Currie, Wotherspoon v.
Curtis and Harvey, Ld., Davies v.
Cutlan, Shoe Machinery Co. v.
Cutler, R. v.
Cutts, Curtis v.
Cyanide Gold Recovery Syndicate, Cassel Gold Extracting Co. v.

Dairy Outfit Co., Aktiebolaget Separator v.
D'Albriquerque, Nunn v.
Dale, Punchard v.
Dale, United Telephone Co. v.
Dale, Wallington v.
Dania, Tatham v.
David Moseley & Sons, Ld., Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. v.
Davidson, Chappell v.
Davidson, Smith v.
Davies, Day, v.
Davies, Lowndes v.
Dawson, Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik v.
Dawson, Cutlan v.
Dawson, McNaught v.
Dawson, Saccharin Corporation, Ld. v.
Day, Emperor of Austria v.
Day, Shaw v.
Deeley, Perks v.
Deighton's Patent Flue and Tube Co., Leeds Forge Co. v.
De la Rue, Sturtz v.
Dellestable, Fox v.
De Mare Incandescent Gas Light System, Incandescent Gas Light Co. v.
Denny, Weir v.
Dent, Turpin v.
Derby Gas Co., Crossley v.
De Vitre, Betts v.
Dewhurst, Charter v.
Dewick, Fisher v.
Diaper, Orr v.
Dickinson, De la Rue v.
Dickinson, Sellers v.
Dickinson, Smith v.
Dix, Lister v.
Dixon, Crossley v.
Dobbie, Cera Light Co. v.
Doig, Dilly v.
Domeiere, Aluminium Co. v.
Donald Macpherson & Co., Lawson v.
Donohoe, United Telephone Co. v.
Dougill, Frentzell v.
Doulton, Allen v.
Down, Fowler v.
Drosophore Co., Dowson Taylor v.
Drysdale, Gwynne v.
Dublin Tramway Co., Ld., British Insulated Wire Co., Ld. v.
Duckett, Allen v.
Dunlop, Pneumatic Tyre Co. v.

Eadie (Albert) Chain, Ld., Appleby's (Alfred) Twin Roller Chain, Ld., v.
Eames, Cartwright v.
East London Rubber Co., Pneumatic Tyre Co. v.
Easterbrook, Saxby v.
Eastern Archipelago Co., R. v.
Eastern Counties Ry. Co., Greaves v.
Easton, Tetley v.
Eastwood, Lister v.
Edelston, Edelston v.
Edge, Garrard v.
Edge, Johnson v.
Edinburgh and Leith Gas Commissioners, New Conveyor Co., Ld. v.
Edison-Bell Consolidated Phonograph Co., Ld., Berliner v.
Edison Phonograph Co., Edison-Bell Phonograph Corporation v.
Edlin-Sinclair Tyre Co., Swain v.
Edwards, Palmer v.

Egerton, Beard *v.*
Electric Lighting Co., Liardet *v.*
Electrical Co., Mica Insulator Co. *v.*
Electrical Power Storage Co., Union Electrical Power and Light Co. *v.*
Eley, Daw *v.*
Eli, Graham *v.*
Elkan, Upman *v.*
Ellams Duplicator Co., Dick *v.*
Elliott, Newall *v.*
Else, R. *v.*
Elsee, Bloxam *v.*
English Card Clothing Co., Ld., Ashworth *v.*
English Cycle and Tyre Co., Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*
Equitable Telephone Co., United Telephone Co. *v.*
Evans, Hill *v.*
Evans, Lamb *v.*
Evans, Vorwerk *v.*
Evered, Brown *v.*
Everington, MacIntosh *v.*
Excelsior T[illegible] and Cement Co., Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.*

Fairburn, Household *v.*
Fairie, Derosne *v.*
Falcon Works, Downes *v.*
Fanta, Graham *v.*
Farquharson, Plating Co. *v.*
Farrar, Boyd *v.*
Faulkner, United Telephone Co. *v.*
Fearby, Automatic Weighing Machine Co. *v.*
Feaver, Griffin *v.*
Fell, Master Wardens and Society of Gunmakers *v.*
Fellows, Duvergier *v.*
Feltham, Slazenger *v.*
Ferguson, Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*
Fernie, Young *v.*
Fielden, Sidebottom *v.*
Finch, Bovill *v.*
Findlater, Siegert *v.*
Fisher, Alma Veneer Felt Co. *v.*
Fisher, Crossdale *v.*
Fleming, United Telephone Co. *v.*
Flemming, Bentley *v.*
Fletcher, Dewrance *v.*
Footman, Blank *v.*
Forrester, Upman *v.*
Foster, Claughton *v.*
Foster, Day *v.*
Foster, Ford *v.*
Foster, Hoe *v.*
Foster, Muntz *v.*
Fothergill, Neilson *v.*
Fox, Bush *v.*
Fox, Holland *v.*
Foxwell, Thomas *v.*
Franklin, Hall *v.*
Franklin Hocking, Franklin Hocking & Co. *v.*
Franks, Pidding *v.*
Fraser, Franklin Hocking & Co. *v.*
Fraser, Hocking *v.*
Fraser, Macdonald *v.*
French, Robertson *v.*
Friswell, British Motor Syndicate, Ld. *v.*
Friswell, Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*
Fuller, Morgan *v.*
Fullwood, Fullwood *v.*

Gage, Bethell *v.*
Gallairs, Betts *v.*
Gann, Wilson *v.*
Gardner, Bray *v.*
Gardner, Nordenfelt *v.*
Gare Machine Co., English and American Machinery Co. *v.*
Garland, R. *v.*
Gas Light and Coke Co., Patterson *v.*
Gaul, Fowler *v.*
General Incandescent Co., Ld., New Inverted Incandescent Gas Lamp Co., Ld. *v.*
General Sewage and Manure Co., MacDougall *v.*
Gibbs, National Company for the Distribution of Electricity by Secondary Generators, Ld. *v.*
Gisborne, Lang *v.*
Glace, Commissioners of Sewers *v.*
Glasgow Gas Commissioners, Fletcher *v.*
Globe Light, Ld., New Inverted Incandescent Gas Lamp Co., Ld. *v.*
Glover (T. W.) & Co., American Steel and Wire Co. *v.*
Gloucester Waggon Co., Saxby *v.*
Goddard, Lyon *v.*
Goldberg, Davenport *v.*
Goldstein, Dubowski *v.*
Goodfellow, Haslam Foundry and Engineering Co. *v.*
Goodier, Bovill *v.*
Goodman, Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*
Goodwin, Higgs *v.*

Gormully and Jeffery Manufacturing Co., North British Rubber Co. *v.*
Govan, Williams *v.*
Grace, Barber *v.*
Graham, Starey *v.*
Grand Hotel (Birmingham), Ld., National Opalite Glazed Brick and Tile Co., Ld. *v.*
Grand Junction Ry. Co., Newton *v.*
Gray, Bateman *v.*
Gray, McCormick *v.*
Graydon, Bassett *v.*
Graydon, Roberts *v.*
Great Eastern Ry. Co., Sheehan *v.*
Great Northern Ry. Co., Harwood *v.*
Great Western Ry. Co., Easterbrook *v.*
Great Western Ry. Co., Smith *v.*
Greaves, Felton *v.*
Green, Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.*
Green, Mathers *v.*
Green, Robb *v.*
Greener, Couchman *v.*
Greenway, Heathfield *v.*
Grenfell, Muntz *v.*
Grimshaw, Huddart *v.*
Griswold, London and Leicester Hosiery Co. *v.*
Groom, London and South Western Ry. Co. *v.*
Groth, British Tanning Co. *v.*
Grovesend Tinplate Co., Elias *v.*
Guest, Kane *v.*
Guest, Williams *v.*
Gunn, Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., *v.*

HADLEY, Bovill *v.*
Hague, Hullett *v.*
Hague, Losh *v.*
Hall, Brooks *v.*
Hall, Halden *v.*
Hall, Haslam *v.*
Hallmark, Heys *v.*
Hamilton, Hayward *v.*
Hamling, Scott *v.*
Hanbury, Philpot *v.*
Handy, Fuller *v.*
Hanley, Burgess *v.*
Hardcastle, Bramah *v.*
Hardcastle, Haworth *v.*
Hardie, Hensee *v.*
Harding, Haws *v.*
Hare, Taylor *v.*
Harford, Neilson *v.*
Hargreaves, Nuttall *v.*
Harley, Harley *v.*
Harrap, Birch *v.*
Harris, Savage *v.*
Harrison, Edge *v.*
Harrison, Newby *v.*
Harrison, United Telephone Co. *v.*
Hart, Colley *v.*
Hart, Mullins *v.*
Hartlepools Pulp and Paper Co., Partington *v.*
Hartley, Heap *v.*
Haslam, Dick *v.*
Haslam, Nickels *v.*
Hastie, Brown *v.*
Hatfield, Russell *v.*
Hawkes, Brunton *v.*
Haworth, Townsend *v.*
Hay, Burdett *v.*
Hay, Gonville *v.*
Hay, Saccharin Corporation, Ld., *v.*
Haynes, Massey *v.*
Head, Powell *v.*
Heald, Steiner *v.*
Heath, Unwin *v.*
Heathman, Keeley *v.*
Heaton, Jones *v.*
Henery, Alexander *v.*
Hennett, Saxby *v.*
Henry, United Telephone Co. *v.*
Hepponstall, Holliday *v.*
Hermand Oil Co., Young *v.*
Herold, Lane, *v.*
Heywood, Roberts *v.*
Hicks, Lovell *v.*
Hicks, Musgrave *v.*
Hickson, Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik *v.*
Higginbottom, Bunge *v.*
Higgins, Seed *v.*
Higham, London and Leicester Hosiery Co. *v.*
Hill, Bennington *v.*
Hills, Burgess *v.*
Hindes, Peck *v.*
Hinks, Rollins *v.*
Hirsch, Britain *v.*
Hirschfeld, Leather Cloth Co. *v.*
Hirst, Osmond *v.*
Hitchcock, Bovill *v.*
Hitchcock, Wright *v.*
Hitchman, Simmonds *v.*
Hobson, Fritz *v.*
Hocking, Hocking *v.*
Hodgson, Hattersley *v.*
Hoffman, Chollet *v.*

Holborn Tyre Co., Ld., Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.*
Holden, Oxley *v.*
Holland, Edison and Swan Co. *v.*
Holland, Electrolytic Plating Apparatus Co. *v.*
Holland, Patterson *v.*
Holliday, Simpson *v.*
Holliday, Watson *v.*
Holt, Spence *v.*
Homan, Fawcett *v.*
Homer, British Mutoscope and Biograph Co., Ld. *v.*
Hope, Jenkins *v.*
Hopkinson, Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.*
Horrocks, Boyd *v.*
Horsfall, Ashworth *v.*
Horsfall, Bates *v.*
Horton, Allen *v.*
Hoskins and Sewell, Ld., Evans and Taunton, Ld. *v.*
Hough, Edison-Bell Phonograph Corporation *v.*
Household, Fairburn *v.*
Howard and Bullough, Tweedale *v.*
Howarth, Sykes *v.*
Howell, Grenwell *v.*
Hubbard Patents and Tyre Syndicate, Ld., Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.*
Hubert Unchangeable Eylet Syndicate, Engels *v.*
Hudson, Perrin *v.*
Hughes & Co., Downes *v.*
Hughes, Rann *v.*
Hughes, Thomson *v.*
Hull Steam Fishing and Ice Co., Scott *v.*
Hulse, Macnamara *v.*
Humber, Bown *v.*
Hunt, Hunt *v.*
Hunt, Thomas *v.*
Hutchinson, Haskell Golf Ball Co., Ld. *v.*
Hutchinson, Haslett *v.*
Hyde Rubber Co., Ld., Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.*
Hydrocarbon Syndicate, Walker *v.*

IBBOTSON, Crompton *v.*
Imperial Tramways Co., Ld., Electric Construction Co., Ld. *v.*
Incandescent Gas Light Co., Heald *v.*
Incandescent Gas Light Co., Sunlight Incandescent Gas Lamp Co. *v.*
Indiarubber Co., Edison Telephone Co. *v.*
Inman, Bishop *v.*
International Hygienic Society, Automatic Weighing Machine Co. *v.*
International Phonograph Indestructible Record Co., Ld., Lambert Co. *v.*
Isaacs, Collyer *v.*
Isaacs, Rolls *v.*
Isler, Badische Anilin und Soda, Fabrik *v.*
Ivel Cycle Co., Phillips *v.*
Ivy, Horne *v.*
Ixion Patent Pneumatic Tyre Co., Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*

JACK, Spencer *v.*
Jackson, Brown *v.*
Jackson, Makepeace *v.*
Jackson, Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.*
James, Finnegan *v.*
James, Newburry *v.*
James, Thomson *v.*
James, Wilcox and Gibbs' Sewing Machine Co. *v.*
Jarve, Dalglish *v.*
Jarvis, Hall *v.*
Jebson, Davenport *v.*
Jennings, Whitton *v.*
Johnson, Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik *v.*
Johnson, Charter *v.*
Johnson, Edge *v.*
Johnson, Hookham *v.*
Johnson, Jandus Arc Lamp and Electric Co., Ld. *v.*
Johnson, Liardet *v.*
Johnson, Needham *v.*
Johnson, Orr-Ewing *v.*
Jones, Bacon *v.*
Jones, Canham *v.*
Jones, Dangerfield *v.*
Jones, Moser *v.*
Jones, Nobel's Explosives Co. *v.*
Jones, Saunders *v.*
Jones, Shaw *v.*
Judge of County Court of Halifax, R. *v.*

KALLÉ, Leonardt *v.*
Karo, Siemens *v.*
Kaye, Tucker *v.*

Keating, Stevens v.
Keegan, Incandescent Gas Light Co. v.
Keeling, Dowler v.
Keen, Cornish v.
Keen, Westhead v.
Keighley, Bentley v.
Kelley, Poulton v.
Kennard, Booth v.
Kensington and Knightsbridge Electric Lighting Co., Lane-Fox v.
Kenyon (Lord), Myddelton v.
Kerr, Guilbert-Martin v.
Keyworth, Bovill v.
Kidd, Albo-Carbon Light Co. v.
King Mendham & Co., Jardine v.
King, Rothwell v.
Kinnell, Baker v.
Kirby, Hogg v.
Kirkman, Meadows v.
Kitchin, Leadbeater v.
Knight, Automatic Weighing Machine Co. v.
Krebs, British Dynamite Co. v.
Krupp, Vavasseur v.
Kurtz, Gamble v.
Kynock, Batley v.

Lafitte, Fabriques de Produits Chimiques de Thann et Mulhouse v.
Lambert, Wood v.
Laming, Hills v.
Lamplough, Brooks v.
Lancashire and Yorkshire Ry. Co., Westinghouse v.
Lane-Fox Electrical Co., Kensington and Knightsbridge Electric Light Co. v.
Laporte, Farbenfabriken vorm F. Bayer, v.
Lardeur, Briggs, v.
Larmuth, Shillito v.
La Roche, Talbot v.
La Société des Usines du Rhône, Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik v.
Latham, Blakeys v.
Lavater, Walton v.
Law, Ashworth v.
Lawes & Co., Ld., McLay, v.
Leadbitter, Wood v.
Leathem, Quinn v.
Leather, Lister v.
Ledsam, Russell v.
Lee, Jones v.
Lee, Sudbury v.
Leeds Forge Co., Ld., North Eastern Marine Engineering Co., Ld. v.
Leese, Charter v.
Leicester Pneumatic Tyre and Automatic Valve Co., Pneumatic Tyre Co. v.
Levinstein, Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik v.
Levinstein, Cassalla v.
Levinstein, Renard v.
Lewis, Davis v.
Leyson, Carter v.
Liebig's Extract of Meat Co., Anderson v.
Lindsay, Gaulard v.
Linford, Otto v.
Linotype Co., Ld., Pashley v.
Lister, R. v.
Livesey, Ward v.
Lloyd, Coppin v.
Lloyd, Flower v.
Lockwood, Chartered Institute of Patent Agents v.
Loe, Frearson v.
London and Globe Telephone and Maintenance Co., United Telephone Co. v.
London and North-Western Ry. Co., Holmes v.
London and North-Western Ry. Co., Sharrod v.
London County Council, Cooper Patent Anchor Rail Joint Co., Ld. v.
London County Council, North Metropolitan Tramways Co., Ld. v.
London Gas Light Co., Hills v.
London Phonograph Corporation, Edison-Bell Phonograph Corporation v.
London Small Arms Co., Dixon v.
Longford Wire, Iron, and Steel Co., Rowcliffe v.
Longmead, Oldham v.
Loog, Singer Manufacturing Co. v.
Lord Mayor, &c., of Manchester, Geipel v.
Lund, Axman v.
Lycett (E.), Ld., Brooks v.
Lycett's Saddle and Motor Accessories Co., Ld., Brooks v.
Lyle (D. T. J.) & Son, Ld., Saccharin Corporation, Ld. v.
Lyons, Fairfax v.
Lyons, Walcott v.

Mabon, Horton v.
Macdonald, Neil v.

Macdonald, Thomson *v.*
Macfarlane, Templeton *v.*
Macintosh, North British Rubber Co. *v.*
MacIvor's Patents, Alliance Pure White Lead Syndicate *v.*
Mackenzie, Bulnois *v.*
MacKernan, How *v.*
Mackie, Solvo Laundry Supply Co. *v.*
Mackintosh, Rothwell *v.*
Maclaren, Aveling *v.*
Maddever, Three Towns Banking Co. *v.*
Magill, Hugh *v.*
Maignen's Filtre Rapide Co., Parker *v.*
Malcolmson, Plimpton *v.*
Malins, Moss *v.*
Mallett, Dunnicliff *v.*
Maltz, Hague *v.*
Managers of the Metropolitan Asylums District, Fleet *v.*
Manchester Steam Tramways Co., Winby *v.*
Mangnall, McAlpine, *v.*
Mann, Newsum *v.*
Manton, Manton *v.*
Marling, Lewis *v.*
Marsden, Monforts *v.*
Marsden, Moser *v.*
Marsh, Miligan *v.*
Marsh, Steadman *v.*
Marshall, Kay *v.*
Marshalls, Ld., Chameleon Patents Manufacturing Co., Ld. *v.*
Martin, Lyons *v.*
Martyn, Ellam *v.*
Marwood, Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*
Massam, Thorley's Cattle Food Co. *v.*
Massey, Pilkington *v.*
Mather, Birch *v.*
Matin, Nadel *v.*
Maxim-Nordenfelt Guns and Ammunition Co., Delta Metal Co. *v.*
Maxim-Nordenfelt Guns and Ammunition Co., Nordenfelt *v.*
May, Wenham *v.*
Mayor and Corporation of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Lyon *v.*
Mayor, &c., of Bradford, Chamberlain and Hookham, Ld. *v.*
Mayor, &c., of Huddersfield, Chamberlain and Hookham, Ld. *v.*
Mayor of Manchester, British Thomson-Houston Co., Ld. *v.*
Mayor of Manchester, Gadd *v.*
Mayor of Salford, Automatic Coal-gas Retort Co. *v.*
McAlpine, Bridson *v.*
McGeoch, Leggott *v.*
McGrady (John) & Co., Welsbach Incandescent Gas Light Co., Ld., *v.*
McMillan, Bergman *v.*
Meehan, Chadburn *v.*
Menzies, Betts *v.*
Mercantile Bank of Lancashire, Ld., Chatwoods Patent Safe and Lock Co., Ld. *v.*
Metcalf, R. *v.*
Meyer's Patent, Meyenburg and The Clayton Anilin Co.'s Application *v.*
M'Grundy & Co., Incandescent Gas Light Co. *v.*
Middleton, Morton *v.*
Midland Acetylene (Parent) Syndicate, Acetylene Illuminating Co., Ld. *v.*
Midland Lighting Co., Société Anonyme pour le Fabrication d'Appareils d'Eclairage *v.*
Midland Ry. Co., Stark *v.*
Miles, Earl de la Warr *v.*
Mill, R. *v.*
Millard, Grover and Baker Sewing Machine Co. *v.*
Miller, Lucas *v.*
Mitchell, Perry *v.*
Monte Video Gas Co., Jones *v.*
Moore, Bovill *v.*
Moore, Jordan *v.*
Moore, Thomson *v.*
Moorwood, Crossthwaite *v.*
Morgan, Burt *v.*
Morgan, Knott *v.*
Morgan, Shrewsbury and Talbot Cab Co. *v.*
Morley, Mandelberg *v.*
Morris, Rowcliffe *v.*
Morris, Young *v.*
Mort, Parnell *v.*
Mottershead, United Telephone Co. *v.*
Moule's Earth Closet, Baird *v.*
Moulton, Hancock *v.*
Mower, Minter *v.*
Moy (Ernest F.), Ld., Reason Manufacturing Co., Ld. *v.*
Mullinar, Hedges *v.*
Muntz Metal Co., Drake *v.*
Murdock, Warner *v.*
Mussary, R. *v.*
Mutual Cycle and Manufacturing Co., Ld., Osmond, *v.*

NAIRN, Linoleum Co. v.
Nash, Williams v.
National Bolivian Navigation Co., Republic of Bolivia v.
National Exhibitions Association, Automatic Weighing Machine Co. v.
Neal, Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. v.
Neal, Smith v.
Needle, Jackson v.
Neilson, Baird v.
Neilson, Betts v.
Neilson, Househill Co. v.
Neilson, R. v.
Neilson, United Telephone Co. v.
Nelson, Swinborne v.
New Incandescent Mantle Co., Incandescent Gas Light Co. v.
New Ixion Tyre and Cycle Co., Pneumatic Tyre Co. v.
New Lamb Tyre Co., Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. v.
New Seddon Pneumatic Tyre and Self-closing Tube Co., Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co. v.
New Townsend Cycle Co., Ld., Dover (H. W.) and Dover, Ld. v.
Newton Hindmarch on Patents, R. v.
Nicholls, Clark v.
Nicholson, Murchland v.
Nickalls, Merry v.
Nightingale, Arkwright v.
Noel, Betts v.
Norden, Heine v.
North British Ry. Co., Adams v.
North British Rubber Co., Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. v.
North British Rubber Co., Ld., Gormully and Jeffery Manufacturing Co., Ld. v.
North Somerset Ry. Co., Bristol v.
Norton, Geary v.
Norton, Lister v.
Nott, Electric Telegraph Co. v.
Nottingham Manufacturing Co., Lamb v.
Nurse, Hewett v.
Nuttall, Cannington v.
Nuttall, Cheetham v.
Nye, Williams v.

OATES, Allen v.
Oldham, Cheetham v.
Oppenheim, Wittman v.
Orme Evans & Co., Ld., Presto Gear Case and Components Co., Ld. v.
Osborne, Hind v.
Osgerby, Hudson v.
Owen, Peters v.
Owens, Tadman v.
Oxley, Needham v.

PAIN, Schermuly v.
Palmer, Parrott v.
Parker, Manton v.
Parker, Mountain v.
Parmentier, Mathews v.
Parnell, Dredge v.
Parr, Potter v.
Parr (J.) & Co., Pneumatic Tyre Co. v.
Partington, McDougall v.
Passberg Grain Syndicate, Stavert v.
Patent Oxonite Co., Anderson v.
Patents Investments Co., Crampton v.
Paterson, Montgomerie v.
Patterson, United Telephone Co. v.
Patterson, Washburn and Moen Manufacturing Co. v.
Patullo, Hutchinson v.
Pavement Light Co., Hayward v.
Payne, Blofield v.
Payne, Elwes v.
Peach, Crofts v.
Pearce, Cook v.
Pearce, Jones v.
Pearson, Morrell v.
Pearson, Whateman v.
Penn, Dobbs v.
Perks, Deeley v.
Perks, Westley, Richards & Co. v.
Perry, Lawrence v.
Perry, Skinner v.
Phillips, Davenport v.
Picksley, Bamlett v.
Pimm, Bovill v.
Pinto Leite, Craven v.
Pintsch's Patent Lighting Co., Douglass v.
Piper, Gregory v.
Pirrie, Elmore v.
Pitcher, McGrunther v.
Pitman, Nicols v.
Pfaff, Deutsche Nähmaschinen Fabrik vorm Wertheim v.
Plane, Harmer v.
Platt, Curtis v.
Pneumatic Tyre and Brook's Cycling Agency, Edlin v.

Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld., Palmer Tyre Co., Ld. *v.*
Pointon, Pooley *v.*
Postill, Hoffman *v.*
Potter, Crossley *v.*
Potter, Walton *v.*
Pratt, Jupe *v.*
Prescott, Pickard *v.*
Price, Crane *v.*
Price, Macfarlane *v.*
Price, Savory *v.*
Priestman, Rockliffe *v.*
Prosser, R. *v.*
Provezende, Seixo *v.*
Province of Brescia Steam Tramways Co., Fraser *v.*
Puncture Proof Pneumatic Tyre Co., Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*
Purday, Chappell *v.*
Purser, Lawes *v.*
Pyatt, Allen *v.*

QUEEN, Feather *v.*
Quick, Southwark and Vauxhall Water Co. *v.*
Quincey, Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.*

RAMSEY Urban District Council, Bostock *v.*
Raphael, Wood *v.*
Ratner Safe Co., Ld., Chatwood's Patent Safe and Lock Co., Ld. *v.*
Rawlinson, Coleman *v.*
Rawson, Allen *v.*
Reddaway, Gandy *v.*
Redgate, Bates *v.*
Reitmeyer, Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.*
Reliance Tyre Co., Birmingham Pneumatic Tyre Syndicate, *v.*
Remus, Actien Gesellschaft für Cartonagen Industrie *v.*
Rennie, Mackelcan *v.*
Reynolds, Mitchell *v.*
Reynolds, Nettlefolds *v.*
Richards, Davenport *v.*
Richards, Patent Type Foundry Co. *v.*
Richardson, Benno Jaffi und Darmstaedter Lanolin Fabrik *v.*
Richardson, Bereton *v.*
Richardson, Universities of Oxford and Cambridge *v.*
Rickman, Thierry *v.*
Riemer, Incandescent Gas Light Co. *v.*
Rimington, Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.*
Riviere, Forsyth *v.*
Roberts, Ashworth *v.*
Roberts, Smith *v.*
Robertson, Bailey *v.*
Robertson, Holste *v.*
Robinson, Germ Milling Co. *v.*
Roburite Explosives Co., Lancashire Explosives Co. *v.*
Rodgers, Stocker *v.*
Roe, Taylor *v.*
Rogers, Steers *v.*
Rolte, Gordon *v.*
Rosenberg, Edinson-Bell Consolidated Phonograph Co., Ld. *v.*
Rosenthal, Young *v.*
Rosenwald, Kopp *v.*
Ross, Nickels *v.*
Ross, Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.*
Rothwell, Harris *v.*
Rowland, Peckover *v.*
Royle, Challender *v.*
Rudge's Cycle Co., Singer *v.*
Runcorn Soap and Alkali Co., Henderson *v.*
Russell, Ledsam *v.*
Rylands, Davenport *v.*
Rylands, Hazelhurst *v.*
Rylands, Useful Patents Co. *v.*
Rylands' Glass and Engineering Co., Ld., Beavis *v.*

SAFETY Lift and Elevator Co., Ld., General Electric Co. *v.*
Safety Lighting Co., Hinks *v.*
Salsbury, Hoffnung *v.*
Salvo Laundry Co., Mackie *v.*
Sampson, Printing and Numerical Registering Co. *v.*
Samuel, Postcard Automatic Supply Co. *v.*
Sansom, Brown *v.*
Sausum, Woodward *v.*
Saqui, Cole *v.*
Saupe, Embossed Metal Plate Co. *v.*
Saville Street Foundry and Engineering Co., Marsden *v.*
Sayer, Herbert *v.*
Schrœder, Actien Gesellschaft für Cartonagen Industrie *v.*
Schwan, Beardsell *v.*
Scott, Smith *v.*
Seabrook, Combination Hubs, Ld. *v.*
Searle, Miller *v.*

Sears, Pickard *v.*
Seaward, Morgan *v.*
Seine, R. *v.*
Sewell, Moser *v.*
Seymer, Patent Bottle Envelope Co. *v.*
Shankey, Duckett *v.*
Sharp, Cartsburn Sugar Refining Co. *v.*
Sharples, United Telephone Co. *v.*
Shaw, Barker *v.*
Shaw, Longbottom *v.*
Shaw, Pether *v.*
Sheba Gold Mining Co., African Gold Recovery Co. *v.*
Shephard, Gavioli *v.*
Sherrin, British Motor Syndicate, Ld. *v.*
Sherwood, Defries *v.*
Shewes, Bickford *v.*
Shippey, Edison Electric Co. *v.*
Siddell, Vickers *v.*
Siemens Brothers & Co., Ld., Patent Exploitation, Ld. *v.*
Silber, Sugg *v.*
Silver, Tuck *v.*
Simmons, Hicks *v.*
Simms, Colburn *v.*
Simon, Parkinson *v.*
Simplex Gear Case Co., Ld., Presto Gear Case and Components Co., Ld. *v.*
Singer, Otto *v.*
Singer Manufacturing Co., Ld., Gammons *v.*
Singer Manufacturing Co., Nähmaschinen Fabrik *v.*
Skidmore, Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.*
Skinner, Perry *v.*
Sluces, Incandescent Gas Light Co. *v.*
Smethurst, Cochrane *v.*
Smith, Bancroft *v.*
Smith, Bovill *v.*
Smith, Bowden's Patent Syndicate (E. M.), Ld. *v.*
Smith, Carpenter *v.*
Smith, Cropper *v.*
Smith, Edison-Bell Phonograph Corporation *v.*
Smith, Heath *v.*
Smith, Jensen *v.*
Smith, Kerrison *v.*
Smith, Oddy *v.*
Smith Ralston *v.*
Smith (Herbert) & Co., Ld., Reynolds *v.*
Smith, Riding *v.*
Smith, Vidi *v.*
Société de Lunetiers, Perry *v.*
Société General d' Electricité, Werderman *v.*
Somervell, Hancock *v.*
Somervell, Kenny's Patent Button-holing Co. *v.*
South Eastern Ry. Co., London Chatham and Dover Ry. Co. *v.*
Sowerby Bridge Flour Society, Van Gelder Apsimon & Co. *v.*
Speight, Tolson *v.*
Spence, Kurtz *v.*
Spence, Mayer *v.*
Spiller, Plimpton *v.*
Spilsbury, New Ixion Tyre and Cycle Co. *v.*
Spirey, Badische Anilin Und Soda Fabrik, *v.*
Sponge, Heine *v.*
Spottiswood, Bacon *v.*
Squire, Herrberger *v.*
Starbruck Waggon Co., Eades *v.*
Stassen, Singer *v.*
Steel, Brooks *v.*
Steel, Crossthwaite *v.*
Steel, Otto *v.*
Stephens, Edgebury *v.*
Sterckx, Shrewsbury and Talbot Cab Co. *v.*
Stevens, Parkes *v.*
Stevens, Watling *v.*
Stevenson, Boake Roberts & Co. *v.*
Stevenson, Hess *v.*
Stevenson, Temler *v.*
Stewart, Crossley *v.*
Stewart, United Horseshoe and Nail Co. *v.*
St. George, United Telephone Co. *v.*
St. James Electric Light Co., Hopkinson *v.*
Stone, Wyeth *v.*
Stone and Corser, Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*
Stott, Tangye *v.*
Stowers, York *v.*
Stubbs, Horrocks *v.*
Suction Cleaners, Ld., British Vacuum Cleaners Co., Ld. *v.*
Sugg, Ungar *v.*
Sunlight Incandescent Gas Lamp Co., Incandescent Gas Light Co. *v.*
Sutton Lodge Chemical Co., Proctor *v.*
Sutton, Swabey *v.*
Swears, Nicoll *v.*
Swedish Horse Nail Co., United Horseshoe and Nail Co. *v.*
Syer, Humpherson *v.*
Szalay, Sandow *v.*

TANGYES, Magee *v.*
Tasker, United Telephone Co. *v.*
Tate, Burnett *v.*
Taunton, Pow *v.*
Taylor, Bailey *v.*
Taylor, Bowman *v.*
Taylor & Sons (John), Ld., British Motor Syndicate, Ld. *v.*
Taylor, Harrison *v.*
Taylor, Hilleary *v.*
Taylor, Millar *v.*
Taylor, Siemens *v.*
Taylor, Willoughby *v.*
Temler, Action Gesellschaft für Cartonagen Industrie *v.*
Terry, Hyam *v.*
Thierry, Rickman *v.*
Thiee, Ehrlich *v.*
Thompson, Guyot *v.*
Thompson, Neilson *v.*
Thomson, American Braided Wire Co. *v.*
Thomson, Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik *v.*
Thomson, British United Shoe Machinery Co., Ld. *v.*
Thomson, Dudgeon *v.*
Thomson, Hill *v.*
Thomson, Moore *v.*
Thorley's (T. W.) Cattle Food Co., Massam *v.*
Tilghman's Patent Sand Blast Co., Société Anonyme de Manufactures de Glaces *v.*
Timmis Patent, Currie *v*
Tindal, Wilson *v.*
Tobin, Ruston *v.*
Todd, Stoner *v.*
Tolley, Westley *v.*
Tombs, Hill *v.*
Tomey, Crossley *v.*
Toms, White *v.*
Toope, Pascall *v.*
Tootal Broadhurst Lee Co., Boyd *v.*
Topham, Leaf *v.*
Touts, Hill *v.*
Townsend, Davies *v.*
Townsend, R. *v.*
Tremere, Lainson *v.*
Trigg, Hall *v.*
Truman, Hall *v.*
Tubeless Tyre and Capon Heaton, Ld., Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*
Tullis, Dick *v.*
Tupper, Morewood *v.*
Turner, Beard *v.*
Turner, Elliot *v.*
Turner, Winter *v.*
Turton, Turton *v.*
Tweedales, Howard *v.*

ULLMANN, Gramaphone and Typewriter, Ld. *v.*
Union Boot and Shoe Machine Co., English and American Machinery Co. *v.*
Union Oil Mills, Wilson *v.*
United Alkali Co., Ld., Acetylene, Illuminating Co., Ld. *v.*
United Flexible Metallic Tubing Co., Ld., Crowther *v.*
United Motor Co., De Young *v.*
United Rubber Works, Ld., Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.*
United Telephone Co., Barney *v.*
Unwin, Heath *v.*
Upton, Smith *v.*
Urry, Automatic Diversions Syndicate *v.*
Usher, Lines *v.*

VAN Vlissingen, Caldwell *v.*
Vaucher, Newton *v.*
Vestry of Bermondsey, Attorney-General *v.*
Vickers, Siddell *v.*
Victoria Rubber Co., Moseley *v.*
Vivian, Muntz *v.*

WAGSTAFFE, Palmer *v.*
Wakeham, Legge *v.*
Walker, Betts *v.*
Walker, Cheaving *v.*
Walker, Collins *v.*
Walker Mitchell, John Varey, Ld. *v.*
Walker, Power *v.*
Walker, United Telephone Co. *v.*
Wallington, Weston & Co., Sirdar Rubber Co., Ld. *v.*
Wallis, Crow *v.*
Wallis, R. *v.*
Wallwork, Cleaver *v.*
Walter, Patent Type Founding Co. *v.*
Wapshaw Tube Co., Ld., Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.*
Warmer, Stocker *v.*
Warrillow, Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*
Waterloo & Co., Driffield *v.*
Watson, Grafton *v.*

Watson, Haggenmacher *v.*
Webb, Copeland *v.*
Webb, Kynoch & Co., Ld. *v.*
Webber, Howes *v.*
Webber, Parmenter *v.*
Webster, Foxwell *v.*
Welch, Thomas *v.*
Weller, Fradella *v.*
Wells, Minter *v.*
Wells, Parker *v.*
Welsbach Incandescent Gas Light Co., Ld., Bevan *v.*
West London Cycle Works, Lees *v.*
West London Rubber Co., Pneumatic Tyre Co. *v.*
Wigan & Co., Lee *v.*
Wigg, Brooke *v.*
Wilby, Gillett *v.*
Wild, Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.*
Wild, Wheatstone *v.*
Wild, Wren *v.*
Wilk's Patent, Thornborough *v.*
Williams, Elsas *v.*
Williams, Minter *v.*
Williams, Stead *v.*
Williams, Thomas *v.*
Williams, Williams *v.*
Wills, Dawson *v.*
Wilmott, Betts *v.*
Wilson, Bowden's Patent Syndicate, Ld. *v.*
Wilson, Church (Walter C.) Engineering Co. *v.*
Wilson, Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld. *v.*
Wilson, Fenner *v.*
Wilson, Grover and Baker Sewing Machine Co. *v.*
Wilson, Newall *v.*
Wilson, Singer Manufacturing Co. *v.*
Wilson & Co. (Barnsley), Ld., Wilson *v.*
Wilson & Co. (Barnsley), Ld., Wilson Brothers Bobbin Co., Ld. *v.*
Windover, Morgan *v.*
Winter, Thomas *v.*
Winter, Turner *v.*
Winyard, Youatt *v.*
Wheeler, R. *v.*
White, Baker *v.*
White (R.) & Sons, Ld., Saccharin Corporation, Ld. *v.*
White, Young *v.*
Whitecross Co., Lang *v.*
Whitehead, Duckett *v.*
Whitlingham, Cooper *v.*
Whitworth, Roskell *v.*
Wolstenholms, Jackson *v.*
Wood, Lister *v.*
Wood, Siddell and Hilton, Ld. *v.*
Wood, Trotman *v.*
Woodhouse, Edison and Swan Co. *v.*
Woodley, David *v.*
Worthing Skating Rink Co., Thorn *v.*
Wren, Bercham *v.*
Wright, Bossmans *v.*
Wright, Hassall *v.*
Wright and Butler, Ld., Tilghman's Patent Sand Blast Co. *v.*
Wrightson, Richmond & Co., Ld. *v.*
Wrigley, Bainbridge *v.*
Wyatt, Johnson *v.*

Yates, Mathias *v.*
Yeatley Vacuum Hammer Co., Pilkington *v.*
York Street Flax Spinning Co., Pirrie *v.*
Young, Adair *v.*
Young, Edison United Phonograph *v.*
Young, Fernie *v.*
Young, Morris *v.*
Young, Scott *v.*

Zimmer, Wood *v.*

ADDENDA.

VOLUME I.

Page 40, note (*d*), *add* "Northern Press and Engineering Co., Ld. *v.* Hoe (R.) & Co., (1906) 23 R. P. C. 417."
,, 108, ,, (*r*), *add* "Hudson, Scott & Sons, Ld. *v.* Barringer, Wallis & Manners, Ld., (1906) 23 R. P. C. 502."
,, 125, ,, (*x*), *add* "23 R. P. C. 506."
,, 207, ,, (*f*), *add* "23 R. P. C. 461."
,, 291, ,, (*i*), *add* "*Times*, July 24th, 1906."
,, 334, ,, (*t*), *add* "Gawthorp *v.* Mason, (1906) 23 R. P. C. 401."
,, 367, line 16, *add* "*Brown* v. *Hastie* (*John*) *& Co., Ld.*, (1906) 23 R. P. C. 361."
,, 376, note (*z*), *add* "23 R. P. C. 433."
,, 492, ,, (*b*), *add* "Davidson *v.* Sun Fan Co., Ld., (1906) 23 R. P. C. 493."
,, 513, line 24, *add* "*Dr. Joung* v. *United Motor Co.*, (1903) 20 R. P. C. 472."
,, 521, note (*b*), *add* "as to principles on which objections should be certified as reasonable and proper, *see* Clay *v.* Allcock & Co., Ld., (1906) 23 R. P. C. 381."
,, 529, ,, (*a*), *add* "Anti-Vibration Incandescent Lighting Co., Ld., *v.* Wholesale Incandescent Fittings Co., (1906) 23 R. P. C. 399."
,, 533, ,, (*x*), *add* "See also Osmond *v.* Mutual Cycle and Manufacturing Supply Co., Ld., [1899] 2 Q. B. 488."

VOLUME II.

Page 83, note (*l*), *add* "Andrews' Patent, (1906) 23 R. P. C. 441; Waterhouse's Patent, (1906) 23 R. P. C. 470."
,, 179, ,, (*i*), *add* "Scott's Patent, (1906) 23 R. P. C. 478."
,, 182, ,, (*n*), *for* "L. R. 4 P. C., App. Cas. 88 *n.*," *read* "L. R. 5, App. Cas. 88 *n.*"
,, 182, ,, (*q*), *add* "Cross, Bevan and Beadle's Patent, (1906) 23 R. P. C. 485."

LETTERS PATENT FOR INVENTIONS.

CHAPTER I.

THE PATENTEE.

INTRODUCTORY.

Early monopolies.

BEFORE the reign of James I., the Sovereigns of England laid claim to, and exercised, the right of granting monopolies of carrying on certain trades, or producing various articles within the realm, or importing them from other countries.

These monopolies were given to the recipients in respect of services rendered by them, or as marks of royal favour.

The system of creating monopolies was made the means on various occasions of raising large sums of money for the expenditure of the government, and the support of the Crown, to the detriment of the public at large.

Statute of Monopolies.

Under the Tudor Sovereigns monopolies were granted to such an extent, and became so monstrously oppressive, that, finally, in the twenty-first year of James I., Parliament passed the celebrated Statute of Monopolies, (a) which, *as a declaration of the Common Law on the subject* must be considered as the foundation of our modern patent laws.

The Statute of Monopolies is the earliest statute which relates to grants of the sole use and exercise of inventions, though several Acts had been previously passed for suppressing various illegal monopolies. (b)

There is no doubt, however, that the Crown, previous to the Statute of Monopolies, (c) did exercise the right, which it claimed at Common Law, of granting to inventors the sole use and exercise of their inventions. There are several reported

(a) 21 Jac. I. c. 3.

(b) See Mag. Ch. c. 30; 9 Edw. III. st. 1, c. 1; Stat. of Cloths (25 Edw. III. c. 2); Stat. 27 Edw. III. st. 2; 28 Edw. III. c. 13, s. 3; 31 Edw. III. c. 10; 2 Ric. II. st. 1, c. 1; 7 Hen. VII. c. 9; and 12 Hen. VII. c. 6.

(c) 21 Jac. I. c. 3.

Introductory.

cases dealing with grants of letters patent from the Crown to inventors before 1623, the date of the statute, (d) and the practice is referred to by the early text-writers. (e)

Statute of Monopolies.

The unrepealed portions of the Statute of Monopolies (f) recite and enact, shortly, as follows:—

Preamble.

The preamble recites:

> "Forasmuch as your most excellent Majesty, in your royal judgment, and of your blessed disposition to the weal and quiet of your subjects, did in the year of our Lord God one thousand six hundred and ten, publish in print to the whole realm and to all posterity, that all grants of monopolies, and of the benefit of any penal laws, or of power to dispense with the law or to compound for the forfeiture, are contrary to your Majesty's laws, which your Majesty's declaration is truly consonant and agreeable to the ancient and fundamental laws of this your realm: And whereas your Majesty was further graciously pleased expressly to command that no suitor should presume to move your Majesty for matters of that nature; yet, nevertheless, upon *misinformations* and *untrue pretences of public good*, many such grants have been unduly obtained and unlawfully put in execution to the great grievance and inconvenience of your Majesty's subjects, contrary to the laws of this your realm, and contrary to your Majesty's most royal and blessed intention so published as aforesaid: For avoiding whereof and preventing the like in time to come, may it please your excellent Majesty," &c.

First section.

The first section of the statute declares and enacts that:—

> "All monopolies and all commissions, grants, licences, charters, and letters patent heretofore made or granted, or hereafter to be made or granted, to any person or persons, bodies politic or corporate, whatsoever, of or for the sole buying, selling, making, working, or using of anything within this realm or the dominion of Wales, or of any other monopolies, or of power, liberty, or faculty to dispense with any others; or to give licence or toleration to do, use or exercise anything against the tenor or purport of any law or statute; or to give or make any warrants for any such dispensation, licence, or toleration, to be had or made, or to agree or compound with any others for any penalty or forfeitures limited by any statute, or of any grant or promise of the benefit, profit, or commodity of any forfeiture, penalty, or

(d) Darcy v. Allin, (1602) Noy R. 182; 1 W. P. C. 5; Hastings' Case, (1561) Noy R. 182; 1 W. P. C. 6; Clothworkers of Ipswich Case, (1615) Godb. 252; S. C. 1 Rol. R. 4; Mitchell v. Reynolds, (1713) 1 P. Wms. 181; 10 Mod. 130.

(e) Sheppard's Abridgment, part iii. tit. Prerog. p. 61; Hawkins, Pleas of the Crown, bk. i. c. 79, s. 20; Coke, 3 Inst. 184.

(f) See Vol. II. p. 197.

Intro-ductory.

Statute of Monopolies.

> sum of money, that is or shall be due by any statute before judgment thereupon had, and all proclamations, inhibitions, restraints, warrants of assistance, and all other matters and things whatsoever, any way tending to the instituting, erecting, strengthening, furthering, or countenancing of the same or any of them, *are altogether contrary to the laws of this realm, and so are and shall be utterly void and of none effect, and in nowise to be put in use or execution.*"

Second section.

The second section provides that all monopolies, and all such grants, letters patent, &c., ought to be, and shall be, tried by the common laws of the realm, and not otherwise.

Third section.

The third section provides that all persons shall be disabled and incapable to have or exercise any monopoly, or any such grant, letters patent, &c., as aforesaid.

Fourth section.

The fourth section provides that any person aggrieved by any monopoly, or any such commission, grant, letters patent, &c., shall have a remedy by action to recover treble damages and double costs, and imposes the penalties of præmunire upon persons delaying such actions except by authority of the Court.

The fifth and sixth sections refer to letters patent for inventions, and exclude them from the effect of the foregoing clauses, which effectually suppressed all illegal monopolies, and deprived the Crown of all claims to grant such monopolies in the future, and also of all power to prevent persons aggrieved from pursuing their legal remedies.

Fifth section.

The repealed fifth section referred to patents already granted, and declared that none of them should be of any force for a longer period than twenty-one years from the date of the grant.

Sixth section.

The terms of the sixth section, which deals with patents to be granted in future, are as follows:—

> "Provided also that any declaration before mentioned shall not extend to any letters patent and *grants of privilege*, for the term of fourteen years or under, hereafter to be made, *of the sole working, or making of any manner of new manufactures within this realm, to the true and first inventor and inventors of such manufactures, which others at the time of making such letters patents and grants shall not use,* so as also they be not contrary to the law, or mischievous to the State, by raising prices of commodities at home, or hurt of trade, or generally inconvenient; the said fourteen years to be accounted from the date of the first letters patents

Who may Apply.

or grants of such privilege hereafter to be made, but that the same shall be of such force as they should be if this Act had never been made and of none other."

Who may Apply for Letters Patent.

Any person may be an applicant,

From the above quoted sixth section it is clear that the grantee of letters patent for an invention must be the true and first inventor, and, if there are two or more grantees, the true and first inventor must be included in their number, otherwise the Crown, as the dispenser of the privilege, has no power to make the grant. (*g*)

It is expressly provided by the Patents Designs and Trade Marks Act 1883, and subsequent enactments, that any person, whether a British subject or not, may make an application for letters patent for an invention, (*h*) and that two or more persons may make a joint application, and a patent may be granted to them jointly. (*i*) Moreover, a patent granted to several persons, jointly, is not invalid because some or one of them only are or is the true and first inventors or inventor, (*k*) and, consequently, a capitalist may advance money to a needy inventor and obtain an interest in the patent from the beginning.

if he can make the necessary declaration.

Every application must contain a declaration to the effect that either the applicant is in possession of an invention, whereof he claims to be the true and first inventor, or, in the case of a joint application, one or more of the applicants claims or claim to be the true and first inventor or inventors, and for which he or they desires or desire to obtain a patent. (*l*)

Previous to the direct enactment above referred to it had long been the practice for the Crown to grant letters patent for inventions to foreigners who were, in law, the true and first inventors thereof within this realm: (*m*) and in one case the question was raised whether a patent granted to a person in trust for an alien enemy would be valid, but the Court did not determine the point, as the patent was found defective on other grounds. (*n*)

(*g*) Marshall's Application, (1888) 5 R. P. C. 961.

(*h*) 46 & 47 Vict. c. 57, s. 4 (1).

(*i*) 46 & 47 Vict. c. 57, s. 4 (2).

(*k*) 48 & 49 Vict. c. 63, s. 5.

(*l*) 46 & 47 Vict. c. 57, s. 4 (2). See Vol. II. p. 5.

(*m*) Chappell *v.* Purday, (1845) 14 M. & W. 318; *In re* Wirth's Patent, (1879) L. R. 12 Ch. D. 303; Beard *v.* Egerton, (1846) 3 C. B. 97.

(*n*) Bloxam *v.* Elsee, (1827) 1 C. & P. 558; 6 B. & C. 169; see p. 20 *post*.

Who may Apply.

A married woman may be a patentee, and the property in the invention will be her separate estate. (*o*)

Married woman. Infant.

It might be doubted whether the grant of letters patent to an infant inventor alone would be valid, as there does not appear to be any case which judicially decides the point; but it would seem that in the case of a grant to two persons, one of whom is an infant, the infancy of such joint grantee does not affect its validity. (*p*)

Lunatic.

A patent may be granted to a person found lunatic; but, in such case, the declaration, which must accompany the application, must be made by the guardian or committee of the lunatic, or a person appointed by the Court or a Judge. (*q*).

The Comptroller of the Patent Office does not inquire as to the age, coverture, or sanity of an applicant.

Legal representative.

The legal representative of a person dying possessed of an invention in respect of which no application for a patent has been made, may apply for, and obtain, a patent in respect of it, if such application be made within six months after the decease of such person, and contains a declaration by the legal representative that he believes such person to be the true and first inventor. (*r*)

The application in such a case must be accompanied by the original probate or letters of administration or an official copy of such probate or letters, and such further evidence as may be necessary. (*s*)

The legal representative of a person dying possessed of an invention in respect of which he has made an application for a patent within fifteen months prior to his decease, may obtain a grant of a patent in respect of the invention within twelve months of the decease of the person so dying.

It is the practice for the legal representative of a person so dying, after having made an application for a patent, to produce the probate of the will, or letters of administration granted of the estate and effects of the deceased, for the inspection of the Comptroller, and subsequently to carry out the later stages of the application in his own name.

True and First Inventor.

Patent invalid unless true and first inventor is a grantee.

Letters patent for an invention can, except under sec. 34, 103 or 104 of the Act of 1883, be validly granted only to

(*o*) M. W. P. Act (45 & 46 Vict. c. 75).

(*p*) Cheavin *v.* Walker, (1877) L. R. 5 Ch. D. 858; 46 & 47 Vict. c. 57, s. 4 (2); 48 & 49 Vict. c. 63.

(*q*) Vol. II. p. 5.

(*r*) 46 & 47 Vict. c. 57, s. 34.

(*s*) See Patent Rules, (1903) r. 6.

True and First Inventor.

the true and first inventor either alone or together with another person or persons. (*t*)

Except where pursuant to sec. 103 or 104 of the Act of 1883, a patent obtained by one person alone who was not the true and first inventor or his legal representative would be void, for the Crown would have been deceived in its grant. (*u*)

It therefore becomes a very important question to decide what, in the patent law, is the meaning of the words "true and first inventor."

Except in the case of an invention communicated from abroad (*x*) a person will not be considered the true and first inventor if he himself did not make the invention, or if the idea of it did not originate in his own mind, (*y*), or if it was suggested to him by another, (*z*) or taken from a book or other document circulated in Great Britain, (*a*) or if the invention had been previously used by the public. (*b*)

It is not an objection to a patent that the discovery was the result of accident; and it is immaterial whether it be the outcome of some happy thought, or great study, labour, and expense. (*c*)

The true and first inventor must have invented every part of that for which he claims protection. (*d*) If he claims a number of things, as being the inventor of them, whether they consist of improvement or original inventions, and it turns out that some of them are not his own ideas, his patent is void. (*e*)

Inventor who first discloses the invention.

The person who himself actually makes an invention and is the first to disclose that invention will be the true and first inventor in the legal sense of the term, and a valid patent may be granted to him notwithstanding the fact that it may possibly be shown that the invention had been previously made by another who did not disclose it. (*f*) Thus,

(*t*) In the Matter of Marshall's Application, (1888) 5 P. O. R. 661; 46 & 47 Vict. c. 57, s. 5.

(*u*) Com. Dig. Grant, c. 8 and 9; Earl of Devon's Case, 11 Co. 90; R. *v.* Mussary, 1 W. P. C. 41; Minter *v.* Wells, (1834) 1 W. P. C. 129.

(*x*) pp. 16–19 *post.*

(*y*) Jones *v.* Pearce, (1832) 1 W. P. C. 124.

(*z*) Tennant's Case, (1798) 1 W. P. C. 125.

(*a*) Arkwright's Case, (1785) Dav. P. C. 61; Hill *v.* Thompson, (1817) 8 Taunt. 375; 2 B. Mo. 424, S. C.; The Househill Co. *v.* Neilson, (1843) 1 W. P. C. 673; Lang *v.* Gisborne, (1862) 31 Beav. 133; Plimpton *v.* Malcolmson, (1876) L. R. 3 Ch. D. 531; Plimpton *v.* Spiller, (1877) L. R. 6 Ch. D. 412; chap. iii.

(*b*) Chap. iii.

(*c*) Crane *v.* Price, (1842) 1 W. P. C. 411.

(*d*) Tennant's Case, (1798) 1 W. P. C. 125; Arkwright's Case, (1785) Dav. P. C. 61.

(*e*) Losh *v.* Hague, (1838) 1 W. P. C. 203.

(*f*) Chap. iii.

True and First Inventor.

Tindal, C.J., in *Cornish* v. *Keene*, (*g*) stated the law as follows:—

Law as to first discloser, stated by Tindal, C.J.

"Sometimes it is a material question to determine whether the party who got the patent was the real and original inventor or not; because these patents are granted as a reward, not only for the benefit that is conferred upon the public by the discovery, but also to the ingenuity of the first inventor; and although it is proved that it is a new discovery, so far as the world is concerned, yet if anybody is able to show that although that was new—that the party who got the patent was not the man whose ingenuity first discovered it, that he had borrowed it from A. or B., or taken it from a book that was printed in England, and which was open to all the world—then, although the public had the benefit of it, it would become an important question whether he was the first and original inventor. . . . A man may make experiments in his own closet for the purpose of improving any art or manufacture in public use; if he makes these experiments and never communicates them to the world, and lays them by as forgotten things, another person who has made the same experiments, or has gone a little further, or is satisfied with the experiments, may take out a patent, and protect himself in the privilege of the sole making of the article for fourteen years; and it will be no answer to him to say that another person before him made the same experiment, and, therefore, that he was not the first discoverer of it—because there may be many discoverers starting at the same time, many rivals that may be running on the same road at the same time, and the first which comes to the Crown and takes out a patent, it not being generally known to the public, is the man who has a right to clothe himself with the authority of the patent and to enjoy its benefits." (*h*)

And again in *Gibson* v. *Brand* (*i*):

"A man may publish to the world that which is perfectly new in all its use, and has not before been enjoyed, and yet he may not be the first and true inventor; he may have borrowed it from some other person, he may have taken it from a book, he may have learnt it from a specification, and then the Legislature never intended that a person who had taken all his knowledge from the art of another—from the labours and assiduity or ingenuity of another—should be the man who was to receive the benefit of another's skill."

(*g*) (1835) 1 W. P. C. 501, 507.

(*h*) But see Vol. II. chap. i.

(*i*) (1841) 1 W. P. C. 627, 628.

True and First Inventor.

The proof of publication must be very clear indeed in order to invalidate a patent granted to a person for a process producing a useful article at an economical rate when that person was, *de facto*, the first to produce the thing to the public practically in a working state. (*k*)

Dollond's Case.

In *Dollond's Case*, one of the earliest on the subject of true and first inventor, which is not reported, but is often referred to (*l*) in subsequent decisions, and always with approval, it was objected that *Dollond* was not the inventor of a new method of making object-glasses, but that a Dr. *Hall* had made the same discovery before him. It was, however, held that as Dr. *Hall* had confined it to his closet, and the public were not acquainted with it, *Dollond* was to be considered as the inventor.

Tennant's Case.

In *Tennant's Case* (*m*) the patent was declared void on the ground that though the utility of the invention and the general ignorance of it of those engaged in the trade to which it referred were proved, yet the plaintiff was not the true and first inventor, as the process had been used by one engaged in the trade for five or six years previous to the date of the patent.

Result of above cases.

From the principles of these two cases it appears that in order to invalidate a patent on the ground that the patentee is not the true and first inventor, it is not enough to show that the alleged invention is only a disclosure of what was known to others before; but it must be shown that it was communicated to some extent, or that it was more or less made use of, so as to constitute discovery as applied to the subject with which the invention deals—*i.e.*, that the alleged prior user was not merely experimental and partial, but was a user of the completed invention. (*n*)

Several inventors.

If several persons about the same time discover the same thing, but keep it secret, and make no use of it, the party first making application for a patent becomes the true and first inventor, and is entitled to the benefit of a grant of letters patent; (*o*) provided that no application has been made by or on behalf of a person, who has within twelve months applied for protection in respect of the same invention in any State with the Government of which His Majesty

(*k*) Von Heyden *v.* Neustadt, (1880) 50 L. J. N. S. Ch. 126; L. R. 14 Ch. D. 230.

(*l*) Boulton *v.* Bull, (1795) 2 H. Bl. 463.

(*m*) (1798) Dav. P. C. 429; 1 W. P. C. 125.

(*n*) Hill *v.* Thompson, (1818) 1 W. P. C. 239.

(*o*) p. 116 *post*.

has made any arrangement for mutual protection of inventions. (*p*)

True and First Inventor.

If a man makes a discovery and is enabled to produce an effect from his own experiments, judgment, and skill, it is no objection that some one else has made a similar discovery by his mind unless it has become public (*q*) or been put to practical use. (*r*).

There is no case in which a patentee has been deprived of the benefit of his invention because another also had invented it, unless he had also brought it into practical use or disclosed it. (*s*)

First person who produces a commercial success.

An inventor who succeeds in producing in abundance, suitable for economic and commercial purposes, that which was before only produced as a rarity and unsuited for either of the above purposes, will be considered the true and first inventor of the process, and entitled to a patent in respect of it.

Thus, in *Young* v. *Fernie* (*t*) the plaintiff's claim was for "obtaining paraffin oil, or an oil containing paraffin, and paraffin, from bituminous coals by treating them in the manner hereinbefore described." The defendant proved that paraffin was discovered in 1830, twenty years previous to the date of the plaintiff's patent, by Dr. *Reichenbach*, and was first obtained from beechwood tar. On the other hand the plaintiff had found out and stated in his specification that cannel coal, or other highly bituminous coal, was suitable for producing paraffin, but that the temperature should be much lower than that employed in the dry distillation of coal for gas-making, and should not rise above a low red-heat which was visible in the dark. An American book containing the following extract from a publication of *Reichenbach*, in 1854, was adduced in evidence, "So remained paraffin until this hour a beautiful item in the collection of chemical preparations, but it has never escaped from the rooms of the scientific man." *Stewart*, V.C., who tried the case, pointed out that this illustrated the important distinction between the discoveries of the merely scientific chemist and of the practical manufacturer who invents the means of producing in abundance, suitable for

(*p*) 46 & 47 Vict. c. 57, s. 103; 1 Edw. VII. c. 18, s. 1 (1), chap. vii.

(*q*) Per Bayley, J., Lewis *v.* Marling, (1829) 1 W. P. C. 496; also p. 116 *post*.

(*r*) See pp. 119-140 *post*.

(*s*) Lewis *v.* Marling, (1829) 1 W. P. C. 497; as to practical use see chap. iv.

(*t*) (1863) 33 L. J. Ch. 192; 35 L. J. Ch. 523.

True and First Inventor.

economic and commercial purposes, that which had previously existed as a beautiful item in the cabinets of men of science. It was established to the satisfaction of the Vice-Chancellor that the plaintiff *Young* was an inventor of the latter class, and that his patent was entitled to the protection of the law. *Young* had ascertained, by a course of laborious experiments, a particular class of material among many, and a particular process among many, which enabled him to create and introduce to the public a useful manufacture which amply supplied the market with that which, until the use of the materials, process, and temperature indicated by him, had never been supplied for commercial purposes. At the date of his patent something remained to be ascertained which was necessary for the useful application of the chemical discovery of paraffin and paraffin oil. This brought it within the principle laid down by Lord *Westbury*, L.C., in *Hill* v. *Evans*, (*u*) and the Court held that the manufacture, with the materials and process indicated by the inventor, according to the sense in which the word "manufacture" is used in the Statute of Monopolies, was a new manufacture not in use at the date of the patent. (*v*)

Inventors with similar objects in view.

It is no objection to a person being the true and first inventor to show that a patent having a similar object had been previously obtained by another, or that an apparatus or process giving similar results had been previously used, if the means employed by the person seeking to obtain the protection of the law are substantially different to those comprised in the alleged anticipating patent or previous user. (*x*)

For example, in the year 1828 *W. E. Kneller* obtained a patent for "improvements in evaporating sugar." The patent related to a method of evaporating water from a solution of sugar by blowing air into the liquid. This was done according to the specification by an apparatus consisting of a large horizontal pipe, placed near the surface of the liquid, from which a number of small blowing tubes radiated downwards in different directions. Two things were described as essential to the invention. (1) That a stream of air should issue from each blowing tube at the same time. (2) That the ends should all be in the same horizontal plane, whereby the fluid would exert the same pressure at each orifice. At the trial of

(*u*) (1862) 31 L. J. Ch. 457.

(*v*) See judgment of Stuart, V.C., 33 L. J. Ch. 192; 35 L. J. Ch. 523.

(*x*) Walton *v.* Potter, (1841) 1 W. P. C. 590; see chap. ii.

True and First Inventor.

an action (*y*) brought for the infringement of this patent, the defendant put in evidence the specification of a patent obtained in 1822 for a similar apparatus, consisting of a set of perforated pipes, coiled or otherwise, shaped and accommodated to the nature and form of the vessel. The pipes might be replaced by a shallow metallic vessel, in the nature of a colander. *Kneller's* patent was, however, declared valid, and Lord *Tenterden*, C.J., said, "I cannot forbear saying that I think a great deal too much critical acumen has been applied to the construction of patents, as if the object was to defeat and not to sustain them. It is evident that the object of the two patents is the same. But the mode of effecting that object is different."

Omission of component parts.

A person may be the true and first inventor of an invention, which merely consists of the omission of one of several component parts of something previously known, if it requires the exercise of invention to make such omission. (*z*)

Thus, *Minter* took out a patent for "an improvement in the construction, making, or manufacture of chairs," and claimed as his invention "the application of a self-adjusting leverage to the back and seat of a chair, whereby the weight on the seat acts as a counterbalance to the pressure against the back of such chair." When the validity of the patent was contested, it appeared that one *Brown* had previously made chairs embodying the principle patented by this *Minter*, though *Brown's* chair was encumbered with additional machinery. The patent was declared void on the ground of the specification claiming too much. (*a*) But Lord *Denman* having asked the jury to suppose that *Brown's* chair would have been a chair with a self-adjusting leverage if the additional encumbering part had been taken away, said, "then the question is, whether the principle of self-adjustment was at all discovered or thought of at that time. Because, it seems to me, if that principle might have been deduced from the machinery of the chair that was made, but that it was so encumbered and connected with other machinery that nobody did make that discovery, or ever found out that they could have a chair with a self-adjusting leverage, by reason of that or any other defect in the chair actually made; I confess, it seems to me, that does not prevent this from being a new invention when the plaintiff says, I have discovered, throwing aside everything but this

(*y*) Hullett v. Hague, (1831) 9 L. J. O. S. K. B. 242; 2 B. & Ad. 370.
(*z*) See chap. ii. (*a*) See chap. v.

True and First Inventor.

self-adjusting leverage itself, that will produce an effect, which I think a very beneficial one." (*b*)

Previous failures.

A person who produces an invention which successfully does that which a previous or similar invention failed to do will be the true and first inventor, and entitled to a patent. (*c*)

If the result produced by a new method is either a new article, or a better article, or a cheaper article to the public than that produced before by an old method, such new method is an invention, or manufacture intended by the statute to be protected, and may become the subject of a patent, (*d*) and there does not appear to be any principle or authority upon which the exhibition of a useless machine which turns out a failure can be held to affect the right of a patentee who has made a successful machine, although there may be a degree of similarity between some of the details of the two machines. (*e*)

Joint inventors.

A true and first inventor must have invented every part of that which he claims to have invented; (*f*) hence, if different parts of an invention are the outcome of the inventive faculty of different minds, it will be necessary that all the inventors join in applying for a patent to be granted to them jointly.

Inventors may employ assistants.

Master and Servant.—There is nothing in law to prevent an inventor from availing himself of the assistance of workmen or servants in the prosecution of his search after a new manufacture. Indeed, many processes cannot be conducted by the unaided exertions of a single individual, and in almost all cases actual experiments are a necessity in order to find out how a desired end may be best obtained. It would, therefore, be absurd to confine the rewards given to inventors to that small class of them only, who have entirely, and without any assistance whatever, brought their discoveries to perfection, and it is grave matter of doubt whether, strictly speaking, any such could be found. The law, therefore, considers workmen and servants merely as tools of the inventor, and instruments in his hands, carrying out the ideas which originate in the master mind; and a person who has invented

(*b*) Minter *v.* Mower, (1835) 1 W. P. C. 140; 4 L. J. Ex. 72; see also Saxby *v.* The Gloucester Waggon Co., (1881) L. R. 7 Q. B. D. 305; 50 L. J. Q. B. 577.

(*c*) Chap. ii.

(*d*) Judgment of Tindal, C.J., (1842) Crane *v.* Price, 4 M. & G. 580; 1 W. P. C. 393. See also W. P. C. 71 (note); p. 163 *post.*

(*e*) Murray *v.* Clayton, (1872) L. R. 7 Ch. 570; L. R. 15 Eq. 115.

(*f*) See p. 6 *ante.*

True and First Inventor.

a main and leading idea remains the true and first inventor, and, as such is entitled to apply for a patent notwithstanding that he avails himself of the assistance and suggestions of workmen and servants in bringing his invention to a state of perfection. (*g*)

Cases.

This principle has been frequently acted upon by the Courts in cases of which the following are examples:—

In *Minter* v. *Wells*, (1834) 1 W. P. C. 132, *Alderson*, B., addressing the jury, said: "*Minter* and *Sutton* were together about the time the invention took place: which of the two suggested the invention, and which carried it into effect, is the question for you to decide. If *Sutton* suggested the principle to Mr. *Minter*, then he would be the inventor. If, on the other hand, Mr. *Minter* suggested the principle to *Sutton*, and *Sutton* was assisting him, then Mr. *Minter* would be the first and true inventor, and Sutton would be a machine, so to speak, which Mr. *Minter* uses for the purpose of enabling him to carry his original conception into effect. You will judge which is the more probable of the two. Mr. *Minter* makes out his *primâ facie* case; he is the person who takes out the patent, if *Sutton* has received a compensation, nothing would have been more simple and easy than that he should have taken out the patent, and still Mr. *Minter* might have the same benefit to-day; and there is no apparent reason why *Sutton* should not have taken out the patent which Mr. *Minter* has taken out, unless they were both desirous to ruin the invention: for suppose two persons are engaged on an invention of this description, they know perfectly well between themselves who is the real inventor of it, and who is the workman to carry into effect the conception, but they would destroy the value of it to both if they did not take it out in the name of the right person." (*h*)

In *Bloxam* v. *Elsee*, (1825) 1 C. & P. 558, an action in respect of two patents granted to *John Gamble*, it was objected that the improvements on the first invention, which formed the subject of the second patent, were the invention of one *Donkin*, an engineer. It was established that the improvements were the invention of *Donkin*, but it appeared that at the time he invented them he was employed by the patentee and one *Foudrinier*, his partner, as an engineer, for the purpose of bringing the machine to perfection, and was paid by them for so doing; and therefore he was acting as their servant for

(*g*) Minter *v.* Wells, (1834) 1 W. P. C. 132; Bloxam *v.* Elsee, (1832) 1 C. & P. 567; 1 W. P. C. 132; Allen *v.* Rawson, (1845) 1 C. B. 551; David *v.* Woodley, (1884) Griff. L. O. C. 26; Kurtz *v.* Spence, (1888) 5 P. O. R. 181; Healey's Application, Johnson's Pat. Man., 6 ed. 165; Macfarlane's Patent, *ibid.*

(*h*) See also Makepeace *v.* Jackson. 4 Taunt. 770.

True and First Inventor.

the purpose of suggesting improvements in the machine. The plaintiff, on the other hand, contended that the improvements were the patentee's inventions, and that *Donkin* was employed by him to carry his ideas into effect, and this view of the case seems to have prevailed with the Court.

Allen v. *Rawson*, (1845) 1 C. B. 551, is another case supporting the same principle. In this case it was sought to upset a patent for improvements in the manufacture of felted fabrics on the ground that parts of the invention were discovered by two workmen. *Erle*, J., in directing the jury, put his idea of the law thus: "I take the law to be that, if a person has discovered an improved principle, and employs engineers, agents, or other persons to assist him in carrying out that principle, and they, in the course of experiments arising from that employment, make valuable discoveries accessory to the main principle and tending to carry that out in a better manner, such improvements are the property of the inventor of the original improved principle, and may be embodied in his patent; and if so embodied the patent is not avoided by evidence that the agent or servant made the suggestion of the subordinate improvement of the primary and improved principle." A motion for a new trial on the ground that the Judge had misdirected the jury was refused, *Tindal*, C.J., (1 C. B. 574) saying: "It would be difficult to define how far the suggestions of a workman employed in the construction of a machine are to be considered as distinct inventions by him so as to avoid a patent incorporating those taken out by his employer. Each case must depend upon its own merits. But when we see that the principle and object of an invention are complete without it, I think it is too much that a suggestion of a workman employed in the course of the experiments, of something calculated more easily to carry into effect the conceptions of the inventor should render the whole patent void."

In *the matter of Smith's Patent*, (1904) 22 R. P. C. 57, the above statement of the law by *Tindal*, C J., in *Allen* v. *Rawson* was applied to the particular facts before the Court, and the patent was revoked on the ground that the patentee was not the true and first inventor.

The reward of workmen employed to make inventions or improvements upon existing inventions, whether patented or not, is often made the subject of special contract, which is, of course, enforceable in an action for specific performance. (*i*)

Master is not entitled to the

The mere relationship of master and servant gives no right

(*i*) See Pashley *v.* Linotype Co. (1903), 20 R. P. C. 633.

True and First Inventor. — *invention of his servant,*

to the master in the invention of his servant. (j) If an employer takes out a patent for an invention discovered and worked out by a workman in his employ, and the patentee has no more connection with the invention than that he is the employer of the workman, the patent will be void, on the ground that the workman and not the patentee is the true and first inventor. Thus, in *Arkwright's Case* (k) it appeared that the patentee *Arkwright* had been told of a particular roller, part of the machinery, by one *Kay*, and, perceiving the value of the invention, he took *Kay* into his service for two years, and employed him in making models, and subsequently applied for and obtained a patent for the invention as his own. In the same way *Arkwright* adopted a crank invented by one *Hargreave*. At the trial *Arkwright* was declared not to be the true and first inventor. (l)

but only to improvements in details made by him.

When, however, a workman, who is employed by his master to make models, or to carry out experiments, in the course of his employment, makes improvements in details, the improvements so made are the property of the master, (m) and the workman cannot patent them. (n) There is in fact a confidential relationship between a master who experiments with a view to taking out a patent for an invention, the leading idea of which originated with him, and the workman he employs in aiding him to perform those experiments, and anything suggested by the workman during such confidential employment will not necessarily vitiate the subsequent patent of the master. (o) It is always, however, a question of evidence whether such confidential relationship actually existed between the employer and employed. (p) In general, whether the benefit of suggestions made by a person employed to carry out an invention belong to him or to his employer is a question depending on the merits of each case, but where the main principle and object are complete without the suggestions, which are merely matters calculated more easily to carry

(j) Saxby *v.* Gloucester Waggon Co., (1883) Griff. L. O. C. 56.

(k) (1785) Rex *v.* Arkwright, Dav. P. C. 61; 1 W. P. C. 64; Barker *v.* Shaw, 1 W. P. C. 126 *n*.

(l) Rex *v.* Arkwright, (1785) Dav. P. C. 61; 1 W. P. C. 64.

(m) p. 12 *ante*.

(n) David *v.* Woodley, (1884) Griff. L. O. C. 26; Kurtz *v.* Spence, (1888) 5 R. P. C. 181; Healey's Application. Johns. Pat. Man. 6 ed.; Conniff's Application, *ibid.*; Macfarlane's Patent, *ibid.* 165.

(o) Saxby *v.* Gloucester Waggon Co., (1883) Griff. L. O. C. 57; Homan's Patent, (1889) 6 P. O. R. 104.

(p) Humpherson *v.* Syer, (1887) 4 R. P. C. 407, 413.

True and First Inventor.

into effect the conceptions of the inventor, they are considered as merely accessory. (*q*)

In the absence of special contract, the invention of a servant, even though made in the employer's time, and with the use of the employer's materials, and at the expense of the employer, does not become the property of the employer so as to justify him in opposing the grant of a patent for the invention to the servant, who is the proper patentee, (*r*) and the patent when obtained is the exclusive property of the servant. (*s*) It may very well be that, under the circumstances of a particular case, it is inconsistent with the good faith which ought properly to be inferred or implied as an obligation arising from the contract of service that the servant should hold the patent otherwise than as trustee for his employer, and a declaration of the Court may be obtained to that effect. (*t*)

A patent may be invalidated on the ground of publication of the invention by one workman to another, for there is no necessary presumption of any confidential relationship between fellow-workmen such as will prevent this result ensuing. (*u*)

Inventions communicated from abroad.

Communicators of Foreign Inventions.—We next come to the subject of patents for inventions communicated from abroad which are new within this realm. Before the passing of the Patent Act, 1883, the law had long allowed grants of patents, in their own name, to persons who were in possession of inventions which they had received from others resident in foreign countries, but which inventions had never before been published within this realm.

It was stated in the celebrated *Clothworkers of Ipswich Case*, (*x*) which was prior to the Statute of Monopolies, "if a man hath brought in a new invention and a new trade within the kingdom in peril of his life and consumption of his estate, or stock, &c., or if a man hath made new discovery of anything, in such cases the King of his grace and favour in

(*q*) See Allen *v.* Rawson, p. 13 *ante*; Smith's Patent, (1904) 22 R. P. C. 58.

(*r*) Heald's Patent. (1891) 8 R. P. C. 430; Homan's Case, (1889) 6 R. P. C. 184; Siddell *v.* Vickers, (1888) 5 R. P. C. 93; Saxby *v.* Gloucester Waggon Co., (1880) Griff. L. O. C. 56. The above statement was approved by Farwell, J., in Marshall and Naylor's Patent (1900) 17 R. P. C. 555.

(*s*) Saxby *v.* Gloucester Waggon Co., Griff. L. O. C. 56.

(*t*) Worthington Pumping Engine Co. *v.* Moore, (1902) 20 R. P. C. 41; Richmond & Co., Ltd. *v.* Wrightson, (1904) 22 R. P. C. 25; Lamb *v.* Evans, L. R. [1893] 1 Ch. 218; Robb *v.* Green, L. R. [1895] 2 Q. B. 315.

(*u*) Saxby *v.* Gloucester Waggon Co., (1883) Griff. L. O. C. 56.

(*x*) (1615) Godb. 252; S. C. 1 Rol. R. 4.

True and First Inventor.

recompense of his costs and travail may grant by charter unto him that he only shall use such trade or trafique for a certain time, because at the first the people of the kingdom are ignorant, and have not the knowledge or skill to use it. But when that patent is expired the King cannot make a new grant thereof." This practice was continued after the framing of the Statute of Monopolies of 21 James I., and has frequently been sanctioned by the judges in many cases, from *Edgebury* v. *Stephens*, (y) which decided that if the invention be new in England, a patent may be granted though the thing was practised beyond sea before; "for the statute speaks of new manufactures within this realm; so that if it be new here it is within the statute; for the Act intended to encourage new devices useful to the kingdom, and whether learned by travel or by study it is the same thing," down to cases such as *Carpenter* v. *Smith*, (z) *Nickels* v. *Ross*, (a) and *Plimpton* v. *Malcolmson*, (b) from which the proposition is established that the first actual importer of an invention into this country is *in law the true and first inventor*.

First importer is the true and first inventor.

The Act of 1883 and subsequent legislation does not contain anything to prevent a person who has become acquainted with an invention abroad, though it was not actually made by him, coming over to this country and applying for a patent for it in his own name, and making the declaration (c) as to true and first inventor comprised in Form A, (d) in the schedule to the Patent Rules 1903, which is sufficiently wide to meet such a case. Before the Act of 1883 it was long the practice for a person applying for a patent in respect of a communication from abroad in his declaration (e) to state that he was the true and first inventor *within this realm*—though the words "within this realm" might have been omitted, without detraction, from the validity of the declaration; and in the form of declaration, given in the schedule to the repealed Act of 1852 they were in fact so omitted. It was objected by some that under the Act of 1883 a person cannot obtain a valid patent for an invention communicated from abroad, seeing that the Act requires him to declare himself the true and first inventor, which it was said he cannot be unless he himself actually made the discovery,

(y) (1691) Salkeld's Rep. 477; 1 W. P. C. 35; Dav. P. C. 36.
(z) (1841) 1 W. P. C. 530, 535.
(a) (1849) 8 C. B. 679.
(b) L. R. (1876) 3 Ch. D. 531.
(c) Vol. II. chap. i.
(d) See Appendix; see also Société Anonyme du Générateur du Temple's Patent, (1896) 13 R. P. C. 54.
(e) Vol. II. chap. i.

True and First Inventor.

and the case of *Milligan* v. *Marsh*, (*f*) decided in 1856, and *Renard* v. *Levenstein*, (*g*) decided in 1865, were relied on as supporting this view. On a reference to these cases it will be found that neither of them amounts to a decision on the point; they are at most dicta of *Wood*, V.C., and *Knight Bruce*, L.J.

The Act of 1883 defines "invention" to be "any manner of new manufacture as defined in 21 Jac. I. c. 3," and it is only reasonable to infer that "inventor" has the same meaning as it has been declared to have in the latter statute—*i.e.*, it includes the actual importer of a communicated invention. (*h*)

Communicators of foreign inventions.

Many patents have in fact been granted under the Act of 1883 to importers in respect of inventions communicated to them from abroad, and it has never been established that the grantees of such patents are not entitled to hold them for their own benefit in the absence of a fiduciary relationship between them and the actual foreign inventor. (*i*)

It must also be noticed that the clauses in the Act of 1883 relating to revocation of the grant of a patent do not exclude the case of a person without the knowledge or against the will of a foreigner endeavouring to forestall him in this country, even though the Comptroller and law officer on appeal have decided to allow the patent. (*k*)

Preference to foreign inventor who has made an application abroad.

In virtue of sec. 103 of the Act of 1883, and the International Convention of 1884, (*l*) a foreign inventor who has applied for a patent in any State or States to which the powers of sec. 103 of the Act of 1883 have been applied, has a right of priority to a British patent, if he applies for it during a period of twelve months from the date of his first foreign application, notwithstanding any intermediate publication of the invention in this country. (*m*)

Communications made in England.

The communication, made in England, by one British subject to another of an invention does not make the person to whom the communication is made the true and first inventor within the meaning of 21 Jac. I. c. 3, so as to enable him to obtain letters patent for the invention in his own name alone. (*n*)

(*f*) (1856) 2 Jur. N. S. 1083.

(*g*) (1865) 10 L. T. N. S. 177.

(*h*) Marsden *v.* Saville Street Foundry and Engineering Company, (1878) L. R. 3 Ex. D. 203.

(*i*) See Nickels *v.* Ross, (1849) 8 C. B. 679; Steadman *v.* Marsh, (1856) 2 Jur. N. S. 391; Avery's Patent, (1887) L. R. 36 Ch. D. 307, 318, 324; See Vol. II. chap. i. *post*.

(*k*) See Edmunds' Patent, (1886) Griff. P. C. 281; Higgins' Patent, (1891) 9 R. P. C. 74.

(*l*) See Appendix.

(*m*) See Vol. II. p. 19 *post*.

(*n*) Marsden *v.* Saville Street Foundry and Engineering Company, (1878) L. R. 3 Ex. D. 203.

There may well be circumstances under which an oral communication by an agent of a foreigner made in this country to a British subject might entitle such British subject to apply for a patent, and to sustain it on the ground that it was a *boná fide* communication from abroad; *e.g.* where a foreigner resident abroad sends over his clerk to communicate the invention orally to a British subject. (*o*) It would appear that a valid patent could not be granted in respect of a communication by an alien permanently domiciled in this country as being a communication from abroad.

True and First Inventor.

Wirth's patent (*p*) decided that letters patent may be granted to a foreigner resident abroad for an invention communicated to him by another foreigner resident abroad; but patents will not in future be granted to agents resident abroad in respect of communications to them by foreigners also resident abroad. (*q*)

Communications made abroad.

In *Beard* v. *Egerton*, (*r*) it was held that a person taking out a patent for a communication from abroad need not necessarily be the *meritorious* importer; he may be the mere clerk or agent of the foreign inventor.

Patentee need not be meritorious importer.

The law recognises, however, only the person to whom the patent is granted. Thus it is no objection to the sufficiency of a specification that a foreign inventor was possessed of knowledge, which ought to have been indicated in the specification, when it appeared that the actual patentee, who was merely the agent of the foreign inventor, was not possessed of that information. (*s*) And again, it is not a sufficient answer to an objection that a specification is insufficient to say that it contains all the information which the foreign inventor communicated to his agent, the actual patentee. (*t*)

Persons Incapable of being Patentees.

We have seen that any person, whether a British subject or not, may make an application for a patent, (*u*) but there are certain persons who, by virtue of their position, could not obtain a valid grant.

(*o*) See Pilkington *v.* Yeakley Vacuum Hammer Co., (1901) 18 R. P. C. 459. On the facts of this case the communication was held in fact to have been made from abroad: Jameson's Patent, (1902) 19 R. P. C. 246.

(*p*) (1879) L. R. 12 Ch. D. 303.

(*q*) Notice 21st April, 1884; P. O. J. 9th May, 1884.

(*r*) (1846) 3 C. B. 97; see also Chappell *v.* Purday, (1845) 14 M. & W. 310.

(*s*) Plimpton *v.* Malcolmson, (1876) L. R. 3 Ch. D. 531, 582.

(*t*) Wegmann *v.* Corcoran, (1878) L. R. 13 Ch. D. 65; 41 L. T. N. S. 357.

(*u*) p. 4 *ante*.

Persons incapable of being Patentees.

The King.

It seems that the King himself could not become a patentee, for he could not grant to himself.

Body corporate.

Rule 59 of the Patent Rules 1903, provides that a body corporate may be registered as a proprietor by its corporate name; but it is clear that such a body could not alone obtain a grant of a patent for an original invention, for it could not make the requisite declaration, (x) invention being the act of the mind, which could not proceed from such a body in its corporate capacity.

Letters patent may be granted to a body corporate, together with the true and first inventor, since "person," as defined by the Act of 1883, (y) includes a body corporate. (z) It is the practice of the Patent Office in the case of an invention communicated from abroad to grant the patent to a corporation alone, since such corporation, as the first introducer of the invention into this country, is in law the true and first inventor. (a) A foreign corporation is entitled to apply for a patent under the provisions of sec. 103 of the Act of 1883. (b)

Corporation sole.

A corporation sole, *as such*, cannot become a patentee of an original invention, for he must make the invention by his own mind in his individual capacity, and in that capacity only could he, therefore, become a patentee.

Official persons.

Official persons are in certain cases incapable of obtaining a patent for an invention connected with the subject-matter of their official position.

Thus, in *Patterson* v. *Gas Light and Coke Co.*, (c) the House of Lords held that *Patterson*, who had obtained a knowledge of the patented process in the discharge of the duties of his official position of gas referee, appointed by the Board of Trade, under the City of London Gas Act of 1868, was incapable of obtaining a valid patent, as such process was described in an official report of himself and his two colleagues, and thus was public property, notwithstanding that the report was kept back from the authorities to whom it was addressed till after the date of the patent.

Alien enemy.

It is doubtful whether a patent granted to an alien enemy would be valid. It has been doubted whether letters patent taken out on a secret trust, to be held for the benefit of the

(x) Vol. II. p. 5.

(y) Sec. 117.

(z) *Ibid.*

(a) In the matter of Carez's Application, (1889) 6 R. P. C. 552, p. 18.

(b) Carez's Patent, (1889) 6 R. P. C. 18; Société Anonyme du Générateur du Temple, (1896) 13 R. P. C. 56; see Vol. II. p. 19.

(c) (1875) L. R. 2 Ch. D. 812; L. R. 3 App. Cas. 239.

real inventor, who was an alien enemy, were void or not. To hold that such a trust could not exist would appear contrary to the spirit and policy of the patent law, in recognising communications from foreigners as good subject-matters for letters patent; but no action could be maintained by such alien, or by the trustee on his behalf, on any contract, because the resulting moneys might be employed against the country. (d)

Persons incapable of being Patentees.

(d) Webster on Patents, p. 23; also 1 W. P. C. 418 n.

CHAPTER II.

SUBJECT-MATTER.

General.

Subject-matter defined by 21 Jac. I. c. 3, s. 6.

Any Manner of Manufacture.—The Statute of Monopolies, in a sense the statutory foundation of our modern patent laws, (*a*) defines, by its *sixth* section, the Common Law right of the Crown to grant letters patent for inventions as limited to the granting of patents for "the sole working or making of any manner of new manufactures within this realm to the true and first inventor or inventors of such manufactures, which others at the time of making such letters patent and grants shall not use, so as also they be not contrary to the law, nor mischievous to the State, by raising prices of commodities at home, or hurt of trade, or generally inconvenient."

Subsequent enactments have not in any way altered the provisions of the Statute of Monopolies as regards subject-matter of letters patent for inventions; and the Act of 1883 (*b*) expressly states that the word "invention" shall mean any manner of new manufacture the subject of letters patent and grants of privilege within section "six" of the Statute of James I.—*i.e.*, the above quoted words.

The effect of this sixth section of the celebrated statute is twofold: (i) it exempts all patents and grants of privilege which its terms embrace from the abolition of monopolies in general which the preceding sections of the Act effected, and (ii) it expressly declares that such patents and grants of privilege shall have the same effect as they would have had if the Act had never been passed and none other—*i.e.*, they are not rendered valid by virtue of the Act, but obtain their force from the Common Law.

The words "working and making of any manner of new manufacture," coupled with the fact that "manufacture" is capable of more than one meaning, suggest the question,

(*a*) Vol. II. p. 197. (*b*) Sec. 46.

What is it the working and making of which the enactment contemplates as forming the subject-matter of a patent?

Subject-matter must be an Art.

"Manufacture" used as a noun may mean either (i) the art or practice of making or constructing any piece of workmanship, or (ii) anything made by art. The words "working or making" used in conjunction with the word "manufactures," seem to imply both these meanings, and the decisions of various Courts warrant the statement that in the contemplation of the patent law the word bears both significations. (c)

"Manufacture."

It is to be noticed that the word "manufactures," construed with the word "working," signifies the art or processes of making, and the words "working of manufactures" refer to the exercise of arts of making or constructing; whereas the word "manufactures" construed with the word "making" signifies articles or things made, and the words "making of manufactures" therefore mean the art of making articles or things which, when made, may properly be nominated manufactures, and which must be articles of trade or commerce. (d)

The subject of a valid patent must, consequently, be the working or making of a manner of new manufacture (in one or other of its two meanings) which must be new, useful, and not contrary to the law, nor mischievous to the State by raising the prices of commodities at home, or hurt of trade, or generally inconvenient. It must be new and useful because if it were not so the consideration for which the Crown makes the grant would fail; and it must be not contrary to the law, nor mischievous to the State by raising the prices of commodities at home, or hurt of trade, or generally inconvenient, for the Crown has not the power to make such a grant.

Subject-matter must be a manufacture which is new, useful, and not contrary to the law, nor mischievous to the State by raising the prices of commodities at home, or hurt of trade, or generally inconvenient.

The commodities above referred to must clearly be commodities open to trade before the patent, and cannot include the commodity which is the subject of the new invention. The patentee in fixing the price at which he will sell the new article does not raise the price of the commodity, for the article was not to be obtained at all before he put it on the market. The idea prevalent at the date of the Statute of Monopolies was that some inventions might be of such a nature that if they were put in practice the manufacture

(c) Crane v. Price, (1842) 4 M. & G. 580; Househill Co. v. Neilson, (1843) 1 W. P. C. 683; Hornblower v. Boulton, (1799) 8 T. R. 98; Dav. P. C. 225; R. v. Wheeler, (1819) 2 B. & Ald. 349; 1 Cary. P. C. 393; Stevens v. Keating, (1847) 2 W. P. C. 182.

(d) Boulton v. Bull, (1795) 2 H. Bl. 463; Hindmarch on Patents, pp. 80, 81. See also cases note (k) p. 25 post.

Subject-matter must be an Art.

would consume such a quantity of a known article of common use in trade as would, in consequence of a limited supply, raise its price to the hurt of other trades, and this is the evil which the limitation is intended to guard against. Protection of trade was a very prevalent notion when the Statute was passed. Whether or not the objection of general inconvenience would be maintained against any particular invention would depend upon the notions of public convenience and political economy prevalent at the time of decision. Thus in the case of a new invention referred to by Coke, (*e*) which related to a fulling mill by means of which more bonnets and caps might be thickened and fulled in a single day than by the labour of four-score men who got their living by the trade, this objection as to hurt of trade was held to prevail. The ground of the decision, as recorded by Coke, was that it was ordained that bonnets and caps should be thickened and fulled by the strength of man and not in a fulling mill, for it was holden inconvenient to turn so many labouring men to idleness. It is safe to predict that this objection to the patent for the fulling mill would not prevail to-day. There is no recorded case within modern times in which a patent has been declared void expressly on the ground of mischief to the State by raising the prices of commodities at home, or hurt of trade, or general inconvenience. The objection now takes the form of a plea that the invention is not new or useful. (*f*) The plea of want of utility is, therefore, in effect, a plea that the invention is, on the specific ground of lack of utility, tainted with the defect which renders the patent granted in respect of it void by reason of the proviso of section six of the Statute of Monopolies. It is open to a defendant in an action, or petitioner for revocation, to allege any other specific ground which is covered by the proviso in question. If the plea were raised in the general form, according to modern practice, the person raising it would be required to give particulars as a matter of course.

Subject-matter must be an art.

Subject-Matter must be an Art.—The subject-matter of letters patent for an invention must be an *art*. For, if any person other than the patentee makes any article or articles in accordance with the patentee's specification, he thereby commits an infringement of the patent, and yet the patent does not vest in the grantee the right to use the particular materials of which the articles made in infringement consist,

(*e*) 3 Inst. c. 85, p. 184. (*f*) See p. 161 *post*.

for they may never have been his property. What the infringer does besides using the materials, which he has a right to do, and the physical power, which he is also entitled to avail himself of, is to use the art of applying the physical power to the materials in the manner set forth in the specification. (*g*) It is this *art*, therefore, which is the exclusive property of the patentee, and which he, his agents or licensees, and no one else, is entitled to use during the continuance of the privilege. In the case of an article made in infringement of a patent the right of property remains in the infringer, (*h*) though he may be ordered to destroy such article, completely or partially, as may be necessary to render further infringement by its use impossible. (*i*)

Subject-matter must be an Art.

It has been said that only an art by the exercise of which vendible articles, or articles of trade or commerce, are capable of being produced can form the subject-matter of valid letters patent, (*k*) for two reasons:—(i) If the articles made by the exercise of the protected art cannot be sold, the invention will not be used, and therefore will not give any new employment to the people, and the public will receive no benefit from the invention. (ii) The intent of the patent is to reward the inventor by means of the profit arising from making and selling the patented articles during the continuance of the privilege. (*l*) Since the subject of the patent must be a manufacture, it must result in the production of a material entity. Consequently a patent could not be validly granted for a literary composition, or a mere scheme or plan—*e.g.*, a plan for becoming rich; a plan for the better government of a State; a plan for the efficient conduct of business. (*m*)

by which vendible articles can be produced,

An art which is to be exercised for the sole object of breaking the law, or for the sole purpose of producing anything designed to be used for an illegal purpose—*e.g.*, implements for housebreaking, picking pockets, locks, &c.—cannot form the subject-matter of valid letters patent. A grant of letters patent for such an object would be void, both on the ground of want of utility, (*n*) and as being contrary to public policy. "It would be absurd if by one law patents might be granted

and which is not to be exercised for illegal purposes.

(*g*) Huddart *v.* Grimshaw. (1803) Dav. P. C. 278; 1 W. P. C. 86.

(*h*) Vavasseur *v.* Krupp, (1878) L. R. 9 Ch. D. 351; p. 508 *post*.

(*i*) See p. 508 *post*.

(*k*) Boulton *v.* Bull, (1795) 2 H. Bl. 493; R. *v.* Wheeler, 2 B. & Ald. 349; Cornish *v.* Keene, (1837) 3 Bing. N. C. 570; Cooper's Patent, (1901) 19 R. P. C. 53; Johnson's Patent, (1901) 19 R. P. C. 56.

(*l*) See Hindmarch on Patents, pp. 101, 102.

(*m*) See Cooper's Patent, (1901) 19 R. P. C. 54.

(*n*) Chap. iv. *post*.

Subject-matter defined by Courts and early Text-Writers.

to reward persons for providing the means of violating any other law. (*o*) It is, however, no objection to a patent that it was taken out for the purpose of evading a statute—*e.g.*, the Pharmacy Act. (*p*)

Definition by Court of King's Bench.

Subject-Matter defined by the Courts and Early Text-Writers. —The Court of King's Bench, in *Mitchell* v. *Reynolds* (*q*) stated what may be deemed capable of forming the subject-matter of a patent—viz.:

> "A grant of the sole use of *a new invented art* is good, being indulged for the encouragement of ingenuity; but this is tied up by the Statute of 21 James I. c. 3, s. 6, to the term of fourteen years; for after that time it is presumed to be a known *trade*, and to have spread itself among the people." After a statement of the reasons why monopolies are generally void at Common Law, the judgment of the Court continues: "But none of the cases of customs, by-laws to enforce these customs, and *patents for the sole use of a new invented art*, are within any of these reasons; for here no man is abridged of his liberty or disseised of his freehold; a custom is *lex loci*, and foreigners have no pretence of right in a particular society exempt from the laws of that society; *and as to new-invented arts nobody can be said to have a right to that which was not in being before;* and therefore it is but a reasonable reward to ingenuity and uncommon industry." (*r*)

Definition by Sir Edward Coke.

The Chapter of Monopolies in Sir *Edward Coke's* Third Institute of the Laws of England (*s*) contains the following commentary respecting the exception specified in the Statute of Monopolies as being fit subject-matter of letters patent:

> In reference to the proviso in section 5 the learned author writes: "The first is that this Act shall not extend to any letters patents, or grants of privilege heretofore made of the sole working, or making, of any manner of new manufacture, but that new manufacture must have seven properties.
>
> "*First*, it must be for twenty-one years or under.
>
> "*Secondly*, it must be granted to the first and true inventor.
>
> "*Thirdly*, it must be of such manufactures which any other at the making of such letters patent did not use, for albeit it were newly invented, yet if any other did use it at the making,

(*o*) See Hindmarch on Patents, p. 142.

(*p*) Vaisey's Patent, (1894) 11 R. P. C. 593.

(*q*) 1 P. Wms. 181; 10 Mod. 130 S. C.

(*r*) See also The Master, Wardens, and Society of Gunmakers *v.* Fell, Willes, R. 388.

(*s*) 3 Inst. c. 85, pp. 181, 184.

Subject-matter defined by Courts and early Text-Writers.

of the letters patents, or grants of privilege, it is declared and enacted to be void by this Act.

"*Fourthly*, the privilege must not be contrary to law: such a privilege as is consonant to law must be substantially and essentially newly invented; but if the substance was *in esse* before, and a new addition thereunto, though that addition make the former more profitable, yet is it not a new manufacture in law; and so was it resolved in the Exchequer Chamber, Pasch, 15 Eliz., in *Bricot's Case*, for a privilege concerning the preparing and melting, &c., of lead ore: for then it was said that that was to put but a new button to an old coat, and it is much easier to add than to invent. And then it was also resolved, that if the new manufacture be substantially invented according to law, yet no old manufacture in use before can be prohibited.

"*Fifthly*, nor mischievous to the State, by raising of prices of commodities at home. In every such new manufacture that deserves a privilege there must be *urgens necessitas* and *evidens utilitas*.

"*Sixthly*, nor to the hurt of trade. This is very material and evident.

"*Seventhly*, nor generally inconvenient.

"There was a new invention found out heretofore that bonnets and caps might be thickened in a fulling mill, by which means more might be thickened and fulled in one day than by the labours of four-score men who got their living by it. It was ordained that bonnets and caps should be thickened and fulled by the strength of man and not in a fulling mill, for it was holden inconvenient to turn so many labouring men to idleness.

"If any of these seven qualities fail, the privilege is declared and enacted to be void by this Act, and yet this Act, if they have all these properties, set them in no better case than they were before this Act."

In reference to Section 6 of the Statute of Monopolies, Sir *Edward Coke* says:

"The *second* proviso concerneth the privilege of new manufacturers *hereafter* to be granted: and this also must have seven properties: first, it must be for the term of fourteen years, or under; the other six properties must be such as are aforesaid, and yet this Act maketh them no better than they should have been if this Act had never been made, but only excepts and exempts them out of the purview and penalty of the laws.

"The cause wherefore the privileges of new manufacturers, either before this Act granted, or which after this Act should be granted, having these seven properties, were not declared to be good was, for that the reason wherefore such a privilege is good

Subject-matter defined by Courts and early Text-Writers.

in law is, because the inventor bringeth to and for the commonwealth a new manufacture by his invention, cost and charges; and therefore it is reason that he should have a privilege for his reward (and the encouragement of others in the like), for a convenient time, but it was thought that the times limited by this Act were too long for the private, before the commonwealth should be partaker thereof, and such as served such privileged persons by the space of seven years, in making or working of the new manufacture (which is the time limited by law of apprenticehood), must be apprentices or servants still during the residue of the privilege, by means whereof such numbers of men would not apply themselves thereunto as should be requisite for the commonwealth after the privilege ended, and this was the true cause wherefore, both for the time past and for the time to come, they were left of such force as they were before the making of this Act."

Exhaustive definition is not possible.

It is impossible to give any definition which will enable the question to be at once answered whether a given example is capable of forming the subject-matter of a valid patent. Each instance must be considered on its own merits.

Common Law authorities.

The Common Law authorities, respecting what may be the subject of a valid patent, decided before the passing of 21 Jac. I. c. 3, are not very numerous, but they agree perfectly with the construction which the modern law has placed upon the words of the sixth section of that Act.

In the *Case of Monopolies* (Noy, 182) it was argued by counsel that the Crown may grant a patent of "*a new trade*" or "*any engine tending to the furtherance of a trade that never was used before.*"

In *The Clothworkers of Ipswich Case*, (1615) Godb. 252, 253, it was said that, "if a man hath brought in *a new invention and a new trade*, or *a new discovery of anything*," the Crown may grant to him that he only shall use such a trade.

Edgebury v. *Stephens*, (1691) 2 Salk. 447; 1 W. P. C. 35, held that the exception contained in the sixth section of the Statute of Monopolies intended to encourage *new devices* useful to the kingdom.

It is stated in Sheppard's Abridgment (Part iii., tit. Prerog., p. 61) that the King may grant a patent for a new *trade* or *device*, or any new *engine* tending to the furtherance of it.

And Serjeant *Hawkins* says (Hawk. P. Cr. part i. c. 79, s. 20) the King may grant the sole use of "*An Art* invented or first brought into the realm by the grantee."

Discovery and Invention.

Difference between discovery and invention.

Discovery and Invention.—The words of the exception clause of the statute of James I. appear so wide and extensive as to embrace almost the whole domain of the inventive faculty of the human mind, but there are, nevertheless, certain discoveries which may be most highly beneficial to mankind, and yet, for meritorious reasons, are not capable of forming the subject-matter of a valid patent. Moreover, if a part of what the patentee claims as being his invention is not proper subject-matter, it will vitiate the whole and render the grant entirely void so long as the specification remains unamended. (*t*)

Many instances of discoveries which are incapable of protection by letters patent, and the reasons why, will be found in the following pages.

Discovery and invention are clearly not the same thing. A discovery will not form the basis of a patentable invention unless the discoverer thereby adds something to the stock of public knowledge, and points to an act to be done, which, besides being new and useful is, on the facts of the particular case, the outcome of skilful ingenuity. (*u*)

In the language of *Buckley*, J. (*v*)—

> "Of course the difference between discovery and invention is very familiar. Discovery adds to the amount of human knowledge, but it does so only by lifting the veil and disclosing something which before had been unseen or dimly seen. Invention also adds to human knowledge, but not merely by disclosing something. Invention necessarily involves also the suggestion of an act to be done, and it must be an act which results in a new product, or a new result, or a new process, or a new combination for producing an old product or an old result." (*x*)

Per Lindley, L.J.

The following words of Lord *Lindley*, then *Lindley*, L.J., taken from his judgment in *Lane Fox* v. *Kensington and Knightsbridge Electric Lighting Co.* (*y*) are most instructive upon this point.

> "An invention is not the same thing as a discovery. When *Volta* [*sic, Galvani*] discovered the effect of an electric current from the battery on a frog's leg he made a great discovery, but

(*t*) Vol. II. p. 63.

(*u*) See p. 108 *post*.

(*v*) Reynolds *v.* Herbert Smith & Co., Ltd., (1902) 20 R. P. C. 261.

(*x*) See also Jandus Arc Lamp and Electric Co., Ltd. *v.* Arc Lamp Co., (1905) 22 R. P. C. 277, 296-7.

(*y*) (1892) 9 R. P. C. 416.

Discovery and Invention.

no patentable invention. Again, a man who discovered that a known machine can produce effects which no one knew could be produced by it before may make a great and useful discovery, but if he does no more his discovery is not a patentable invention. *Britain* v. *Hirsch*, (1888) 5 R. P. C. 226 (on p. 232); *Harwood* v. *Great Northern Railway Co.*, (1865) 11 H. L. C. 654; *Horton* v. *Mabon*, (1862) 12 C. B. N. S. 437; *Saxby* v. *Gloucester Waggon Co.*, (1880) L. R. 7 Q. B. D. 305. He has added nothing but knowledge to what previously existed. A patentee must do something more; he must make some addition, not only to knowledge, but to previously known inventions and must use his knowledge and ingenuity so as to produce either a new and useful thing or result, or a new method of producing an old thing or result. On the one hand, the discovery that a known thing—such for example as a *Planté* battery—can be used for a useful purpose for which it has never been used before is not alone a patentable invention; but, on the other hand, the discovery how to use such a thing for such a purpose will be a patentable invention, if there is novelty in the mode of using it as distinguished from novelty of purpose; or if any new modification of the thing, or any new appliance is necessary for using it for its new purpose, and if such mode of using or modification or appliance involves any appreciable merit. It is often extremely difficult to draw the line between patentable inventions and non-patentable discoveries; but I have endeavoured to state the distinction as I understand it, and so far as is necessary for the purpose of the present case. I have, of course, been guided by the previous decisions on the subject, and especially by *Harwood* v. *Great Northern Railway Co.*, (1865) 11 H. L. C. 654, which is the most instructive of them all. I have been induced to make these observations in order to apply them to the question whether the plaintiff's invention is anything more than a discovery that *Planté* cells can be usefully employed for incandescent lighting." (z)

Invention.—At common law the Crown has authority to grant letters patent for inventions to the true and first inventor only, *i.e.*, to the true and first inventor alone, or in conjunction with some other person or persons. This is the effect of the statements contained in the Statute of

(z) See also Welsbach Incandescent Gas Light Co., Ld. *v.* Daylight Incandescent Mantle Co., (1899) 17 R. P. C. 141, 148; Case *v.* Cressy, (1900) 17 R. P. C. 261, 263; Acetylene Illuminating Co., Ld. *v.* United Alkali Co., Ld., (1903) 20 R. P. C. 173; 22 R. P. C. 156; and compare Jandus Arc Lamp and Electric Co., Ld. *v.* Arc Lamp Co., (1905) 22 R. P. C. 296-7.

Monopolies, (*a*) and the provisions of sec. 4 of the Patents Act 1883. It is evident, therefore, that the grantee of the patent, or one of the grantees as the case may be, must be an inventor. That is to say he must, in arriving at the discovery, which is the subject-matter of the patent, have exercised that faculty of the mind which is called invention.

Invention.

Mere scintilla of invention is sufficient to support a patent.

The question arises as to whether any particular quantum of invention, in this sense, is necessary to the support of a grant of letters patent. The result of the cases on the point is that, provided the subject-matter of the patent is a manufacture, within the meaning of the Statute of Monopolies, (*b*) which is new and useful, a mere *scintilla* of invention is sufficient. (*c*) In all cases the question to be decided is, does the specification describe and claim *an* invention. If an invention is disclosed, it is quite immaterial, from the point of view of the validity of the patent as regards subject-matter, whether the invention is a great one or a small one. The essential consideration is the pure question of fact in each instance whether, in view of the circumstances peculiar to each case and the state of public knowledge at the date of the application for the patent, there has been an exercise of invention or not. (*d*) There are dicta of some judges which, at first sight, at any rate, appear to the contrary, (*e*) but it is submitted that the above is a correct statement of the law.

It is true that every invention capable of supporting a patent must be a new manufacture, but it does not follow that every novelty, though an important and useful one, is good subject-matter. In order to support a patent the novelty must be *de jure* as well as *de facto.* (*f*) In other words, it must be the result of invention. It is not, however, necessary that any great amount of thought, design, or skilful ingenuity must have actually been expended in making the invention, for the discovery may have been the outcome of a mere guess

(*a*) See p. 3 *ante.*

(*b*) p. 22 *ante.*

(*c*) See p. 34 *post.* American Braided Wire Co. *v.* Thomson, (1899) 6 R. P. C. 518; Vickers *v.* Siddel, (1890) 7 R. P. C. 292; Rickmann *v.* Thierry, (1896) 14 R. P. C. 105; Longbottom *v.* Shaw, (1891) 8 R. P. C. 333; Harwood *v.* Great Northern Ry. Co., (1865) 11 H. L. C. 654; 35 L. T. Q. B. 27; Losh *v.* Hague, (1837) 1 W. P. C. 202, 207; R. *v.* Cutler, (1847) 4 Q. B. 372 *n.*; 3 C. & K. 215; Neilson *v.* Harford, (1841) 8 M. & W. 806; 11 L. J. Ex. 20; 1 W. P. C. 331; Crane *v.* Price, (1842) 4 M. & G. 580; 12 L. J. C. P. 81; 1 W. P. C. 393; Hayward *v.* Hamilton, (1879-81) Griff. P. C. 115; Patent Exploitation, Ld. *v.* Siemens Brothers & Co., Ld., (1904) 21 R. P. C. 549; Gramaphone and Typewriter, Ld. *v.* Ullmann, (1906) 23 R. P. C. 260.

(*d*) See pp. 29, 39 *post.*

(*e*) *E.g.* Carter *v.* Leyson, (1902) 19 R. P. C. 478.

(*f*) See Murray *v.* Clayton, (1872) L. R. 7 Ch. 578.

Invention.

or happy accident, suggesting the novel application which is the real meritorious invention. Thus, the discovery of water tabbies was made by mere accident. A man having spat upon the floor, placed a hot iron on the moisture, and observed that it spread out into a kind of flower. He afterwards tried the experiment upon linen, and found it produced the same effect. He then obtained a patent for a process based on the accidental discovery, which proved of great value. (*g*)

Unsatisfied demand.

When an article suddenly springs into existence and meets a long-unsatisfied demand, the length of time during which the demand was unsatisfied is matter from which it may be inferred that it is ingenuity alone which has enabled the inventor to surmount the obstacle, which otherwise would seem, from the mere existence of the long unsatisfied demand, to have existed somewhere, or in some shape; (*h*) and the merits of an invention are not to be deemed any the less because it subsequently appears what a little alteration was required in, or in the adjustment of, some of the parts of previously known machines, in order to produce the patented machine which will successfully do the work first done by it. (*i*)

The fact, however, must not be overlooked that the demand itself may be quite new, and the novelty of the demand may have led immediately to the production, without ingenuity, of an obvious article to satisfy it, which consequently could not be good subject-matter. (*k*)

Practical success.

The practical success of a new article is in itself cogent evidence from which the conclusion may be drawn that the exercise of invention was necessary to the first production of the article, (*l*) but practical success is by no means in all cases proof of the exercise of invention. (*m*)

Essential considerations.

If the alleged invention is obvious, and it cannot be

(*g*) See Liardet *v.* Johnson, (1778) 1 W. P. C. 54; see also 2 H. Bl. 486; Crane *v.* Price, (1842) 1 W. P. C. 411.

(*h*) Gosnell *v.* Bishop, (1888) 5 R. P. C. 158; American Braided Wire Co. *v.* Thomson, (1888) 5 R. P. C., 5 P. O. R. 125; Blakey *v.* Latham, (1889) 6 R. P. C. 187; Elias *v.* Grovesend Tinplate Co., (1890) 7 R. P. C. 455; Morgan *v.* Windover, (1890) 7 R. P. C. 131; Gammons *v.* Battersby, (1901) 21 R. P. C. 331.

(*i*) See *ibid.*; Gammons *v.* Battersby, (1904) 21 R. P. C. 332.

(*k*) *Ibid.*

(*l*) American Braided Wire Co. *v.* Thomson, (1888) 5 R. P. C. 125; Ehrlich *v.* Ihlee, (1888) 5 R. P. C. 205; Edison-Bell Phonograph Corporation *v.* Smith, (1894) 11 R. P. C. 398; Hayward *v.* Hamilton, (1881) Griff. P. C. 117; Parker *v.* Satchwell, (1901) 18 R. P. C. 307-8; British Vacuum Cleaner Co., Ld. *v.* Suction Cleaners, Ld., (1904) 21 R. P. C. 312.

(*m*) Rickmann v. Thierry, (1896) 14 R. P. C. 105; Fawcett *v.* Homan, (1896) 16 R. P. C. 274; Longbottom *v.* Shaw, (1891) 8 R. P. C. 333.

presumed that the exercise of thought, design, or skilful ingenuity was required in making it, the patent is void, on the ground of lack of subject-matter. (*n*)

Invention.

It has been authoritatively stated that in point of law the labour of thought or experiment, and the expenditure of money, are not the essential grounds of consideration on which the question whether the invention is, or is not, the subject-matter of a patent ought to depend; for if the invention be new, and useful to the public, it is not material whether it be the result of long experiment and profound search, or of some sudden and lucky thought, or mere accidental discovery. (*o*)

Conception of the idea may be the whole merit.

The conception of the idea is, in many cases, the whole merit of the invention; and its application, when once conceived, becomes the simplest thing in the world, and, consequently, does not evidence the expenditure of much thought, design, or skilful ingenuity. (*p*)

An obvious combination is not subject-matter.

Therefore, the question whether any alleged invention is proper subject-matter depends, not on whether it was the result of great thought, design, or skilful ingenuity, but whether it required the exercise of some thought, design, or skilful ingenuity to arrive at the result claimed by the patentee—*e.g.*, a new combination which is obvious and consists merely in putting together two known things, each being applied to do that which it had been used to do before, without making any other experiment, or gaining any further information, is not proper subject-matter, (*q*) neither is the mere duplicating of a known thing, though the result is eminently useful. (*r*)

For example, in *Williams* v. *Nye*, (*s*) the patent was for a sausage-making machine, and it appeared that there was known

(*n*) White *v.* Toms, (1867) 32 L. J. Ch. 204; Britain *v.* Hirsch, (1888) 5 R. P. C. 74, 226; Jackson *v.* Needle, (1885) 2 R. P. C. 191; Sharp *v.* Bauer, (1886) 3 R. P. C. 193; Guilbert-Martin *v.* Kerr, (1887) 4 R. P. C. 18; Rowcliffe *v.* Longford Wire Co., (1887) 4 R. P. C. 281; Haslam *v.* Hall, (1888) 5 R. P. C. 21; Longbottom *v.* Shaw, (1888) 5 R. P. C. 497; 6 P. O. R. 143; 8 R. P. C. 333; Gaulard & Gibb's Patent, (1888) 5 R. P. C. 525; Herrburger *v.* Squire, (1889) 6 R. P. C. 194; Morgan *v.* Windover, (1890) 7 R. P. C. 131; Wood *v.* Raphael, (1897) 14 R. P. C. 496; Haws *v.* Harding, (1897) 14 R. P. C. 640, 930.

(*o*) Per Tindal, C.J., Crane *v.* Price, (1842) 1 W. P. C. 411.

(*p*) See pp. 34, 42, 47 *post*.

(*q*) Sanders *v.* Aston, (1832) 3 B. & Ad. 881, 886; Saxby *v.* Gloucester Waggon Co., L. R. (1880) 7 Q. B. D. 305; 50 L. J. Q. B. 577; Gaulard and Gibbs' Patent, (1890) 7 R. P. C. 380–1; Williams *v.* Nye, (1890) 7 R. P. C. 62; Ormson *v.* Clarke, (1862) 13 C. B. 339; 14 C. B. 490; Newsum *v.* Mann, (1890) 7 R. P. C. 307; Heys *v.* Hallmark, (1891) 9 R. P. C. 25; Bridges Patent, (1901) 18 R. P. C. 257; Wardroper *v.* George Gibbs, Ld., (1903) 20 R. P. C. 355.

(*r*) Elias *v.* Grovesend Tinplate Co., (1890) 7 R. P. C. 455; Morgan *v.* Windover, (1890) 7 R. P. C. 131.

(*s*) (1890) 7 R. P. C. 37, 62, 66.

Invention.

an old machine, *Nye's*, in which there was a combination of a cutting process and a forcing forward or filling into the skin which was to enclose the meat when cut up. *Nye's* cutting process was defective. There was also known an old cutting process, *Donald's*, which was satisfactory. What the plaintiff did, was to introduce into *Donald's* cutting machine, and on the shaft which worked it, a screw to force the meat when minced into the sausage skin. Such a forcing screw was used in *Nye's* machine. Though the plaintiff did in fact turn *Donald's* machine into a machine which filled as well as cut, and so produced a machine which was new and better than *Nye's* cutting and filling machine, yet the Court of first instance and the Court of Appeal held that there was no sufficient invention, and the patent was bad on the ground of lack of subject-matter.

Leading cases to the effect that a scintilla of invention is sufficient.

The following are the leading authorities on the point that a mere *scintilla* of invention is sufficient to support a patent for subject-matter which is in fact a new and useful "manufacture" within the meaning of the Statute of Monopolies, with the most important passages of the quoted judgments printed in italics:—

Harwood *v.* Great Northern Railway Co.

Harwood v. *Great Northern Railway Co.*, (1865) 11 H. L. C. 654; 35 L. J. Q. B. 27. In this case the patent related to "improvement in fishes and fish-joints for connecting the rails of railways," and was declared invalid. When the case reached the House of Lords the Judges were summoned and requested to give their opinions as to whether upon the findings of the jury on the facts of the case a verdict should be entered for the plaintiffs or the defendants.

Blackburn, J., in delivering the opinions of himself and *Shee*, J., stated the law in the following terms, with which all the Judges consulted and the House agreed (11 H. L. C. 666): "The Statute of Monopolies (21 Jac. I. c. 3, s. 6) excepts from the abolition of monopolies patents for 'the sole working or making of any manner of new manufactures within this realm to the true and first inventor and inventors of such manufactures, which others at the time of making such letters patents and grants shall not use.' In order to bring the subject-matter of a patent within this exception, there must be *invention* so applied as to produce a practical result. And we agree with the Court of Exchequer Chamber that a *mere* application of an old contrivance in the old way to an analogous subject, *without any novelty or invention* in the mode of applying such old contrivance to the new purpose, is not a

Invention.

Leading cases.

valid subject-matter of a patent. There are many decisions to that effect, which were referred to at your Lordships' Bar; and, if the matter were now, for the first time, to be decided on the construction of the statute, without reference to the cases, we should think on principle that such should be the conclusion of the Court. But then in every case arises a question of fact whether the contrivance before in use was so similar to that which the patentee claims that there is no invention in the differences, if any, between the old contrivance and that for which the patentee claims a monopoly; and, if there is none, there arises a further question—viz., whether the purpose to which the contrivance was before applied and the new purpose are so analogous or cognate that there is no discovery or invention in the new application? Whether, in short, it is a *mere* application or not? *For if there is invention or discovery producing a practical benefit, as in the case of* Crane *v.* Price, (1840) 1 W. P. C. 377; 4 Man. & Gr. 580, *it is the valid subject of a patent.* And we think it always must be a question of degree—a question of more or less—whether the analogy or cognateness of the purposes is so close as to prevent them being an invention in the application. Mr. *Grove, in his very able arguments, contended, we believe correctly enough, that if there was any real invention, though a slight one, producing a practical beneficial result, the patent was good.* But the question still remains, was there such an amount of cognateness in the purposes that there was no real invention or discovery?"

Lord *Westbury*, L.C., in moving the House to confirm the decision of the Court of Exchequer Chamber, said (11 H. L. C. 682): "*Then, my Lords, the question is, whether there can be any invention of the plaintiff in having taken that thing which was a fish for a bridge, and having applied it as a fish to a railway.* Upon that I think the law is well and rightly settled, for there would be no end to the interference with trade and with the liberty of adopting any mechanical contrivance, if every slight difference in the application of a well-known thing should be held to constitute ground for a patent. There is the familiar contrivance of the button to the button-hole taken from the waistcoat or the coat, which may be applied in some particular mechanical combination in which it has not hitherto been applied; but it would be an idle thing, if it were possible, to take a well-known mechanical contrivance, and by applying it to a subject to which it had not hitherto been applied to constitute that application the subject of a patent to be granted as for a new invention. No sounder or more wholesome doctrine, I think, was ever established than that which was established by the decisions which are referred to in the opinions of the four learned Judges who concur in the second opinion delivered

Invention.

Leading cases.

to your Lordships, namely, that you cannot have a patent for a well-known mechanical contrivance merely when it is applied in a manner or to a purpose, which is not quite the same, but is analogous to the manner or the purpose in or to which it has been hitherto notoriously used."

Elias v. Grovesend Tinplate Co.

In *Elias* v. *Grovesend Tinplate Co.*, (1890) 7 R. P. C. 455, *Smith*, L.J., pointed out that when Lord *Westbury*, L.C., stated that you cannot have a patent for a well-known mechanical contrivance *merely* when it is applied in an analogous manner or to an analogous purpose his Lordship meant "*unless there is invention in the adaptation or mode of application.*"

Penn v. Bibby.

In *Penn* v. *Bibby*, (1866) L. R. 2 Ch. 127; 36 L. J. Ch. 453, the patent related to "an improvement in the bearings and brushes for the shafts of screw and submerged propellers."

It was objected against the patent that it was a case of mere analogous use of bearings known in connection with grindstones and water-wheels. Lord *Chelmsford*, L.C., to whom there was an appeal for a new trial, in reference to the question of invention, said (L. R. 2 Ch. 135): "It was objected that the finding was erroneous, because the alleged invention was merely a new application of an old and well-known thing. It is very difficult to extract any principle from the various decisions on this subject which can be applied with certainty to every case; nor indeed is it easy to reconcile them with each other. The criterion given by Lord *Campbell* in *Brook* v. *Aston*, 8 E. & B. 485, has been frequently cited (as it was in the present argument), that a patent may be valid for the application of an old invention to a new purpose, but to make it valid there must be some novelty in the application. I cannot help thinking that there must be some inaccuracy in his Lordship's words, because according to the proposition, as he stated it, if the invention be applied to a new purpose, there cannot but be some novelty in the application.

"In every case of this description one main consideration seems to be whether the new application lies so much out of the track of the former use as not naturally to suggest itself to a person turning his mind to the subject, but *to require some application of thought and study.* Now, strictly, applying this test to the present case, it appears to me impossible to say that the patented invention is merely an application of an old thing to a new purpose."

Thomson v. American Braided Wire Co.

Thomson v. *American Braided Wire Co.*, (1889) 6 R. P. C. 518, was a case near the border line, but the patent was upheld by the House of Lords on the ground that there was quite sufficient invention in the mode of application. Lord *Herschell's* judgment contains the following passage (6 R. P. C. 527): "It cannot be denied that both the prior patents to which I have

referred afford some colour to the defendants' contention that the patentee has done nothing more than apply a known substance in a manner and to a purpose analogous to that in and to which it had been already applied, and that the patent therefore cannot be supported. If I thought that the patentee had claimed the mere use of tubular sections of braided wire as a bustle, however fastened or secured, I should arrive at the conclusion that the defendants' contention was well founded, but I do not thus construe the specification. I have already stated that in my opinion it is the combination alone for which protection is sought, and that the method of fastening the ends by clamping plates is an essential part of that which is claimed. Taking this view of the patent, *I think that*, even with the state of knowledge which existed at the time the patent was applied for, *some invention was required to produce the bustle claimed to be protected by it.* All the learned Judges in the Court of Appeal, although they arrived at the same conclusion, stated that they had done so with hesitation, and expressed the opinion that but little invention was requisite, and that the case was near the border line. I entirely agree, and have not been without doubt as to the proper decision to be arrived at."

Vickers v. Siddell.

In *Vickers* v. *Siddell*, (1890) 7 R. P. C. 292, the subject-matter of the patent related to an improved mechanical appliance for making or operating on large forgings in iron or steel. In the House of Lords, Lord *Herschell* said, 7 R. P. C. 304: "The objections of want of novelty and subject-matter cover to some extent the same ground, but it will be expedient to deal with them as far as possible separately. The invention, so far as we are concerned with it in this part of the case, consists of an apparatus for turning heavy forgings, composed of a wheel and endless chain, the wheel being internally toothed, and having a ratchet working in it, by means of which the wheel is caused to rotate, and the forging which rests in the endless chain is thus turned from time to time to the extent desired. It is admitted by the respondent that the elements which form this combination are all old. On the other hand, the appellants admit that the combination was never in use prior to the date of the patent. But they allege that to combine these well-known elements into the apparatus needed no invention, and that it is therefore not proper subject-matter for a patent. Forgings, they say, had long rested in an endless chain, the idea of turning such forgings by turning the wheel over which the chain passed was not a new one, and a ratchet, working in teeth was a well-known device for causing a wheel to rotate to the desired extent. All this, I think, cannot be denied. But the result is an apparatus of extremely simple character, which possesses the advantage of being easily moved

Invention.

Leading cases.

from place to place and applied wherever wanted. And the question remains whether this mode of dealing with forgings which require to be gradually turned was so obvious that it would at once occur to any one acquainted with the subject and desirous of accomplishing the end, or *whether it required some invention to devise it.* There is no doubt about the law applicable to such a question, though it is often difficult to apply it to the circumstances of a particular case, and its application is perhaps most difficult when the alleged invention consists of a new apparatus combining known elements. If the apparatus be valuable by reason of its simplicity, there is a danger of being misled by that very simplicity into the belief that no invention was needed to produce it. But experience has shown that not a few inventions, some of which have revolutionised the industries of this country, have been of so simple a character that when once they were made known it was difficult to understand how the idea had been so long in presenting itself, or not to believe that they must have been obvious to every one." (*t*)

Decision may be difficult in cases of mechanical combinations.

When the patentee's claim, properly construed, is for a thing substantially as described, and the fact is that no such thing ever existed before and, by means of the thing, a result not previously produced can be attained, it is difficult to say that that thing is not subject-matter for a valid patent, especially where there is no evidence of any prior instrument performing the same function as the thing described and claimed. (*u*) In this connection the following words of Lord *Halsbury*, L.C., are very instructive: "There is nothing, I suppose, more difficult, when you are dealing with a mechanical combination, than to keep one's mind free from the impression created by the fact that all the elements, or most of the elements, in such a case are old . . . it is, of course, extremely difficult to deal with such questions in the abstract, and I am disposed to think myself that the source of error is in dealing with it in the abstract; because you have to start with the proposition that everything is old, and until you apply yourself to what is the peculiar mechanism for the purpose required, you do not adequately appreciate—and I may frankly say that I did not adequately appreciate—what the invention is until you come to put it in a concrete form and to see what the thing is, what the thing was intended to do, and then apply

(*t*) See also Patent Exploitation, Ltd. *v.* Siemens Brothers & Co., Ltd., (1904) 21 R. P. C. 541.

(*u*) See the above-quoted passage from Vickers *v.* Siddell; Annand *v.* Taylor, (1900) 18 R. P. C. 53; British United Shoe Machinery Co. *v.* Thompson, (1904) 22 R. P. C. 177, 196.

Invention.

your mind to see whether in its combination it has been anticipated or not." (x)

Commercial success.

The immediate commercial success of a new article is not necessarily proof of invention, but it has a very important bearing on the question whether or not it required invention to produce it, when it appears that the thing never was done in the memory of man down to a particular point, and at the moment it is done it is a great success as regards utility. (y)

Invention purely a question of fact.

It is thus purely a question of fact in each instance whether, upon a consideration of the circumstances peculiar to each case and the state of public knowledge at the date of application for the patent, there has been an exercise of invention or not; and a decision of fact in one case is neither an authority, nor a help, to a decision of fact in another case. (z) In the words of the late Lord *Bowen* (a): "Has there been an exercise of the inventive faculties? That depends on a true view of all the circumstances, and it cannot be governed in any one case by a finding of fact, on a totally different invention, by a tribunal like the House of Lords. We must apply our minds to the specific facts in the case before us; and nothing is more pernicious, or likely to lead the Court astray, than, when it has to decide a question of fact in one case, to wander into another case; to look at the decision of fact in that case and then to see what differentiations there can be between the facts in the cited case and the one before the Court. The Court that travels on these lines always goes wrong." (b)

Effect of common knowledge on question of invention.

Though the exact thing claimed by the patentee cannot be said to have been anywhere actually published or described in its entirety yet the state of common knowledge may be

(x) Taylor v. Annand, (1900) 18 R. P. C. 62.

(y) See per Bowen, L. J., American Braided Wire Co. v. Thomson, (1888) 5 R. P. C. 125; Ehrlich v. Ihlee, (1888) 5 R. P. C. 205; Edison-Bell Phonograph Corporation v. Smith, (1894) 11 R. P. C. 398; Parker v. Satchwell, (1901) 18 R. P. C. 307-8; British Vacuum Cleaner Co., Ld. v. Suction Cleaners, Ld., (1904) 21 R. P. C. 312; Patent Exploitation, Ld. v. Siemens Brothers & Co., Ld., (1904) 21 R. P. C. 518.

(z) Crossley v. Beverley, (1829) 1 W. P. C. 107; Lewis v. Marling, (1829) 1 W. P. C. 496; King, Brown & Co. v. Anglo-American Brush Corporation, (1889) 6 R. P. C. 414; 7 R. P. C. 436; 9 R. P. C. 313; United Telephone Co. v. Harrison, Cox, Walker & Co., (1882) L. R. 21, Ch. D. 720; Actien Gesellschaft fur Cartonagen Industrie v. Schroeder, (1896) 13 R. P. C. 466; Kratz-Boussac v. Bechmann, (1905) 22 R. P. C. 448; Gramaphone and Typewriter, Ld. v. Ullmann, (1906) 23 R. P. C. 230.

(a) Lyon v. Goddard, (1893) 10 R. P. C. 316.

(b) See also Case v. Cressy, (1900) 17 R. P. C. 263; Saxby v. Gloucester Waggon Co., (1883) L. R. 7; Q. B. D. 305; 50 L. J. Q. B. 577; Griff. L. O. C. 54; Cropper v. Smith, (1884) L. R. 26 Ch. D. 700; 53 L. J. Ch. 891; 1 R. P. C. 90; Morgan v. Windover, (1890) 7 R. P. C. 131; Gadd v. Mayor of Manchester, (1892) 9 R. P. C. 516.

Invention.

such that there is, as a fact, no invention in passing from what was known to the thing claimed by the patentee. (*c*)

Simplicity no bar to invention.

No apparent smallness or simplicity in what the patentee does will prevent the patent being good, if some invention was requisite to produce the new result; but, on the other hand, mere novelty of manufacture, or usefulness in the application of known materials to analogous uses or the arrangement of old parts in combination, will not necessarily establish invention within the meaning of the patent law. (*d*)

Sometimes an invention which is an improvement on what has gone before appears extremely simple when discovered and explained, but it does not at all follow that it was obvious before, or did not require invention, or is not of great merit, and the proper subject-matter of a patent. Thus in the case of the discovery of Lanolin the invention consisted in freeing the known commercial wool-fat from fatty acids and other impurities and so leaving only the cholesterine fats, which it was discovered when kneaded and worked take up water and form the highly useful product Lanolin. At the date of the patent the methods used for separating the cholesterine fats were old and known, and a preparation of wool-fat described by *Dioscorides* and called *œsypus*, from which the fatty acids had not been completely removed, was known as an unguent to the ancients. The Courts nevertheless found that the process which yielded the highly useful product Lanolin was the outcome of great invention and the subject-matter of a valid patent. (*e*)

Conception of an idea may be the merit of an invention.

Sometimes the merit of an invention consists in clearly appreciating some particular useful end to be attained, or, as has been aptly said, in "apprehending a desideratum," the merit of the patent consisting not so much in the way in which the idea was carried out as in conceiving the idea

(*c*) See cases note (*d*) *infra*, and pp. 107, 154, 418, 640 *post*.

(*d*) Rickmann *v.* Thierry, (1896) 14 R. P. C. 105; Longbottom *v.* Shaw, (1891) 8 R. P. C. 336; Hinks *v.* Safety Lighting Co., (1876) L. R. 4 Ch. D. 607; Brook *v.* Aston, (1857-9) 8 Ell. & B. 478; Ormson *v.* Clarke, (1862) 13 C. B. 339, 14 C. B. 400; Saxby *v.* Gloucester Waggon Co., (1880) L. R. 7 Q. B. D. 305; 50 L. J. Q. B. 577; Williams *v.* Nye, (1890) 7 R. P. C. 62; Newsum *v.* Mann, (1890) 7 R. P. C. 307; Elias *v.* Grovesend Tinplate Co., (1890) 7 R. P. C. 455; Morgan *v.* Windover, (1890) 7 R. P. C. 131; Heys *v.* Hallmark, (1891) 9 R. P. C. 25; Duckett *v.* Whitehead, (1895) 12 R. P. C. 376; Actien Gesellschaft fur Cartonagen Industrie *v.* Schroeder (1896) 13 R. P. C. 466; Fuller *v.* Handy, (1903) 21 R. P. C. 6; McNaught *v.* Dawson, (1905) 22 R. P. C. 389; 23 R. P. C. 219; Arnot *v.* Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co., Ld., (1904) 22 R. P. C. 105, 472.

(*e*) Benno Jaffé und Darmstaedter Lanolin Fabrik *v.* Richardson, (1893) 11 R. P. C. 93, 261; see also *ibid.*

itself. (*f*) Thus it has been held the fact that a chemist would know *à priori* that by mixing two known substances together an explosive would be the result, did not destroy the patent of a man, who by experimentally mixing them together and treating the result in a certain known way so as to waterproof it found he did get an explosive, Roburite, which satisfied commercial requisites which were not satisfied by explosives known before. (*g*) In this case the invention consisted, as it often does in other cases, of putting together items of common knowledge which no one else has ever thought of combining—common knowledge that you may mix, common knowledge that you may waterproof—but the essence of the invention was that the inventor had taken a great many things which were common knowledge and tried which of them would produce a useful and new result, and he thus ascertained that, following the process described by him in his specification, he arrived at a new and useful result, which was undoubtedly invention, and in the particular case invention of a somewhat high order. (*h*)

Invention.

Selection of a member of a class.

Invention, again, may sometimes consist in the selection of particular members of a class of substances, which possess properties by means of which the inventor is able to produce a result which is new and useful, or, if old, is attained in a better or more economical way than hitherto. (*i*)

So, though a class of bodies may have been employed before for a particular purpose, there may be such invention in selecting one member of the class which possesses particular advantages not shared by the other members of the class as will support a patent for the use of that particular member. (*k*)

New application of known machine.

So also, though different machines of a certain general class or character be well known, if a person selects and applies one specially adapted for his purpose to effect a new object and produce a new article, or an old article in a

(*f*) See Fawcett *v.* Homan, (1896) 13 R. P. C. 405, 410; Hayward *v.* Hamilton, (1881) Griff. P. C. 116-117; also p. 47 *post*.

(*g*) Lancashire Explosives Co. *v.* Roburite Explosives Co., (1895) 12 R. P. C. 470, 482.

(*h*) See per Rigby, L.J.; 12 R. P. C. 482.

(*i*) Farbenfabriken vorm F. Bayer *v.* Bowker, (1891) 8 R. P. C. 389; Lancashire Explosives Co. *v.* Roburite Explosives Co., (1895) 12 R. P. C. 470, 478; 13 R. P. C. 429; 14 R. P. C. 303; but see Fabriques de Produits Chimiques de Thann et de Mulhouse *v.* Lafitte, (1899) 16 R. P. C. 61.

(*k*) Hills *v.* The London Gas Light Co., (1857) 27 L. J. Ex. 60; 5 H. & N. 312; 29 L. J. Ex. 409; Wylie and Morton's Patents, (1896) 13 R. P. C. 97, in which a patent was refused on the ground that there was in that case no invention in making the selection.

Invention.
——

substantially more expeditious and economical way than it was produced before, then he may properly claim, as subject-matter of a patent, that machine as applied to the new object, notwithstanding that he could not have claimed the machine *per se*—that is to say, without limitation as to its application. (*l*)

Use according to new method of old machine.

Again, invention may consist in the use according to a new method of a known machine whereby no structural alteration is required in the machine, but a new and useful result is produced, (*m*) or it may consist in degree—*e.g.*, strengthening a part of a previously proposed combination whereby what is in fact a new and useful process may be effected; (*n*) or it may consist in selecting a known thing of a particular size or degree whereby a result highly desired, but till then incapable of attainment, is achieved. (*o*)

Degree.

Mere use of known machine in a more beneficial manner.

The foregoing instances of invention must, however, be contrasted with, and not confused with, the case of a claim to a mere use of a known machine in a more beneficial manner, which is not subject-matter for a valid patent. (*p*)

Mere adaptation of old idea.

It is not invention to adapt, without ingenuity, a well-known idea in a well-known manner for a well-known purpose, though the identical adaptation has not been made before and a very useful effect is the result, (*q*) or merely with greater skill to apply well-known tools and processes, and so to satisfy a want felt by persons in a particular trade, (*r*) or the mere judicious carrying out of a well-known method together with mere adaptive skill in manufacture. (*s*)

Mere skilful application of known tool, or judicious carrying out of known method, or mere alteration of shape or proportions of parts is not invention.

Neither is it invention merely to alter the shape of a known thing, though to do so might possibly be the subject of a new design; (*t*) or to alter the proportions of parts used in combination before, when proportion is not of the essence of success. (*u*)

Classes of Inventions.—Any invention which possesses all the

(*l*) Adamant Stone and Paving Co. *v.* Corporation of Liverpool, (1896) 14 R. P. C. 21; Dowling *v.* Billington, (1889) 7 R. P. C. 191.

(*m*) Dowling *v.* Billington, (1889) 7 R. P. C. 191.

(*n*) British Vacuum Cleaner Co., Ltd. *v.* Suction Cleaners, Ltd., (1904) 21 R. P. C. 303; Lyon *v.* Goddard, (1893) 10 R. P. C. 121, 334; 11 R. P. C. 113.

(*o*) Jandus Arc Lamp and Electric Co., Ltd. *v.* Arc Lamp Co., (1905) 22 R. P. C. 277, 297.

(*p*) See pp. 78 and 56 *post*.

(*q*) pp. 90–98 *post*.

(*r*) Dredge *v.* Parnell, (1899) 16 R. P. C. 625.

(*s*) See Beavis *v.* Rylands Glass and Engineering Co., Ltd., (1899) 17 R. P. C. 98, 704.

(*t*) Heys *v.* Hallmark, (1892) 9 R. P. C. 25; Beavis v. Rylands Glass and Engineering Co., (1900) 17 R. P. C. 98, 704.

(*u*) Savage *v.* Harris, (1896) 13 R. P. C. 364.

Classes of Inventions.

attributes imposed as conditions by the law—viz., that it is included in the term "new manufactures" as used in the sixth section of the Statute of Monopolies (*x*) and is new and useful—may be the subject of a grant of letters patent.

Exhaustive classification not possible.

It is not possible to give a classification of inventions, including all which may be held to fall within the definition given in 21 Jac. I. c. 3, s. 6. The difficulty which exists in giving an exhaustive classification of all inventions which could possibly support a grant of letters patent arises from the fact that the arts and manufactures of the country are in a continual state of progression, and consequently desirable results, never before contemplated, are continually presenting themselves, and the most minute changes may constitute new and useful inventions when they are the outcome of thought, design, or skilful ingenuity.

It may, however, be pointed out that all inventions for which letters patent have hitherto been upheld on the ground of subject-matter may be classed under one or more of the following heads:—

I. New or old methods of applying new principles.
II. New methods of applying old principles.
III. New contrivances applied to new objects or purposes.
IV. New contrivances applied to old objects or purposes.
V. New combinations of new or old, or partly new and partly old, parts, which result either in the production of a material object or process.
VI. New methods, involving the exercise of invention, of applying old things or processes.
VII. Improvements on known methods, processes or combinations consisting in the addition to, the omission from, or the rearrangement of, old steps or parts.
VIII. Application, with ingenuity, of materials, processes, or things previously unapplied to useful purposes to some one or more specific useful purpose or purposes.

Principles.

Principles alone are not subject-matter.

A new principle—*i.e.*, an abstract law of Nature, a fundamental law of science—cannot be the subject-matter of a valid patent.

(*x*) 21 Jac. I. c. 3, s. 6.

Principles.

Principles may be of the utmost value to mankind, as, for instance, the principle of gravitation or the doctrine of evolution, which have in the hands of their discoverers and others been productive of the greatest usefulness. The law, however, will not attempt to secure to the discoverer the sole use and enjoyment of such a bare principle, or to prohibit others from making use of it. In the language of Lord *Kenyon*, it would be difficult to frame a specification of a philosophical principle, it would be something like an idea without a substratum. (*y*)

Moreover, the very statement of what a principle is proves it not to be a ground for a patent. It is a first ground and rule for arts and sciences, or, in other words. the elements and rudiments of them. A patent must be for some production from those elements, and not for the elements themselves; for some new manufacture, whether with or without principle, produced by art or accident. (*z*).

A principle cannot of itself, apart from a practical application, produce any vendible article or manufacture, and therefore, unless the discoverer of a principle points out some practical application of it, it is clear that he cannot give the public the consideration necessary to support a patent—viz., a new and useful manufacture.

but may be together with a method of application.

Principles in a concrete form, together with a method of applying them to a new and useful purpose, may form the subject of a grant of letters patent. In other words, a new principle or a new idea as regards any art or manufacture, together with a mode of carrying it into practice, may be patented, though the idea alone, and very likely the machine alone, because the machine might not be new, is not proper subject-matter. (*a*)

The following remarks of *Jessel*, M.R., (*b*) in reference to the patent for the *Otto* gas engine are most instructive in this connection:

> "The first objection is that this is not the subject-matter of a patent, because it is said that what is claimed is a principle . . . or, as it is sometimes termed, the idea of putting a

(*y*) Hornblower *v.* Boulton, (1799) 8 T. R. 95; Dav. P. C. 221; see also Boulton *v.* Bull, (1795) 2 H. Bl. 463.

(*z*) Boulton *v.* Bull, (1795) Dav. P. C. 196, 198.

(*a*) Otto *v.* Linford, (1881) 46 L. T. N. S. 35; L. R. 18 Ch. D. 394; Crossley *v.* Porter, (1853) Moor, P. C. 240; Cassel Gold Extracting Co. *v.* Cyanide Gold Recovery Syndicate, (1895) 12 R. P. C. 232, 256.

(*b*) Otto *v.* Linford, (1881) 46 L. T. N. S. 35.

Principles.

cushion of air between the explosive mixture and the piston of the gas motor engine, so as to regulate, detain, or make gradual what would otherwise be a sudden explosion. Of course that could not be patented. I do not read the patent so. I read the patent as being to the effect that the patentee tells us that there is the idea which he wishes to carry out, but he also describes other kinds of machines which will carry it out, and he claims to carry it out substantially by one or other of these machines. That is the subject of a patent. If you have a new principle, or a new idea, as regards any art or manufacture, and then show a mode of carrying that into practice, you may patent that, though you could not patent the idea alone, and very likely could not patent the machine alone, because the machine alone would not be new. One of the strongest illustrations that I know of is the patent for the hot blast in the iron manufacture, where there was nothing new at all except the idea that the application of hot air instead of cold air to the mixture of iron ore and fuel would produce most remarkable results in the shape of economy in the manufacture of iron. The inventor or discoverer could not patent that, but what he did was this. He said: 'I will patent that idea in combination with the mode of carrying it out; that is, I tell you you may heat your air in a closed vessel next your furnace, and then that will effect the object.' It was held that that would do. . . . Now that is a much stronger illustration than this of the validity of a patent as regards the subject-matter. For here is a complicated machine. . . . In the case of the hot blast the man did not pretend to invent anything; he said a machine of any shape in which you can heat air is sufficient. Mr. *Otto* does allege he has invented a machine. It appears that he did, although a machine which, *per se*, was not of sufficient novelty probably to support a patent. It comes therefore to this, that we have a principle and a mode of carrying it out, and, I will assume for this purpose, sufficiently described, and that is good subject-matter for a patent."

Claim to all methods of application amounts to claim to principle itself.

A claim to every mode of carrying a principle or idea into effect amounts to a claim for the principle or idea itself, and therefore renders the patent void, (*c*) unless the patentee has described in the specification a method or methods of utilising the principle or idea, *i.e.*, unless he has embodied the principle or idea, in which case such a claim is good provided always

(*c*) See Neilson *v.* Harford, (1841) 1 W. P. C. 295; Booth *v.* Kennard, (1856) 2 H. & N. 84; 26 L. T. Ex. 23, 305; Wyeth *v.* Stone, 1 Story, 273; Arnold *v.* Bradbury, (1871) L. R. 6 Ch. App. 711; Patterson *v.* Gas Light and Coke Co., (1875) L. R. 2 Ch. D. 812; 3 App. Cas. 239.

Principles.

that the patentee was the discoverer of the principle or idea. (d)

Illustrations of good claims to principles coupled with methods of application. Neilson v. Harford, and Houschill Co. v. Neilson.

Thus the patent, the validity of which was questioned in *Neilson* v. *Harford*, (e) and also in *Houschill Co.* v. *Neilson*, (f) was for an improved method of applying air to produce heat in furnaces, and the specification stated that "a blast or current of air must be produced by blowing apparatus in the ordinary way. The blast so produced is to be passed from the blowing apparatus into an air-vessel, and from that vessel by means of a pipe into the furnace. The air-vessel must be kept artificially heated at a considerable temperature. It is better to be kept to red heat, or nearly so, but so high a temperature is not absolutely necessary to produce a beneficial effect. The size of the air-vessel must depend upon the blast and on the heat necessary to be produced. *The form or shape of the vessel*, or receptacle, *is immaterial to the effect*, and may be adapted to the local circumstances or situation." There was no separate claim. The defendants contended that the patent was bad, as being for a principle only, but the Court of Exchequer, after much debate, came to the conclusion that it claimed not only a principle, but also a practical means of carrying the principle into effect—viz., heating the air in a separate vessel, and was therefore good.

In the *Houschill Co.* v. *Neilson*, (g) Lord Justice Clerk *Hope*, addressing the jury and referring generally to the validity of patents for methods of carrying principles into effect, used the following words, which were not objected to by the House of Lords in that case, and have often been quoted with approval by Judges in subsequent cases:

> "It is quite true that a patent cannot be taken out solely for an abstract philosophical principle—for instance, for any law of Nature, or any property of matter, apart from any mode of turning it to account in the practical operations of manufacture, or the business, and arts, and utilities of life. The mere discovery of such a principle is not an invention in the patent law sense of the term. Stating such a principle in a patent may be a promulgation of the principle, but it is no application of the principle to any practical purpose. And without that application of the principle to a practical object and end, and without the application of it to human industry, or to the

(d) See p. 51 *post*.
(e) (1841) 1 W. P. C. 295, 328, 331.
(f) (1843) 1 W. P. C. 673.
(g) (1843) 1 W. P. C. 673, 683.

Principles.

purposes of human enjoyment, a person cannot in the abstract appropriate a principle to himself. But a patent will be good, though the subject of the patent consists in the discovery of a just, general, and most comprehensive principle in science or law of Nature, if that principle is by the specification applied to any special purpose, so as thereby to effectuate a practical result and benefit not previously attained. The main merit, the most important part of the invention, may consist in the conception of the original idea—in the discovery of the principle in science, or of the law of Nature, stated in the patent—and little or no pains may have been taken in working out the best manner and mode of the application of the principle to the purposes set forth in the patent. But still if the principle is stated to be applicable to any special purpose, so as to produce any result previously unknown, in the way and for the objects described, the patent is good. It is no longer an abstract principle. It comes to be a principle turned to account to a practical object, and applied to a special result. It becomes, then, not an abstract principle, which means a principle considered apart from any special purpose or practical operation, but the discovery and statement of a principle for a special purpose, that is, a practical invention, a mode of carrying a principle into effect. That such is the law, if a well-known principle is applied for the first time to produce a practical result for a special purpose, has never been disputed. It would be very strange and unjust to refuse the same legal effect, when the inventor has the additional merit of discovering the principle as well as its application to a practical object. The instant that the principle, although discovered for the first time, is stated, in actual application to, and as the agent of, producing a certain specified effect, it is no longer an abstract principle, it is then clothed with the language of practical application, and receives the impress of tangible direction to the actual business of human life."

In *Patterson* v. *Gas Light and Coke Co.*, (*h*) a patent, which claimed the employment of sulphide of calcium in separate purifiers as a means of purifying coal-gas from sulphur existing in other forms than that of sulphuretted hydrogen, was declared void, on the ground that the claim amounted to a claim to the known principle however effected as distinct from a particular invented means of carrying it out. The judgment of *James*, L.J., which was affirmed in the House of Lords, contains the following passage in reference to the

(*h*) (1875) L. R. 2 Ch. D. 812; 3 App. Cas. 239; 45 L. J. Ch. 843; 47 L. J. Ch. 402.

Principles. claim for "the employment of sulphide of calcium in separate purifiers as a means of purifying coal-gas from sulphur existing in other forms than that of sulphuretted hydrogen":

> "There is nothing in this but the enunciation of a chemical truth that pure sulphide of calcium will absorb the sulphur compounds. The plaintiff believed that he had discovered that chemical truth, although it had been taught for many years in many books, and was well known to chemists. There is no invention of any particular process or means of employing the pure sulphide of calcium. If pure sulphide of calcium is to be used, it must be used in some separate purifier, and there is nothing therefore in any previous part of the specification to limit the universality of the claim to the employment of sulphide of calcium for the removal of sulphur in other forms than sulphuretted hydrogen. It is obviously impossible to support such a claim as that, which was plainly based on the plaintiff's mistaken idea that he had discovered that peculiar property in sulphide of calcium."

Dangerfield v. Jones.

In *Dangerfield* v. *Jones*, (i) a patent for a mode of bending wood for the handles of walking-sticks, &c., in which the claim was "the application of a flame of gas or other combustible fluid or liquid as described for softening the fibres of the wood while being bent in combination with a clamping apparatus for securing the wood in its bent form until the fibres are set, so that the work may remain permanent as herein set forth," was declared to be perfectly valid, Vice-Chancellor *Wood*, before whom the case was tried, saying: "If, having a particular purpose in view, you take the general principles of mechanics, and apply one or other of them to a manufacture to which it has never been before applied, that is a sufficient ground for taking out a patent, provided that the Court sees that that which has been invented is new, desirable, and for the public benefit." (j)

Minter v. Wells.

In *Minter* v. *Wells*, (k) on motion to nonsuit the plaintiff, who had succeeded in an action against the defendant for infringement of a patent, in the specification of which *Minter* claimed "the application of a self-adjusting leverage to the back and seat of a chair, whereby the weight on the seat acts as a counterbalance to the pressure against the back of such chair, as above described," the defendant contended that

(i) (1865) 13 L. T. N. S. 142. (j) *Ibid.*
(k) (1834) 1 W. P. C. 134.

Minter had claimed the principle of the lever, but the Court held that it was the application of a self-adjusting leverage to the back and seat of a chair, the patentee having described what that self-adjusting leverage was. And it was further held that any application of a self-adjusting leverage to the back and seat of a chair producing this effect, that the one acts as a counterbalance to the pressure against the other, would be an infringement of the patent, and it was not a leverage only, but the application of a self-adjusting leverage; and it was not a self-adjusting leverage only, but a self-adjusting leverage producing a particular effect, by means of which the weight on the seat counterbalanced the pressure against the back. *Parke*, B., in reply to the statement that this was nothing more than one of the first principles of mechanics, observed: "But that not being in combination before cannot that be patented? It is only for the application of a self-adjusting leverage to a chair—cannot he patent that? He claims the combination of the two, no matter in what shape you may combine them, but if you combine the self-adjusting leverage, which he thus applies to the subject of a chair, that is an infringement of his patent."

Principles.

Electric Telegraph Co. v. Brett.

In the *Electric Telegraph Co.* v. *Brett* (*l*) the patentees claimed, substantially: (1) "We wish it to be understood that we make no claim to the application of the multiplying coils of conducting wires herein described (meaning thereby the galvanometer coils and magnetic needles), but the improvement and the adaptation of magnetic needles for giving signals consists in disposing the needles in vertical planes with fixed horizontal axes, making them heavier at one end than the other, so that they hang perpendicularly, and limiting the angular motion by stops, against which the needles may rest in suitable inclining directions for pointing out on a vertical dial the signification of the signals. (2) The combining several needles, so as to give signals by determinate angular motions. (3) The improvement whereby the complete apparatus for giving signals and sounding alarms, as described, may have duplicates of such apparatus at intermediate places between the two ends, all such duplicates operating simultaneously with each other." In the judgment, *Cresswell*, J., said: "It was insisted that the giving of duplicate signals at intermediate stations was not the proper subject of a patent, being an idea or principle only, and not

(*l*) (1851) 10 C. B. 838; 20 L. J. C. P. 123.

Principles.

a new manufacture. But we think that the patentees not only communicated the idea or principle that duplicate signals might be given, but showed how it might be done—*i.e.*, by duplicate apparatus at each station—and that this is a fit subject of a patent."

Claim to a general arrangement distinguished from claim to a principle.

A claim to a particular general arrangement must be distinguished from a claim to a principle itself. If it falls short of a claim to a principle, it does not invalidate the patent. This may be illustrated by a reference to the history of the development of the phonograph. Phonographs were at one time made with a single diaphragm, with a single tool or point for recording and reproducing. Later, two diaphragms were used with separate recording and reproducing points, together with a floating weight applied to give the proper pressure to the reproducing point. Edison then discovered that the floating weight might also be applied to the recording point, and so a single diaphragm with both the points on it might be used. For this discovery a patent was obtained, and the specification claimed (*inter alia*) "In a phonograph, attaching both the recording point and the reproducing point to the same diaphragm, means being provided whereby either of the points may be brought into operative position on the surface of the phonogram." In an action brought for the infringement of this patent, it was sought on the defendant's behalf to invalidate the grant on the ground that the above claim was a claim for a mere idea of having both points on a single diaphragm divorced from the idea of carrying it out, and might so prevent any one else making a useful and totally different arrangement. It was however held, both by the Judge of first instance and the Court of Appeal, that on the evidence the claim was not for a principle, but for a novel and useful arrangement. (*m*) Lord *Esher*, M.R., in the Court of Appeal, adopted the decision of *Wright*, J., *ipsissimis verbis*, and said (*n*):

"Now, I have said I have confined this mode of dealing with this patent to the case of a machine, and I therefore adopt precisely the way in which Mr. Justice *Wright* has stated the matter: 'There remains the question whether the patent is invalidated by the first claim. That claim appears to me to be, on the face of it, a claim of monopoly for every form of phonograph in which two styles are attached to one diaphragm, so

(*m*) Edison-Bell Phonograph Corporation *v.* Smith, (1894) 11 R. P. C. 148, 389.

(*n*) 11 R. P. C. 397.

> that each style can be brought to bear on the cylinder. It is stated that such a claim is a claim to monopolise a principle. I think not.' Now that is the part with which I say I agree. 'It is a claim for a particular arrangement of essential parts of a machine, which arrangement has obvious advantages, but has never before been made practicable in a way disclosed by the specification. Such a claim ought properly to be construed as a claim of monopoly for that arrangement carried out by any means substantially similar to those disclosed in the specification, and that appears to be sufficient.' I agree with that, and therefore I think that so far as this objection is concerned, applying it to each and every one of the claims, it shows that these claims are none of them wanting in that respect."

Principles.

Ambit of patent for carrying a new principle into effect.

It has been demonstrated in the foregoing pages that a patent for carrying a principle which is new into effect protects the grantee against all other modes of carrying the same principle into effect. (o)

In order that a patent may secure to the patentee the application of a principle by means different to those described in the specification, it is only necessary that the principle itself be new, and the patentee sufficiently describes a means of applying it. It is not necessary that the means, as well as the principle, should be new, for the novelty of the invention consists in applying the new principle by the means specified. If, however, not only the principle but the means is also new, then the means may form the subject of a distinct claim or a separate patent.

Dictum of Alderson, B., explained.

In *Jupe* v. *Pratt*, (p) *Alderson*, B., in the course of the argument, laid down the law thus:

> "You cannot take out a patent for a principle; you may take out a patent for a principle coupled with the mode of carrying the principle into effect, provided you have not only discovered the principle, but invented some mode of carrying it into effect. But then you must start with having invented some mode of carrying the p. inciple into effect; if you have done that, then you are entitled to protect yourself from all

(o) Jupe v. Pratt, (1837) 1 W. P. C. 146; Chamberlain and Hookham v. Mayor, &c., of Bradford, (1903) 20 R. P. C. 684; Ashworth v. English Card Clothing Co., Ld., (1903) 20 R. P. C. 797; Consolidated Car Heating Co. v. Carne, (1903) 20 R. P. C. 767; Sandow v. Brooks, (1903) 21 R. P. C. 33, 333; 23 R. P. C. 6; Haskell Golf Ball Co. v. Hutchison, (1905) 22 R. P. C. 492; Minter v. Wells, (1834) 1 W. P. C. 127; Househill Co. v. Neilson, (1843) 1 W. P. C. 685; Otto v. Linford, (1881) 46 L. T. N. S. 35; Crossley v. Beverley, (1829) 1 W. P. C. 106; Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik v. Levenstein, (1883) L. R. 24 Ch. D. 156, 171; Easterbrook v. The Great Western Ry. Co., (1885) 2 R. P. C. 201.

(p) 1 W. P. C. 145, 146.

Principles.

other modes of carrying the same principle into effect, that being treated by the jury as piracy of your original invention."

The above expressions of *Alderson*, B., would at first sight appear to establish the proposition, that if a man has invented a new principle, and shows one method of carrying it into effect, he thereupon becomes entitled to protection against every other possible method of carrying out the new principle. That it does do so must now be conceded, since it has been accepted by the House of Lords as a correct statement of the settled state of the law on the subject. (*q*) Before this decision of the House of Lords, there was some doubt as to whether the dictum must be considered a correct statement of the law. For instance, *Cotton*, L.J., pointed out that the above language of *Alderson*, B., was used during the discussion of the case, probably to meet something that was said by counsel, and did not express his full opinion. The Lord Justice s' ˈed that in his opinion a patentee could prevent any one from using the same method of carrying a new principle into effect, or from using the same thing with only a colourable difference. Where there is a principle first applied in a machine, capable of carrying it into effect, the Court looks more narrowly at those who carry out the same principle, and say they do it by a different mode, and looks to see whether, in effect, although the mode is not exactly the same, it is only a colourable difference—a mechanical equivalent for a substantial part of the patentee's invention, being looked upon as a mere colourable difference, and therefore he is entitled to an injunction against that mode of carrying out his principle, which is only the same in substance as that which he patented, though there are colourable differences. (*r*) There is no longer any necessity for this qualification of Baron *Alderson's* dictum, since, as stated by Lord *Davey*, the question in every case is in what consists the originality and merit, or to use the well-known phrase of Lord *Cairns*, the "pith and marrow," of the patented invention. If that includes the discovery or suggestion of a new principle, as well as the means of carrying it into effect,

(*q*) Chamberlain and Hookham *v.* Mayor, &c., of Bradford, (1903) 20 R. P. C. 684.

(*r*) See judgment of Cotton, L.J., Automatic Weighing Machine Co. *v.* Knight, (1889) 6 P. O. R. 304-305; see also Automatic Weighing Machine Co. *v.* Combined Weighing Machine Co., (1889) 6 P. O. R. 367; Automatic Weighing Machine Co. *v.* National Exhibitions Association, (1891) 8 R. P. C. 345; 9 R. P. C. 41, 44; Nobel's Explosives Co. *v.* Anderson, (1894) 11 R. P. C. 527, 530.

an infringer is not entitled to take the principle although he uses somewhat different machinery for the application of it to a particular purpose. (*s*) If a patentee desires to claim a general principle he should in his own interest make it clear that he does so, (*t*) and he should be careful not to frame his claim so that it will be construed as one for a particular combination only. (*u*)

Processes.

Ambit of patent for carrying old principle into effect.

If a principle is not new, whether or not it has been successfully applied before does not matter, (*x*) a patent for a method of applying it only secures to the patentee protection in respect of the particular method specified, and there may be other perfectly valid patents in respect of different methods of carrying the same principle into effect. (*y*)

Thus it has been held that finishing hosiery and other goods by pressing them between rollers heated by steam was no infringement of a patent for finishing such goods by pressing them between flat-sided boxes filled with steam. (*z*)

Processes.

Processes are subject-matter.

The proposition that a method or process of itself and apart from the thing produced, or result, can be the subject-matter of a valid patent was finally established by the decision in *Crane* v. *Price*, (*a*) in 1842.

History of the cases.

For some time prior to that decision there were many cases and dicta of the Judges indicating the general opinion that grants made in respect of such subject-matter were not invalid. *Abbot*, C.J., in *R.* v. *Wheeler*, (*b*) pointed out that the word "manufacture" "may perhaps extend to a new

(*s*) Chamberlain and Hookham *v.* Mayor, &c., of Bradford, (1903) 20 R. P. C. 684; Consolidated Car Heating Co. *v.* Came, (1903) 20 R. P. C. 767; Ashworth *v.* English Card Clothing Co., Ld. (1903) 20 R. P. C. 797, 798; Sandow *v.* Brooks, (1903) 21 R. P. C. 33, 333; 23 R. P. C. 6; Haskell Golf Ball Co. *v.* Hutchison, (1905) 22 R. P. C. 492.

(*t*) See p. 207 *post*.

(*u*) See Ackroyd and Best, Ld. *v.* Thomas, (1904) 21 R. P. C. 737.

(*x*) Chamberlain and Hookham *v.* Mayor, &c., of Bradford, (1903) 20 R. P. C. 673.

(*y*) Proctor *v.* Bennis, (1887) 4 R. P. C. 333; L. R. 36 Ch. D. 740; Automatic Weighing Machine Co. *v.* Knight, (1889) 6 R. P. C. 113; Siddell *v.* Vickers, (1888) 5 R. P. C. 416; Needham *v.* Johnson, (1888) 5 R. P. C. 49; Bovill *v.* Pimm, (1856) 1 Ex. R. 718, 739; Barber *v.* Grace, (1847) 1 Ex. R. 339; 17 L. J. Ex. 122; Jupe *v.* Pratt, (1837), 1 W. P. C. 145; Curtis *v.* Platt, (1863) L. R. 3 Ch. D. 135 *n.*; Lister *v.* Leather, (1857) 8 E. & B. 1004, 1033; Saxby *v.* Clunes, (1877) 43 L. J. Ex. 228; Dudgeon *v.* Thomson, (1877) L. R. 3 App. Cas. 34; Nordenfelt *v.* Gardner, (1884) 1 R. P. C. 61; Hocking *v.* Hocking, (1889) 6 R. P. C. 76.

(*z*) Barber *v.* Grace, 1 Ex. R. 339; 17 L. J. 122.

(*a*) 4 M. & G. 580; 1 W. P. C. 393; 12 L. J. C. P. 81; see p. 55 *post*.

(*b*) (1850) 2 B. & Ald. 493.

Processes. process to be carried on by known implements, or elements, acting upon known substances, and ultimately producing some other known substance, but producing it in a cheaper or more expeditious manner, or of a better or more useful kind." In *Boulton* v. *Bull*, (c) the Court was divided in opinion, but *Eyre*, C.J., made the following remarks:

"It was admitted in the argument at the Bar that the word '*manufacture*' in the statute (d) was of extensive signification, that it applied not only to things made but to the *practice of making*, to principles carried into practice in a new manner, to new results of principles carried into practice. Let us presume this admission. Under *things made* we may class, in the first place, new compositions of things, such as manufactures in the most ordinary sense of the word; secondly, all mechanical inventions, whether to produce old or new effects, for a new piece of mechanism is certainly a thing made. Under the *practice of making* we may class all new artificial manners of operating with the hand, or with instruments in common use, new processes in any art producing effects useful to the public. When the effect produced is some new substance or composition of things, it would seem that the privilege of the sole working or making ought to be for such new substance, or composition, without regard to the mechanism or process by which it has been produced, which, though perhaps also new, will be only useful as producing the new substance. . . . When the effect produced is no substance or composition of things, the patent can only be for the mechanism, if new mechanism is used, *for the process, if it be a new method of operating*, with or without old mechanism, by which the effect is produced. . . . In the list of patents with which I have been furnished there are several for *new methods* of manufacturing articles in common use, where the sole merit and the whole effect produced are the saving of time and expense, and thereby lowering the price of the article and introducing it into more general use. Now I think these *methods* may be said to be new manufactures. . . . The patent cannot be for the effect produced, for it is either no substance at all, or, what is exactly the same thing as to the question upon a patent, no new substance, but an old one produced advantageously for the public. It cannot be for the mechanism, for there is no new mechanism employed; it must then be for the method; and I would say, in the very significant words of Lord *Mansfield*, in the great case of the copyright, (e) it must be for the method detached from all physical existence whatever."

(c) (1795) 2 H. Bl. 463; 3 Revised Reports, 430. (d) 21 Jac. I. c. 3.
(e) 4 Bur. 2397.

Hall v. *Jarvis* (*f*) decided that though the application of the flame of oil to remove the superfluous fibres from lace and other goods was a mere process, yet a patent for this invention could be upheld on the ground of subject-matter. In *Hill* v. *Thompson*, (*g*) Lord *Eldon*, L.C., stated that "there may be a valid patent for a new combination of materials previously in use for the same purpose, *or for a new method of applying such materials.*" So also in *Morgan* v. *Seaward*, (*h*) *Parke*, B., said that the word "manufacture" in the statute (*i*) must be construed in one of two ways; it may mean the machine when completed, *or the mode of constructing the machine;* but in *Gibson* v. *Brand*, (*k*) *Tindal*, C.J., pointed out that it was not necessary in that case to go into the question whether or not a patent can be supported for a *process* only. If the specification were properly prepared it probably might be considered a fit subject for a patent.

Processes.

Law settled by Crane *v.* Price.

Crane v. *Price*, (*l*) tried in 1842, finally settled the question. In this case the patent related to the use of anthracite or stone coal, in conjunction with a hot-air blast, for the smelting of iron, and the claim was in the following terms: "The application of anthracite or stone coal combined with the using of a hot-air blast in the smelting and manufacture of iron." In delivering the judgment of the Court of Common Pleas, *Tindal*, C.J., said:

> "The question becomes this, whether admitting the using of the hot-air blast to have been known before in the manufacture of iron with bituminous coal, and the use of anthracite or stone coal to have been known before in the manufacture of iron with the cold blast, but that the combination of the two together (the hot-air blast and the anthracite) was not known before in the manufacture of iron—such combination can be the subject of a patent. We are of opinion that, if the result produced by such a combination is either a new article, or a better article, or a cheaper article to the public than that produced before by the old method, such combination may well become the subject of a patent."

Decision in Crane *v.* Price doubtful upon the facts.

Though the above statement of the law by *Tindal*, C.J., in *Crane* v. *Price* has never been questioned, Judges have expressed doubts as to whether, upon the facts, the case was

(*f*) (1822) 1 W. P. C. 100, approved in Losh *v.* Hague, (1838) 1 W. C. P. 207, and Crane *v.* Price, (1842) 5 M. & G. 580; 1 W. P. C. 393; 12 L. J. C. P. 81.

(*g*) (1817) 1 W. P. C. 237.

(*h*) (1837) 2 M. & W. 558.

(*i*) 21 Jac. I. c. 3, s. 6.

(*k*) (1841) 4 M. & G. 179; 1 W. P. C. 627.

(*l*) (1842) 4 M. & G. 580; 1 W. P. C. 393; 12 L. J. C. P. 81.

Processes.

correctly decided. (*m*) Novelty of the result is, no doubt, evidence of invention in the process which produces it, but it is not necessarily conclusive evidence. (*n*) If the case were open to review on the facts, another Court would probably come to the conclusion that since the hot-air blast was known with bituminous coal, and the cold blast was in use with anthracite, and both processes were used for the manufacture of iron, the patent could not be supported; for all that the patentee did was to apply the hot blast in conjunction with anthracite to the manufacture of iron in a manner analogous to the former application of the hot blast to bituminous coal for the same purpose, and though the discovery was commercially very important, it was not one involving the exercise of invention. Further, the grant of the patent was an undue curtailment of the right of the public to use the hot blast in the manufacture of iron with bituminous coal, anthracite, or any other known fuel.

Sometimes in a patent case a conclusion may be arrived at in favour of the defendant by considering the infringement apart from the patent. If it can be shown that the alleged infringement is an act which, having regard to the state of public knowledge prior to the date of the patent, the public actually did or had the right to do (*i.e.*, passing from what was actually known or done to the act complained of involved no inventive step), the patentee cannot complain. He is in this dilemma, either the patent includes that which was actually done before or that which the public had the right to do—that is, something which involved no invention—in which case the patent is bad for want of novelty; or it does not include it, in which case the defendant is not an infringer.

The analogous case of Partington *v.* Hartlepools Pulp and Paper Co.

In *Partington* v. *Hartlepools Pulp and Paper Co.*, (*o*) which is somewhat analogous to *Crane* v. *Price*, it appeared that paraffin had been used to make wood-pulp pass more easily through the meshes of machines in which it was manufactured, and had also been used for the purpose of cleaning the machine from resin deposited from the pulp. The patentee discovered that if the machine were perfectly clean to start with, the addition of paraffin to the contents of the machine thus prevented the formation of objectionable specks of a pitchy or

(*m*) See Bamlett *v.* Picksley, (1875) Griff. 40; Rushton *v.* Crawley, (1870) L. R. 10 Eq. 522; Murray *v.* Clayton, (1872) L. R. 7 Ch. 570.

(*n*) Steiner *v.* Heald, 6 Exch. 607; Booth *v.* Kennard, (1856) 1 H. & N. 527, 531; Higgs *v.* Goodwin, (1858) E. B. & E. 585.

(*o*) (1895) 12 R. P. C. 295.

resinous nature in the pulp, and also the partial coating or fouling of the machine. *Romer*, J., held that this commercially important discovery was not the subject-matter for a patent, since all the patentee claimed was to use the old process of adding paraffin, but in a clean machine where the process effected the additional advantages discovered by him. Had the patent been upheld the public would have been prevented from using the old process *with clean machines*, whether for the purpose of making the wood-pulp pass through the meshes as previously, or for the sake of the additional advantage discovered by the patentee. A patent which so curtailed the public right could not be supported. (*p*)

Processes.

New method of using old machine.

On the other hand, a new method of using an old machine in a manner not analogous to any use to which it has hitherto been put may, as the outcome of invention, be good subject-matter—*e.g.*, a new method of using an existing weaving machine requiring no structural alteration in the machine, but producing a novel and useful result. (*q*)

Strengthening of a part.

The strengthening, in a manner obvious when the desirability of strengthening is appreciated, of a part of a known or suggested combination of parts may be good subject-matter, if the performance of what is in fact a new and useful process is thereby rendered possible. For instance, the patent for the vacuum carpet cleaner, the subject-matter of which was not the mere general known but ineffective statement of a combination of extractor, dust collector, and pump at large, but the new and useful process comprising the use of an implement which sits lightly on the carpet so that there is practically similarity of vacuum both at the instrument end and at the filter end, which vacuum must be at least five pounds per square inch; (*r*) or *Lyons* patent for the process of disinfecting articles by subjecting them to contact with dry superheated steam in a container jacketed with superheated steam, when all that had to be done to effect the new process was to strengthen various parts of an existing apparatus. (*s*)

Discovery of theory of what was done before only empirically.

A man cannot have a patent merely because he discovers the theory and reason of that which has before been done empirically. On the other hand, if by reason of knowing the theory he is enabled to make some improvements he may

(*p*) See also Patterson *v.* Gas Light and Coke Co., (1875) L. R. 2 Ch. D. 812; 3 App. Cas. 239; p. 78 *post*.

(*q*) Dowling *v.* Billington, (1889) 7 R. P. C. 191; see also p. 42 *ante*.

(*r*) British Vacuum Cleaner Co., Ld. *v.* Suction Cleaners, Ld., (1904) 21 R. P. C. 303.

(*s*) Lyon *v.* Goddard, (1893) 10 R. P. C. 121, 334.

Processes. take out a patent for those improvements, but he cannot have a patent to prevent others from using what they had used before, though empirically. (*t*)

Theory of action not part of consideration for patent. A patentee, further, in his specification is under no obligation to give any theory of the action of a combination or process which he directs to be constructed or carried out, and he is not to be injuriously affected by the fact that he has given a wrong theory in the absence of a statement which, if acted upon, would lead to failure. (*u*)

Use on commercial scale of process used on small scale. A process which results in a larger yield of a known article, when the new process is not an obvious one, may well form the subject-matter of a valid patent; (*v*) but it is not a patentable invention merely to adopt and use on a commercial scale a process which has been previously known and used to produce the same result on a small scale. (*x*)

Discovery of a hidden property or virtue. The discoverer of a hidden and concealed virtue in something known before, which enables him to apply the known thing to some useful purpose of life to which it has not been applied before, is entitled to patent the novel application. Thus, in *Muntz* v. *Foster*, (*y*) it appeared that *Muntz*, by experiment, ascertained that a certain mixture of the alloy of zinc with copper in certain proportions, when made into plates and used for the purpose of sheathing the bottoms of ships, possessed great advantages over the ordinary copper plates previously in use for the same purpose, by reason of the plates of the alloy possessing the property of oxydating just in sufficient quantities—*i.e.*, not too much, so as to wear away and impair the sheathing and render the vessel unsafe, but enough at the same time to keep, by its wearing, the bottom of the vessel clean from those impurities which attached to it. *Muntz* obtained a patent for his invention, the title of which was "An improved manufacture of metal plates for sheathing the bottoms of ships or other vessels." The action was brought for the infringement of the patent, and the defendant objected to the validity on the ground (*inter alia*) that the invention above described was not subject-

(*t*) Patterson *v.* Gas Light and Coke Co., (1877) L. R. 3 App. Cas. 246; judgment of Lord Blackburn.

(*u*) See per Finlay, S.G., Dellwik's Patent, (1898) 15 R. P. C. 687; p. 202 *post*; Atkins and Applegarth *v.* Castner-Kelner Alkali Co., (1901) 18 R. P. C. 294; Badische Anilin, &c. *v.* Levinstein, (1887) 4 R. P. C. 449; Monnet *v.* Beck, (1897) 14 R. P. C. 847; Badische Anilin, &c. *v.* La Société Chemique des Usines du Rhone, (1898) 15 R. P. C. 368.

(*v*) Saccharin Corporation *v.* Chimical and Drug Co., (1899) 17 R. P. C. 28.

(*x*) Acetylene Illuminating Co. *v.* United Alkali Co., (1902) 19 R. P. C. 213; 20 R. P. C. 161; 22 R. P. C. 145.

(*y*) (1844) 2 W. P. C. 96; see also Newton *v.* Vaucher, p. 102 *post*.

matter; but the objection was not sustained. *Tindal*, C.J., in his charge to the jury, directed them thus (z):—

Processes.

> "I cannot think, as at present advised, that if it was shown —as possibly it might be—that sheets had been made of metal before, in the same proportions which he has pointed out, that if this hidden virtue or quality had not been discovered or ascertained, and consequently the application never made, I cannot think the patent will fail on that ground—that is the opinion which I form upon it. I look upon it that there is as much merit in discovering the hidden and concealed virtue of a compound alloy of metal as there would be in discovering an unknown quality which a natural earth or stone possessed. We know by the cases that have been determined, that where such unknown qualities have, from the result of experiments, been applied to useful purposes of life, such application has been considered as the ground, and a proper ground, of a patent; and therefore when I come to that part of the case in which they seek to show this is not so, because these metal plates have been invented before—that is, persons have used them before—in my judgment it will not go far enough, unless they can show there has been some application of them before to this very useful purpose."

Again, a valuable and validly claimed process for the extraction of gold from its ore, was founded on the discovery of the selective action possessed by a dilute solution of cyanide of potassium, and its application to the extraction of gold from ores in which other baser metals occur. (a)

In the case of the valuable patent for Lanolin, the patentee discovered that if wool-fat (which was known in the days of *Dioscorides*, and a preparation of which was then used as an unguent) be thoroughly freed from the constituent fatty acids and other impurities, the remaining cholesterine fats when kneaded with water possess a great capacity for taking up water, and yield the highly useful unguent Lanolin. The process formed the subject-matter of a patent, which was declared valid both by the Judge of first instance and the Court of Appeal. (b)

Objection to the term "patentable process."

It is sometimes objected that to speak of a patentable process is in reality a misuse of terms, for the subject of the patent is *a manufacture according to a new process*, and therefore a new

(z) 2 W. P. C. 103.

(a) Cassel Gold Extracting Co. *v.* Cyanide Gold Recovery Syndicate, (1895) 12 R. P. C. 232.

(b) Benno Jaffé und Darmstaedter Lanolin Fabrik *v.* Richardson, (1893) 11 R. P. C. 93, 261.

Processes.

manufacture. To take the above case of *Crane* v. *Price*, (*c*) the subject there was the manufacture of iron by a new process —*i.e.*, the combination of a hot-air blast and anthracite in the furnace.

This idea seems to have been in the mind of *Pollock*, C.B., when he gave judgment in *Stevens* v. *Keating*, (*d*) and made use of the words, "the real invention may be, not so much the thing when produced, as the mode in which it is produced; and its novelty may consist, not so much in its existence as a new substance as in its being an old substance, but produced by a different process. In one sense, an old substance produced by a new process is a new manufacture; of that there cannot be a doubt, and therefore, although the language of the Act has been said to apply only to manufactures and not to processes, when you come to examine it, either literally or even strictly, it appears to me the expression 'manufacture' is free from objection, because, though an old thing, if made in a new way, the very making of it in a new way makes it a new manufacture; therefore, although I think this is a patent for the process rather than the product, I think it may be a patent for the product."

Bearing in mind, however, the very wide interpretation given to the word "manufacture" as used in the Act of James I., the exposition of which term, "as far as usage will expound it, has gone very much beyond the letter," (*e*) the above excuse by way of explanation becomes unnecessary. For instance, the word "manufacture" has a very wide and extended meaning, and may be interpreted "invention," (*f*) and it includes both process and result. (*g*) Lord *Westbury*, in discussing the meaning of the word, said, "By the large interpretation given to the word 'manufacture,' it not only comprehends productions, but it also comprehends the means of producing them. Therefore, in addition to the thing produced it will comprehend a new machine, or a new combination of machinery; it will comprehend a new process or an improvement of an old process." (*h*)

"Manufacture" is a wider term than "process," and for this reason a patentee, who desired to do so, was not allowed to amend his specification by altering the words *a process of*

(*c*) (1842) 2 M. & G. 580; p. 55 *ante*.
(*d*) (1847) 2 W. P. C. 182.
(*e*) Eyre, C.J., in Boulton *v.* Bull, (1795) 2 H. Bl. 463.
(*f*) Cornish *v.* Keene, (1835) 1 W. P. C. 508.
(*g*) Bush *v.* Fox, (1852) Macr. P. C. 176.
(*h*) Ralston *v.* Smith, (1865) 11 H. L. C. 223.

preparing, &c., in a claiming clause to *the manufacture of, &c.*, since such an amendment would be contrary to the provisions of sub-sec. 8 of sec. 18 of the Patents Act 1883. (*i*)

Processes.

Many patents have been granted for processes pure and simple. Examples.

A reference to the cases will show that patents have again and again been granted and held valid for processes pure and simple. For example, the application of a known detonating powder to the discharge of known kinds of fire-arms was held (*k*) to be a patentable invention. And (*l*) a patent was granted and upheld for the application of metal plates, made in a known way, to ships and buildings, for the purpose of protecting them against fire by preventing the access of air. In the case of the *Electric Telegraph Co.* v. *Brett*, (*m*) a patent was upheld for a method of giving duplicate signals at intermediate stations; and in *Newall* v. *Elliott*, (*n*) where the patent was for improvements in apparatus employed in laying down submarine telegraph wires, and the claim was, "First, coiling the wire or cable round a cone; secondly, the supports placed cylindrically outside the coil round the cone; thirdly, the use of the rings in continuation with the cone as described," the Court declared the patent valid, and overruled the objection that the invention claimed was merely a mode of coiling and paying out cables, and not a new manufacture, and therefore incapable of being the subject-matter of a patent.

A new process which consists merely in the omission of a step hitherto thought to be important from an old process may support a patent.

Thus a process for the manufacture of gelatine by cutting hides into thin slices and then submitting them in that state to the action of caustic alkali, whereby the use of blood, as in the method previously used, was rendered unnecessary, was declared to be subject-matter. (*o*)

And vegetable gas having been obtained from oils which were separated from seeds and other oleaginous substances by pressure, the discovery that the same gas might be distilled at once from the seeds, &c., without separating the oils, was held to be fit subject-matter, (*p*) though the patent was upset on other grounds.

(*i*) Vidal's Patent, (1898) 15 R. P. C. 721.

(*k*) Forsyth *v.* Riviere, (1819) 1 Carp. Rep. 401.

(*l*) Hartley's Patent, (1777) 1 W. P. C. 54.

(*m*) (1851) 1 C. B. 838.

(*n*) Newall *v.* Elliott, (1858) 13 W. R. 11.

(*o*) Wallington *v.* Dale, (1852) 7 Exch. 888.

(*p*) Booth *v.* Kennard, (1856) 1 H. & N. 527.

Processes.

Ambit of patent for a process.

Questions sometimes arise as to the ambit of patents for processes. As a result of the cases, (q) the wide dicta in the earlier of which were questioned in some of the later ones, it may be stated that when a patentee has discovered a process for arriving at a new result or product not known before—*i.e.*, the patent is a pioneer patent or master patent (r)—and in the specification there is described one process which is effectual for the purpose of arriving at that result, new at the time when the patent is taken out, the patentee will be protected against all other *analogous equivalent* processes for arriving at the same result, and no one can without infringing his patent adopt simply an equivalent process to achieve the same result. Where, on the other hand, the invention is a process which achieves what at the date of the patent is a known result, any other person may obtain another patent for any new though analogous process for arriving at the same result; or he may use any other process without infringing the patent first taken out. (q)

Per Lord Westbury, L.C.

Lord *Westbury*, L.C., in *Curtis* v. *Platt*, (s) referring to a patent for a new means of attaining an old object, laid down the law thus:—

> "If the invention be, as I have already described, nothing more than a particular means to attain a given result which is perfectly well known, then you can no more say that the invention of one distinct set of means interferes with the invention of another than you could say originally that there ought not to be patents for the inventions of distinct means to an end. I would illustrate it familiarly by this example. If we suppose a patent may be for a ladder to go down a pit, that patent may be made to comprehend all ladders, whether constructed of wood or of iron, or of hemp or of wire; but if another man invented a mode of letting men down the pit by a rope and pulley, it would be impossible to say that the one means of attaining that particular end was to be regarded as identical with or comprehended in the other. . . . It is extremely

(q) Jupe *v.* Pratt, (1837) 1 W. P. C. 145; The Househill Co. *v.* Neilson, (1843) 1 W. P. C. 673; Curtis *v.* Platt, (1863) L. R. 3 Ch. 135 *n.*; L. R. 1 H. L. 337; Badische Anilin und Soda Fabrik *v.* Levinstein, (1885) 2 R. P. C. 89; L. R. 24 Ch. D. 156; Proctor *v.* Bennis, (1887) 4 R. P. C. 333; L. R. 36 Ch. D. 740; 57 L. J. Ch. 11; Gosnell *v.* Bishop, (1888) 5 R. P. C. 158; Bovill *v.* Pimm, (1856) 11 Exch. 718, 739; Barber *v.* Grace, (1847) 1 Exch. 339; 17 L. J. Exch. 122; Automatic Weighing Machine Co. *v.* Knight, (1889) 6 R. P. C. 304; Nobel's Explosives Co. *v.* Anderson, (1894) 11 R. P. C. 519, 527; Incandescent Gas Light Co. *v.* De Mare Incandescent Gas Light System, Ld., (1896) 13 R. P. C. 331; see pp. 51–53, *ante.*

(r) See chap. viii. *post.*

(s) (1863) L. R. 3 Ch. D. 139 *n.*

desirable that when a beneficial idea has been started by one man he should have the benefit of his invention, and that it should not be curtailed or destroyed by another man simply improving upon the idea; but if the idea be nothing in the world more than the discovery of a road to attain a particular end, it does not at all interfere with another man discovering another road to attain that end, any more than it would be reasonable to say that if one man has a good road to go to Brighton by Croydon, another man shall not have a road to go to Brighton by Dorking."

Processes.

Per Lord Halsbury, L.C.

Lord *Halsbury*, L.C., in *Moore* v. *Thomson*, (t) referring to the ambit of Lord *Kelvin's* invention of a card for the mariner's compass—which was in fact the first card in which the principle or system of employing a very light card with the greater part of its weight thrown on to the periphery was successfully applied in practice with all the attendant advantages of reduction of frictional and other sources of error—and overruling the judgment of the Irish *Master of the Rolls*, who had construed the patent as being merely for a new means of attaining an old object, stated the law applicable to the case in like manner thus:—

"Now what appears to me with all submission to be the fallacy, to be found in the very lucid and learned judgment of the *Master of the Rolls*, is that he has used the phrase 'a new instrument, and a new end, and a new means of attaining an old end,' as if those words in themselves were sufficient to explain the subject-matter to which he applied them. In certain relations those words may be sufficiently clear; but I will take the illustration which I think is that of Lord *Westbury* in one of the cases relied on, (u) in which he points out that the end and object (that is to say, the end in the Greek sense) of a ladder is to get down to the bottom of a pit, and that a man might have taken out a patent for a ladder which would include all sorts of instruments of that kind, but that, if somebody invented a mode of lowering a man to the bottom of a pit with a rope, that could not be said to be an infringement of a patent for any sort of ladder, and yet the end and object of the invention would be the same, to get to the bottom of the pit. When the *Master of the Rolls*, using the word 'end' in that sense, says that the end and object of both instruments here is to obtain a mariner's compass which shall, under all circumstances, as nearly as possible point to the true north, he

(t) (1890) 7 R. P. C. 332.

(u) See quotation from Lord Westbury's judgment in Curtis v. Platt, above.

Products.

seems to me to omit to consider the machinery by which that is effected. I do not mean merely the construction of the particular machine, but he omits to consider that there may be new principles of construction by which that end is to be attained, as distinct as the lowering by a rope is from the lowering by a ladder. . . . The moment you come to apply yourself to see how this compass differs from all other compasses which have been hitherto in use, you perceive (at least it appears to me to be so, as a matter of fact, upon the evidence) that it is absolutely different from any compass which anybody has ever seen before. Upon principles, the ascertainment of which was the result undoubtedly of great study and wonderful powers of invention, Sir *William Thomson* found out that he could obtain those great things which had been pointed out as most material for the purpose of securing the steadiness of the needle, that which should keep the needle in its position, notwithstanding the rolling of the ship, in whatever direction it should take place, and he invented an instrument accomplishing that object. I think it is a fallacy to say that this is an old instrument; it is not an old instrument; it is a new instrument. It is an instrument in which the end is attained by certain expedients, by the weight being thrown on to the circumference, and being in the position in which it is and the weight of the whole compass card, as it is called, being reduced."

Upon the motion of his Lordship the House held that a compass card, which differed in its details from the card specified and claimed by the patentee, but resembled it in that it possessed the characteristics above described, which were the real substance of the invention, was an infringement of the patent.

PRODUCTS.

Is a patent for a product valid?

The question arises whether a grant of a patent for a product is valid. There is no reported case in which the point has been fully discussed and definitely decided, though there are dicta of various Judges which appear, at first sight at any rate, to be conflicting. (*x*)

The word "product" is defined in "Webster's Dictionary" as "anything that is produced, whether as the result of

(*x*) See Boulton *v.* Bull, (1795) Dav. P. C. 208; Ralston *v.* Smith, (1865) 35 L. J. C. P. 49; 11 H. L. C. 223; Vorwerk *v.* Evans, (1890) 7 R. P. C. 265; Automatic Weighing Machine Co. *v.* Knight, (1889) 6 R. P. C. 297; Nobel's Explosives Co. *v.* Anderson, (1894-95) 11 R. P. C. 519; 12 R. P. C. 164; Rickmann *v.* Thierry, (1896) 14 R. P. C. 106; Lancashire Explosives Co. *v.* Roburite Co., (1896) 13 R. P. C. 429, 476; 14 R. P. C. 303; Kopp *v.* Rosenwald, (1902) 19 R. P. C. 211.